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ABSTRACT

Power Motivation and Style of Selected Successful Community College Presidents

Veldon Lee Law

The problem this study addressed was, what was the personal power management profile of selected successful community college presidents. In analyzation of this problem the power motivation and style theories of McClelland and Burnham, Blake and Mouton, and Hall and Hawker were used. The three sets of theorists had theorized about power motive and style and its implication for the "good or ideal" manager.

The conjectures of these theorists and the practical writings of Fisher, Power In The Presidency, and Vaughan, The Community College Presidency, were applied to twenty community college presidents in the development of a power management profile. Through the use of an expert panel a sample of twenty successful presidents and three each of their direct line staff were identified. The presidents, his Dean of Instruction, Business Manager, and Dean of Students were surveyed with a biographical survey, and Hall and Hawker's test instruments, Power Management Profile (PMP), and the Power Management Inventory (PMI).

Using descriptive statistics the data was analyzed and a profile
resulted. The data was visually presented using Hall and Hawkers scoring graphs, as well as being narratively described. The results of the study indicated that no one single power profile was dominant or assures success. Perceptions of individual power motive and style differed greatly among the presidents themselves, as well as between the presidents and the subordinates, and among just the subordinates. A cumulative personal power management profile resulted from the work.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The concept of power was one that intrigued philosophers and theorists from Machiavelli to Freud. It was also a concept that was grappled with in the daily trenches of organizational management life and personal interaction. Everyone was in the influencing game, either influencing or being influenced (Hawker and Hall 1).

Adler felt that this need to influence was a major goal of human activity and that human development was centered around an individual gaining power over the external forces by which they found themselves surrounded (Adler 1956). Hawker and Hall said that another early theorist, Murray, also included power in his list of two dozen manifest needs where power was desired in order to influence others and provide control over one's environment (Hawker and Hall 1).

Most recently, noted psychologist McClelland traced the development of the human need for power through a number of studies and his book, Power: The Inner Experience (1975). McClelland's work identified the various forms of expression that power may take. Some of the expressions were constructive, and some were less so; however, the end result was all human beings were characterized by a need for power.

In addition to the human need for power, McClelland stated that organizational managers had a need for power.
... managers are primarily concerned with influencing others, it seems obvious that they should be characterized by a high need for power, and that by studying the power motive we can learn something about the way effective managerial leaders work. Thus, leadership and power appear as two closely related concepts, and if we want to understand better effective leadership, we may begin by studying the power motive in thought and in action (McClelland 254).

As McClelland and one of his associates, Burnham, began the study of power motive in "thought and action," they discovered that a good manager was not one who needed personal success or one who was people-oriented, rather a "good manager" was one who liked power (Hall and Hawker A Word 1). They found that the effective use of power was a necessary, indeed critical, part of organizational life, and that the desire to have impact, to be strong and influential was essential to sound management practice. Their results showed that a strong motivation for power was more characteristic of good managers than either the need for personal achievement or the need to be liked by others. This desire for having impact and for being strong and influential resulted in the identification of two kinds of power motives.

The first motive was identified as Personalized Power, where the individual was driven toward power by the achievement of personal gain and aggrandizement. The second motivation was Socialized Power. With this power need came individual motivation to influence others for the "common good." The results of McClelland and Burnham's study indicated that the manager with Socialized Power was more successful; however, their power motivation had to be consistent with their action in order to achieve optimal results (Hall and Hawker A Word 2).

Hall and Hawker theorized further that power was used in a number of
ways and that this action represented one's power style. They also stated that individual power style was just as important as individual power motivation, with an individual's power style taking the form of one of a number of recognized management styles, autocratic, democratic, or laissez faire. Their studies concluded that the "good manager," the one with the need for socialized power, was characterized by a coaching democratic kind of power style (Hall and Hawker A Word 2).

Fisher's book, Power of the Presidency took the concept of power further than the generic term of manager and provided an indepth look at power and the presidential office in institutions of higher education. He contended that there was a great need for college and university presidents to understand and develop both personal and positional power, the acquisition of this power being paramount to successful leadership so critical for the future of higher education (24).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

It was the purpose of this study to ascertain the personal power management profile of selected successful community college presidents as depicted by Hall and Hawker's Power Management Profile and Power Management Inventory.

Statement of the Problem

In addressing the purpose of the study, the following question served as a basis for the collection and analysis of data.

1. What was the personal power management profile of selected
Though man had been fascinated through the ages with the concept of power, only recently was research begun to study it systematically. Despite recent research there were still relatively few reference citations to power (Kipnis 1976). Fisher also indicated that there was very limited research and literature available on power, particularly as it related to one of society's most important leadership positions - the college presidency (24). Continuing, Fisher revealed, "few would become presidents without a desire for power, but most do not know enough about its nature or use and are, therefore, less effective than they might be" (1984).

Stanford University Professor Pfeffer and his associate Salancik concurred that even the literature of organizational theory had neglected power. They felt that maybe the management and leadership writers found the concept of power a subject just too uncomfortable with which to deal (1981). Pfeffer also indicated that the uncomfortable concern that writers had with power extended to higher education. He reported a study at the University of California where a respondent to a power questionnaire refused to cooperate with the study. The respondent said, "If I saw the university in the terms implied in your questionnaire, I would be seeking, frankly, some other way of making a living..." (qtd. in Fisher 11). It appeared that power attracted, repulsed and based on research, was essential to good management.

Addressing good management Millett asserted:
The imperatives of good management are so important. A college or university is not a debating society, a legislative assembly, or a recreational center. It is first of all and primarily a productive enterprise, an enterprise to produce learning in all its various dimensions and forms. As a productive enterprise, a college or university cannot afford to be indifferent to the imperatives of production management (258).

Millett contended that it was presidential power, leadership and performance that did make the difference. The president's role existed to provide the influence to bring together the resources necessary for the institution to accomplish its purposes (1978).

In his study of the Presidency of the United States, Neustadt argued that to understand the role of the presidency required one to study more than the formal power structure, it required the study of the officeholder's personal ability to influence (1960). The same concept held true for presidents of higher education institutions and leaders in other organizations, to understand the presidency one needed first to study the president's ability to influence or in other words, their power (Fisher 1984, McClelland and Burnham 1976, Kipnis 1976, Hawker and Hall 1981).

Further, to provide additional support for the need of the study, Hawker was consulted regarding his specific knowledge of any current power motivation and style research being conducted on the community college presidency. He was unaware of any such studies, and observed that research on power and positions of educational leadership had been seriously lacking and was a fruitful area which needed considerable work (Hawker 1986). A letter supporting his initial statements had been received from his research associate, Donnell (Appendix 1). Secondly, Dr. Fisher was contacted and briefed as to the purpose of
this study and his letter of support regarding the intent and design of
the study was included in the appendix (Appendix 2). Finally, Dr.
Vaughan, community college president and noted author, had written a
letter of support regarding the importance of additional research into
the community college presidency and the vital leadership role of that
office (Appendix 3).

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The assumptions of the study included:
1. To have effectively led institutions of higher learning, presidents need to have developed a powerful presidential image. Research on presidential power would assist presidents in building that powerful image.
2. Power was a reality of organizational life and a leadership concern within higher education, including community colleges.
3. The development of a power profile of successful community college presidents would assist current and potential presidents to understand the importance of power in their positions.
4. The successful community college presidents and their subordinates selected to participate in the study possessed a sufficiently high level of interest in the study to respond to the survey instruments.
5. The sample size and response rate of both the presidents and their subordinates provided adequate data for analysis.
The delimitations of the study were:

1. The test instruments, **Power Management Profile** and **Power Management Inventory**, was used to measure the president's power motive and style.

2. The sample was restricted to include twenty selected successful presidents and three of each president's subordinates. It was not a representative sample of all community college presidents. Presidents not identified as successful community college presidents, may very well be successful presidents and mirror the appropriate power profiles of successful presidents; however, due to the limitations of the study, only the twenty presidents identified by the expert panel as successful, were included in the research.

3. The research completed utilized descriptive statistics and a power profile of successful college presidents was developed using the test instruments and accompanying instructions noted previously.

4. Responses were limited to a personal data sheet and the **Power Management Inventory** and **Power Management Profile**.

The limitations of the study were:

1. The twenty successful community college presidents surveyed in the study were selected by an expert panel comprised of the
Executive Committee of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' President's Academy. As an expert, the individual panel members selected the successful presidents based on their own individual criteria. They were provided a criteria list of characteristics of successful community college presidents as a reference, gathered from a review of the literature. The criteria submitted to the expert panel were found in the appendix (Appendix 4).

2. The presidents, and the number of presidents identified by the expert panel, as well as the number of members of the expert panel who participated in the research were beyond the direct control of the researcher.

3. The rate of return of the surveys from the identified sample of presidents and their subordinates was also outside the researcher's control.

THEORETICAL BASE OF THE STUDY

The study utilized the power theories of three different sets of theorists. McClelland and Burnham's theory, which stated that successful managers had a greater need for power than the need to achieve, was the basis of the study. They purported that there were two forms of power used by a manager. In addition, as a check on the manager's power motivation, the need to be like was measured. The more successful institutional manager used socialized power, and was concerned about the good of the organization. The personal power manager was more interested in the need for achievement and personal accomplish-
ment. The manager that had a high need for group acceptance was the affiliative manager. This manager was the least successful and was perceived as being indecisive, inconsistent and unfair (McClelland and Burnham 103).

Blake and Mouton's concept on power was also utilized in the form and treatment of the president's power style. Their work suggested that the distribution of managerial power occurs between the manager and subordinate in a number of ways. In having considered a manager's total power as a unit of one, the manager distributed this unit as he pleased. At the manager's discretion he retained total power and was autocratic, he abdicated all power to the subordinate, or he elected to share his power. In any given situation the manager shared his power somewhere within the range of 1 for the manager and 0 for the subordinate, to the opposite end of the spectrum - 0 for the manager and 1 for the subordinate. Other examples of how power may have been shared included: managerial power of .8 and subordinate power of .2, subordinate power of .8 and managerial power of .2, or power equally shared at .5 and .5 (Hawker and Hall 3).

The work of Hawker and Hall was also used. They took the work of the above theorists and developed survey instruments to measure a manager's power motivation and power style. The results obtained from the power motivation instrument determined a manager's profile in the three need areas of socialized power, personalized power and affiliative need. These results were then graphed and checked for consistency with the manager's power style, which was plotted on a power spectrum (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1981).
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A review of the literature was completed to determine factors and characteristics of a successful community college president. Those factors were compiled into a criteria list which the expert panel used as a reference in the identification of the sample of presidents with which the study worked. The expert panel was the Executive Committee of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' President's Academy.

Using the criteria listed only as a guide, each panel member submitted the names and institutions of twenty successful presidents (Appendix 5). The names were then compiled into a master list to determine the frequency with which each name was mentioned, with the twenty most frequently mentioned names becoming the sample population. In the event that there was a tie or a series of ties and the sample of twenty was not achieved based solely on the number of times that a name was mentioned, a random method of filling the remaining sample slots was used.

The test instrument, Power Management Inventory (PMI) (Appendix 6), was administered to the selected presidents, and the Power Management Profile (PMP) (Appendix 7) was administered to three subordinates that directly reported to the sample of presidents. The three subordinates were the Academic Vice-president or Academic Dean, the Business Manager, the Vice-president for Student Affairs or the Dean of Students. Both survey instruments were designed to measure a manager's power motivation and power style.

The PMI was a two part survey that an individual manager completed
to determine how he typically handled situations calling for the exercise of power. With this instrument the individual president rated himself as he perceived his action in a number of commonly encountered leadership situations. The scores from both parts of this test were compiled into a composite score from which a power motive was determined. The score was also plotted on a graph that indicated the president's power style. Both the power motive and style were determined by using the scoring provided with the test instrument.

The PMP was a three part questionnaire that the three president's subordinates completed. The instrument allowed the subordinates to score their president in how they perceived his handling of the same commonly encountered leadership situations on which the president rated himself. The Profile provided a balance to the president's perception of his own actions. The Profile also presented a series of questions which determined employee morale. Scoring of the Profile was accomplished in the same manner as the Inventory. A questionnaire for both the presidents (Appendix 8) and the subordinates (Appendix 9) was developed and administered to gather biographical data.

Upon return of both sets of surveys, the data were grouped and tabulated according to the instructions provided by the PMP and PMI. The resultant data provided the basis for the development of individual and collective power motivation and power style profiles of successful community college presidents.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. **Affiliative Need** - individuals who had a high need for group
acceptance and being liked by others. Managers who had a high need in this area were known as affiliative managers (McClelland and Burnham 103-104).

2. **Charismatic Power** - the single most effective form of influence, which was based on the admiration and liking that people felt for an individual. Charismatic power was also known as referent power (Fisher 39).

3. **Coercive Power** - the least effective type of power for a college president. It employed threats and punishments to gain compliance (Fisher 29).

4. **Expert Power** - the deference accorded a perceived authority. The deference was given based on expert skill, knowledge, etc. (Fisher 37).

5. **Legitimate Power** - power given based on a group's acceptance of common beliefs, practices and authority (Fisher 33-34).

6. **Personalized Power** - desire for impact, influence, and power for one's own personal achievement. A manager who had a high need in this area was known as a personal power manager (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2).

7. **Power** - "refers to the human capacity to act effectively, to influence and lead other humans so as to realize a worthwhile action ... Power, in its purest sense, is as ethical a concept as action" (Fisher 2).

8. **Power Management Inventory (PMI)** - a questionnaire developed by Hawker and Hall that measured a manager's personal power motivation and power style (Hall and Hawker Power Management Inventory 1981).
9. **Power Management Profile (PMP)** - a questionnaire developed by Hall and Hawker that measured a manager's power motivation and power style as viewed by his subordinates (Hall and Hawker 1981). (This term was also used to describe the power profile of the individual manager, which resulted from the PMP questionnaire).

10. **Power Motive** - the need for power and influence that motivated an individual. The motive was either the need for personalized power or socialized power (McClelland and Burnham 101-103).

11. **Power Style** - the manner in which a manager used his power (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1981).

12. **Reward Power** - implied the ability of a manager to accomplish desired outcomes by favors, recognition, or rewards to group members (Fisher 31).

13. **Socialized Power** - power which was viewed as an instrument to be used for the common good. The manager who operated in this realm was an institutional manager (McClelland and Burnham 103-105).

**ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

Chapter One introduced the study, stated the purpose of the study and defined the problem statement. The question which the study addressed was proposed, along with a declaration of need for the work, assumptions that provided guidance, the limitations of the study, the research design, and a definition of the terms that were particularly relevant to the research.

Chapter Two provided a documented review of the pertinent liter-
nature. In so doing, the following concepts were discussed:

Chapter Three included a discussion of the test instruments, their validity, the research design, the method of data collection, the sample population, as well as the procedures used for analysis of the data gathered.

Chapter Four restated the problem, presented the data gathered through the survey instruments, analyzed the data, and presented the power management profile of successful community college presidents.

Chapter Five concluded the research with a summary, the study's conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2  
REVIEW OF LITERATURE  
INTRODUCTION

A review of the literature was conducted to identify relevant research essential to an investigation of power, power motives, and power styles of community college presidents.

The literature review included the derivation of the word "power," Definitions and Perspectives on Power including views of educators, social scientists and political scientists. A portion of the literature review outlined the various Theories, Concepts and Classifications of Power, as well as covered Leadership and Power, Power and the Presidency in Higher Education, The Ethical Use of Power, and Power Motivation and Power Style.

To identify pertinent studies and information on power as it related to the problem statement, bibliographies, periodicals, and major works on, and related to, the topic were reviewed. An Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Dissertation Abstract search was conducted through the facilities at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Additional information was gathered through a "DIALOG" computer search of the data banks of "ERIC," "Harvard Business Review," "Psycinfo," "Social Science search," "Management Contents," and ABI/Inform."
DEFINITIONS AND PERSPECTIVES ON POWER

The English word "power" was derived from the Old Latin root "potere" which meant "to be able" (Winter 4). Since recorded time power has held human fascination. Part of the fascination, British associationist philosophers speculated, was due to the fact that observations of individual abilities shaped individual concepts of power (Winter 4).

Plato argued that man's consuming lust for power was a "demonic flaw" that was corrupt and destructive. He encouraged the temperament of power, either by humility, which sprang forth from classical moderation and restraint, or by both avoiding the desire to rule and at the same time looking after the needs of the ruled (Plato 572-573). Plato made the following declaration concerning the role of power in human interaction:

When a master passion is enthroned in absolute dominion over every part of the soul, feasting and reveling with courtesans and all such delights will become the order of the day...he will look out for any man of property whom he can rob by fraud or violence...when the numbers of such criminals and their hangers-on increase and they become aware of their strength, then it is they who, helped by the folly of the common people, create the despot out of that one among their number whose soul is itself under the most tyrannical despotism (Plato 174).

In contrast, former presidential candidate Robert Kennedy once said of power, "The problem with power is how to achieve its responsible use rather than its irresponsible and indulgent use - of how to get men of power to live for the public..." (Fisher 27). It was this concept of power that this study and a majority of the review of literature in this
chapter addressed.

Power has had a number of different meanings. Respected authors, theorists, and philosophers all have held their own definition of exactly what power was. According to Fisher, Weber defined power as, "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests" (28). Dahl put it this way, "it is the ability of A to get B to do something that B would otherwise not do" (Fisher 28). Fisher said that power was as the kings had known, "the ability to get people to wait for you and to be thrilled when you arrive" (28).

Summarizing the positive definitions and views on power, Robertson added his definition:

Power stands for the capacity to accomplish positive social ends or to make decisions that influence behavior of others for the good as we understand it. This "good" or "end" must itself always stand under critical examination, as must the nature of the influence. Plato had, for our purposes, perhaps the most useful understanding of power. He saw the dialectical relationship between the influencer' and the influenced' (vii).

Plato suggested two dimensions to power. One was "active" and the other "passive," with both dimensions existing simultaneously within institutions and people. In given situations a person was each an agent of power active, power passive, or both (Robertson vii).

Presenting the other face of power was Lasswell and other political scientists. They described all concerns with power as a defensive attempt to compensate for a feeling of weakness (McClelland Power: The 260). Lasswell argued that power was a relationship of giving and taking with
the participants being subject to sanctions to ensure performance. The searching for power is abnormal and an instrumental goal in serving ego needs...leaders who accentuate power will always rationalize the use of power in terms of the general good (Robertson 81).

McClelland reported that even the vocabulary of some behavioral scientists was negative in tone. He cited as an example the book, The Authoritarian Personality, one of the major works dealing with people concerned with power. The book depicted those individuals with power as "harsh, sadistic, fascist, prejudiced, Machiavellian, and neurotic." The scientists also seemed to think that in exercising leadership, even influencing individuals for their own good, was manipulation and exploitation (McClelland Power: The 255).

The negative face of power was characterized by dominance and submissive roles with an "I win and you lose" personalized power mentality. Individuals treated others as pawns acquiring their own supplies of prestige, strictly Machiavellian (McClelland Power: The 263).

Despite the strong contentions of Lasswell and others, McClelland, in Human Motivation, reported a study that seemed to refute the idea that power was always sought for one's own good. The report, completed by Winter, indicated that there was a correlation between an individual's desire for power and the occupation that he chose. He cited as an example those that desired to influence in a socialized power manner entered teaching, psychology, business, ministry and journalism professions. His work suggested that individuals that entered these professions had a significantly higher power need than those that entered other occupations (282).

McClelland supported this concept as he commented that persons who were or want to be educators held a high need for power. The field of
education was a "help giving" profession and suggested that those that were attracted to the teaching profession were attracted because they received the opportunity to feel powerful as they assisted others (McClelland Power: The 19).

THEORIES, CONCEPTS AND CLASSIFICATIONS OF POWER

Most researchers seemed to agree that the types of power available for use were quite diverse, and the type of power that was used varied from situation to situation, and resulted in either or both an unconscious or conscious attempt to influence (Fisher 28).

There were a number of means by which power has been classified. Clark in Pathos of Power derived five premises of power from the numerous definitions of power. These premises were:

1. Power is amoral. It can be used for good or evil, but in itself cannot determine value. It may be rational, irrational, constructive, or destructive in its consequences.

2. Power may manifest itself in varying degrees of intensity on a continuum from pseudo power of mere verbalization, or claims of a power that does not, in fact, prevail in the face of conflict and cannot effect change in the desired direction; through latent power which demonstrates itself only when challenged and to the minimal extent required to meet or contain the challenge; through active power which is usually overt, understood, sustained and institutionalized; to coercive power which involves the enforcement of the desires of the holders of power in the face of overt, persistent and intense challenges.

3. Power can be seen as operating in terms of a "law of the economy of power." The power holders do not expend any greater degree of power than that which is required to deal with the degree of challenge that confronts them.

4. The conditions of passive or active resistance determines the degree of power exerted in any given situation. Power can be expressed through: persuasion, argumenta-
tion, negotiation, bargaining, institutional controls, restraints, sanctions, or privileges.

5. The forms, the manifestation, and the intensity of the social power exerted vary according to the nature of the threat; or according to the stability, the security or the psychological health and strength of the holders of power (Clark 77-79).

Etzioni introduced the concept that the manner in which one exercised power was one way of classifying types of authority. He classified types of power in his trichotomy of power, which included coercive, utilitarian and normative power (Etzioni 3).

According to Blau, the central concern in his exchange theory was power relations. When one person held power over another, that person could either make "fair" or "unfair" demands. Any "unfair" demand gave rise to opposition and rebellion. The "fair" exercise of power gave rise to social approval. He also contended that the power to command compliance was equivalent to credit, which was drawn on at a future time in order to obtain various benefits. This "supply of credit" became a source of power. This exchange process gave rise to a differentiation of power. A person who commanded the services others needed and was independent of them gained power over them by satisfying their needs. This was based on the idea that down the road the one that had their needs met would comply with a request from the individual who had fulfilled their needs previously. In a manager subordinate relationship, the manager's power waned if the subordinate was able to resort to coercion, had equally good alternatives, or was able to do without the benefits that his manager had at his disposal (Blau 1964).

McClelland classified power into two dimensions. The first dimension was when the source of power was outside or inside the self;
and the second dimension was when the object of power was the self or someone or something outside the self. McClelland felt these dimensions were divided into four modalities and stressed the fact that an individual stayed in any one stage for a lifetime or progressed or regressed through the various stages (McClelland Power: The 13).

Stage I was referred to as "it strengthens me." The first way an infant was able to feel strong was to incorporate strength from another. Later in life the "Stage I" person continued to draw strength from others such as friends, family or an admired leader (McClelland Power: The 13).

Stage II was referred to as "I strengthen myself." A child learned that he was powerful simply by saying "no." As the child learned to strengthen himself, he had a major opportunity to learn self-assertiveness and self-control. The child learned that no one controlled his thoughts. Eventually, by extension, the adult who employed this modality of feeling powerful accumulated possessions envisioned by them as part of themself, such as fancy cars, boats, credit cards (McClelland Power: The 15).

Stage III was classified as the "I have impact on others" stage. If consideration was returned to the growing child, soon after he learned to feel powerful by controlling or building up himself, he also learned to feel power as he controlled others. As the child grew older, simple methods of environmental control gave way to more subtle techniques of persuasion, bargaining and maneuvering. These subtle techniques were used in order to control the behavior of others. It was in this stage that helping behavior belonged. McClelland looked at helping or giving in the light that there was a giver and a receiver in order for help to be given. In accepting a gift, or help, the receiver acknowledged that
he was weaker to the extent that he accepted help from the giver (McClelland Power: The 18).

Stage IV was referred to as "it moves me to do my duty." As an example, McClelland cited a situation where a little boy realized that he could not defeat his father, he then incorporated the father's image and tried to be like him. Power based on this type of collective authority carried far more dangerous potential than power based on the authority of one individual. McClelland felt that what a person would not do on his own behalf, he would do if he perceived it as his duty to a higher authority (McClelland Power: The 21).

The most widely accepted classification of power types available for research was developed by French and Raven in the late 1950s (Fisher 28). French and Raven indicated that there were five forms of power: coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, expert power, and charismatic power. All attempts to influence others employed at least one of these power forms.

As an example of the typology's usefulness to research, Farmer and Richman examined nineteen sources of power in use in higher education. The nineteen sources of power, when categorized into French and Raven's five forms of power broke down to nine sources that were charismatic in nature, three sources expert in nature, five sources legitimate, two sources coercive, and no sources for reward power (Richman and Farmer 174-176). The remainder of this section reviewed French and Raven's topology to the extent their five forms of power related to leadership and power within higher education.
Coercive Power

As defined, coercive power employed threats and punishment to gain compliance. Accordingly, it was viewed as the least effective form of power that could be used by a college president (Fisher 29). Raven and French found that the threat of punishment induced greater conformity than actual punishment and that once the punishment was used the leader lost at least some degree of power (Raven and French 1957). French, Morrison, and Levinger discovered that a leader's perceived legitimacy reduced resistance to conformity and made punishment more acceptable to those who received punishment (qtd. in Fisher 29).

It was also discovered that people worked harder for a leader that they found to be charismatic than for a leader that they perceived to be coercive (Zander and Curtis 1962). Kipnis found that as long as the punishment of a coercive leader was respected and feared that the punishment tended to induce compliance. He also found evidence to support the idea that less confident leaders tended to rely more heavily on coercive influence than those who had confidence in their individual abilities (Kipnis 1976).

Kipnis also established that a mature group of followers, tended to be more productive when fear of punishment was absent. Institutions of higher learning seemed to fit into this category. It was also well established that if a supervisor or college president was not granted sufficient authority to exercise the authority of his office, he was more apt to use coercive means to meet his objectives (Kipnis and Vanderveer 1971). Fisher asserted that if a president allowed his power to be usurped by others he was bound to be less effective. The president no longer had the power to grant privilege and the subordinates looked at
the privilege as an assumed right (30). If successful influence via other means of power was diminished, the leader's expectations were also lowered, which resulted in more use of coercive power (Goodstadt and Hjelle 1973). Raven summarized and said that a leader who wanted to establish long-lasting compliance needed to avoid the use of coercive power (1974).

Reward Power

Machiavelli warned the Prince that rewards would not guarantee that the Prince would be held in high esteem by his followers (Machiavelli 1952). Research supported Machiavelli's contention as Raven and Kruglanski found that rewards were not likely to change attitudes permanently. As soon as the reward stopped, the original behavior returned with a focus of resentment for the reward that was withheld (Fisher 32).

It was found that it was better for a leader to reward a person that he liked than to reward a person that was unliked. The reason was it was easier to influence those who were liked and it took considerably more effort to influence the others who were unliked. An effective leader was one who dealt rewards to those that supported the goals of the organization (Fisher 32). Fisher also observed that it was difficult to give tangible rewards in higher education. He felt that "subtle and nebulous rewards like selected words and notes of praise, and appointments to key positions and committees within the institution was more effective (33). In parting, Fisher offered this advice: "Presidents should bear in mind that there are limits to the secure and effective use of reward power" (33).
Legitimate Power

Common norms accepted by a group allowed a leader to exercise power that otherwise would not be accepted. Power thus legitimized by a group allowed the use of the other four forms of power to be more acceptable to the group influenced (Fisher 34). A leader who appeared to fit roles consistent with a group of subordinate's expectations were supported more consistently than those who did not fit the expected role. If group expectations were met the actions of the leader was legitimized by the group (Pfeffer 1981).

Weber outlined three pure types of legitimate authority. They were:

1. Rational grounds - resting on a belief in the legality of rules and the rights of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (also known as legal authority, this authority functions within a bureaucracy).

2. Traditional grounds - resting on the sanctity of traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them (also known as traditional authority, obedience coming through personal loyalty).

3. Charismatic grounds - resting on devotion to the exemplary character of an individual person (also known as charismatic authority, compliance comes through a belief in the leader's individual mission). (Miller 63).

Fisher felt that if a legitimate leader overstepped the bounds of his role he invited needless resistance; however, in a college, university, or other formal organization the norm was, and expectations developed to the point, that the exercise of power was expected and accepted by the group. Fisher cited Clark's work which stated that "the more legitimate a leader becomes the more the leader is accept by the group. And the more legitimate the leader, the more effective he or she can be in exercising the other forms of power" (Fisher 35).

Once legitimacy was established it was maintained by the degree to
which the group continued to adhere to the common and unifying bonds that produced the legitimacy in the first place. Fisher continued, "As has been suggested, legitimate power adds stability to the group and can only be used effectively after one thoroughly understands and appreciates the other forms of power" (36). Mechanic advised that acceptance of some form of authority was critical to all forms of organizations (1962).

In summary Fisher noted

...legitimate power is an effective and necessary form of presidential power, and people tend to be more accepting of a legitimate leader when they are in fundamental agreement with his or her policies and actions. The legitimate leader will be effective to the extent that he or she appreciates and uses the other forms of power (37).

**Expert Power**

Based on research, Fisher outlined the two ways of wielding the influence of an expert. The first was by being introduced as an expert, and the second was through acquired knowledge and skill perceived to be needed in order to be an expert (37-38). The opposite was also apparently true. According to Pfeffer, one wielded measurable power by withholding information or expertise (1981). As a leader attempted to develop support for a particular cause, it was valuable for him to be perceived as an expert. If he was perceived as such, it inspired support for the cause (Fisher 38).

Additional studies showed that the more acknowledged experts there were in a group, the less effective was their expert power (Fisher 38-39). This had a great impact on higher education leadership due to the number of experts on the faculty. To provide leadership in a situation where there were many experts, it was perceived better to have
held high status rather than expertise (Fisher 39).

Fisher suggested that it was extremely important that college and university presidents knew the literature on higher education and other fields related to leadership. In other words, presidents needed to become experts on presidents. "...Knowing more about subjects related to the presidency than others know, combined with the office itself, gives an incumbent a decided advantage in virtually any situation" (Fisher 39).

Charismatic Power

Milton spoke of charismatic power by saying "it is the power which erring men call chance" (Fisher 57). Fisher believed that it was the most influential power that a president could have. He also believed that charisma was cultivated (42).

Tedeschi and associates stated that someone who was liked and trusted by others was most able to exert influence over them (1969). Charismatic leaders were also able to lead others beyond their normal limits if they learned to use their charismatic power ethically. As effective leaders were studied, it became more apparent that those leaders who used power, and the leaders desire for respect and influence related more to good management than to the gratification of their ego (McClelland and Burnham 103).

Invariably effective leadership seemed to be rooted in charismatic influence rather than in the more traditional forms of power. This was also true among highly educated groups like college and university faculties (Fisher 41). Richman and Farmer also support this notion as their work suggested that charisma often produced desired results without
using any of the other four forms of power (1974).

One of the more controversial ideas about charisma was the idea that it could be developed. 
"...There is nothing genetic or intuitive about charisma. Anyone of reasonable intelligence and high motivation can develop charismatic characteristics" (Fisher 42). Fisher outlined the following characteristics, each which could be individually worked on to develop the creation of charisma.

...sincerity, appearance, goodness, confidence, wisdom, courage, thoughtfulness, kindness, control; but after reviewing virtually every published study on the subject, I have concluded that the three principal conditions for charisma are distance, style, and perceived self-confidence. And the most clearly documentable of the three charismatic conditions is distance (Fisher 43).

Fisher supported his notion on distance by reporting a study by Katz (1973) that indicated that day-to-day intimacy destroyed illusions which distance created (43). Katz continued that the charismatic leader was close enough to the group for them to have developed a sense of identification and yet kept enough distance so that they were perceived as mystical and superior (Fisher 44). Fisher also cited thirteen other studies that demonstrated the value of both social and psychological distance in providing effective leadership (Fisher 46). In the area of productivity, Stogdill listed twenty-one studies which demonstrated that distance was positively related to group productivity (1974).

The other two important characteristics of a charismatic leader that Fisher mentioned was style and perceived self-confidence. Stogdill felt that style distinguished a leader from his group but was not as easy to document as distance (1974). One's style was made up of "mannerisms, appearance, personal habits, speech, dress, attitude, and comportment"
(Fisher 48). The quality of perceived self-confidence in the eyes of others was an important quality of being a charismatic leader (McClelland The Two 1979, Fisher 1984, Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1981).

Time and experience tended to diminish a leader's ability to use charismatic power. This was due to "...what appears to be an inevitable progress toward mutual knowledge" (Fisher 49). Weber felt additional factors that contributed to the breakdown of charisma were:

1. if the leader's mission is not recognized by those he feels he is to lead.

2. if the leader is unable to maintain his authority by proving his strength in life (Weber On Charisma 20-22).

On the other hand, Weber felt that by constantly proving one's strength in life allowed one to gain and maintain charisma (22).

Richman and Farmer provided a knowledgeable summary that tied together all the forms of power and at the same time supported Fisher's contention that charismatic power was the form of power that was most useful to the college president.

...we treat power and influence as part of the same process, there are some technical differences between these two concepts. An individual can exert power if he has or is perceived to have the means or ability to employ coercion, penalties, rewards, or incentives to get something done. If he is a manager or administrator, much of this power stems from formal authority that goes with this position, and this involves formal or official powers, and this influence stems from personal qualities (expertise, knowledge, personality traits) and from various situational factors. Such influence is manifested in the ability to produce an effect or get something done without the exertion of coercion or the direct exercise of command. It involves getting the voluntary cooperation of others, though it may also mean convincing or swaying them in a desired direction. Effective leadership is often based more on influence than on formal authority or power, especially in academic institutions (157).
Emerson once said, "an institution is the lengthened shadow of one person" (Fisher 1). After an analysis of the problems that faced higher education the greatest problem was identified as a lack of leadership (Fisher 58), which produced concern for higher education's future.

Crawford quoted Mayhew who defined leadership as "the presence of an enlightened vision of what an institution is and can become and the ability to persuade others to accept that vision and to act responsibly to achieve it" (74).

A myriad of studies have been completed over the years on leadership and the qualities, abilities, and characteristics that comprise a leader. At the time of the literature review, the following provided a series of observations from a few of these many leadership studies. Some of the literature that was reviewed pertained directly to leadership in higher education and some pertained to leadership that was construed to be useful to those in leadership positions within higher education. In either case, and as was appropriate, the relationship to power was reviewed.

In providing direction to subordinates it had been found that group members did not develop or accept group norms and expectations unless these norms and expectations were well defined by those in leadership positions (McClelland Power The 1975, Pfeffer 1981). Those norms and policies were more readily accepted the longer they were in force; therefore, the leader was also more accepted (French and Raven, 1968). As previously pointed out in this review of literature, the leader that was appointed to his position, rather than being elected was more readily
accepted and followed (Fisher 20-21).

Fisher reported additional studies by Torrance (1959) and Benezet et al. (1981) that showed evidence that there was an expectation on the part of the group to have their leader try to influence them (22). Additionally, the group wanted and needed structure and, if it was not given, a majority coalition developed and assumed the leadership role. Therefore, the key for those in presidential authority was to provide structured opportunities for participation by the campus constituency, but to maintain the final say (21).

The first studies of leadership examined a number of personal characteristics which resulted in leaders being described with words such as a sense of humor, intelligence, extroversion, boldness, courage, fortitude and sensitivity. Generally, leaders were thought of in terms of being male, white and attractive. More recent studies proved that the physical characteristics and socioeconomic background were not as important as they were once thought to be (Fisher 23). Stogdill (1974) reported that there was evidence that leaders tended to be decisive, to be knowledgeable, to have superior judgment and were able to communicate fluently (qtd. in Fisher 23).

Fisher said that today's leaders were characterized by descriptive words and phrases such as:

"...a strong drive for responsibility, vigor, persistence, willingness to take chances, originality, ability to delegate, humor, initiative in social interaction, fairness, self-confidence, decisiveness, sense of identity, personal style, capacity to organize, boldness, willingness to share the credit for successes and absorb virtually all of the stress of failure, and tolerance of frustration and delay. All of these constitute an ability to influence the behavior of others" (Fisher 24).

Referencing leadership and power, McClelland stated, "...a leader is
traditionally described as one who is able to evoke feelings of obedience or loyal submission in his followers... A leader tends to empower and uplift followers, and not make them less powerful or submissive" (Power The 259). Continuing, McClelland described the fine line between a dominant leader and one with socialized power,

...a leader balances on a knife edge between expressing personal dominance and exercising more socialized power. They show first one face of power and then the other. Even if a man is a socialized leader he must take initiative in helping the group he leads to form its goals. If he takes no initiative he is no leader. If he takes to much he is a dictator (McClelland Power The 265).

Crawford completed a dissertation in 1982 that identified skills that were perceived to lead to success in higher education. Her study reviewed the writings of sixty-nine authors. From their works she tabulated a list of one hundred and three distinct skills. When her tabulation was completed, she indicated the frequency with which each skill was mentioned. The top five skills she listed as being essential to higher education administration were:

1. Ability in administrative techniques and management principles—cited twenty-five times.

2. Ability to deal with financial matters and budgetary concerns—cited twenty-three times.

3. Ability to lead—cited twenty-two times.

4. Ability to demonstrate human relations skills (interpersonal/group and intrapersonal/individual)—cited twenty times.

5. Ability to make decisions—eighteen times (116).

Crawford's review of literature indicated that higher education administrators needed power skills, which she labeled the "ability to have/use power." This skill was mentioned fourteen times and was number eleven on
Crawford's skill list (122).

Crawford's review of literature indicated that two styles of leadership were to emerge in the 1980s. She cited Walker (1981), who felt there was to be a "strong leader," who administered with an authoritarian style, and the "democratic-political leader," who recognized the real division of power within higher education and was able to draw fully on all the talents available in the academic community. Walker held that the most effective leadership emphasized the decision making process and involved people in solutions, rather than solutions pressed from the top down (73).

Walker contended that leadership in higher education was a matter of cooperation and collaboration in a collegial environment. Crawford, quoted Elmore (1977) and agreed that leadership in higher education was a complex human activity that was unable to be reduced to one or two factors, rather it focused on data and consciousness, power and persuasion, decisiveness and diplomacy, policies and personalism, and hard actualities mixed with soft myths and traditions (74).

At this time more was now known about what it took to be an effective leader in higher education with characteristics and traits having been examined; however, there was still much to learn about higher education leadership because of its changing environment. According to Keegan (1975), former president of Salem State College, the leadership skills required to be an effective president had changed and continued to change significantly. He noted

..being a college or university president is no longer an accolade or crown for previous academic service, but rather a demanding and difficult assignment undertaken with high risk factors and with a constantly fragmenting authority and power (7).
At this time it was appropriate to review the findings of McClelland and Burnham as they related directly to leadership. Their studies showed that an effective leader was not one who needed personal success or who was people oriented, but one who liked power. They found that a strong motivation toward power was essential to good leadership. Power was a more telling characteristic of effective leaders than either the need for personal achievement or the need to be liked by others (McClelland and Burnham 103).

Power and the need for power in higher education leadership is well understood within hallowed academic halls, though as previously noted it was a subject that was often ignored in the literature and in less than candid conversations. However, it took only a cursory examination of the skills and techniques required to direct the affairs of an institution of higher learning to be able to realize the importance that power and leadership skills played in the management of a higher education enterprise. President Trachtenberg vividly illustrated

I manage a conglomerate. We have a couple hundred acres over in Hartford. It includes hotel facilities, restaurant facilities, athletic facilities, plus theatres, bookstores, sundry shops, parking lots, and a post office ...on the side, we also offer educational services to about 10,000 students each year (136).

Crawford cited Mayhew (1979) who best summarized that the future of higher education rested to a large extent on responsible leadership that did

1. ...make strong appointments to the chief subordinate administrative offices and to deanships.

2. ...devote considerable time to the details of management so that they know the precise financial situation of the institution, the exact enrollment situation, the way in which various offices function or do not function, and
the relative strengths and weaknesses of the faculty.

3. ...appear to have a highly developed intuition for finances. While they may not have been trained to make or use a budget, they seem to sense when figures are fuzzy or when gaps appear. And if their instincts say something is wrong, they keep questioning until they do fully understand a financial condition.

4. ...are able to establish priorities for their own agendas and concentrate on those, leaving to others matters which, while possibly interesting, do not demand presidential time and energy.

5. ...are able to value and trust their faculties but, at the same time, resist faculty efforts to intrude on prerogatives essential to the governing of the institution.

6. ...lastly, successful presidents know the fundamental nature of higher education and what things will not work. In short, they are masters of the enterprises over which they preside (137-138).

"Presidential leadership, then, will be of vital importance during the immediate future of higher education and, according to many observers, strong leadership is in short supply in the college presidency today" (Fisher 24).

POWER AND THE PRESIDENCY

The former president at Indiana University, Wells, observed that today's presidents needed "the physical stamina of a Greek athlete, the cunning of a Machiavelli, the wisdom of a Solomon, the courage of a lion, and the stomach of a goat" (Buxton, Prichard and Buxton 80). It also appeared that regardless of the president's ability to acquire necessary presidential skills the president's tenure was precarious at best. Olds, president of Kent State University outlined that the president has to be academically competent so that he will enjoy the support of the faculty, administratively competent so he
can perform feats of fiscal dexterity, able to deal with students, be of impeccable integrity, and fearlessly open. Most of us probably stay in the saddle by a precarious five to four vote (Buxton, Prichard and Buxton 80).

Fisher also seemed to agree that presidential leadership was a serious problem facing higher education (1984). However, his feelings indicated that the real problem did not lie in the skills of individual presidents but rather in the need to have presidents that were able to "lead and act" (16). He continued, and pointed out that "presidents often fail to understand the value of the presidential position...to their ability to accomplish legitimate and essential institutional goals" (2). Fisher inferred that presidential position did not necessarily mean the office itself, but the power that came with the office that helped the individual president to build his own personal power and credibility (1984).

Fisher cited research completed by Bird (1940) that indicated that "boldness" was a requisite for effective leadership (17). This study was supported by additional work done by Pfeffer (1981). Fisher recalled the words of one of his mentors, Dr. Bone, who admonished, "Jim, the college president who doesn't feel inside that he may be putting his job on the line at least once a year is either unworthy of the office or the times are so tranquil that the office is unworthy of him" (17).

Veysey (1965) declared that "Jordan was selected as the first president of Stanford because he was a firm-minded executive and could manage things like a railroad" (qtd. in Fisher 18). In addition to bold decision making ability Fisher indicated that the strength of institutional leadership was ascertained by "observing accomplishments and sensing the ambiance of the place" (18).
Fisher cited *Style and Substance: Leadership and the College Presidency*, by Benezet et al., and reported that despite today's clamor for more involvement by all segments of the college, the faculty disliked the "nice guy" president who professed to make all institutional decisions democratically as much as they disliked the "devious president." It was apparent that "students and faculty know that the president has the final say in most matters" (17). These findings suggested that contrary to popular opinion that directive leadership was generally found to be more effective than non-directive leadership (McClelland and Burnham 1976, McClelland *The Two* 1970). "People seem to want an astute, strong, assertive figure who involves them in the decision-making process but makes the final decision and accepts the responsibility for it" (Fisher 20). Benezet et al. supported this contention. "On campus, the key is for the president to provide structured opportunities for participation by faculty, students, and staff, but clearly to retain final authority and responsibility; for, indeed, this is what faculty and students expect from their president" (qtd. in Fisher 21-22). Gross and Grambsch conducted a study that reiterated what already seemed apparent. "Administrators make all the major decisions...and the president has the most power" (qtd. in Richman and Farmer 158).

Richman and Farmer also elaborated on the varied skills required of today's president

The president must often be a negotiator and a mediator, jockeying among power blocs, trying to carve out viable futures for his institution. He should not be either an autocrat or bureaucrat, or merely an administrator. He should be a professional manager, and active leader, and often an entrepreneur as well. He must understand and effectively use both formal bureaucratic and informal
expert and participative structures and processes. He must also maintain channels of communication and influence between the formal and informal structures. However, when conflicts cannot be resolved in a reasonably timely fashion, and when there are not enough resources to meet all demands, the president must resolve conflicts either through his overall budgetary powers or some other means. ...If the president does not possess all of these basic abilities to a relatively high degree, it is important that he and his key deputies, working as a team, do. A good balance is needed between overall managerial competence regarding the basic functions of management, highly dynamic leadership, and entrepreneurship (23).

Cohen and March declared that power, including presidential power, tended to be quite ambiguous at academic institutions. This was largely related to the ambiguous nature of the institution's goals and systems (1974). They also suggested that the president was resented because he was perceived as having more power than he should. Yet the president thought that he had less power than he needed in order to be effective (1974).

Richman and Farmer quoted Cohen and March

...the president is like a driver of a skidding automobile. The marginal adjustments he makes, his skill and his luck may possibly make some differences to the survival prospects of his riders. As a result, his responsibilities are heavy. But whether he is convicted of manslaughter or receives a hero's medal is largely outside his control (169).

At odds with Cohen and March was a study by Demerath, Stephens and Taylor. They examined the changing of the guard at North Carolina University and found that power was not as ambiguous as assumed and that higher education could do a great deal to clarify formal authority, power, participatory roles and relationships. They also reported that faculty felt better about leadership that defined the formal authority relationships within the college or university structure (qtd. in Richman and Farmer 170).
Many of the presidential skills listed in this section required the effective use of one of the five forms of power previously discussed in the review of literature. It was evident that a president should rarely rely on the use of coercive or reward power as neither was very effective in a college environment where the group was mature (Fisher 32), the group was not motivated to a great extent by rewards or punishment (Fisher 32) and where there were a number of acknowledged group experts (Fisher 38).

What was the right combination of power for college presidents? Again, Fisher seemed best to summarize:

The leader who combines charismatic power with expert and legitimate power, adding a carefully measured portion of reward power and little or no coercive power, achieves maximum effectiveness (40).

Cohen and March provided the following summary, "Presidents must know their institution and their position in it if they are to exert greater power and become a more effective leader" (qtd. in Richman and Farmer 169).

THE ETHICAL USE OF POWER

McClelland held that there were two faces to power. One face of power was viewed in a positive and constructive light and the other face of power was viewed as negative, coercive, manipulative, and in a destructive light (McClelland The Two 1970).

The following quotes illustrate the dichotomy that existed with the two faces of power. Thomas Babington, Lord Macaulay said, "The highest proof of virtue is to possess boundless power without abusing it" (qtd.
in Fisher 73). At the opposite end of the spectrum was the statement by Machiavelli, "All men are motivated by self-interest: man should play his friends as pawns on a chessboard, one against the other" (qtd. in Fisher 135). Agreeing with Machiavelli was Lord Action, "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (qtd. in Fisher 1). Referring to power Twain admonished, "Always do right. This will gratify some people, and astonish the rest" (qtd. in Fisher 121). Depending on perspective, the use of power seemed to have accrued an ugly connotation that made people uncomfortable, or it was viewed as an ethical action concept (Fisher 2).

McClelland reported that the negative reactions to the exercise of power became vividly apparent during the course of his research to develop achievement motivation. He explained that as it became evident that people could be changed in a relatively short period of time that this created concern for a number of observers. Questions such as, was it ethical to change a person's personality? Were people being brainwashed? What magical powers were being employed to change an underlying personality? were being asked (McClelland The Two 32). These types of questions gave rise to a dilemma that confronted anyone who became involved in any portion of the "influencing game." A leader

...may think that he is exercising leadership, ie., influencing people for their own good, but if he succeeds, he is likely to be accused of manipulating people. We thought that our influence attempts were benign. In fact, we were a little proud of ourselves. After all, we were giving people a chance to be more successful in business and at school. Yet we soon found ourselves attacked as potentially dangerous brainwashers (McClelland The Two 32-33).

The real "problem, then, is to try to discern and understand the two
faces of power. When is power bad and when is it good? Why is it often perceived as dangerous? Which aspects of power are viewed favorably, and which unfavorably? When is it proper, and when improper, to exercise influence" (McClelland The Two 34)?

To be certain that ethical use of power was maintained McClelland proposed that there were two safeguards. The first was psychological:

...the leader must thoroughly learn the lesson that his role is not to dominate and treat people like pawns, but to give strength to others and to make them feel like origins of ideas and of the courses of their lives. If they are to be truly strong, he must continually consult them and be aware of their wishes and desires. A firm faith in people as origins prevents the development of the kind of cynicism that so often characterizes authoritarian leaders (McClelland The Two 42).

The second safeguard was social: "democracy provides a system whereby the group can expel the leader from office if it feels that he is no longer properly representing its interests" (McClelland The Two 42).

To many the ethical use of power depended on one and only one thing, motivation. Robertson concluded that Lasswell contrasted the difference between his power personality, the "authoritarian personality," and the "democratic personality" as being committed to values beyond rulership. The difference was the purpose for which power was used. A democratic personality achieved values consistent with democratic culture and the authoritarian sought after ego gratification and the protection of their elite interests (Robinson 82). McClelland specifically named Lasswell's purpose as being motivation. In Power: The Inner Experience, McClelland reiterated, "When is power good or bad? When is it proper or improper? It depends on one's power motivation" (256).
McClelland and his colleague, Burnham studied five hundred successful managers and their less successful counterparts in sales, research, product development and product operation divisions in twenty-five major organizations. Their major finding was that "a good manager is not one who needs personal success or who is people oriented, but one who likes power" (100). They discovered that the desires to have impact, to be strong and influential, was essential to good management. They termed this need for power as "power motivation." Their research indicated that seventy percent of the managers studied were higher in power motivation than non-management personnel (McClelland and Burnham 102).

Those managers judged as better managers based on the morale of their subordinates tended to be even higher in their need for power. The single most important factor that determined high morale among subordinates was whether the manager's power motivation was higher than his need to be liked (McClelland and Burnham 103).

Specifically, "McClelland and Burnham identified three motivational profiles which they labeled Affiliative Managers, Personal Power Managers, and Institutional Managers" (Hawker and Hall 1). These managers are described as follows:

1. Affiliative Managers have a high need for group acceptance and being liked by others which results in their being somewhat indecisive and inconsistent in their handling of employees. The net result of such an approach is to create rather low morale and low feelings of responsibility among employees (Hawker and Hall 1). This kind of person creates poor morale because he or she does not understand that other people will tend to regard exceptions to the rules as unfair to themselves. These managers were
perceived as being the least successful managers (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1).

2. Personal Power Managers have a high need for achievement and personal accomplishment which reflects what McClelland has called the personalized face of power. Such managers tend to be impulsive and undisciplined and, while they do inspire personal loyalty among employees, lack of organizational clarity often results. However, Personal Power Managers were more effective than the Affiliative Manager.

3. Institutional Managers also have a high need for power but it is directed toward the common good rather than toward personal aggrandizement. Such managers tend to be more psychologically mature and reflect what McClelland termed the socialized face of power. They tend to be more self-controlled, more egalitarian and more likely to use a democratic or coaching style of management. This approach leads to increased morale and a greater sense of organizational clarity on the part of employees, and was the most effective in defining successful managers (Hawker and Hall 1-2).

Hall and Hawker's studies indicated that Institutional Managers, those with socialized power, tended to be

1. Inhibited and self-controlled in their use of power.
2. Respectful of others' rights.
3. Concerned with fairness.
4. Oriented toward justice.
5. Committed to the value of working per se.
7. Organization-minded; joiners.
8. Ambivalent about power.
9. Collaborative.
10. Concerned with realistic goals.
11. Non-defensive, willing to seek help.
13. Replaceable by other managers - leave a system intact and self-sustaining.
14. Source of strength for others (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2).

In many respects the Personalized Manager was almost an exact opposite of the Institutional Manager. Hall and Hawker again provided a number of generalized characteristics.

1. Impulsive and erratic in their use of power.
2. Rude and overbearing.
3. Exploitative of others.
4. Oriented toward strength.
5. Committed to the value of efficiency.
6. Proud.
7. Self-reliant; individualists.
8. Excited by the certitudes of power.
10. Concerned with exceptionally high goals.
11. Defensive - protective of own sense of importance.
12. Inspirational leaders.
13. Difficult to replace - leave a group of loyal subordinates dependent on their manager.
14. Sources of direction, expertise and control (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2).

Hall and Hawker reasoned that "one's total approach to power management entails an interaction of power motives and stylistic practices" (Interpreting 1). This was supported by Blake and Mouton who noted that "the critical element is how the manager utilizes that power in their relationships with subordinates" (qtd. in Hawker and Hall 3).

Blake and Mouton claimed that in the development of their Power Spectrum that there were three possible forms of power interaction—competition, collaboration, and powerlessness. They contended that based on a manager's style he distributed his power in any number of ways. In understanding Blake and Mouton's theory they argued that the total power available to a manager was equal to one unit. The manager then distributed this unit of power along a spectrum as he saw fit. If he decided to "retain the full unit of power, this results in a 1.0/0 distribution of power or what could be termed an authority—obedience power style" (Hawker and Hall 3). However, if the manager decided to relinquish his power, and gave the subordinate full power, then the distribution was labeled 0/1.0, permissive or laissez-faire style of management. The third option was to share in some form of collaboration.
the manager's power. The power was shared along a scale from .9 for the
manager and .1 for the subordinate, to .1 for the manager and .9 for the
subordinate. Hawker and Hall felt that ideally, a joint-determination
approach of .5/.5 was best (Hawker and Hall 3).

Speaking of the Power Spectrum, Hawker and Hall pointed out

Interestingly, the three Power Spectrum styles seem to
correspond nicely with the three power motivation profiles
identified by McClelland and Burnham. The 1.0/0 power
style seems to clearly involve the use of Personalized
Power, the .5/.5 style suggests the use of Socialized
Power, and the 0/1.0 style (representing a reluctance to
use power) reflects the Affiliative approach (Hawker and
Hall 3).

Hall and Hawker professed that power style had a great deal to do
with subordinate morale. They divulged that "research shows that
personal feelings of satisfaction, responsibility, commitment, and pride
may be expected to vary as a function of one's power" (A Word 2). In an
extreme example where the manager retained full power and gave the
subordinate no power (1.0/0 style) the manager had mostly positive
feelings and the subordinate had few if any positive feelings. "The
general rule is: the more personal power one has, the more positive he
or she will feel in a situation" (Hall and Hawker A Word 2). The only
exception to this rule was if the manager and subordinate shared the
power. This way both parties experienced positive feelings, and,
according to Hall and Hawker, these positive feelings were even stronger
than when either party possessed total power (Hall and Hawker A Word 2).

Summarizing the effect that power style had on morale Hall and
Hawker assured that

...a major aspect of power style is its effect on morale
which, in turn, bears directly on the likelihood that
decisions, agreements, instructions and the like will be
carried out to the best of everyone's ability (A Word 2).
The connections between power motivation, power style, and morale now seemed obvious; however, McClelland and Burnham's conclusions and observations provided an excellent summary.

The good manager's power motivation is not oriented toward personal aggrandizement but toward the institution which he serves. The better managers are high in power motivation and low in affiliation motivation. They care about institutional power and use it to stimulate their employees to be more productive (McClelland and Burnham 103).

SUMMARY

The literature reviewed in this chapter dealt primarily with Perspectives on Power, Theories, Concepts and Classifications of Power, Leadership and Power, Power and the Presidency in Higher Education, The Ethical Use of Power, and Power Motivation and Power Style. Particular emphasis was placed on the examination of power as it related to presidential leadership in higher education. The topics reviewed were in accordance with the framework determined as relevant to the research.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND COLLECTION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the test instruments, to present the research design and the method of data collection and analyzation.

SELECTION OF THE TEST INSTRUMENT

In preparation for the study, The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook was reviewed to determine the various test instruments that were available to measure power motivation and power style. The need for an instrument to address both concerns - power motivation and power style - was deemed critical to the intent of the study. Also determined as essential to the study was the need to have an instrument that closely fit McClelland and Burnham's power theory, an instrument that was objective, valid, administered, scored, and analyzed effectively, all within the scope of the investigation.

The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook critiqued three potential tests. They were the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), the Edward's Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), and the Power Management Inventory (PMI) and its companion instrument, the Power Management Profile (PMP). Only the PMI and PMP addressed both elements of power motivation and power style. The TAT and EPPS only addressed power motivation.
Additional problems with the TAT and EPPS included both requirements of extensive training in administration and scoring; and incompatibility of data collection, analysis and testing procedures as compared to the scope of the study. Due to the above findings Hall and Hawker's Power Management Inventory and Power Management Profile was selected, as it was most applicable to the intent and purpose of the research conducted.

THE TEST INSTRUMENT'S DEVELOPMENT

A two part scale that measured both power motivation and power style was developed by Hall and Hawker. Part I of the scale measured power motivation and yielded scores on three tendencies - affiliative motive, socialized power and personalized power - the three power motives identified by McClelland and Burnham. Approximately thirty item stems were written as were alternatives reflecting those three power motives.

A total of twenty item stems were ultimately selected and arranged into a forced-choice format with pairs of responses reflecting the three power motive categories. Therefore, each item stem appeared three times to accommodate the pairings of the possible responses, sixty questions resulted. The paired alternatives included: personalized power and socialized power, personalized power and affiliative motivation, and socialized power and affiliative motivation.

The questions called for the subjects to distribute five possible points between two response questions. The most preferred response received a higher distribution of points. As an example, each set of questions had a possibility of the points being distributed in one of
the following ways 5-0, 4-1, 3-2, 2-3, 1-4, or 0-5. A total of three hundred points resulted and were distributed among the three possible power motivations.

Hawker and Hall labeled Personal Power Motive as Type A, Social Power Motive as Type B, and Affiliative Motive as Type C. They defined the power motives as:

Type A (Personalized Power Motive): The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of personal aggrandizement and control. High A scores indicate a personal need to be the center of attention, generally in control of interpersonal situations, and to prevail in most encounters with others. . .

Type B (Socialized Power Motive): The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of serving and benefiting the common welfare. High B scores indicate a personal need to have impact on cultures and systems and to be an influence for widespread enhancement. . .

Type C (Affiliative Motive): The tendency to value being liked and warmly regarded by other people. High C scores indicate a personal need to be of service, to nurture and give support to others, and to reassure and make others comfortable, even when these are done at one's own expense or to the detriment of one's other personal aspirations (Hawker and Hall 2).

Part II of the PMI was created to reflect one's individual power style in handling various leadership dilemmas. Power style was measured by Hall and Hawker through the development of ten questions that addressed various aspects of the leader's job. A forced choice scale was used where the respondent had to mark an appropriate location on a continuum that most closely described how they would handle a particular situation. The numeric score from the responses was added and divided by one hundred to arrive at a Power Style Index (PSI). The PSI ranged from 1.00 to .00 and corresponded to Blake and Mouton's "power spectrum."
Blake and Mouton's power spectrum was the foundation of Hall and Hawker's utilized power style, or their "theory in action." The power spectrum asserted that three forms of power interaction between a leader and subordinate were possible. The types of interactions were competition, collaboration, and powerlessness. Figure 1 indicated how a manager shared his power. A manager's power viewed as a total unit of one was shared in a number of possible methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competition | Forms of Collaboration | Powerlessness

Figure 1

Types of Interaction

(Hall and Hawker 3)

Concentrating on collaboration, a manager that retained full power (1/0 power distribution) resulted in an "authority-obedience" power style. A manager who shared his power with subordinates to some degree had a "joint-determination" style. Hawker and Hall suggested that ideally this resulted in a .5/.5 distribution; however, power could be shared along the continuum from a .9 for the manager and .1 for the subordinate to a .1 for the manager and .9 for the subordinate. If the manager relinquished his full unit of power to his subordinates an 0/1 power distribution resulted. This manager was labeled a "permissive or laissez-faire" manager.
The three power spectrum styles corresponded with McClelland and Burnham's three power motivation profiles. A 1/0 power style fit personalized power, a 0/1 style where power was reluctantly used reflected the affiliative motive, and the ideal collaboration of .5/.5 suggested the use of socialized power.

Hawker and Hall's initial validation used a sample of one hundred and eighteen (53 males and 65 females) and used EPPS to determine the internal consistency of each of the three scales: personalized power, socialized power and affiliative motive. The EPPS was based on Murray's fifteen manifest needs of achievement: deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. The coefficient alpha was computed between the EPPS and the three power orientations to determine internal consistency. Hawker and Hall's test had an average internal consistency reliability of .73. The power style section of the PMI had a coefficient of .66. Taken together, Hawker and Hall determined that the PMI was reliable as a measuring instrument (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Personalized Power</td>
<td>90.57</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Socialized Power</td>
<td>117.86</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Affiliative Motive</td>
<td>91.58</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

Summary Statistics and Estimates of Internal Consistency for Scales on the PMI

(Hall and Hawker 4)
Hawker and Hall validated their test instrument in two ways. First, they used bivariate correlation coefficients between the EPPS and the PMI. Second they converted all raw scores to standardized T-scores, grouped the subjects and performed a discriminant function analysis.

The bivariate correlation indicated significant positive correlation between personalized power motivation, dominance, aggression and exhibition. There was significant negative correlation between personalized power orientation and nurturance, intraception, and affiliation. This pattern suggested that individuals with high personal power scores want to dominate, be the focus of attention, tended to be aggressive, were not sensitive, and shied away from personal relationships.

Those with socialized power had significant positive correlation with intraception, achievement and had significant negative correlation with abasement and aggression. This pattern suggested that those with high socialized power scores were sensitive, motivated to accomplish something of significance, were not prone to aggressive behavior, and did not feel inferior when things went wrong.

Affiliative motive showed significant positive correlation with EPPS scales of abasement and nurturance and negative correlation with achievement and dominance. The relationship pattern formed suggested these individuals tended toward feeling inferior to others, preferred to give in and not dominate, were not motivated to accomplish and related to others in a nurturing manner.
In summarizing the results of the bivariate correlation coefficient method, Hawker and Hall reported that the results seemed to differentiate among the three power motivation orientations, and tended to support the basic differences outlined by McClelland and Burnham (Hawker and Hall 5).

Further support to the validity of the instruments was provided by the data from the discriminant function analysis that was performed. The data indicated that the three power motivations fundamentally differ and that the descriptions that resulted were consistent with McClelland and Burnham's basic power motivation classifications. "Thus, it does appear that the present instrument is tapping into basic findings of the underlying power motivations" (Hawker and Hall 7).

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

The presidents' test instrument, PMI, had two sections and the subordinates' survey, PMP, had three sections. Section one and two of both instruments asked the different subject groups the same questions. Two differences between the questionnaires existed. The first difference was the presidents' instrument was written so that the president responded to questions as they applied to himself, and the subordinates responded to the same questions, only the questions were worded so that the subordinates responded to the questions as it applied to their president. The other difference between the instruments was that the subordinate's survey provided questions that led to the development of a morale index.

On part one of the survey the subjects divided a numeric value of
five between two answers to a leading statement. The numeric value assigned indicated how the president felt he would respond to the situation described, or how the subordinate felt his president would respond to the same situation. The leading statements and possible answers cross compared each of McClelland and Burnham's three power motives in a variety of leadership settings. A total numeric score for each of the three power motives resulted. The individual composite scores for the presidents and the composite scores of the subordinates were tabulated and analyzed to arrive at the presidents' power motive profiles. This was accomplished by taking the raw scores from each group and tabulating the scores and equating the raw scores to a percentile score and plotting that percentile score onto the Power Motive Chart provided with the survey instrument.

Part two of the questionnaire ascertained the power style which most characterized the president's transactions with those he managed. Part two of the instrument used a Likert Scale that allowed the respondent to choose any one of ten responses to a particular question. The answers ranged from "I decide completely" to "We decide jointly" to "They decide completely." Again, each of the questions on the subordinates' and presidents' instruments were the same. Each of the ten choices had a numeric value so that a raw score resulted which was, according to the instrument's instructions, plotted to determine the power style of the president as viewed by the subordinates and the presidents.

Section three of the subordinates' survey instrument, PMP provided a morale index as to how satisfied the subordinates were with their president's power motive and style. Part three was a modified Likert
Scale with nine possible choices for each question. Again, numeric values were assigned to each possible response. The raw scores were tabulated and plotted based on the instructions provided with the test instrument to indicate the general morale of the presidents' subordinates.

All individual and personal information collected through the course of the research were held in strict confidence. All individual profiles and information that resulted from the study have had all possible identifying features removed so that anonymity was maintained. Those presidents that participated in the study and requested that their own individual Power Management Profile be developed and returned have had their profile returned to them.

To ensure an accurate response from the subordinates, the profile that was developed from the subordinates' individually completed surveys were not shared with their president. To be certain that an adequate return was received, each questionnaire was coded so that necessary follow-up occurred. The rate of return was considered a success as fifteen completed instruments were received from the twenty presidents, and thirty-two subordinate instruments were returned.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The PMI was administered to the subjects identified as being successful community college presidents by the study's expert panel, and the PMP was administered to three subordinates of each of the subject presidents. In addition, a questionnaire designed to elicit biographical data on the respondents and types of power used by the
presidents was also administered to each president and subordinate.

The data gathered from the questionnaires was tabulated and analyzed by group (the presidents' responses to the questionnaire, and the president's subordinates' responses to the questionnaire). Each group of responses led to an individual profile of the president's power motive and power style, additionally; a combined profile was also developed.

The responses to the survey's questions resulted in a raw score that indicated strength toward a given power motive and power style: the higher the score, the stronger the inclination toward that motive or style.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Without the use of an expert panel the criteria for who was or was not a successful community college president was open to individual interpretation. Therefore, to identify the sample population it was deemed important to have an expert panel indicate presidents that were successful. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) was contacted for assistance. The Association was requested to identify a body of experts who had sufficient knowledge and experience to serve as an expert panel. The Association suggested that the executive committee of the Association's President's Academy was the logical body to provide this function.

The President's Academy was comprised of all the presidents whose institutions were members of AACJC. The Academy's executive committee was an elected body of twelve presidents that had sufficient knowledge and experience to serve the Academy's members as their leaders. Because
of their standing in their profession, and their experience and knowledge of the other presidents that comprised the membership of the Academy, the executive committee was selected to serve as the expert panel.

The chairman of this distinguished body was contacted regarding his feelings about the research project (Appendix 10). With his support a request for the executive committee to serve as the expert panel was placed on the April 21, 1987 agenda for the committee's action. Prior to the April meeting that took place in Dallas, Texas the individual committee members were contacted and requested to support the proposal they were to receive (Appendix 11). At the April 21 meeting the President's Academy's executive committee agreed to serve as the expert panel.

On May 20, 1987 the members of the expert panel were sent a letter of explanation (Appendix 12), a criteria list of what the literature suggested was a successful president, and a form on which they were to place the names and institutions of the twenty individuals they believed to be successful presidents. The form was returned in a self-addressed and stamped envelope. Eleven forms from the twelve member expert panel were returned. Listed were one hundred and fifteen individual presidents. The one hundred and fifteen presidents mentioned were narrowed, to the twenty successful community college presidents using the method described in the following section.

SAMPLE POPULATION

To determine the study's sample, the expert panel used the criteria
list that was provided as a reference and their own experience, knowledge, and expertise, to identify twenty successful presidents and their institution. These twenty presidents became the sample population. Responses were received from eleven of the twelve member expert panel, one of the panel members was out of the country consulting. It was determined that responses from eleven of the experts was sufficient to determine the sample group of twenty successful presidents.

A list of one hundred and fifteen successful presidents was submitted by the expert panel. The sample group was identified based on the frequency with which each president was mentioned. The twenty most frequently mentioned presidents became the sample population.

Once the president sample was complete, the presidents that comprised the sample were mailed a letter (Appendix 13) and the appropriate survey instruments. When the president's instruments were returned, the three institutional officers that were identified by the president as reporting directly to him (the Academic Vice-president or Academic Dean, the Business Manager, Vice-president for Student Affairs or Dean of Students) were mailed a letter of instruction similar to the letter their president had received, and their two questionnaires. If the institution did not have positions with the exact title as requested, the names and titles of the individuals who reported directly to the president and were responsible for the institutional functions outlined above were solicited. This process developed the subordinate sample of sixty subordinates. If a president could not or would not participate in the study the next president on the frequency list became part of the sample.
DATA COLLECTION

The presidents that comprised the subject population were mailed a cover letter, a copy of Hawker and Hall's PMI a biographical questionnaire, and instructions. The subordinate sample was tested following the return of the presidents' completed PMI survey. The subordinates were mailed a cover letter, a biographical questionnaire, instructions, and their test instrument, Hall and Hawker's IMP. Once the questionnaires were completed, the subjects returned their surveys via the mail.

Upon receipt of the subordinates' returned questionnaire, the results of both surveys were tabulated and a power motivation and power style profile was developed using the scoring instructions provided with the test instruments.

DATA

The following data was compiled:

1. Successful community college presidents individual and collectively perceived power motivation.

2. Successful community college presidents individual and collectively perceived power style.

3. Successful community college president's subordinates individual and collectively perceived power motivation of the successful presidents.

4. Successful community college president's subordinates individual and collectively perceived power style of the successful
presidents.

5. Individual and collective subordinate morale score.

6. Biographical data on the presidents and their subordinates.

7. Use of various types of power (French and Raven's typology) as identified by the successful presidents.

8. Use of various types of power (French and Raven's typology) as identified by the successful president's subordinates.

DATA ANALYSIS

The study did not use statistical comparisons or correlations between the subordinates' and presidents' scores or profiles. Only group profiles were developed and presented. Inferential statistics were not used for the study, as they assumed both a random sample and a normal distribution, neither of which applied to this investigation. Descriptive statistics, mean, median, mode and standard deviation, were used with the end result of the research being a profile of the subjects' power motive and power style, as viewed by the subjects, and a power motivation and power style profile as viewed by the subjects' subordinates. The profiles indicated which of McClelland and Burnham's three power motives, Personalized, Socialized, or Affiliative, successful community college presidents were most likely to have. Evaluative statements relative to the general match between the presidents' power motive and power style were also presented. Additionally, a morale index indicated the subordinates' feelings as to their satisfaction with the manner in which their president handled leadership situations which were presented in the questionnaire, and the at work decision structure
in which they functioned. The profile that was developed from the data gathered from the presidents, and the profile that was developed from the data gathered from the subordinates were quite diverse. As an example, a majority of the subordinates viewed the successful community college presidents as having their strongest tendency toward the socialized power motive with a mean Power Style on Blake and Mouton's power spectrum of .39. However, the presidents were equally divided between affiliative and personalized power motives. Six presidents viewed themselves as having personalized power motives, six as having affiliative power motives and three as having their strongest tendency toward socialized power. Their mean Power Style was .56.

Cumulative biographical data on the respondents were also collected, tabulated, and reported. Full analyzation of the scores and profiles was presented in Chapter Four.

The Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in the analysis of the data collected. This particular software package was specifically designed for the statistical analysis of data gathered in performing social science research. The mainframe version of this package provided for the convenient analysis of many different types of data. SPSS provided for descriptive statistics frequency distributions and cross tabulations of data.

For this particular study the SPSS FREQUENCIES subprogram was used. The program provided for the following statistics: mean, mode, range, median, variance, and standard deviation.

Once the study's subjects returned their surveys, the data was recorded on a spreadsheet and then placed into SPSS data files by a Clark County School District researcher. A printout of all the data
files was obtained and proofed against original sources. After the errors were corrected input files were developed by the school district researcher and the program was run as specified.

The program was run on Clark County School District's Data Processing Department's Sperry-Univac mainframe computer. Output files were then available for immediate review and analysis.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the personal power management profile of selected successful community college presidents as depicted by Hall and Hawker's PMP and PMI. This chapter discussed the selection, development, and validation of the test instruments, the design of the research, data collection and analysis, the identification and function of the expert panel, the determination of the sample population and the data gathered.

The research consisted of administering a questionnaire to twenty successful community college presidents and three of each of their subordinates. The questionnaires used were Hall and Hawker's PMP and PMI which were based on McClelland and Burnham's theory of power motivation. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics, and the scoring instructions provided with the test instruments that resulted in the development of individual and collective power profiles of successful community college presidents.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The problem that guided this investigation and which served as the basis for the selection of the survey instruments and the collection and analysis of data was "What was the personal power management profile of selected successful community college presidents." To address this specific problem a review of the literature was completed, an expert panel identified, appropriate test instruments were selected, personal data questionnaires developed, the expert panel identified the sample population of presidents, the presidents and three of their subordinates were surveyed, the results of the surveys have been returned, entered into the computer, and descriptive statistics obtained.

The purpose of this chapter was to take the descriptive statistics that resulted from the surveys and to present those results in both narrative and visual form, and provide as much interpretation of the data as possible. A report of findings and data analysis, data interpretation, and a summary are included in this chapter.

Specifically, and in order of analysis, the following data and topics were addressed: biographical information of the presidents and their subordinates, the presidents' use of the forms of power as identified by French and Raven's typology; the presidents' subordinate's perception of his president's use of power as classified by French and
Raven; the cumulative power motive and style profile of successful community college presidents as depicted by Hall and Hawker's Power Management Inventory (PMI), and Power Management Profile (PMP); the cumulative power motive and style profiles of the presidents based on their strongest power motive tendency; individual power motive and style profiles of each of the presidents; data interpretation; the presidents' power management profile; and a summary of the results and the chapter.

To assist the reader in understanding the data presented the following information is provided. The standard deviation was listed only in those situations where its use helped to clarify the range of the data's variance. Additionally, the mean scores were selected for use as they seemed to represent the most accurate data available for analysis.

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Biographical Data

Upon return of all of the presidents' and their subordinates' biographical surveys the results for the sample population was totaled and percentages were calculated, or arbitrary groups and classifications were established, as deemed appropriate.

The sample return of fifteen successful community college presidents' and their thirty-two subordinates' mean ages were fifty-three and fifty-two, respectively. The president's ages ranged from forty-two to sixty-six while the subordinates ages ranged from thirty-six to sixty-nine (Figure 3).

One hundred percent of the sample presidents were male, as were
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seventy-five percent of the subordinates who returned the surveys (Figure 4). In the expert panel's original listing of successful presidents one-hundred and fifteen individual presidents were mentioned. Of that figure twelve of the presidents, or approximately ten percent were female. Out of the thirty-five successful presidents that were mentioned more than once by the expert panel, three were women; however, none of the women presidents were mentioned with the frequency necessary to become part of the actual sample population. Nationally, 126 of the 1224 community college presidents were women (Palmer 1988). According to Jim Palmer, who was responsible for research and statistics with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the number of women presidents has remained fairly constant over the past five years (Palmer 1988).

As was suspected the sample population was highly educated. Only one percent of the presidents surveyed held a Master's degree, and the remainder held either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. Sixty percent held the Ed.D. (Figure 5). The degree emphasis of ninety-three percent of the presidents was in some form of educational administration with fifty-three percent having their degree specifically in Higher Education Administration (Figure 6). Only forty percent of the presidents received their terminal degree from an institution west of the Mississippi River, and thirty-three percent received their degree from an institution in the southeast quadrant of the United States (Figure 7).

A majority of the subordinates also held a Ph.D. or Ed.D.; however, thirty-nine percent held a degree other than a doctorate. Some form of Educational Administration was the degree emphasis most frequently cited
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Presidents' and Subordinates' Degree

Subordinates

- Ed.D. 32%
- Masters 23%
- Ed. Specialist 5%
- MBA 4%
- Bachelors 6%

Presidents

- Ph.D. 35%
- Ed.D. 64%
- Masters 1%
Figure 6
Sample's Degree Emphasis

Subordinates

Presidents

Degree in Educational Administration 75%

31% in Higher Education Admin.

Degree in Something Other Than Educational Administration 25%

50% in Higher Education Admin.

Degree in Something Other Than Educational Administration 7%
Figure 7

Geographical Area Degree From
as being held by the subordinates, with thirty-one percent of those who had a degree in Educational Administration having that degree in Higher Education (Figure 6). A significant segment of the subordinates (sixteen percent) received their terminal degree from an institution of higher learning in the state of Florida, while only twenty-three percent of the subordinates received their degree from an institution west of the Mississippi River (Figure 7).

The presidents in the sample had served as a community college president for sixteen years (mean), with the fewest years served being eight, and the most years served being twenty-seven (Figure 8). The mean years served in their current presidency was ten years and eight months, with a range of one to twenty-two years (Figure 9). The subordinates closely mirrored the presidents as the years they had spent in their current position ranged from one year up to twenty-three years. The mean years the subordinates had served was seven years and three months (Figure 9).

Figure 10 illustrates the type of career the presidents and their subordinates desired in ten years. Sixty-one percent of the presidents would like to still be in a presidency and forty percent of the subordinates desired that same opportunity. Forty percent of the subordinates were planning on being retired, as were twenty-seven percent of the presidents. From the data indicated in this figure it was apparent that the sample presidents and subordinates were relatively satisfied with their roles as chief executive and executive officers of community colleges. None of the presidents desired to change their career focus and return to the classroom in either a community college or university setting. Only six percent of the presidents planned on
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Years in Position

President:
Mean: 10.8
Range: [0, 1]
Mode: 1 Year (6)

Subordinates:
Mean: 7.3
Range: [0, 1]
Mode: 1 Year (6)
Presidents

Percent | Category
--- | ---
61 | Presidency
27 | Retired
6 | Business
6 | Unsure
0 | Teach at Com. College
0 | Teach at University

Subordinates

Percent | Category
--- | ---
40 | Presidents
40 | Retired
7 | Business
7 | Unsure
3 | Teach at Com. College
3 | Teach at University

Figure 10

Career Desired in 10 Years
leaving education to enter the business world. The data reflected very similar subordinate attitudes.

According to the U.S. Department of Education's 1985 Center for Education Statistics, seventy-one percent of public community colleges have enrollments under five thousand students. Yet eighty percent of the sample population of successful presidents represented institutions that had student enrollments in excess of five thousand students. This data suggested that "large" and perceived "success" went hand-in-hand (Figure 11).

**French And Raven's Power Typology**

The biographical survey that was administered to the presidents and their subordinates requested information on how often the presidents used French and Raven's various forms of power. French and Raven had identified the following forms of power: reward, coercive, expert, legitimate, and charismatic (Fisher 28). Each of the presidents were asked how often they used the various power forms. Their choices for frequency were: daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, a few times in my career, and never in my career. The presidents' subordinates were also asked how often they had observed their president using the various power forms. The choices to which they responded were: daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, observed a few times, I've never observed him using this form of power. The presidents and subordinates were only able to select one response to each question regarding power use. The results provided percentages which were graphically compared in Figures 12 through 16.

Statistically, differences existed in the responses between the two
groups; however, the differences were not so great as to hide the outward conclusion that the presidents and subordinates were in relative agreement as to how often the presidents used the various forms of power.

Forty-two percent of the presidents claimed they had used reward power only a few times or never in their career. The subordinates' observations were approximately the same, as fifty-one percent reported the same results (Figure 12).

Coercive power use was even less with eighty-eight percent of the presidents indicating they never used, or had used that power form only a few times in their career. Seventy-eight percent of the subordinates agreed (Figure 13).

In the use of expert power seventy-five percent of the subordinates felt their president used that form of power on a daily basis, and sixty-seven percent of the presidents subscribed to the same impression (Figure 14).

Forty percent of the presidents said they used legitimate power on a daily or weekly basis, and forty percent said they had used legitimate power only a few times or never in their career. The majority of the subordinates were also split between the extremes. Forty-four percent indicated that they had observed their president using legitimate power on a daily or weekly basis. At the other end of the spectrum, forty percent had never or only in a few instances observed their president using legitimate power (Figure 15).

The final form of power, charismatic, also exhibited considerable overall agreement between the two groups. Using charismatic power on a daily or weekly basis were ninety-four percent of the presidents.
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- Few Times
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Perceptions as to How Often the President Uses Legitimate Power
Sixty-nine percent of the subordinates affirmed the presidents' response and only eighteen percent reported that they had never observed, or had seen their president use this power only on rare occasions (Figure 16).

Additional general agreement was found in the compared responses to the following questions: "How critical is it to have and use power in order to be successful?" "Is the amount of power possessed by the president the right amount?" And, "From where does the president's power tend to come?"

In response to the question, "How critical is it to have and use power in order to be successful?" sixty percent of the presidents and sixty-five percent of the subordinates responded that it was "very critical" (Figure 17). Surprisingly, a wide majority of the presidents and subordinates felt that the president had the "right amount" of power. This information contradicted statements by Cohen and March, who found that presidents thought they had less power than needed in order to be effective (Cohen and March 1974). Seventy-three percent of the presidents and eighty-eight percent of the subordinates in this study responded that the presidents had the "right amount" of power (Figure 18).

Responding to the question, "From where does your president's power come?" fifty-two percent of the subordinates identified expert power, twenty-nine percent marked charismatic, ten percent singled out legitimate, six percent coercive and three percent specified reward power. The presidents felt their power source was: thirty-six percent charismatic, thirty-six percent legitimate, and twenty-eight percent noted expert (Figure 19).

To ascertain the level of power the successful community college
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Perception As To How Often The President Uses Charismatic Power

Subordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Times</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few Times</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Perceptions as to How Critical it is to Have and Use Power to be Successful
Figure 18
Perception As To The Amount Of Power
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Figure 19

Perception Of Which Power Source The Presidents' Power Tends To Come
presidents held as compared to other presidents for which the subordinates had worked, the subordinates were asked to answer the following question. "In comparison with other community college presidents for which I've worked this president is: considerable more powerful, a little more powerful, as powerful, a little less powerful, considerable less powerful." Seventy-four percent of the subordinates stated their president was a little more powerful or considerably more powerful than the other presidents for which the subordinate had worked (Figure 20). This response verified the notion that the presidential sample, as identified by the expert panel, was a group where power was a dominate characteristic. This dominance facilitated the examination of the various power theories that acted as the underpinnings of the investigation.

To assist the reader in putting the graphs, statistics, and responses in perspective, figure 21 showed the number of presidents for which the subordinates had worked. The subordinates worked for a mean of 2.8 presidents. This data indicated that the subordinates had opportunities to assess presidential power among a number of presidents during their professional career.

**Power Motive/Style Of Successful Community College Presidents**

McClelland and Burnham, and Hall and Hawker theorized that strong motivation for power was more characteristic of good managers than either the need for personal achievement or the need to be liked by others. McClelland and Burnham labeled the two motives as Personalized Power, the individual desired power for personal gain and aggrandizement, and Social Power, where power need came from the desire to
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57  Considerably More Powerful
17  A Little More Powerful
22  As Powerful
  0  A Little Less Powerful
  4  Considerably Less Powerful
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influence for the common good. The need to be liked was labeled, Affiliative Motive. Hall and Hawker stated that power was used in a number of ways and this action represented one's power style. The theories concluded that the "good manager" was a manager that had socialized power motives and was characterized by a coaching, democratic type of power style (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1981). This investigation applied these theories to successful community college presidents, which led to a power management profile, the power management profile being the combination of power motive and power style.

Figure 22 illustrated the percentile distribution of both the presidents' power motive distribution and the subordinates' perception of their president's power motive. The distribution also showed that only three of the presidents viewed themselves as having their strongest tendency toward the socialized power motive, six having a personalized power motive, and six having an affiliative power motive. Figure 22 did not indicate that fifteen of the thirty-two subordinates saw their president's strongest power motive tendency being the socialized power motive. Twelve subordinates listed the personalized power motive as their president's strongest motive, and five subordinates felt their president's strongest power motive was affiliative.

The president's power style fell into the socialized, democratic, coaching style as viewed by the presidents. The subordinates rating of their president indicated that they saw their presidents quite differently. A large majority saw their president on the affiliative end of the scale tending to be laissez faire in their power management style (Figure 23).

It was apparent that the various subordinates who were part of the
President's Power Motive
Percentile Distribution

Subordinate's Perception Of Their President's Power Motive
Percentile Distribution

Figure 22
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Perception of Presidents’ Power Style
sample had high morale as indicated by the responses to the test instrument and the resultant data presented in figures 24 and 25. Evident in the distribution was that one hundred percent of the subordinates whose president's strongest power motive was the socialized motive scored their morale as excellent. Seventy-seven percent of the subordinates whose president's strongest power motive was personalized power listed their morale as excellent. Of the subordinates whose president's strongest power motive was the affiliative motive, only thirty-three percent rated their morale as excellent using the test instrument developed by Hall and Hawker.

Overall, figure 26 accurately depicted all of the presidents' perceptions of their motive and style, as well as all of the subordinates' perceptions of their morale and their president's motive and style. Listed were the mean raw scores, the percentile scores, and the standard deviations.

Figure 26 graphically presented the presidents' perception of their power motive and style. The presidents saw their power style as being socialized, democratic or coaching in nature, as indicated by the mean score of 56.667. However, they were split as to which power motive was their strongest. The percentile scores of 53 for the personalized power motive and 53 for the affiliative power motive evenly divided their strongest tendency. A score of 43 for the socialized motive kept all three motives approximately the same, with no motive standing out to any great extent.

The subordinates' scores also presented the same interpretive problems. The personalized and socialized power motives were the same, with the least dominate motive being affiliative. However, the
Figure 24
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Power Motive and Style of All Presidents and Subordinates
subordinates saw their presidents' power style as leaning toward an affiliative, laissez faire style. Even though there was discrepancy between the motive and style the subordinates rated their overall mean morale as almost excellent, 28.913.

It was very difficult to analyze these results. According to Hall and Hawker, the "ideal" power profile had the socialized power motive as its strongest tendency and a corresponding power style that closely fit that motive. This prohibited mixed messages from being sent to the subordinates through inconsistent action and intent. In other words the ideal manager, according to Hall and Hawker, had a socialized motive at the ninetieth percentile, a personalized motive at the thirty-fifth percentile, and an affiliative motive at the tenth percentile. The power style should fall somewhere between the range of four to six points on Hall and Hawker's power style scale. Ideally, the power style was five on the scale, where "joint-determination" was practiced in sharing power and where democratic, coaching management style was present (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2).

According to Hall and Hawker, "both Socialized and Personalized power scores should be higher than the Affiliative score. This should be at least twenty-five percentile points higher in order to sufficiently indicate a strong desire for impact and influence. A preference of more than 25 percentile points is required for more than a chance difference" (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2). A higher affiliative score indicated more concern with being liked than for having real influence and impact (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 2).

Speaking on the need for dominate power motive and style to be "plumb," Hall and Hawker said, "The more consistent a given style is
with the motive the more managerial consistency is indicated. A lack of consistency in style and motive indicates inconsistency between action and intent" (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 3).

Figure 27, 28, and 29 portrayed the presidents' views as compared to the views of each subset of their subordinates, Deans of Instruction, Business Managers, and Deans of Students. As indicated in figure 27 the Deans of Instruction viewed the presidents' socialized power motive as being his strongest motive. In comparing the Dean of Instructions' view of the presidents' power motive with the other subordinates views, they saw the presidents as being most like Hall and Hawker's "ideal" manager. Their view of the presidents' power style leaned toward the affiliative, laissez faire style and their morale was rated toward the high end of the "good" range on Hall and Hawker's morale index.

The Business Managers definitely saw their president as having a Personalized Power Motive. As presented in Figure 28 their morale was a little lower than the Deans of Instruction. They also saw the presidents' power style in the affiliative range; however, it was a little closer to the socialized, democratic style than was the Deans of Instructions' rating.

The Deans of Students felt the presidents strongest power motive was also the socialized motive. They also indicated through their responses that his power style fell within the socialized, democratic, coaching style. Of the three subgroups of subordinates the Deans of Students had the highest morale ranking, a mean of 31.75 on the morale index (Figure 29).

Based on the interpretive instructions no clear cut power motive stood out. The presidents viewed themselves as having fairly equal
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Power Motive and Style of All Presidents and Deans of Students
power motives, and the data suggested that the combined views of the subordinates was approximately the same. The presidents saw their power style being in the socialized range, while the subordinates saw the presidents' power style being more affiliative. The morale index indicated that the overall subordinate morale fell within the good range, though on a distribution scale the large majority of the subordinates listed their morale as excellent (Figure 24).

**Presidents' Power Profile By Strongest Power Motive**

To provide a more in depth evaluation of the data provided by the presidents and their subordinates, the presidents and their subordinates were arbitrarily grouped by the president's dominate power motive. Once grouped, the presidents' motives and styles were compared with their subordinates' perceptions in the same manner as previously outlined. Presidents who had a dominate socialized power motive were compared against the views of all of their subordinates, then compared with the views of just their Deans of Instruction, then their Business Managers, and then their Deans of Students (Figures 30-33). In like manner the presidents with the dominate power motive of Personalized Power and Affiliative Motive were grouped, illustrated and analyzed with their respective subordinates. The data for these groups can be found in Appendix 14 and Appendix 15 respectively.

The presentation of the data that resulted from this arbitrary grouping, combined with the data from the total group, provided a "clearly hazy" picture. The picture painted being one that portrayed the presidents and subordinates viewing the president's personal power management profile in a different light. The data indicated that many
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S.D. 6.028

Affiliative Motive
Mean 74.667
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Figure 32
Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Socialized Power Motivation and Their Business Managers
times the perspectives contrasted with each other. The closest agreement was found between the presidents who had a dominate socialized power motive and their Deans of Instruction (Figure 31). Both showed a very strong socialized motive and yet the practice of that motive via the power style showed contrasting perspectives. The presidents saw their style falling in the democratic, coaching realm and the Deans saw the presidents' action being in the affiliative, laissez faire range.

A further break down of the data was provide in Appendix 16 where individual power management profiles were portrayed. Again, little agreement was found between presidents and subordinates. Only in a few cases was there significant agreement even on a single motive or power style.

Data Interpretation

As previously described, the data provided a very mixed view with wide disparity in the samples' perspectives. The comparisons in Figures 30 through 33, and the figures found in Appendix 14, 15, and 16 were provided for informational purposes to more accurately display the variance in perceptions of the successful presidents' power motive and style. The nature of the study was to discover and present a power management profile of successful community college presidents; therefore, individual, small and total group profiles were presented. The intent of the investigation was only to discover and present, not to prove or disprove the various theories and test instruments on which the study was based. Rather, the study used the various theories and test instruments to develop the composite power management profile of
successful community college presidents. This visual profile was graphically presented in figure 26 and described in narrative form in this chapter's following section.

The diversity of data that resulted from the questionnaires may have been due to a number of factors, not the least of which was the sample and its size. Another factor might have been the president viewing himself from an external power dimension and his subordinates viewing him from an internal power dimension, or visa versa. In an external dimension the perception of power could arise from the use of social political acumen, ability to be viewed as a leader among peers, common interest, effective and charming manner. An internal power dimension might have been driven by internal decision structure, degrees of subordinate autonomy and transaction analysis within the institution. Gouldner's concept of "cosmopolitans and locals" seemed to describe the different orientations these two power dimensions could have taken (1957). If, as supposed, the internal and external dimensions were contrasting, the data would also have been contrasted.

An additional consideration that would effect the harmony of the data from this study as compared with the data results from Hall and Hawker's work is the possible dissimilarity between educational and business management environments. Studies in each environment, when compared with each other, could easily contrast. The theorists' work on which this research was based theorized using a business environment. This study was done in an educational environment, which, according to the expressions of a number of authors, is so different that theories that may apply to a business environment may not fit an educational environment. Corson pointed out "institutions of higher education exist
to serve a multiplicity of purposes, they are more dispersed than a
typical business, and their responsibility for decision making is more
widely dispersed and diffused when compared to business" (Corson 9-10).
This idea and the concept of collegiality might also explain the large
percentage of presidents and subordinates who viewed the president as
having had an affiliative motive and operating style.

Corson added:

the authority and responsibility placed in the faculty, as
a body, by tradition, by custom, or by formal bylaw or
regulation and the freedom of speech and of thought
accorded the faculty member as an individual comprise two
factors that have organizational and administrative con­
sequences that are unparalleled in business or
governmental enterprise (Corson 97).

Cohen and March also outlined major differences that supported the
fact that management theory for higher education was unique. They
stated that the college's goals were problematic and vague, that they
possessed unclear technology, and experienced fluid participation (23).
Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley enumerated additional differences in
their work Policy Making and Effective Leadership. Some of the
differences they outlined were major organizational differences,
governance and management variance, differences in the way professional
values and autonomy were promoted and controlled. Further, they were
"people-processing" institutions, high professionalism dominated the
staff and tasks, and they were becoming more environmentally vulnerable
(Baldridge, et al 8-24).

The differences and thus the difficulty of applying business
environment theories to education were great. Hoy appropriately
summarized and stated, "borrowing concepts and models from the social
and behavioral sciences does not provide useful (educational) theory"
While the previous ideas may have provided an explanation for the considerable differences existing in the data, again, the focus of the study was profile development. The development of the profile did not necessitate a significant need for data agreement between the presidents, subordinates, and the presidents and subordinates, nor did the data gathered in this study need to agree with the standardized data put together by Hall and Hawker for the "ideal profile." The lack of agreement in comparison is mentioned only as a point of interest.

Successful Community College President's Power Management Profile

As previously indicated, the power profile of successful community college presidents as depicted by Hall and Hawker's PMP and PMI was visually displayed in figure 26. The figure presented the scores of the presidents' power motives as viewed by the presidents and as viewed by his subordinates. Also shown was the subordinate morale index and the presidents' and subordinates' power style.

From the data gathered during this research the following factually described, in narrative form, the successful community college president's power profile. The president was male and held a doctorate with an emphasis in Higher Education. He was in his mid-fifties, had served for 16 years as a community college president and held his current post for almost eleven years. He was relatively satisfied with his role as chief executive officer of an institution with an enrollment in excess of five thousand students in that he desired to continue to hold the position of president in the foreseeable future.
The successful community college president used charismatic and expert power on a daily basis and had never, or, only a few times during his career, used coercive, reward, and legitimate power. His power came from legitimate, expert and charismatic sources. The president felt that it was very critical to have and use power in order to be successful and that the amount of power he currently possessed was the "right amount." The president saw his strongest power motive split between McClelland and Burnham's Personalized (53 percentile) and Affiliative (53 percentile) Power Motives, with his power style being in the socialized power range (.56) where he effectively used a democratic, coaching management style of "joint-determination." As determined by the presidents' subordinates, the president was considerably more powerful than the other presidents for which they had worked. The president's power motive was evenly split between the Socialized and Personalized Power Motive, and his operationalized power style was in the affiliative range (Figure 26), and the majority of the subordinates' morale was in the excellent category (Figure 24).

Summary

This chapter presented the data gathered during the research in visual and narrative form. Presented was an introduction; biographical data; presidential power use according to French and Raven's typology; a discussion of the power theories that provided the basis of the study and the data as it related to those theories; interpretation of the presidents' power profile, based on their strongest power motive; data interpretation and analyzation; and the successful community college
The results of the interpretation of data indicated a real disparity in views among the presidents, among the subordinates, and between the presidents and subordinates. The resultant power management profile of the president did not fit Hall and Hawker's "ideal manager;" however, the intent of the study was not to compare the results of the research with businesses' "ideal." The intent was to discover and present a profile of successful community college presidents. This was done using the data gathered through the presentation of individual, group, and total group profiles. Appropriate explanations of the profiles was provided, as were possible reasons for the disparity in the profiles and the differences between the "ideal" profile developed by Hall and Hawker in a business environment and the power management profile that resulted from the data provided by successful community college presidents and their subordinates.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

To examine the study's problem, (what was the personal power management profile of selected successful community college presidents) a thorough review of the literature was conducted, a sample selected, surveyed, and the resulting data tabulated. Following data tabulation the data was presented and analyzed. The purpose of this chapter was to provide a summary, conclusions and present recommendations for further study.

The research used the theories of McClelland and Burnham, Hall and Hawker, and Blake and Mouton as the support upon which the investigation was based. The three sets of theorists had theorized about power motive and style and its implication for the "good or ideal" manager. McClelland and Burnham's work stated that the good manager was one that desired to have impact and influence for the good of the organization. A manager that desired and used his power in this way had a socialized power motive. A manager that desired influence for personal achievement had a personalized power motive. Finally, a manager that had a greater desire to be liked than to have influence was labeled as having an affiliative power motive (Hall and Hawker Interpreting 1981).

Hall and Hawker indicated that Blake and Mouton's Power Spectrum
portrayed the power style or action of the individual's power motive. Their scale indicated the manner in which a manager shared or distributed his power with his subordinate. Hall and Hawker developed test instruments, the **Power Management Inventory (PMI)**, and the **Power Management Profile (PMP)**, scoring instructions and graphs that depicted the manager's motive, style and the subordinate's morale. The manager and subordinates' perceptions were used to arrive at the profiles' motive and style, and the subordinates' perception, were used to arrive at the morale score (Hall and Hawker **Power Management Profile**, 1981).

Utilizing the above theories and test instruments, successful community college presidents, as identified by an expert panel and three of their subordinates, were surveyed. The data resulting from those queries showed considerable variance in perceptions. The end result did not match the projections of the theorists. The successful community college presidents did not fit the conjectured "ideal." Their strongest motive, as viewed by themselves, was evenly split between the personalized motive and affiliative motive. The socialized motive was a close third. Their power style was strongly a socialized, democratic, coaching management style.

The subordinates of the successful presidents viewed their president as having their strongest motives as tied between personalized and socialized power motives. Unlike the presidents, the subordinates saw their presidents' power style tending to be toward the affiliative, laissez faire end of the power spectrum. In spite of the theorists' assumption that a manager's power motive and style must be consistent in order to have good subordinate morale, the subordinates rated their morale as being high on the end of the "good" range on Hall and Hawker's
Morale Index without the assumed consistency.

Individual, allied groups, and total group profiles were developed and presented. Differences in perception, and differences between the data gathered and the "ideal" characterized the profiles. However, the intent of the study was not to compare what was discovered with the ideal; rather, it was to simply develop a power management profile of successful community college presidents. The developed graphic profile was exhibited in figure 26.

It was discovered that the successful community college president was a male in his mid-fifties, held a doctorate with an emphasis in Higher Education, and had sixteen years experience as a community college president. He was satisfied with his role as chief executive officer to the extent that he wanted to remain in that role for at least the next ten years. The president used charismatic and expert power on a daily basis to manage his institution that had an enrollment in excess of five thousand students. Never, or only a few times during his career had he used coercive, reward or legitimate power. His identified power sources were legitimate, expert and charismatic power. The power held was, in his opinion and in the opinion of his subordinates, the "right amount." He viewed power as being critical to have and use in order to be successful. He was, as determined by his subordinates, considerably more powerful than other presidents for which they had worked.

Conclusions

The study reinforced the idea that power was, indeed, part of society and a vehicle by which action was caused. Power, in higher
education management and in community colleges in particular, was evidenced by the research and review of the literature. As a real force and as indicated by the presidents and their subordinates, power was deemed as "very critical" to the success of the president. From the literature reviewed it was apparent that power can be developed and was needed for effectiveness. Fisher proposed that charismatic power was the most influential power source a president could have and that, from this power base, a president more effectively used the other forms of power that were identified by French and Raven (Fisher 1984).

McClelland and Burnham, and Hall and Hawker's theories regarding power may be valid in the business world but need modification for the unique world of higher education. The theory of socialized, personalized, and affiliative power motives and the concept of consistency between power motive and style were fine as the "ideal;" however, the reality of the limited data and analysis provided through this study indicated that business management theory and reality in higher education do not necessarily match. Tradition, the authority of the faculty, the highly educated and specialized nature of the faculty, the dispersion and diffused decision making process in higher education, termed collegiality, all supported the notion that management practice in business and higher education differed one from the other (Hoy 1982).

The concept of socialized power required further study, as this study's sample size may have provided a distorted picture. One would have assumed that the executive leaders of the "people's college" would have had a strong socialized power motive due to the unique nature and role of their institution. This assumption required further invest-
igation, as no conclusive evidence was discovered. It was discovered that though there were inconsistencies and the president's motives did not appear as the projected socialized "ideal," the presidents viewed the operationalization of their power (power style) as being socialized, coaching, democratic in nature.

The results of the data analysis produced little conclusive evidence regarding the problem, other than the power management profile. It was apparent that the sample was a group that held and used power, and that presidents were perceived as having power. Also indicated was the idea that morale based on Hall and Hawker's Morale Index, was relatively high and that subordinates were generally well satisfied with how, and how much power was used by the presidents in running their organizations. This conclusion contrasted with Hall and Hawker's declaration regarding the positive relationship between morale and consistent use of power motive and power style.

There was no consistent single prevalent perspective of the president's power motive and style. Presidents' views differed one from another, subordinates' views differed one from another, presidents and subordinates' views differed one from another. And yet, in spite of the inconsistency of the data, each of the presidents had been viewed as being successful. Regardless of power motive and power style each president in the sample had been selected by an expert panel based on their individual success in their profession. Based on the study it would seem that a president can be successful regardless of his power motive and style. In fact the study showed that presidential power and success had very little to do with each other. It was shown that a president could be successful regardless of the degree of consistency
between his power motive and power style.

Recommendations For Further Study

One of the difficulties in analyzing the study's results was having additional and similar studies to which the problem and data results could be compared. It was recommended that the following types of studies be conducted to establish a broader base from which additional research can result.

First was the need to validate and standardize Hall and Hawker's test instruments in a variety of educational settings. A number of settings were recommended as educational management seemed to vary from environment to environment within education; elementary to secondary, secondary to higher education, as much as educational management varies from business management. Even between entities in higher education, community colleges and universities, the management environment was unique enough to warrant independent studies, validation, and standardization.

It would also be appropriate to replicate this study, using inferential statistics, with a much larger sample of successful community college presidents, or to develop power profiles of a random sample of community college presidents.

Finally, studies directed at the development of power profiles of those successful in business need to be developed. With accurate profiles developed of those in educational leadership and of those in business, additional studies could then be conducted to ascertain profile similarities, or differences between those leaders.
Power is dynamic and its role in society is only now being addressed. In light of eroding personal and positional power, additional studies on power and leadership need to be conducted to determine what existed, what was needed, and how power was developed, achieved, and used. This study was a first attempt to examine and develop power profiles of successful community college presidents and was intended to be used as a small foundation on which future studies might build.
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Letter Supporting Need For Study - Susan Donnell
February 26, 1987

Mr. Veldon Law
Clark County Community College
3200 East Cheyenne Avenue
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89030

Dear Mr. Law,

We are pleased to grant your request for a special research price of $1.00 per copy for 40 Power Management Inventories and 120 Power Management Profiles, and they are on their way to you under separate cover. In return, we ask that you provide us with a copy of your completed dissertation.

I've spoken with Dr. Hawker and he indicated that your research has special merit because little systematic work of its kind has been conducted within educational institutions — most has been done in industry and/or business and we have typically extrapolated from those results to leadership in other kinds of organizations. We would welcome the knowledge of the power profiles of successful college presidents; we feel that the power variable is especially important because it impacts all other areas of human expression.

Best wishes for success in your endeavor — we look forward to seeing your results.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Donnell
Research Associate

SMD
APPENDIX 2

Letter Supporting Need For Study - James Fisher
February 23, 1987

Veldon L. Law
Clark County Community College
3200 East Cheyenne Avenue
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Mr. Law:

I was delighted to learn of your project. I am in complete agreement with its spirit and what you have told me of your design.

I look forward to your study.

Sincerely,

James L. Fisher
APPENDIX 3

Letter Supporting Need For Study - George Vaughan
March 5, 1987

Veldon L. Law
Director of Community Education
Clark County Community College
3200 East Cheyenne Avenue
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Mr. Law:

Thank you for your letter of February 19, 1987, in which you asked that I give my opinion regarding the need for further study on the community college presidency, especially in relationship to the leadership role of the president. I am pleased to offer my views on the need for additional studies on the presidency.

As you are well aware, almost nothing has been written on the community college presidency other than my book devoted to the subject. In those few articles that discuss the two-year presidency, the discussion centers around the role of the president as a manager. Some few articles use the term "leadership," however, if you read the articles the subject is management not leadership. Ironically, the many national reports on higher education tend to ignore presidential leadership in bringing about reform. Kerr's work on the presidency is an obvious exception.

I believe that if we are ever going to understand the community college as an entity and if we are ever going to achieve the full potential for our colleges, we must understand leadership. Moreover, presidents must be educational leaders. We cannot move forward without a better understanding of the presidency in relationship to leadership.

As a starting point, I suggest the following reasons for the need for further study on two-year presidential leadership.

1. Our knowledge of academic leadership remains sketchy, with most research and publications dealing with four-year university presidents. (2) If community colleges are ever to move into the leadership positions in the total scheme of things, the presidents of these institutions must have a greater knowledge of
what leadership means in an academic institution. (3) The community college presidency lacks focus. What are the major functions falling under the presidential umbrella? Most presidents would quickly identify themselves as leaders. What does this mean? Leaders of what? Of whom? Academic leaders? Educational leaders (and what does this mean?)? We simply must have a clearer definition of leadership as it relates to the community college presidency. (4) Finally, presidents are members of the academic profession, the life blood of which is scholarly inquiry. The presidency, and those who fill the position of president, should not—must not—be excluded from the same type of scholarly analysis we afford other aspects of our profession.

I hope my observations are useful. I sincerely believe that no area is more in need of study today than is the presidency, especially the community college presidency. Should you have any questions, please give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

George B. Vaughan
President

GBV: jak
APPENDIX 4

Criteria for a Successful Community College President
CRITERIA FOR A SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENT

The literature provides a multitude of skills and qualities perceived to be important in leading to success as a college president or administrator.

Dr. George Vaughan's book The Community College Presidency cites the following as personal attributes of successful community college presidents: Integrity, Judgment, Courage, concern, Flexibility, Philosophy, Loyalty, Energy Level, Optimism, Excel, Humor, Health, Ambiguity, Intelligence, Social Ease, Curiosity, and Charisma.

The above attributes and the following skills/abilities were identified by Dr. Vaughan in his research. He worked with seventy-five community college presidents that were identified by their peers as successful presidents. The skills/abilities that these presidents indicated were necessary for a successful community college president were: Produce Results, Select People, Resolve Conflict, Communication, Motivate Others, Analyze/Evaluate, Articulation, Relate, Define Problems & Solutions, Take Risks, Delegation, Team Member, Know Community, Manage Information, Independence, Peer Network, and Publications.

Anna Lee Crawford's dissertation findings correlate with Dr. Vaughan's research. Dr. Crawford reviewed the writings of sixty-nine authors to determine skills perceived to lead to success in higher education administration. The literature she reviewed revealed one-hundred and three distinct skills. The top nineteen skills were:

- Ability in administrative techniques and management principles
- Ability to deal with financial matters and budgetary concerns
- Ability to lead
- Ability to demonstrate human relation skills
- Ability to make decisions
- Ability to teach
- Ability to communicate (speaking, writing, and reading)
- Ability to cope with selection, retention and promotion issues
- Ability to produce scholarly works
- Ability to plan
- Ability to have/use power and authority
- Ability to deal with curriculum matters and academic course concerns
- Ability to serve as spokesperson to governing boards & legislative bodies
- Ability to know/demonstrate professional or technical competencies
- Ability to make tenure, hire/fire decisions
- Ability to establish college mission and goals
- Ability to persuade
- Ability to organize
- Demonstrates honesty and integrity
APPENDIX 5

Form to Collect Names of Successful Presidents
Please list the names and the institutions of twenty community college presidents that you consider to be most successful. Return the sheet in the self-addressed and stamped envelope to: Veldon L. Law, Director of Community Education CIT - Clark County Community College - 3200 East Cheyenne Avenue - North Las Vegas, Nevada 89030. PLEASE RETURN BY JUNE 8, 1987.

This sheet has been numbered for data collection purposes only, the respondent will remain anonymous to everyone but the researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Twenty Successful Community College Presidents</th>
<th>The Institution of the Successful President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Power Management Inventory - Survey/Sample Questions
POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY

by
Jay Hall, Ph.D.
James Hawker, Ph.D.

ANOTHER LEARNING INSTRUMENT from

1755 Woodstead Court
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(713) 367-0080
A WORD ABOUT THE POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY

Power — the exertion of influence — is a fact of organizational life. Whenever two or more people convene, the dynamics of interpersonal influence may be expected to emerge rather early in the encounter. The process of management is, in many respects, an exercise in the use of formalized authority and influence. Management in its day-to-day trappings concerns many diverse situations in which the exercise of influence is called for. Solving problems, setting objectives, appraising performance, providing direction — all are managerial tasks and all involve the exercise of power. It is important — for both the manager and those he or she manages — to understand as well as possible the dynamics of interpersonal influence and the role one plays in setting these in motion.

The Power Management Inventory is designed to assess a manager's characteristic management of influence dynamics: that is, how a given manager prefers to handle situations calling for the exercise of power and authority. More to the point, the inventory is designed to give you some information about yourself regarding the methods and reasons which most characterize your handling of power situations. There are no "wrong" responses. The best response to any item is simply the one which best reflects your practices, your feelings, and your preferences in the several work situations described.

INSTRUCTIONS

The Inventory is presented in two parts. Part One addresses a wide range of specific issues of concern to a manager. Your preferred or, perhaps, typical way of handling each of these will be surveyed according to the format explained below. Part Two addresses the decision structure which most characterizes your transactions with others. Part Two will be explained at the time it appears in the Inventory. Please read the format for Part One and proceed accordingly.

Part One Format

Three response modes — A, B and C — are assessed in the Inventory, two at a time. For each inventory item you are requested to indicate which of two alternative reactions would be most characteristic of you. Some alternatives may be equally characteristic of you or equally uncharacteristic. While this is a distinct possibility, nevertheless choose the alternative which is relatively more characteristic of you. For each item, you will have five points that you may distribute between each pair of alternatives. For example, A and B types could be rated in any of the following combinations:

1. If A is completely characteristic of your feelings and B is completely uncharacteristic, write a "5" on your test sheet under A and a "0" under B, thus:

   A 5
   B 0

2. If A is considerably characteristic of your feelings and B is somewhat characteristic, write a "4" on your test sheet under A and a "1" under B, thus:

   A 4
   B 1

3. If A is only slightly more characteristic of your feelings than B is, write a "3" on your test sheet under A and a "2" under B, thus:

   A 3
   B 2

4. Each of the above three combinations may be used in the converse order: that is, for example, should you feel B is slightly more characteristic of your feelings than A, write a "2" on your test sheet under A and a "3" under B, thus:

   A 2
   B 3

and so on for A=1, B=4, or A=0, B=5.

Thus, there are six possible combinations for responding to the pair of alternatives presented to you with each inventory item. USE ONLY WHOLE NUMBERS. BE SURE THE NUMBERS YOU ASSIGN TO EACH PAIR SUM TO EQUAL 5. In general, try to relate each situation in the inventory to your own personal feelings. Take as much time as you need to make a true and accurate response. There is no time limit. Remember, THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER. Attempts to give a "correct" response merely distort the meaning of your answers and render the test results valueless as a tool for personal learning.

Copyright 1981, Jay Hall and James Hawker
Published by Telemetrics Inc.

This inventory is copyrighted. The reproduction of any part of it by mimeograph, photostat, or by any other means, whether the reproductions are sold or furnished free, is a violation of the copyright law.
PART ONE

Following are several situations commonly encountered or considered by people such as yourself in managerial positions. Please read each carefully along with the two alternatives presented as possible ways of responding. Indicate your choices among alternatives in the spaces provided according to the format explained in the Instructions. Take as much time as you need for a thoughtful and honest response.

1. In setting goals and identifying objectives, my major concern is:
   C. That the individual needs and capabilities of my people are well met and utilized.
   OR
   A. That the goals and objectives we aspire to are high enough to stretch and challenge all of us.

2. In delegating authority to others, I am most mindful that:
   A. Authority should be commensurate with responsibility such that people can discharge their duties and be held accountable in a fair manner.
   OR
   C. The delegation of authority is a delicate matter which must be done in such a way that no one feels they are simply being asked to do more work.

3. When people come to me with problems, I prefer to:
   B. Act more as a consultant or coach and let people struggle with the problem until, perhaps with my help, they can begin to see their various alternatives more clearly.
   OR
   C. Let people know that I care and am willing to do whatever I can to help them through their dilemma.
APPENDIX 7

Power Management Profile - Survey/Sample Questions
POWER MANAGEMENT PROFILE

by
Jay Hall, Ph.D.
James Hawker, Ph.D.

ANOTHER LEARNING INSTRUMENT from

TELEOMETRICS INT'L.

1755 Woodside Court
The Woodlands, Texas 77380
(713) 367-0060
A WORD ABOUT THE POWER MANAGEMENT PROFILE

Power — the exertion of influence — is a fact of organizational life. Whenever two or more people converse, the dynamics of interpersonal influence may be expected to emerge rather early in the encounter. The process of management, in many respects, is an exercise in the use of formalized authority and influence. Management in its day-to-day trappings concerns many diverse situations in which the exercise is called for. Solving problems, setting objectives, appraising performance, providing direction — all are managerial tasks and all involve the exercise of power. It is important — for both the manager and those he or she manages — to understand as well as possible the dynamics of interpersonal influence and the role one plays in setting these in motion. You are in a unique position to provide information for your manager about the manner in which he or she handles this important facet of manager-subordinate transactions.

The Power Management Profile is designed to assess a manager’s characteristic management of influence dynamics; that is, how you have observed your manager handling situations calling for the exercise of power and authority. More to the point, the profile is designed to give you an opportunity to assess the methods and reasons which most characterize your manager’s handling of power situations. There are no “right” or “wrong” responses. The best response to any item is simply the one which best reflects your observations of your manager in the several work situations described.

INSTRUCTIONS

The Profile is presented in three parts. Part One addresses a wide range of specific issues of concern to a manager’s subordinates. Your assessment of your manager’s preferred or, perhaps, typical way of handling each of these will be surveyed according to the format explained below. Part Two addresses the decision structure which most characterizes your manager’s transactions with you and others and Part Three addresses your feelings about all the former. Parts Two and Three will be explained at the time they appear in the Profile. Please read the format for Part One and proceed accordingly.

Part One Format

Three response modes — A, B and C — are assessed in the Profile, two at a time. For each profile item you are requested to indicate which of two alternative reactions would be most characteristic of your manager. Some alternatives may be equally characteristic of your manager or equally uncharacteristic. While this is a distinct possibility, nevertheless choose the alternative which is relatively more characteristic of the person you are rating. For each item, you will have five points that you may distribute between each pair of alternatives. For example, A and B types could be rated in any of the following combinations:

1. If A is completely characteristic of your manager’s practices and B is completely uncharacteristic, write a “5” on your test sheet under A and a “0” under B, thus:

   A   B
   5   0

2. If A is considerably characteristic of your manager’s practices and B is somewhat characteristic, write a “4” on your test sheet under A and a “1” under B, thus:

   A   B
   4   1

3. If A is only slightly more characteristic of your manager’s practices than B is, write a “3” on your test sheet under A and a “2” under B, thus:

   A   B
   3   2

4. Each of the above three combinations may be used in the converse order: that is, for example, should you feel B is slightly more characteristic of your manager’s practices than A, write a “2” on your test sheet under A and a “3” under B, thus:

   A   B
   2   3

and so on for A=1, B=4, or A=0, B=5.

Thus, there are six possible combinations for responding to the pair of alternatives presented to you with each inventory item. USE ONLY WHOLE NUMBERS. BE SURE THE NUMBERS YOU ASSIGN TO EACH PAIR SUM TO EQUAL 5. In general, try to relate each situation in the inventory to your own personal feelings. Take as much time as you need to make a true and accurate response. There is no time limit. Remember, THERE IS NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWER. Attempts to give a “correct” response merely distort the meaning of your answers and render the test results valueless as a tool for personal learning.

Copyright © 1968. Jay Hall and James Hawker
Published by Telemetrics Inc.

This inventory is copyrighted. The reproduction of any part of it by mimeograph, photostat, or by any other means, whether the reproductions are sold or furnished free, is a violation of the copyright law.
PART ONE

Following are several situations commonly encountered or considered by people such as yourself in encounters with their managers. You are in a prime position to reflect your observations of your manager's characteristic practices. Please read each of the following items carefully along with the two alternatives presented as possible ways of responding. Indicate your estimate of your manager's practices from the alternatives in the spaces provided according to the format explained in the Instructions. Take as much time as you need for a thoughtful and honest response. By answering honestly, you can provide your manager with invaluable information.

1. In setting goals and identifying objectives for us, my manager's major concern is:
   C. That our individual needs and capabilities are well met and utilized.
   OR
   A. That the goals and objectives we aspire to are high enough to stretch and challenge all of us.

2. In delegating authority to us, my manager is most mindful that:
   A. Authority should be commensurate with responsibility such that people can discharge their duties and be held accountable in a fair manner.
   OR
   C. The delegation of authority is a delicate matter which must be done in such a way that no one feels they are simply being asked to do more work.

3. When I go to my manager with problems, he or she prefers to:
   B. Act more as a consultant or coach and let me struggle with the problem until, perhaps with my manager's help, I can begin to see my various alternatives more clearly.
   OR
   C. Let me know that someone cares and is willing to do whatever possible to help me through my dilemma.
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President's Biographical Survey
PRESIDENT'S QUESTIONNAIRE

#### Numbering of the survey is for data collection purposes only; the respondent will remain anonymous to everyone but the researcher!

**BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:**

As appropriate please check ( ) only one response to each question, or fill in the information requested by each question. This should take approximately five minutes. Thank you.

- **Age**
- **Sex:** Male Female
- **Highest degree earned:**
  - **Area of Emphasis**
- **From (Institution):**
- **Years in current position:**
- **Size of your institution (Credit head count unduplicated):**
- **Career position desired in 10 years:**
  - President
  - Private Business
  - Teaching (community college)
  - Teaching (university)
  - Retired
  - Other:
  - **Number of years as a president of a community college:**

**POWER DATA:**

- **How often have you used reward (ability to reward to gain compliance) power:**
  - Daily
  - Weekly
  - Monthly
  - Yearly
  - A few times in my career
  - Never in my career

- **How often have you used coercive (threats, punishment to gain compliance) power:**
  - Daily
  - Weekly
  - Monthly
  - Yearly
  - A few times in my career
  - Never in my career

- **How often have you used expert (knowledge, skill) power:**
  - Daily
  - Weekly
  - Monthly
  - Yearly
  - A few times in my career
  - Never in my career

- **How often have you used legitimate (legal power, follower sanctioned) power:**
  - Daily
  - Weekly
  - Monthly
  - Yearly
  - A few times in my career
  - Never in my career

- **How often have you used charismatic (personal characteristics or attributes) power:**
  - Daily
  - Weekly
  - Monthly
  - Yearly
  - A few times in my career
  - Never in my career

- **In your position as president how critical is having and using power in order to be successful:**
  - Very critical
  - Somewhat critical
  - Moderately critical
  - Of little value
  - Of no value

- **As president do you have:**
  - Too much power
  - A little more power than is needed
  - The right amount of power
  - Feel more power is needed
  - Not nearly enough power

- **From where does most of your power tend to come:**
  - Reward
  - Coercive
  - Legitimate
  - Expert
  - Charismatic

******************************************************************************

Name and title of the individuals that report directly to you that are responsible for:

**NAME:**

**TITLE:**

Please return the results of my individual power motivation and power style profile **yes** **no**
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Subordinate's Biographical Survey
QUESTIONNAIRE

Numbering of the survey is for data collection purposes only; the respondent will remain anonymous to everyone but the researcher!

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:

As appropriate please check ( ) only one response to each question, or fill in the information requested by each question. This should take approximately five minutes. Thank you.

Age: ______ Sex: ______ Male  ______ Female  ______

Highest degree earned: ______ Area of Emphasis: ___________________________

From (Institution): ___________________ Years in current position: ______

Size of your institution (Credit head count unduplicated): ___________________

Career position desired in 10 years: □ President □ Private Business □ Teaching (community college) □ Teaching (university) □ Retired □ Other: __________________________

POWER DATA:

How often does your president use reward (ability to reward to gain compliance) power: ______ daily ______ weekly ______ monthly ______ yearly

I've observed a few times ______ I've never observed him/her using this power

How often does your president use coercive (threats, punishment to gain compliance) power: ______ daily ______ weekly ______ monthly ______ yearly

I've observed a few times ______ I've never observed him/her using this power

How often does your president use expert (knowledge, skill) power: ______ daily ______ weekly ______ monthly ______ yearly

I've observed a few times ______ I've never observed him/her using this power

How often does your president use legitimate (legal power, follower sanctioned) power: ______ daily ______ weekly ______ monthly ______ yearly

I've observed a few times ______ I've never observed him/her using this power

In your opinion how critical is it for your president to have and use power in order to be successful: ______ very critical ______ somewhat critical ______ moderately critical ______ of little value ______ of no value

Does your president have: ______ too much power ______ a little more power than is needed ______ the right amount of power ______ feel he/she needs more power ______ not nearly enough power

From where does most of your president's power tend to come: ______ reward ______ coercive ______ legitimate ______ expert ______ charismatic

Number of other community college presidents for which I have worked: ______

In comparison with other community college presidents for which I've worked this president is: ______ considerably more powerful ______ a little more powerful ______ as powerful ______ a little less powerful ______ considerably less powerful
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Letter to the Chair of AACJC's President's Academy
February 14, 1987

Dear : 

This letter is to request your assistance as the Chair of the Executive Committee of the President's Academy. I am hoping that you can act in my behalf and persuade your committee to act as an expert panel in a research project in which I am engaged.

My name is Veldon Law. I am the Director of Clark County Community College's Community Education Division and a doctorate student in Higher Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. After considerable work and deliberation my advisor and I have decided on a topic for my dissertation. The title of the study is "Power Motivation and Power Style of Selected Successful Community College Presidents." I will base my research on George Vaughn's book, The Community College Presidency, James Fisher's work, Power and the Presidency, David McClelland and David Burnham's theory of power motivation and use Jay Hall and James Hawker's power profile instruments to arrive at a power profile of selected successful community college presidents.

It is my hope that the executive committee of the President's Academy can see their way clear to act as my expert panel and individually submit to me the names of twenty community college presidents they feel are successful presidents. These names would be submitted and based solely on the impressions of the members of the expert panel. As a help I will provide a list of personal and skill qualities that have been identified in the literature as being characteristic of successful presidents.

The twenty presidents that are mentioned the most will be invited to participate in the study. Should the identified presidents agree they will be mailed a copy of Hall and Hawker's Power Management Inventory. Three of their subordinates will also be asked to complete Hall and Hawker's Power Management Profile. A power profile as viewed by the presidents and a separate power profile as viewed by the subordinates will be the end result of the study. Naturally, all responses will be held in strict confidence.

With leadership and influence so closely related and the continuing cry for leadership I feel this study has great promise. I hope you and your committee will feel the same and be able to support me in these efforts. Should you be able to respond to this request in the affirmative I will contact your committee members individually.
Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Should you have questions please feel free to call me at 702-643-6060 extension 200. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Veldon L. Law, Director

cc: Dr. Dale Parnell
    Connie Odems
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Sample Letter to Executive Members of the President's Academy Requesting Them to Act as the Expert Panel
March 19, 1987

Dear :

Following a discussion with has agreed to place on your Dallas AACJC committee meeting agenda my request to have the members of your executive committee serve as an expert panel for my doctoral dissertation.

Attached is a copy of my letter to which outlines my request and the assistance which I am seeking from you and the other members of your committee. It is my hope that you will be able to support this request. If you are, be certain that I will do everything possible to protect the confidentiality of the presidents who are identified as successful and who ultimately agree to participate in the study. The individual power profiles that result from my work will be held in strict confidence.

Naturally, I am enthused about the project and feel it has great potential. I've shared my plans with the theorists and writers mentioned in my letter to and they have been supportive of the study's spirit and intent. It is my hope that after your review of my plans, you will feel the same.

I would be pleased to answer any questions or clarify any points that may seem unclear. Feel free to call me at (702) 643-6060 ext. 200 if I can help in this regard. I will also be in Dallas from the 22nd through the 25th should you care to meet with me individually or as a group.

I appreciate your time and consideration of my request and look forward to a positive response.

Sincerely,

Veldon L. Law
Director
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Sample Letter of Instructions to Expert Panel
May 20, 1987

Dear : 

Thank you so much for your recent support of my request to serve with the other members of AACJC's President's Academy Executive Committee as the expert panel for my doctoral dissertation. As a member of the executive committee you'll recall that the expert panel is to individually identify twenty successful community college presidents. The twenty presidents that each of you, the executive committee members, identify will be tabulated so that the twenty most frequently mentioned will become the sample population with which my research will deal. My dissertation will focus on the development of a power profile for successful community college presidents.

As I gather from you the names and institutions of the presidents you feel are most successful let me again assure you that the names submitted, and the presidents who actually become the sample population, will remain anonymous. The individual power profiles that result from my work will be held in strict confidence.

Enclosed you will find two sheets of paper. The first sheet provides criteria that you may want to consider as a reference in identifying the twenty successful presidents. The second sheet is the sheet on which you will list the names and institutions of the twenty community college presidents you consider successful. After you fill in the twenty names and institutions please return this sheet to me in the self-addressed and stamped envelope. I am hoping to receive your response by June 8. If you run into any difficulties or need further explanation please give me a call at 702-643-6060 ext. 200.

I greatly appreciate you taking time from your busy schedule to assist me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Veldon L. Law
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Letter Sent to Study's Successful Community College Presidents
July 29, 1987

Dear

My name is Veldon Law. I am working on my doctoral dissertation and developing a power motivation and power profile of successful community college presidents. You have been identified by an expert panel, comprised of AACJC's Presidents Academy's Executive Committee, as being one of the twenty successful presidents with which they recommend my study deal.

I am certain that you receive numerous requests to participate in various studies. It is my hope that this is one that you will feel is worthy of your valuable time and participation. Your commitment to assist me would be greatly appreciated as it will require approximately 40 minutes of your time to complete and return the enclosed test instruments. It will also require 45 minutes of time from three of your staff members.

Enclosed you will find a "President's Questionnaire" form, the test instrument, "Power Management Inventory," instructions for completing the surveys, and a pre-stamped return envelope. Upon completion of the surveys please return them both to me in the envelope provided. If I haven't received your instruments by August 15th I will call you to see if I can be of any assistance.

I believe it extremely important for you to know that the information you provide will be held in strict confidence. My study will not identify individual presidents or in any way associate you with the study. The numbering of the surveys is for data collection purposes only; you and your profile will remain anonymous to everyone but myself.

You'll note that on the "President's Questionnaire" form I've requested each of the 20 presidents in my study to provide the names and titles of three of their staff members that report directly to them and are responsible for the institutional services of instruction, student services, business services. The design of the study calls for these individuals to provide their perceptions of their president's power motivation and style. The subordinates will complete survey instruments similar to their president's. They, too, will have the understanding that their responses will be held in strict confidence. Would you please alert your staff members of their forthcoming questionnaire and request that they participate in the study. Any help you can give would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance and I look forward to receiving your materials and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me at Clark County Community College (702-643-6060) or my home (702-456-1625).

Sincerely,

Veldon L. Law
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Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Subordinates
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation

Presidents
Mean 59.667
S.D. 4.885
Subordinates
Mean 40.923
S.D. 17.661

President's Perception of
His Power Style
Subordinate's Perception Of His
President's Power Style

Perceived Power Motive
Percentile Scores of Presidents with Personalized
Power Motivation and Their Subordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personalized Motive</th>
<th>Socialized Motive</th>
<th>Affiliative Motive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Raw Score</td>
<td>114.667</td>
<td>108.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>20.656</td>
<td>19.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>67.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.312</td>
<td>10.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.136</td>
<td>22.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subordinates Perception Of Their President N = 13
President's Perception N = 6

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Personalized Power
Motivation and Their Subordinates
Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Deans Of Instruction
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation

President's Perception of His Power Style

Business Manager's Perception of His President's Power Style

Perceived Power Motive
Percentile Scores of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Business Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motive</th>
<th>Business Manager's Perception</th>
<th>President's Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personalized</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialized</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Raw Score

- Personalized: 114.667, 109
- Socialized: 121, 106.25
- Affiliative: 64, 84.750

S.D.

- Personalized: 20.656, 31.284
- Socialized: 13.312, 10.112
- Affiliative: 10.733, 24.350

Subordinate Morale Index

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Business Manager
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation

President's Perception of His Power Style
Dean Of Student's Perception of His President's Power Style

Percentile Scores of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Dean Of Students

Perceived Power Motive
Mean Raw Score 114.667 99.667
S.D. 20.656 2.082

Mean 59.667
S.D. 4.885
Mean 38.333
S.D. 9.815

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Personalized Power Motivation and Their Dean Of Students
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Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation and Their Subordinates
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation

President's Perception of His Power Style
Subordinate's Perception of His President's Power Style

Subordinate Morale Index

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation and Their Subordinates
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation

President's Perception of His Power Style
Dean Of Instruction's Perception of His President's Power Style

Perceived Power Motive Percentile Scores of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motive and Their Dean Of Instruction

Subordinate Morale Index

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation and Their Subordinates
Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation and Their Business Manager
Perceived Power Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation

President's Perception of His Power Style
Dean Of Student's Perception of His President's Power Style

Perceived Power Motive
Percentile Scores of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motive and Their Dean Of Students

Power Motive and Style of Presidents with Affiliative Power Motivation and Their Subordinates
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Individual President and Subordinate Perceptions of Power
Motive and Style
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Percentile

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinates Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #1
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #2
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #4
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #5
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Morale Index

Excellent

I - 30

Good

Fair

Poor

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #6
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Morale Index

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

B - 13

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Personalized Motive

Socialized Motive

Affiliative Motive

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #7

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Percentile
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/0</th>
<th>9/1</th>
<th>8/2</th>
<th>7/3</th>
<th>6/4</th>
<th>5/5</th>
<th>4/6</th>
<th>3/7</th>
<th>2/8</th>
<th>1/9</th>
<th>0/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Percentile
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Personalized Motive

Socialized Motive

Affiliative Motive

Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons

President #8

Dean Of Students

Business Manager

President

Dean Of Instruction
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #10
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

![Bar Chart: President's Perceived Power Style](chart)

- P: President
- B: Business Manager
- S: Subordinate

Percentile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Personalized Motive</th>
<th>Socialized Motive</th>
<th>Affiliative Motive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morale Index

- Excellent: 35
- Good: 31
- Fair: 29
- Poor: 27
- B - 25

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #11
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Morale Index
- Excellent
- I - 31
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Percentile
- 100
- 90
- 80
- 70
- 60
- 50
- 40
- 30
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- 10
- 0

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Personalized Motive
- President
- Business Manager
- Dean Of Instruction
- Dean Of Students

Socialized Motive

Affiliative Motive

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #12
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/0</th>
<th>9/1</th>
<th>8/2</th>
<th>7/3</th>
<th>6/4</th>
<th>5/5</th>
<th>4/6</th>
<th>3/7</th>
<th>2/8</th>
<th>1/9</th>
<th>0/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

- Personalized Motive
  - President: 65
  - Business Manager: 38
  - Dean Of Instruction: 23
  - Dean Of Students: 3

- Socialized Motive
  - President: 86
  - Business Manager: 3
  - Dean Of Instruction: 1
  - Dean Of Students: 32

- Affiliative Motive
  - President: 62
  - Business Manager: 1
  - Dean Of Instruction: 20
  - Dean Of Students: 3

Morale Index

- Excellent: S - 33
- I - 30
- Good
- Fair
- Poor: B - 16

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #13
Individual President's Perceived Power Style Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual President's Power Motive Compared With Subordinate's Perception

Individual Presidents and Subordinate Comparisons
President #15
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