

POWER STRATEGIES IN ORGANIZATIONS Communication Techniques and Messages

VIRGINIA P. RICHMOND
LEONARD M. DAVIS
KITTY SAYLOR
JAMES C. McCROSKEY
West Virginia University

Two studies examined subordinate perceptions of their own and their supervisors' use of behavior alteration techniques and the relationships between such use and subordinate satisfaction. The results indicated that subordinates seldom use most of the techniques in their interactions with their supervisors, but when they do they favor use of Expert and Self-Esteem approaches. Supervisors were found to use most frequently the techniques labeled Expert, Self-Esteem, Reward from Behavior, Legitimate-Higher Authority, and Personal Responsibility. Strong, positive relationships between supervisor and subordinate use of the individual techniques studied were obtained, suggesting a possible modeling effect within the organization. Almost all of the significant correlations between use of individual techniques and subordinate satisfaction with supervision were negative, suggesting the possibility that increased attempts at behavioral alteration stem from subordinate dissatisfaction or lead to that dissatisfaction.

Supervisory style, leadership style, management communication style, and the ability to control others have been emphasized by many leading researchers in both the management and communication fields (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Bowers & Seashore, 1966; Gibb, 1961; Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973; Kipnis & Lane, 1962; Likert, 1967; Riccillo & Trenholm, 1983; Richmond, McCroskey, Davis & Koontz, 1980;

Virginia P. Richmond (Ph.D., University of Nebraska—Lincoln, 1977) is an associate professor of speech communication at West Virginia University. *Leonard M. Davis* (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1958) is a professor of speech communication at West Virginia University. *Kitty Saylor* (M. A., West Virginia University, 1983) is a doctoral candidate at the University of Maryland. *James C. McCroskey* (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) is a professor and chair of speech communication at West Virginia University.

Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; Richmond, Wagner, & McCroskey, 1983; and Student, 1968). Most of the scholars have concluded that a significant component of effective leadership is the use of power by the leader (Gibb, 1961; Richmond et al., 1983) and that supervisors depend upon power or influence strategies to shape the behaviors of their subordinates and resolve conflicts. That is, supervisors are responsible for directing, coordinating, and guiding subordinates' activity so that organizational objectives may be reached. Thus, not only the coordination and accomplishment of individual tasks depend upon effective supervisor-subordinate relationships, but the stability and success of the entire organization are affected by them as well. For example, Kipnis and Lane (1962) found that supervisors who lacked confidence in their leadership abilities were less likely to hold face-to-face interactions with the subordinate and were more likely to refer the subordinate to a superior for assistance.

In addition to coordinating and managing subordinates, management of conflict is a supervisory role that involves the communication of conflict resolution strategies. Studies indicate that the confrontation method proposed by Blake and Mouton (1964) is a very desirable one for resolving supervisor-subordinate conflict, but forcing and withdrawal methods tend to be undesirable ways of dealing with supervisor-subordinate conflict (Burke, 1970; Renwick, 1975, 1977).

Zammuto, London, and Rowland (1979) studied the role of gender in conflict resolution, commitment, and their relationship. They concluded that "the relation between commitment and conflict resolution depends on the type of commitment and the sexual composition of the supervisor-subordinate dyad" (p. 231). Howat and London (1980) found that in the supervisor-subordinate relationship, "one person's attributions of another are related to the other's perceptions of conflict frequency" (p. 174). In other words, "supervisors and subordinates perceiving higher conflict frequency tended to be viewed by the other member of the dyad as using force" (p. 174-175).

In a similar vein, researchers have studied the impact of power upon the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) found that externally controlled students in an industrial simulation were more likely to use coercive power with their simulated subordinates, but internally controlled students use less coercion and relied more on personal persuasive powers. Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) developed intraorganizational influence tactics that both supervisors and subordinates can employ when influencing the other. When

respondents were asked which methods they would employ with others in the organization it was found that the respondent's own level in the organization was closely associated with the type of influence tactic. For example, high-status persons tended to use rationality and assertiveness when attempting to influence subordinates or superiors and used sanctions more frequently to influence subordinates. They also found that in larger work units assertiveness, sanctions, and upward appeal were used more when influencing subordinates. Erez and Rim (1982) found results similar to Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson. They concluded, "influence is affected by factors of the organizational contexts such as type of ownership, size, position, number of subordinates" (p. 876). Riccillo and Trenholm (1983) found that the supervisor's perception of the employee's trust impacted the type of power employed. For example, supervisors use less coercive power with employees they trust.

The concern of the present investigation is similar to the concerns of Riccillo and Trenholm. They state, "one of the most important decisions a manager must make in organizations today is that of determining effective communication strategies to influence subordinates" (p. 323). If influence techniques can be determined, then the communication between supervisor-subordinate should be more effective, which in turn would lead to reduced conflict and increased subordinate motivation and satisfaction. With these speculations in mind, these studies were designed to examine the following: (1) subordinates' perceptions of their own use of power, (2) subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' use of power, and (3) the relationships among these perceptions and subordinate satisfaction.

The concept of power and its impact in organizations has interested communication researchers and scholars for decades. In spite of this long-standing interest, however, a universally accepted definition of power has proven elusive (Wheless, Barraclough & Stewart, 1983). Many writers, for example, feel the need to distinguish power from compliance-gaining, social control and influence. It is not in the interest of this research to make such distinctions. Instead, it is recognized that although the definition of power, compliance-gaining, social control and influence differ somewhat, they are not entirely unrelated. That is, they all appear to imply the potential for affecting another person's behavior.

Perhaps the most useful discussions of power are those that have moved away from prescriptive models and toward description in attempts to understand and explain how organizational power is used

and its effects upon the organization. A great deal of this literature, both conceptual and empirical, addresses questions concerning power from an individual perspective, that is, "What are the bases of individual power?" (Blackburn, 1981, p. 127). The work on power by French and Raven (1960), Etzioni (1961), Kelman (1961) and others have attempted to answer the above question.

Several authors have offered different analyses of power (e.g., Parsons, 1963; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978), and attempts have been made to integrate their various categories (e.g., Marwell & Schmitt, 1967) in an effort to show that the different approaches actually deal with the same thing, just using different terminology. Such attempts, however, have been less than satisfying. As Wheelless et al. (1983) maintain, "The forced interfacing of the different schemata simply does not work well; they really are not quite talking about the same things" (p. 124).

Even if it were possible, the usefulness of such an integration is questionable. A more productive approach appears to involve the generation of a class of typologies that will subsume all of the power types previously discussed and ultimately offer a diversity of power strategies to persons in positions of authority and nonauthority. More specifically, the use of power requires communication, and although the typologies described identify power strategies, they typically have not examined specific communication messages which these strategies demonstrate. Thus, as Blackburn (1981) suggests, the taxonomies actually provide individuals with little direction for acquiring and exercising influence.

Following this thinking, Kearney, Plax, Richmond and McCroskey (1983) sought to identify a range and diversity of power strategies or "behavior alteration techniques" (BATs) available for teacher use in the classroom. Categories of BATs were derived inductively through a categorization of statements, or "behavior alteration messages" (BAMs), which were generated by students in response to a question specifically designed to elicit a wide range of messages used to influence, or alter, the behavior of others.¹ Ultimately, eighteen representative BATs, or categories, were derived; each category was best represented by a combination of messages, or BAMs. As was expected, the resulting BATs and representative BAMs overlapped somewhat with previously defined power strategies (e.g., French & Raven, 1960; Etzioni, 1961; Kelman, 1961). In addition, however, several other categories were obtained, thus extending the range and diversity of potential techniques.

Although several of the eighteen BATs included do correspond closely with previously defined power strategies and seem to be somewhat related to one another, correlations among the eighteen BATs confirmed that the categories are best interpreted as eighteen independent strategies (Kearney et al., 1983).² Further uniqueness and value of this instrument resides in the fact that it defines power strategies in terms of the specific communicative messages that represent them, thus providing individuals with direction for identifying the various strategies.

It is important to note that the effectiveness of any power strategy, or BAT, depends not on the agent's behavior itself, but rather, on the target's perceptions of that behavior. Power is evident or enforced only when it is recognized by another individual. Thus, a supervisor's perception of his or her own use of power may not accurately assess the actual power he or she has with subordinates. Instead, it is subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' power that probably provide the more accurate assessment.

It is interesting that the training of supervisors usually involves injecting new or removing old behaviors. The assumption underlying such training programs is that by modifying supervisory behavior, subordinates' perceptions will be modified also, and thus, productivity will be increased. As Richmond et al. (1983) suggest, such a model overlooks the importance of subordinates' perceptions: "It is not the behavior of the supervisor which impacts the outcome, it is the subordinates' perceptions of that behavior" (p. 2).

The use of the term "outcome" is of particular importance to the present studies. Certainly, the outcome that is of utmost importance in many, if not all, organizations is productivity. Productivity, however, is obtained only through the efforts of individuals. Furthermore a number of studies have suggested that the performance of individuals within an organization is directly related to their satisfaction. Thus, the outcome that is of primary importance in these studies is satisfaction.

Although a number of variables operating within the organizational environment have been found to impact employee satisfaction, one significant variable that has received little attention is the use of power. As Richmond et al. (1983) note, whatever source of power an individual chooses to employ, that choice is reflected in the communication behavior of that individual. Thus, power requires communication. In fact, communication may be the most important factor in determining an individual's power. Overwhelmingly, the literature suggests that

communication between supervisor and subordinate has an impact on subordinate satisfaction (Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; Richmond et al., 1983). More accurately, employees' perceptions of the communication behaviors of their supervisors have a significant impact on their satisfaction.

There is a need, however, to examine, in a variety of contexts, the relationships between all organizational members' perceptions of power, and the relationship of these perceptions to members' satisfaction. Researchers, as well as administrators and supervisors, generally have assumed that the supervisor's ability to modify subordinate behavior is more critical than the subordinates' ability to modify the supervisor's behavior. As previously discussed, however, the nature of the influence process is *reciprocal*. Findings from a number of studies have indicated that the behavior of subordinates is an important determinant of a supervisor's behavior. That is, not only do supervisory behaviors produce changes in subordinate behaviors, but subordinate behaviors also cause changes in supervisory style (Podsakoff, 1982). The question, then, naturally emerges as to how subordinates perceive themselves as using power in interactions with their supervisors. Specifically,

Research Question 1: What types of power strategies do subordinates perceive themselves using in interactions with their supervisors?

Although it can be argued that supervisors' perceptions of their power usage may, in fact, be related to subordinate satisfaction, it seems higher and more meaningful associations may be found between subordinates' perceptions of supervisor power and their own satisfaction. That is, supervisor power exists only in so far as subordinates perceive it to exist (Richmond & McCroskey, 1983). If the subordinate perceives his or her supervisor to have a certain type of power, then that supervisor does have that power with that particular subordinate. Thus, before any conclusions can begin to be drawn about the relationship between supervisors' power usage and subordinate satisfaction, it is necessary to address the following question:

Research Question 2: What types of power strategies are perceived by subordinates as being used by their supervisors?

An important feature of any supervisor-subordinate unit is relational control. The individual messages that are transmitted back and forth in supervisor-subordinate interactions are not done so in isolation, but

rather, are done so in relation to one another—what one says has impact on what the other will say next. Thus, it is suggested here that a subordinate's response to a supervisor's attempts to influence the subordinate (through the communication of power) may be related to the subordinate's perceptions of the supervisor's power usage. That is, a subordinate's perceptions of the supervisor's behavior may not only affect his or her level of satisfaction, but may also be the direct precursors of his or her behavior toward his/her supervisor. Therefore,

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage and their perceptions of power strategies used by their supervisors?

As previously mentioned, power is not a concept which pertains solely to formal authority in the organization (i.e., the supervisors). Power is often derived from other variables such as personal qualities and/or situational factors. Most often, however, the initiation of power within organizations is entrusted to a relatively small number of persons. Consequently, many competent individuals may feel excluded from decision-making and problem-solving activities. The perceptions, then, that subordinates have of their own power, as well as their supervisors', may be related to their satisfaction. Therefore,

Research Question 4: How do subordinates' perceptions of their own, as well as their supervisors', use of power relate to their satisfaction?

METHODS

From this point on in the paper we will be referring to Study 1 (Teachers) and Study 2 (Bankers). The methods were basically the same for Study 1 and Study 2. Differences will be noted.

SAMPLE

The sample used in Study 1 consisted of 201 elementary and secondary teachers representing 39 school districts in Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. These teachers participated in the study as a result of being enrolled in a graduate class entitled "Communication in the Educational Organization." The sample was representative of employees who held positions near the bottom of their organization's formal hierarchy.

The sample used in Study 2 consisted of 99 bankers representing the state of Virginia. The sample included employees who held key management positions within their organizations. All subjects were responsible to administrative personnel who held positions near the top of the organization's hierarchy. The bankers participated as a result of being in a managerial workshop conducted by one of the authors.

All subjects' responses in both samples were anonymous. All subjects participated as part of an exercise to assess power strategies given at the beginning of the graduate class and workshop in order to prevent any potential contamination.

MEASUREMENT

The following instruments were employed to measure the variables included in both studies:

Power Strategies. The Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) and Messages (BAMs) instrument developed by Kearney, Plax, Richmond & McCroskey (1983) was employed as a measure of power strategies. The instrument included the 18 unlabeled behavior alteration techniques (BATs) with representative message groupings (BAMs).

This instrument was developed with the understanding that the classroom setting, task-oriented objectives, and teacher accountability would contribute to and mediate the types of control strategies that teachers choose to employ in the classroom. Kearney et al. (1983) identified four conditions that provide sufficient reason why strategies employed in the classroom may be qualitatively different from those employed in noninstructional contexts.

Specifically, Kearney et al. contended the following: (1) teachers may attempt to obtain compliance by praising nondisruptive students and avoiding confrontation with disruptive students. That is, they may employ those strategies that rely on "student audience effects" (p. 10); (2) teachers may choose those strategies which reflect a sense of responsibility, "knowing that desist messages may impact not only the noncomplaint student but also other members of the class" (p. 10); (3) because students are not only expected to learn, but also to like what they learn, the strategies employed by teachers must consider students' affective responses to "on task compliances"; and (4) the strategies teachers choose to employ must be appropriate for use in the classroom.

Taking into account the nature of organizations, it can be reasoned that four very similar conditions exist in organizational contexts. First,

TABLE 1
Behavior Alteration Technique (BATs) and Messages (BAMs)

BATs	BAMs
1. Reward from Behavior	You will enjoy it. You will get a reward if you. It will make you happy. It will help you. You will benefit if you do.
2. Reward from Others	Others will think highly of you if you do. Others will like you if you do. Others will respect you if you do.
3. Punishment from Source	I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you if you don't. I will continue doing bad things to you if you don't.
4. Referent-Model	This is the way I always do it. People who are like me do it. People you respect do it.
5. Legitimate-Higher Authority	Do it, I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. I don't know why, you just have to do it.
6. Guilt	If you don't, others will be hurt. If you don't, others will be unhappy. Others will be harmed if you don't.
7. Reward from Source	I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you if you do. I will continue to reward you if you do.
8. Normative Rules	Everyone else does it. We voted, and the majority rules. Society expects you to do it. All of your friends are doing it.
9. Personal Responsibility	It is your responsibility. It is your obligation. There is no one else that can do it. People are depending on you.
10. Expert	From my experiences, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has worked for me, it should work for you too.
11. Punishment from Behavior	You will lose if you don't. You will be punished if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't.
12. Self-Esteem	You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You are good at it.
13. Debt	You owe me one. It's your turn. You promised to do it. I did it the last time.
14. Personal Relationship-Negative	I will dislike you if you don't. I will lose respect for you if you don't. I will think less of you if you don't.
15. Altruism	If you do this, it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do.

(continued)

TABLE 1 Continued

BATs	BAMs
16. Personal Relationship-Positive	I will like you better if you do. I will respect you if you do. I will think more highly of you if you do. I will appreciate you more if you do.
17. Duty	Your group needs it done. Our group depends on you. Our group will be hurt if you don't.
18. Legitimate-Personal Authority	Because I told you to. Just do it. You have to do it, it's required. You don't have a choice.

since organizational subordinates are most often part of a work unit in which members work together in close proximity, supervisors may find those strategies useful that demonstrate to all employees that those who work efficiently and cooperatively will be rewarded (with praise, respect, money, etc.). Second, it is reasonable to assume that supervisors may attempt to discourage all employees from behaving in a non-compliant manner through their communication with an uncooperative few. Third, the organizational environment is certainly task-oriented and employees are expected to be productive. In addition, employee satisfaction is related to absenteeism and turnover, which, in turn, impact organizational efficiency. Thus, there is a similar concern in organizations for affect. Fourth, supervisors are accountable to administrators and thus, must employ techniques that are acceptable and in accordance with organizational norms, standards, and policies. Therefore, although it may be that teachers' use of power strategies in the classroom are different from those used in friendship, marital dyads, or other such contexts, they may, in fact, be very similar in nature to those available for use in organizational interactions.

Subordinate Satisfaction—Measure 1. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall & Hulin (1969) was employed to measure two dimensions of satisfaction; supervision and work. Previous studies have demonstrated that the JDI is a factorially stable instrument with good reliability (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969; Falcione, McCroskey & Daly, 1977; Hurt & Teigen, 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979). Previously obtained internal reliabilities have been satisfactory (e.g., supervision, .92; work, .80).

Subordinate Satisfaction—Measure 2. The instrument employed to measure subordinate satisfaction with position in general was that developed by Richmond & McCroskey (1979). The instrument is composed of two 7-point bipolar scales. One scale ranges from satisfied to not satisfied, the other ranges from dissatisfied to not dissatisfied. Test-retest reliability procedures revealed an estimated reliability of .92 (Richmond & McCroskey, 1979).

DATA COLLECTION

The subjects in both studies were asked to complete the questionnaire on the first day of the class/workshop in order to prevent any potential contamination from the material presented later. At the time of data collection, none of the subjects had had any previous exposure to the content.

The questionnaire included several sections requesting that subjects provide various types of information. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of eighteen message groupings (see Table 1). The subjects were asked to respond on a 5-point scale, in terms of how frequently they used each of the message groupings to get their supervisor to change his or her behavior (5 = very often, 4 = often, 3 = occasionally, 2 = seldom, 1 = never). Using the same messages (BAMs), the subjects were then asked to indicate how frequently they felt that their supervisor used each grouping of BAMs to get them to change their behavior. The same 5-point scale was used. Next, the subjects were asked to complete the JDI scales for supervision and work by indicating on a 7-point scale the degree to which they agreed that various statements described their supervisor and their work (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neutral or uncertain, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree with the item description). In addition, the subjects were asked to indicate on two 7-point scales, how they felt about their current position (1 = satisfied, 7 = not satisfied on the first scale and 1 = dissatisfied, 7 = not dissatisfied on the second scale).

DATA ANALYSES

In order to determine what types of power strategies subordinates use (Research Question 1) and what types of strategies they perceive their supervisors using (Research Question 2), two criteria were imposed: (1) mean scores for frequency of BAT use must be above 3.0 and (2)

frequency scores for responses 4 and 5 (BAT is used often or very often) must be above 40%.

The relationship between subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage and their perceptions of power strategies used by their supervisors (Research Question 3) was examined by computing Pearson product-moment correlations among the eighteen BATs for subordinate use and perceived supervisor use.

In order to obtain answers to Research Question 4, correlation coefficients were obtained for subordinate use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction and for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction.³

Power for testing the above relationships was .99 for medium and large effect sizes and .30 for small effect sizes (Cohen, 1977).

RESULTS

Preliminary analyses in Study 1 indicated satisfactory internal reliabilities on the supervision and work dimensions of the JDI (supervision, .92; work, .90) and the Richmond and McCroskey (1979) measure of subordinate satisfaction with position, (.93).

Preliminary analyses in Study 2 indicated satisfactory internal reliabilities on the supervision and work dimensions of the JDI (supervision, .96; work, .90) and the Richmond & McCroskey (1979) measure of subordinate satisfaction with position (.87).

Research question one asked: What types of power strategies do subordinates perceive themselves using in interactions with their supervisors?

Based on the criteria of mean scores above 3.0 and frequency scores for responses 4 and 5 (often and very often) above 40%, no BATs were found in Study 1 or 2, which could be described as "frequently" used.

Further analysis of Study 1 and Study 2 indicated which BATs were used least often by subordinates in interactions with their supervisors. The following two criteria were used: (1) mean scores had to be below 3.0 and (2) frequency scores for responses 1 and 2 (never and seldom) had to be above 40%. Based on these criteria, all of the BATs were obtained in both studies with two exceptions: (1) Expert and (2) Self-Esteem. In short, the results of both studies indicated that subordinates seldom use virtually any of the BATs examined in this research (see Table 2).

TABLE 2
Means and Percentages of Use of BATs by Subordinates

Category	Item	Study 1				Study 2			
		\bar{X}	S.D.	Very Often/ Often	Seldom/ Never	\bar{X}	S.D.	Very Often/ Often	Seldom/ Never
Reward from Behavior	1	2.18	1.2	16	63	2.15	1.1	11	66
Reward from Others	2	1.92	1.1	9	72	1.77	1.0	5	76
Punishment from Source	3	1.24	.7	2	92	1.04	.2	0	99
Referent-Model	4	1.97	1.1	10	70	1.88	1.0	8	75
Legitimate-Higher Authority	5	1.73	1.0	8	80	1.58	.9	4	86
Guilt	6	2.13	1.1	11	61	1.77	.9	6	78
Reward from Source	7	1.84	1.1	12	74	1.59	1.0	9	81
Normative Rules	8	2.21	1.1	12	59	1.63	.9	3	82
Expert	10	2.93	1.2	36	35	3.13	1.2	38	23
Punishment from Behavior	11	1.43	.8	2	89	1.41	.8	3	90
Self-Esteem	12	2.81	1.3	32	38	2.92	1.3	37	38
Debt	13	1.82	1.1	8	73	1.76	1.0	6	78
Personal Relationship—Negative	14	1.32	.7	2	92	1.10	.4	0	98
Altruism	15	2.77	1.2	30	41	2.51	1.1	22	51
Personal Relationship—Positive	16	1.96	1.1	11	69	1.80	1.0	6	74
Duty	17	2.44	1.2	21	51	2.31	1.3	21	55
Legitimate-Personal Authority	18	1.44	.9	5	86	1.35	.7	3	93

Research question two asked: What types of power strategies are perceived by subordinates as being used by their supervisors?

Based on the criteria of mean scores above 3.0 and frequency scores for responses 4 and 5 (often and very often) above 40%, 5 BATs were obtained in Study 1: (1) Reward from Behavior, (2) Legitimate-Higher Authority, (3) Personal Responsibility, (4) Expert, and (5) Self-Esteem and 2 BATs were obtained in Study 2: (1) Expert and (2) Self-Esteem.

Further analysis indicated which BATs subordinates perceived their supervisors as using least often. Based on mean scores below 3.0 and frequency scores for responses 1 and 2 (never and seldom) above 40%, 11 BATs were obtained in Study 1: (1) Reward from Others, (2) Punishment from Source, (3) Referent-Model, (4) Guilt, (5) Reward from Source, (6) Normative Rules, (7) Punishment from Behavior, (8) Debt, (9) Personal Relationship-Negative, (10) Personal Relationship-Positive, and (11) Legitimate-Personal Authority. In Study 2, the same 11 BATs met the criteria for minimum usage. In addition, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Altruism, and Duty met the criteria (see Table 3).

Research question three asked: What is the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage and their perceptions of power strategies used by their supervisors?

In order to determine the relationship between subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage and their perceptions of strategies employed by their supervisors, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed among the eighteen BATs for subordinate use and perceived supervisor use in both studies. Table 4 reports the obtained correlations between subordinates' perceptions of their own and their supervisors' use of the eighteen BATs in both studies. All but one of the 36 correlations obtained were significant, with correlations ranging up to .52 in Study 1 and up to .63 in Study 2. Clearly, there are substantial relationships between what subordinates perceive themselves doing and what they perceive their supervisor doing, and all of these relationships are positive.

Research question four asked: How do subordinates' perceptions of their own as well as their supervisors' use of power relate to their satisfaction?

Correlational analysis in Study 1 yielded five significant correlations for subordinate use of BATs and satisfaction with supervision; three significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and

TABLE 3
Means and Percentages of Use of BATs by Supervisors

Category	Item	Study 1				Study 2			
		\bar{X}	S.D.	Very Often/ Often	Seldom/ Never	\bar{X}	S.D.	Very Often/ Often	Seldom/ Never
Reward from Behavior	1	3.08	1.2	40	27	2.82	1.1	31	34
Reward from Others	2	2.62	1.2	26	42	2.22	1.0	10	55
Punishment from Source	3	1.72	1.1	11	77	1.19	.5	0	96
Referent-Model	4	2.56	1.3	23	48	2.10	1.1	16	65
Legitimate-Higher Authority	5	3.11	1.3	43	31	2.01	1.1	10	68
Guilt	6	2.27	1.1	13	54	1.65	.9	2	78
Reward from Source	7	2.38	1.2	22	54	2.02	1.1	10	63
Normative Rules	8	2.66	1.4	29	46	1.64	.9	4	82
Personal Responsibility	9	3.50	1.2	56	18	2.83	1.2	33	38
Expert	10	3.56	1.1	58	15	3.35	1.1	52	20
Punishment from Behavior	11	1.92	1.2	13	71	1.31	.6	0	94
Self-Esteem	12	3.20	1.3	46	28	3.18	1.2	42	24
Debt	13	2.07	1.3	17	67	1.58	.9	2	80
Personal Relationship—Negative	14	1.59	1.1	9	83	1.25	.6	1	95
Altruism	15	3.03	1.2	39	31	2.50	1.1	15	43
Personal Relationship—Positive	16	2.34	1.3	21	53	1.98	1.1	14	70
Duty	17	2.97	1.3	39	34	2.53	1.2	25	51
Legitimate—Personal Authority	18	2.80	1.5	33	43	1.91	1.2	12	74

TABLE 4
Correlations Between Subordinates' Perceptions
of Their Own and Their Supervisors' Use of BATs

Category	Item	Study 1	Study 2
Reward from Behavior	1	.38**	.40**
Reward from Others	2	.42**	.30**
Punishment from Source	3	.05	.37**
Referent-Model	4	.48**	.53**
Legitimate-Higher Authority	5	.22**	.52**
Guilt	6	.32**	.53**
Reward from Source	7	.35**	.39**
Normative Rules	8	.41**	.57**
Personal Responsibility	9	.35**	.60**
Expert	10	.38**	.36**
Punishment from Behavior	11	.20**	.36**
Self-Esteem	12	.34**	.63**
Debt	13	.42**	.44**
Personal Relationship—Negative	14	.25**	.25*
Altruism	15	.42**	.36**
Personal Relationship—Positive	16	.52**	.46**
Duty	17	.48**	.54**
Legitimate-Personal Authority	18	.20**	.24**

*Significant, $p < .05$.

**Significant, $p < .01$.

with work; and one significant correlation for subordinate use of BATs and satisfaction with position (see Table 5).

Correlational analysis in Study 2 yielded three significant correlations for subordinate use of BATs and satisfaction with supervision; one significant correlation for subordinate use of BATs and satisfaction with work; and one significant correlation for subordinate use of BATs and satisfaction with position.

Correlational analysis in Study 1 yielded thirteen significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction with supervisor; four significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction with work; and two significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction with position (see Table 6).

Correlational analysis in Study 2 yielded seven significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate

TABLE 5
Correlation Coefficients for Subordinate Use of BATs and Satisfaction

		Subordinate Use																	
BATs***		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Satisfaction	Supervision																		
	Study 1	.01	-.05	-.16	-.16*	-.07	-.07	.02	-.18*	-.09	-.08	-.09	-.06	-.12	-.23**	-.02	-.20**	-.14*	.00
	Study 2	-.04	-.01	.01	-.28**	-.18	-.11	-.19	-.10	-.11	-.04	-.31**	.11	-.15	-.00	-.08	-.20*	-.16	-.00
	Work																		
	Study 1	.13	.15*	.09	.12	.00	.04	.14	.04	.10	.13	.10	.21**	.08	.00	.15*	-.03	.11	.02
	Study 2	.14	.02	-.06	-.16	-.27**	-.13	-.03	-.03	-.08	-.07	-.11	.12	.02	-.01	-.06	.02	-.14	-.09
	Position																		
	Study 1	.09	.10	.06	.02	.06	-.01	.04	.05	-.05	.02	.03	.15*	.06	-.02	.12	-.04	.05	.08
	Study 2	-.07	-.14	-.10	-.15	-.09	-.13	-.16	-.15	-.01	-.16	-.23*	.04	.01	-.02	-.14	-.07	-.08	.02

*Significant, $p < .05$.

**Significant, $p < .01$.

***See Table 1 for BAT Items.

TABLE 6
Correlation Coefficients for Perceived Supervisor Use of BATs and Subordinate Satisfaction

		Perceived Supervisor Use																	
BATs***		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Satisfaction	Supervision																		
	Study 1	-.01	-.13	-.45**	-.36**	-.47**	-.18*	-.15*	-.27**	-.21**	-.01	-.42**	-.01	-.27**	-.40**	-.06	-.16*	-.14*	-.48**
	Study 2	.16*	.12	-.31**	-.23*	-.29**	.00	-.07	-.11	-.10	.04	-.37**	.29**	-.14	-.23*	.02	-.12	.02	-.38**
	Work																		
	Study 1	.11	.03	-.08	-.08	-.16*	.03	.08	.03	.06	.14*	-.17*	.05	.03	-.11	.08	.05	.06	-.20**
	Study 2	.05	.07	-.04	-.18	-.32**	-.09	.07	-.21*	-.21*	-.03	-.23*	.13	-.09	-.19	-.04	-.07	-.14	-.12
	Position																		
	Study 1	-.01	.02	-.09	-.10	-.12	-.08	.00	.04	-.09	.04	-.18*	-.07	-.14	-.13	.02	.04	-.07	-.20**
Study 2	.01	.00	-.02	-.14	-.14	-.05	.23*	-.09	-.04	-.09	-.26*	.14	-.06	-.12	-.04	.07	-.03	-.09	

*Significant, $p < .05$.

**Significant, $p < .01$.

***See Table 1 for BAT items.

satisfaction with supervisor; four significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction with work; and two significant correlations for perceived supervisor use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction with position.

DISCUSSION

The results reported above relating to our first research question clearly indicate that the subordinates studied do not see themselves frequently using BATs to influence their supervisors. Given that the two samples represent very different levels in organizational systems (near bottom and upper-middle management), these results may be very meaningful.

It would appear that subordinates generally do not see themselves as being in an influential position. However, the two groups sampled agreed strongly on which BATs they use in the comparatively unusual situations when they do attempt to influence their supervisors: Expert, Self-Esteem, Personal Responsibility, and Altruism. Similarly, the two groups selected the same four BATs as least likely to be used: Punishment from Source, Personal Relationship-Negative, Punishment from Behavior, and Legitimate-Personal Authority.

The four BATs used by subordinates on their supervisors seem to be the ones that are most available to subordinates. It is very difficult, if not impossible, in most cases for a subordinate to use punishment from Source (I will punish you if you don't) with his or her supervisor. It seems that the subordinates in these two studies intuitively realize that many of the BATs would have no impact on their supervisor or would have a negative impact on their supervisor. It seems reasonable for subordinates to suggest that people are depending on their supervisor (Personal Responsibility), that the subordinate has some expertise (Expert), that the supervisor will feel good about him- or herself (Self-Esteem), and that others will benefit from what you do (Altruism). Even though some of the above BATs have a somewhat manipulative nature (i.e., Altruism), if they work they should be used and the supervisor/subordinate relationship might be improved.

The results reported relating to research question two indicated that the subordinates in both studies perceived their supervisors as using Expert and Self-Esteem BATs. In addition, subjects in Study I indicated that their supervisors used Reward from Behavior, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Personal Responsibility, and Altruism. The above suggests

that subordinates see their supervisors as employing some of the same communication strategies as they use themselves. Since subordinates use Expert and Self-Esteem with their supervisors (research question one) they in turn expect their supervisors to do the same, hence creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. The subordinate's intuitive assumption being if "I'm nice to him or her, she or he will be nice to me."

Subjects in Study I saw their supervisor as having a greater repertoire of BATs. This could be a function of the structure of the educational system. The anonymity and freedom enjoyed by many in educational systems are not experienced by personnel in a business such as a bank. Hence, the supervisor in an educational system has the luxury of choosing from a wider variety of BATs.

The fact that in both studies subordinates selected similar BATs that were never or seldom used indicates the systems may not be as distinct as one would assume from the above, or that subordinates in both systems have supervisors who realize the use of Punishment from Source, Guilt, and Normative Rules will only get compliance from subordinates and not internalization. The use of BATs, such as Self-Esteem and Expert, are much more likely to produce internalization than the use of negative oriented BATs.

The results reported relating to research question three clearly indicate that subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage is related significantly to the power strategies used by their supervisors. There are two plausible explanations for this result: (1) Given that the data were collected from the same subjects for both the subordinate and perceived supervisor use of BATs, the correlations obtained could be an artifact of the method. The above can only be verified or disproven by data collected from subordinates and their corresponding supervisors or direct observations of both. (2) Subordinates' perceptions of their own power usage is correlated to that of their supervisors because the subordinates model the power strategies used by supervisors in the organization. It may be that subordinates look to the behavior of their supervisors to determine appropriate behaviors. If this pattern obtains, either the orientation toward appropriate behavior of the immediate supervisor or that of upper management may be communicated to the subordinate, either intentionally or unintentionally.

The results relating to Research Question 4 are somewhat less clear than those associated with the other research questions. Nevertheless, some conclusions can be drawn. Subordinates' use of BATs with their supervisors is most associated with their satisfaction with supervision.

The association with work and position satisfaction, in both subject samples, is marginal at best. The proportion of significant correlations obtained is only slightly higher than should be expected by chance (6 of 72 or 8%). Consequently, we shall restrict our interpretation to the results relating to satisfaction with supervision.

All of the obtained significant correlations for BAT use and supervisor satisfaction, for both samples, were negative. This means that greater use of the given BAT was related to reduced satisfaction. Referent-Model and Personal Relationship-Positive were significant for both samples. For the teacher group Normative Rules, Personal Relationship-Negative, and Legitimate-Personal Authority were also significant. For the banker group, Punishment from Behavior was also significant. At least for the two BATs that were significant for both samples, a positive subordinate-supervisor relationship would appear to be requisite. Thus, the negative relationship between their use and satisfaction would seem reasonable.

Combining these results with those relating to the first research question allows us to conclude that subordinates of the types involved in this research do not frequently attempt to influence their supervisor, and those who are most satisfied with supervision are even less likely to do so. Although the first part of this conclusion may be somewhat surprising, the latter part (at least in retrospect) seems intuitively obvious. If one is happy with their supervision, why try to change it? The fact that only a few of the correlations between BATs and supervisor satisfaction were significant (8 of 36, 22%), however, suggests subordinates who are dissatisfied may see very few options open to them for altering the situation. Postresearch discussions with several of the subjects, in fact, generated several comments to the effect "Why bother to try to change her or his behavior? He or she won't change anyway."

Although perceived supervisor use of BATs were associated highly with satisfaction with supervision, the proportion of significant associations with work and position satisfaction were only slightly better than chance (11 of 72, 15%). Consequently, as was the case with subordinate BAT use, we will restrict our interpretation to the results relating to satisfaction with supervision.

All of the significant correlations obtained for the teacher sample were negative (13 of 18 possible). All but one of the significant correlations for the banker sample were also negative (1 positive, 6 negative, of 18). There was very good replication of results across samples, for the most part. All six BATs that were significantly

negatively correlated for the banker sample also were correlated significantly negatively for the teacher sample.

Although we should not discount the possibility that supervisors may treat satisfied subordinates differently from dissatisfied subordinates—thus acknowledging the probability of some reciprocal causality—it seems reasonable to conclude that supervisors' use of some BATs leads to less subordinate satisfaction. In particular Punishment from Source, Referent-Model, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Punishment from Behavior, Personal Relationship-Negative and Legitimate-Personal Authority seem to produce negative reactions.

Four of these BATs are associated with coercive or legitimate power. Hence, these results replicate the negative impact of these power bases found in earlier research (Richmond et al., 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, in press). However, Referent-Model and Personal Relationship-Negative do not stem from these power bases. Both of these stem from the referent base, the one found to be associated most positively with desired outcomes in the previous research cited above.

We believe there is a very good explanation of this apparent conflict. In an earlier study, an effect was observed but not explained (Richmond et al., 1983). In that study, supervisors' perceptions of their own use of referent power was found to be correlated negatively with their subordinates' perceptions ($r = -.26$). It may well be that explicit communicative messages (of the type exemplified by the BAMs for these two BATs) may not frequently be used by people who really *do* have referent power (as perceived by receivers). They may more frequently be used by people who *do not* have such power—but think they do. Thus, we suggest the possibility that implicit communicative messages may generate positive outcomes from referent power but explicit use of BATs related to this power base may be counter-productive. Additional research designed to resolve this issue is needed.

NOTES

1. In this first phase of this research, 177 undergraduate students at California State University, Sacramento were asked to generate responses to the following: "People try to get other people to do things they may not want to do. The other person usually thinks and often asks, 'Why should I do this?' Give us the most common answers you would give to this question, such as 'It'll be good for you,' or 'You will lose a lot if you don't.' " Approximately 2500 messages were generated from the sample. The subjects were then divided into 39 groups and asked to group their responses into categories and label the categories. Approximately 150 categories were obtained. Coders, independently and then

jointly, working with both the raw responses and the categories, derived eighteen BAT categories. In a study conducted subsequent to the research reported in this paper, this same procedure was employed with a sample of 343 teachers from the same population sampled in the present research. A total of 22 BAT categories were obtained, the same eighteen as indicated previously and four new ones.

2. The researchers obtained data from 204 teachers from the same population as the present research (but not the same subjects) in terms of their use of the eighteen BATs, the effectiveness of the BATs, their perception of their students' use, and their perceptions of the students' effectiveness. The highest intercorrelations between individual BATs were between .20 and .30. Most of the correlations were nonsignificant. Factor analysis employing both orthogonal and oblique rotations yielded no interpretable solutions.

3. Both multiple regression and canonical analyses were also performed but did not yield insights beyond those drawn from the univariate analyses. Consequently, these will not be reported here.

REFERENCES

- Blackburn, R. S. (1981). Lower participant power: Toward a conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 6, 127-131.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Bowers, D. G. & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Sept., 238-263.
- Burke, R. J. (1970). Methods of resolving superior-subordinate conflict: The constructive use of subordinate differences and disagreements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 393-411.
- Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Erez, M., & Rim, Y. (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. *Human Relations*, 35, 871-878.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C. & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employees' communication apprehension, self-esteem and perceptions of their immediate supervisors. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook I*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), *Group Dynamics* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Gibb, J. R. (1961). Defense level and influence potential in small groups. In L. Petrullo and B. M. Bass (eds.), *Leadership and interpersonal behavior* (pp. 167-178). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Goodstadt, B. E. & Hjelle, L. A. (1973). Power to the powerless: Locus of control and the use of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 190-196.
- Howat, G. & London, M. (1980). Attributions of conflict management strategies in supervisor-subordinate dyads. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 172-175.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T., Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (in press). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. *Communication Education*.

- Kelley, H. & Thibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: John Wiley.
- Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 25, 57-78.
- Kipnis, D., & Lane, W. P. (1962). Self-confidence and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 291-295.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M. & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-452.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marwell, G. & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry*, 30, 350-364.
- Parsons, T. (1963). On the concept of influence. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 27, 37-62.
- Podsakoff, P. M. (1982). Determinants of a supervisor's use of rewards and punishments: A literature review and suggestions for future research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 29, 58-83.
- Renwick, P. A. (1975). Perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 444-456.
- Renwick, P. A. (1977). The effects of sex differences on the perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict: An exploratory study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 19, 403-415.
- Riccillo, S. C. & Trenholm, S. (1983). Predicting managers' choice of influence mode: The effects of interpersonal trust and worker attributions on managerial tactics in a simulated organizational setting. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 47, 323-339.
- Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1979). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple-factor approaches. In D. Nimmo (ed.), *Communication Yearbook III*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1983). Power in the classroom: Two studies. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, Montreal.
- Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (in press). Power in the classroom II: Power and Learning. *Communication Education*.
- Richmond, V. P., Wagner, J. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1983). The impact of perceptions of leadership style, use of power, and conflict management style on organizational outcomes. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 27-36.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Student, K. R. (1968). Supervisory influence and work-group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 188-194.
- Wheless, L. R., Barraclough, R. & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. In Robert N. Bostrom (ed.), *Communication Yearbook VII*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Zammuto, R. F., London, M., & Rowland, K. M. (1979). Effects of sex on commitment and conflict resolution. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 227-231.