The Perception of Power

Samuel B. Bacharach

Cornell University

Edward J. Lawler

University of Iowa

Social Forces (1976), 55(1), 123-134

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Midwest Sociological Association meeting, 1975. The order of authorship does not reflect differential contributions to the paper; in all respects, this has been a truly joint endeavor. The authors would like to thank Dan Moore, Stuart Freedman, and Debra Lower for assistance in the data collection and analysis, Lawrence Williams' comments on an earlier draft were especially helpful as were the remarks of two anonymous reviewers. We also want to thank Donna Updike and Pam Kline for patiently proofreading and typing the manuscript.

Abstract

This study examines the impact of some basic exchange-theory variables, the value and scarcity of outcomes, on perceptions of Self and Other power in a conflict setting. Each respondent took the role of an employee in conflict with an employer, and assessed the magnitude of Self and Other (employer) power. Four variables are manipulated: Self's outcome scarcity, the value of the outcome to Self, Other's outcome scarcity, and the value of the outcome to Other. The results are consistent with predictions drawn from the Blau, and Emerson (a, b) treatments of dependence relations. The results suggest that the stakes contending parties have in a conflict encounter bear on power perceptions, and an elaboration of a recently formulated theory of power perception is undertaken on the basis of the data.

The careers of both Richard M. Nixon and Lyndon B. Johnson attest to the fact that success in politics is based on the constant calculation of one's own power and the power of adversaries. The slightest miscalculation of power can doom momentary giants to the fate of Polyphemus. While power perception is clearly a central feature of political life, it is also important in everyday life: all of us evaluate our power vis-ä-vis others such as landlords, bosses, and spouses. Nevertheless, the perception of power remains a relatively understudied area in sociology and social psychology. Macro and micro research has stressed objective power and neglected to identify the criteria persons use to make subjective estimates of power capabilities.

The analysis of power perception is important for at least two reasons. First, in any interaction involving the use of power, actors seldom have perfect information about their own and the others' power. Power capabilities are typically ambiguous; hence conflicting parties must use situational cues to form subjective power estimates. By managing impressions of power, persons may feign power capabilities and extract concessions from an adversary greater than would be predicted from objective power capabilities. Research on power perception may help us understand such impression management by suggesting how the cognitive aspect of power can be manipulated in social interaction. Second, research on power perception can assess the cognitive relevance and phenomenological validity of objective power concepts by determining whether variables thought to govern objective power form the basis for subjective estimates of power. Such reasons for studying power perceptions do not imply that studies of objective power are unimportant, but only that greater attention to the subjective aspect of power seems warranted.

Determinants of Perceived Power

The present research addresses itself to the criteria individuals use to estimate Self and Other power in conflict situations. Most of the related research has not been done on power perception, per se, but rather on the potency attributed to an adversary. Studies in conflict settings have suggested that the mere use of coercive power creates an impression of potency. Thus, persons who carry out threats, adopt an exploitive strategy, or break promises of cooperation are perceived as more potent than those who do not undertake such action (Horai et al.; Lindskold and Bennett; Lindskold and Tedeschi; Schlenker et al.). While these data on potency may offer some insights into the basis of power estimates, such research has not been explicitly addressed to the question of power perception. Furthermore, research on potency does not provide a theoretical framework for specifying the range of criteria persons use to estimate Self and Other power.

A recent study of power perception has moved in the direction of a theoretical framework (Michener et al.). In this study, power estimates were examined in the relationship of attacker and attacked, where all respondents were in the role of the attacked and where highly valued outcomes were at issue. The authors' suggested that perceptions of power are a function of the control persons exercise over their own (Self) and another's outcomes. Offensive capabilities of the attacker (i.e., damage potential, attack probability) and the defensive capacity of the attacked (attack blockage, retaliation) reflected various aspects of such control. The results of this study showed that the attacked perceived Self power as less and the attacker's power as greater when the attacker's damage capability was high as opposed to low. This implies that an increase in the Other's ability to manipulate (control) Selfs outcomes decreases the power attributed to Self and

increases the power attributed to the Other. Likewise, the attacked perceived his own power as greater and attacker's power as lower when he (the attacked) had a high blockage or high retaliatory capactiy. An increase in the ability of Self to manipulate the Other's outcomes (retaliation) or prevent manipulation of his own outcomes (blockage) apparently increases the power attributed to Self and decreases the power attributed to the Other.

The model of power perception offered by this prior study emphasizes offensive and defensive tactics persons use to manipulate outcomes. While the tactical focus of the Michener et al. study makes it applicable to a variety of conflict settings, the assumption of a high level of outcome stakes unnecessarily limits the scope of the model and begs an elaboration.

The notion of outcome stakes suggests additional determinants of power perception beyond those specified by Michener et al. In exchange theory, outcome stakes may be indexed by an actor's dependence on the outcome of a situation. Where the stakes are high, dependence will be maximized; where the stakes are low dependence will be minimized. That is, when outcomes are not highly valued or can be attained in other relationships (i.e., low dependence) an actor's stake in the situation should likewise be minimized (Blau; Emerson, a, b; Thibaut and Kelley). To the extent that such dimensions reflecting stakes apply to all social relations in contrast to the tactical dimensions stressed by Michener et al., an analysis of stakes may provide a backdrop for a more general model of power perception.

It is a basic tenet of exchange theory that the value attributed to outcomes and the scarcity of alternative outcome sources provide the foundation for social relationships. Persons tend to maintain relationships in which the outcomes received are highly valued and not available in alternative relationships (Blau; Emerson, a, b; Gergen; Homans; Thibaut and Kelley). Applying this general idea to the concept of power, Blau and Emerson (a, b) argue that power is based on

dependence and that outcome value and scarcity determine the degree of dependence. The power of Self over Other is lodged in the dependence of the Other (i.e., Other's outcome value and scarcity) on Self, while the power of the Other over Self is lodged in the dependence of Self (i.e., Selfs outcome value and scarcity) on the Other. Given the link between dependence and power, the power of Self (S) should vary positively with the degree to which O has few alternative outcome sources (i.e., Os outcome scarcity) and the extent to which O values the outcomes at issue (i.e., Os outcome value). Similarly, the power of Other (O) should vary positively with Selfs outcome scarcity and outcome value. Furthermore, considering Emerson's treatment of power balancing and Blau's discussion of the conditions that produce power imbalance, the power attributed to a person (Self or Other) should vary with that person's own value and scarcity. That is, Self power should also vary negatively with his own outcome scarcity and value. Despite somewhat different foci, Blau and Emerson imply that a change in any of these four variables (i.e., Self's outcome scarcity, Self's outcome value, Other's outcome scarcity, and Other's outcome value) will increase the power of one party while decreasing the power of the other. For example, an increase in the scarcity of Selfs outcomes will increase the Other's power and decrease Self's power.[1]

Outcome value and scarcity are thus seen as reflecting the stake each party has in a conflictual encounter, and the present study will determine whether these variables thought to govern objective power serve as criteria for subjective power estimates. The major predictions suggested by the foregoing discussion of Blau and Emerson are as follows and are summarized in Table 1.

1. As Self's outcome scarcity increases, perceived Self power will decrease and perceived Other power will increase.
2. As Self's outcome value increases, perceived Self power will decrease, and perceived Other power will increase.
3. As Other's outcome scarcity increases, perceived Self power will increase and perceived Other power will decrease.
4. As Other's outcome value increases, perceived Self power will increase and perceived Other power will decrease.

Insert Table 1 Here

The impact of these variables on the power attributed to Self and Other is investigated in the context of an employer-employee relationship. Respondents are in the employee position and the outcome at issue is a salary increase. Outcome scarcity, like Thibaut and Kelley's notion of *Clalt*, refers to the availability of alternative relationships in which the outcome can be attained. For Self (employee), scarcity refers to availability of alternative jobs; for the Other (employer), scarcity refers to availability of alternative personnel. The concept of outcome value in exchange theory has been referred to as outcome level or rewards minus costs (Thibaut and Kelley), the degree of reinforcement or satiation (Emerson, b; Gergen; Homans), as well as to subjective assessments of the importance of an outcome (Blau; Emerson, a). Consistent with most treatments of value, it refers to the importance of (or need for) a given outcome (Blau; Emerson, a, b; Homans). For Self (employee), value is the importance of a salary increase given his

financial position; for the Other (employer), it is the importance of keeping the resources necessary for salary increases given its financial position.

Method

A $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design manipulates the four independent variables: outcome value for Self, outcome scarcity for Self, outcome value for Other, and outcome scarcity for Other. A total of 320 undergraduates at Cornell University were randomly assigned to one of the 16 experimental treatments (i.e., 20 per cell). The data were gathered in large group-administered classroom settings. Care was taken to assure that classes selected had not discussed exchange theory or related notions of social power.

Subjects read a description of an altercation between an employer (in a large clothing company) and an employee, a sales person. All subjects were placed in the role of the employee and imagined themselves as sales representatives for a large clothing company. The description explained that, “Sales personnel, like yourself, work on a salary basis and do not receive a commission. Recently, the company did give pay raises to production workers, but did not give salary increases to sales personnel (such as yourself). Over the last year, your own sales have steadily increased, and you are somewhat unhappy about not getting a salary increase.” As in the previous study by Michener et al., a conflict situation was established to make the power dimension more salient to the participants.

Other information in the description manipulated the independent variables. Self and Other value were manipulated by varying the consequence a pay raise would have for one’s own and the employer’s financial security. The following statement manipulated Self value: “A pay

raise is (not at all important/very important) to you because your financial position has (improved/deteriorated) in the last year." Other (i.e., employer) value was manipulated as follows: "The company is in (good financial condition/poor financial condition), and there is a (10%/90%) chance that giving salary increases will affect the financial security of the company. The availability of alternative jobs (for Self) and replacement employees (for Other) manipulated the scarcity variables. The manipulation of Self scarcity stated: "The job market for sales people with your qualifications is (very tight/very good), and there is only a (10%/90%) chance that you could find a better job." Other scarcity was manipulated as follows: "If you quit, the company would find it (difficult/easy) to replace you because there is only a (10%/90%) chance that they could hire another person with your qualifications."

Dependent Variable Measures

Following the description containing the manipultions, subjects were asked: "How do you perceive (Other/Self) in this situation? Rate (Other/Self) on each of the scales below." On a battery of semantic differential items (with nine-point scales), subjects made separate assessments of Self and Other power. The measures of perceived power were interspersed with bogus items not on power to prevent subject awareness of the exact nature of the study. In addition, subjects were assured that there were no right or wrong answers, but that investigators were merely interested in their opinions.

The measures of power were derived from the following semantic differential items: powerful-powerless, potent-impotent, dominant-submissive. The same items measure Self and Other power with the only difference being the perceptual object (i.e., Self or Other). These

items have been included in related research (e.g., Faley and Tedeschi; Michener et al.), and they were selected, in part, on that basis.

Indices of Self and Other power were constructed by summing scores on these items, equally weighting each item. Each index achieves a reasonable degree of reliability (internal consistency) as reflected in Cronbach's alphas of .71 and .75 for Self and Other power, respectively.

Additionally, a single-item measure of the perceived power difference between Self and Other was included to see if persons subjectively apprehended a difference. The questionnaire item, asked after subjects responded to the semantic differential items, stated: "Do you feel the company has more or less power than you in this situation?" Subjects responded on a nine-point scale, labeled "company has much more power" on the low end, "equal power" in the middle, and "I have much more power" on the high end.

To assure that subjects felt they could make judgments based on the information in the description of the situation, the last question on the questionnaire asked subjects "How confident are you with your answers to the above questions?" Subjects responded on a nine-point scale labeled "not at all confident" at the low end and "highly confident" at the high end. The mean score across experimental conditions was 6.9, reflecting considerable confidence.

Results

Self Power

Table 2 contains the mean ratings for Self power by experimental condition. An analysis of variance reveals the predicted main effects for Self scarcity ($F = 92.99, df = 1/304, p < .001$), Other scarcity ($F = 58.47, df = 1/304, p < .001$), and Other value ($F = 5.74, df = 1/304, p < .02$), but no effect for Self value ($F < 1$). An employee with alternative job opportunities (i.e., low Self scarcity) perceives his power as greater than when few alternatives exist (i.e., high Self scarcity). Other scarcity (i.e., employer) is also used as a criterion for attributing power to oneself. Where the employer cannot easily replace Self (i.e., high Other scarcity), Self power is perceived as greater than when the employer has alternative personnel available. Lastly, where the employer highly values the outcomes at stake, more power is attributed to oneself than when Other's value is low. These data support predictions drawn from the Blau-Emerson exchange framework, with one exception: Self value is apparently not a criterion for assessing Self power ($F < 1$).

A complex four-way interaction (Self value × Self scarcity × Other value × Other scarcity) also emerges on perceptions of Self power ($F = 10.39, df = 1/304, p < .001$). Though this was not predicted, the schemes of Blau and Emerson tend to suggest that Self power would be lowest in the HHLL cell i.e., under high Self value, high Self scarcity, low Other value, low Other scarcity, and, highest in the LLHH cell, i.e., under low Self value, low Self scarcity, high Other value, and high Other scarcity. These cells represent the points of greatest power inequality. Visual inspection of Table 1 suggests partial support for this notion. The mean

perceived self power is, indeed, lowest in the HHLL cell ($\bar{X} = 11.90$); but the mean in the LLHH cell ($\bar{X} = 19.50$) is not quite the highest of the 16 cells.

A Duncan's multiple-range test (for a posteriori comparisons) lends general support to the multiplicative decrease in perceived self power in the HHLL cell. The mean of 11.90 in the HHLL cell is significantly different ($p < .05$) from most of the means in the design. It is (a) significantly lower than all means in the high Other scarcity rows where the employer cannot easily replace Self; and (b) significantly lower than all means in the low Self scarcity columns, where one has considerable alternatives. On the other hand, the differences between the LLHH cell and all others does not reveal a consistent or interpretable pattern. These results generally suggest that persons are aware of an extreme power inequality when they are, themselves, in the disadvantaged position (i.e., in the HHLL condition), but not when they are in the superior power position.

Insert Table 2 Here

Other Power

Table 3 presents the mean values for Other (i.e., employer) power by experimental condition. An analysis of variance reveals the predicted main effects for all four independent variables. Where Self highly values a pay raise, the power of the Other is perceived as greater than when Self ascribes low value to such outcomes ($F = 6.29, df = 1/304, p < .01$); and, high outcome scarcity for Self increased the perceived Power of the Other ($F = 37.24, df = 1/304, p < .001$). On the other hand, where the Other (employer) highly values the outcomes

in question, its power is assessed as less than when such outcomes have low value to the Other ($F = 60.93, df = 1/304, p < .001$); and, high outcome scarcity for the Other decreased power attributed to the Other ($F = 34.59, df = 1/304, p < .001$). All four independent variables represent criteria for assessing other power, and predictions based on Blau and Emerson are fully supported.

The four-way interaction, observed for Self power ratings, does not occur for perceived Other power ($F < 1$). However, the data trend is similar to that for Self power. Perceived Other power was lowest ($\bar{X} = 12.45$) in the LLHH cell, where Self had the greatest power advantage; and the largest rating ($\bar{X} = 20.40$) was in the HHLL cell, where the Other had the greatest power advantage.

Insert Table 3 Here

Comparison of Self and Other Power

The foregoing data suggest that Self and Other value and scarcity are important criteria for assessing Self and Other power, separately. How these variables affect subjects' impressions of Self-Other differences in power is also of interest. After completing the ratings for Self and Other power, a questionnaire item asked persons to provide an overall assessment of the difference in power between themselves and the Other. Table 4 presents the mean values by experimental condition.

As one would expect, employer (Other) power was generally rated as higher than that of employee. What is of interest is whether the relative differences vary as a function of value and

scarcity. Despite the tendency of persons to rate the employer (Other) as more powerful than oneself, an analysis of variance reveals effects that further corroborate the importance of value and scarcity for power estimates. Consistent with data on Self and Other power, main effects occurred for Self scarcity ($F = 80.24, df = 1/304, p < .001$), Other value ($F = 23.36, df = 1/304, p < .001$), and Other scarcity ($F = 84.92, df = 1/304, p < .001$). Self low scarcity, Other high value, and Other high scarcity decreased the degree to which the employer was viewed as more powerful. The effect of Self value was not significant ($F = 2.39$, ns), and there are no interaction effects.

Insert Table 4 Here

Discussion

Prior research indicates that various offensive and defensive capabilities as well as the use of coercive power affect the perceived power of an actor (e.g., Lindskold and Tedeschi; Michener et al.). Aside from the fact that only Michener et al. were directly concerned with power perception, all of these studies held the stakes (i.e., value and scarcity) persons had in the conflict constant at a high level. The present research documents the impact of these basic exchange-theory variables on the power attributed to Self and Other.

Seven of eight predictions drawn from Blau and Emerson (a, b) are supported. As expected, if the Other's outcome scarcity is high or if the Other highly values the outcomes at issue, the power attributed to the Other decreases and the power attributed to Self increases. Similarly, where Self's outcomes are scarce, the power attributed to Self decreases and the power

attributed to the Other increases. The only negative evidence occurs with respect to Self value. As predicted, high value (by Self) increases the perceived power of the Other, but contrary to the prediction, a corresponding decrease in perceived Self power is not evident. This negative finding could reflect the confidentiality or privacy of values. Persons might assume they can conceal their outcome value from the Other, and Self value may reduce perceived Self power only if Self believes the Other has information on how important the outcomes are to Self. Regardless of whether the Other has such information, however, high Self value should still increase the power attributed to the Other (as observed in the data) because Self himself is aware of the importance he attaches to the outcomes.

This research has related implications for the phenomenology of power and prior theories of power perception. Emerson and Blau provide an analytical framework of power based on outcome value and outcome scarcity as dimensions of dependence. By showing the applicability of these dimensions to the perception of Self and Other power, this study has affirmed the cognitive relevance and phenomenological validity of this exchange approach to power.

The major implication of this study is that it suggests an extension of the theory of power perception presented in the Michener et al. study. This prior study stressed direct control over outcomes, i.e., manipulation of an Other's outcomes (offensive capability) or preventing manipulation of Selfs outcomes (defensive capability). Results of the earlier study can be derived from the postulate that states: if a person in a conflictual setting increases his control over outcomes valued by himself or another then the power attributed to him increases and the power attributed to the other person decreases. The effects of offensive and defensive tactical leverage are deducible from this general postulate.

The present study examined the underlying stakes persons have in the conflictual situation, as reflected in the value and scarcity of outcomes. These stakes are an important part of the social context within which conflicting parties use offensive and defensive tactics, and they do not necessarily grant persons the prerogative of manipulating outcomes. Stakes, of course, provide potential power, but they do not yield the direct type of control that is emphasized in the Michener et al. study. These considerations, aside from the fact that value is a constant in the former postulate, mean that a second postulate must be added to the theory in order to embrace the results of the current study. The postulate is: if a person's stake in a conflictual situation increases, then the power attributed to him decreases and the power attributed to the other person increases. Our findings support this postulate. The eight predictions implied by the Blau-Emerson framework are deducible from this simple postulate, and only one of these predictions was not supported.

Together, the two postulates indicate that variables known to affect power perceptions can be grouped into two broad categories: "control" (manipulation) variables and stake variables. Across both the Michener et al. study and the present research, a total of fourteen significant effects have been observed on power perceptions. All of these effects can be inferred from the postulates associated with these two types of variables. However, there are still some remaining questions: What are the combined and relative effects of control and stake variables? Are there interaction effects between control and stake variables—for example, will offensive and defensive capabilities still affect power perceptions if the outcomes are not highly valued or if there are alternative outcome sources? Future research should address these questions by building both types of variables into the same research.

Future elaborations of the model might also attempt to predict the relative weights persons will accord certain criteria under varying circumstances. As currently formulated, the model predicts the direction of the relationships (+ or —) but not the relative magnitudes. In the Michener et al. study there were differences in the weights accorded various offensive and defensive variables; and, in the present study, multiple regression of each dependent variable on the four independent variables indicates that persons do not necessarily give equal weight to the value- scarcity criteria. The following equations contain the standardized regression coefficients from separate analyses of Self and Other power:[2]

$$SP = -.44(SS) + .02(SV) + .35(OS) + .11(OV) + e\ (R^2 = .33)$$

$$OP = +.29(SS) + .12(SV) - .28(OS) - .37(OV) + e\ (R^2 = .31)$$

Comparing coefficients within each equation, it is clear that persons do not accord equal weight to the value-scarcity criteria but that the overall pattern of effects for Self power is similar to that for Other power. The scarcity variables are quite important to both perceptions of Self and Other power, and Self value is least important to these power estimates. The only divergent pattern is that Other's value is more important to estimates of Other power than to estimates of Self power. The sign of these relationships is as predicted, but apparently an increase in Other's value will decrease perceptions of Other power more than it will increase perceptions of Self power. Future research should specify situational or other factors that affect the ranking persons give these criteria when making power judgments.

Last, the generality of the model suggested by this study and by Michener et al. warrants further empirical test. The role or position of the person making the power judgments may be especially important. In the Michener et al. study, all respondents were in the position of attacked facing attacker; while respondents in the present study were in the position of a subordinate in a

formal organization. Research should determine whether persons in different roles use divergent criteria or accord similar criteria different weights to make power judgments. Some recent research on formal organizations suggests that perceptions of the power structure vary by one's level in the hierarchy of authority (see Bacharach and Aiken; Tannenbaum et al.) and studies by Rytina et al. suggest that one's image of the national power structure depends partly on one's social position. These differences may occur because people in different positions use different criteria or weights to make power judgments. Therefore, it may be necessary to build the perceiver's role or position into a complete power perception model.

Notes

1. The major difference between Blau's and Emerson's treatment of dependence is that Blau (see, especially, 115-8) views power as neutralized under conditions of equal dependence, suggesting that power relationships are inherently asymmetrical. However, Blau's discussion of this matter is somewhat vague, and this conceptual difference does not clearly suggest predictions about the perception of power that differ from those of Emerson. In fact, Blau's more extensive treatment of the "conditions that produce power imbalance" (118-25) parallels Emerson's treatment of power balancing and implies similar predictions as to the effects of outcome value and scarcity. The present research stresses these common implications of the Blau and Emerson treatments of dependence and power.
2. The symbol SP refers to perceived Self power, and OP refers to perceived Other power. The symbols for the independent variables are as follows: SS is Self's scarcity, SV is Self's value, OS is Other's scarcity, and OV is Other's value.

Table 1

Table 1. PREDICTED EFFECTS OF VALUE AND SCARCITY VARIABLES ON PERCEIVED SELF-POWER AND PERCEIVED OTHER POWER*

	Dependent Variable	
Independent Variable	*Self Power*	*Other Power*
Self's outcome scarcity	-	+
Self's outcome value	-	+
Other's outcome scarcity	+	-
Other's outcome value	+	-

*A plus sign means a positive relationship and a minus sign means a negative relationship.

Table 2

Table 2.* PERCEIVED SELF-POWER BY SELF-VALUE, SELF-SCARCITY, OTHER VALUE AND OTHER SCARCITY

	Low Self-Value		*High Self-Value*	
	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity
Low Other-Value				
Low other-Scarcity	15.05	13.65	17.15	11.90
High other-Scarcity	20.30	14.80	19.20	16.85
High Other-Value				
Low Other-Scarcity	19.50	13.10	16.75	13.25
High other-Scarcity	19.50	16.30	21.05	17.25

*Large number means high power.

Table 3

Table 3.* PERCEIVED OTHER POWER, BY SELF-VALUE, SELF-SCARCITY, OTHER VALUE AND OTHER SCARCITY

	Low Self-Value		*High Self-Value*	
	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity
Low Other-Value				
Low other-Scarcity	18.50	19.20	19.10	20.40
High other-Scarcity	15.85	18.40	15.65	19.25
High Other-Value				
Low Other-Scarcity	13.65	17.35	16.40	18.70
High other-Scarcity	12.45	14.60	12.70	15.75

*Large number means high power.

Table 4

Table 4.* PERCEIVED DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELF AND OTHER POWER BY OTHER VALUE, OTHER SCARCITY, SELF-VALUE AND SELF-SCARCITY

	Low Self-Value		*High Self-Value*	
	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity	Low Self-Scarcity	High Self-Scarcity
Low Other-Value				
Low other-Scarcity	3.25	2.35	3.80	2.05
High other-Scarcity	6.10	3.90	5.35	3.65
High Other-Value				
Low Other-Scarcity	5.45	3.10	4.45	2.60
High other-Scarcity	6.35	4.90	6.40	4.70

*Larger number means higher power for self.

References

Bacharach, S. B., and M. Aiken. 1976. “Structure and Process Constraints of Influence in Organizations.” Working paper. Ithaca: Department of Organizational Behavior, Cornell University.

Blau, Peter M. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York: Wiley.

Emerson, R. M. a: 1962. “Power-Dependence Relations.” *American Sociological Review* 27:31-41.

_____b: 1972. “Exchange Theory, Part II: Exchange Relations and Network Structures.” In J. Berger, M. Zelditch, Jr. and B. Anderson (eds.), *Sociological Theories in Progress.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Gergen, K. J. 1969. *The Psychology of Behavior Exchange.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Homans, G. C. 1974. *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms.* Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Horai, J., I. Haber, J. T. Tedeschi and R. B. Smith III. 1970. “It’s Not What You Say, It’s How You Do it: A Study of Threats and Promises.” *Proceedings of 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association* 5:393-4.

Lindskold, S., and R. Bennett. 1973. “Attributing Trust and Conciliatory Intent From a Coercive Power Capability.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 28:180-6.

Lindskold, S., and J. T. Tedeschi. 1971. “Reward Power and Attraction in Interpersonal Conflict.” *Psychonomic Science* 22:211-3.

Michener, H. A., E. J. Lawler, and S. B. Bacharach. 1973. “Perception of Power in Conflict Situations.” *Journal of Personality of Social Psychology* 28:155-62.

Rytina, J. H., W. H. Form, and J. Pease. 1970. “Income and Stratification Ideology: Beliefs About the American Opportunity Structure.” *American Journal of Sociology 1*5 (November) :703 -16.

Schlenker, B. R., B. Helm, and J. T. Tedeschi. 1973. “The Effects of Personality and Situational Variables on Behavioral Trust.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 25:419-27.

Tannenbaum, B., M. Kovcic, M. Rosner, G. Vianello, G. Wieser. 1975. *Hierarchy in Organizations.* San Francisco: Joseey-Bass.

Thibaut, J. W., and H. H. Kelley. 1959. *The Social Psychology of Groups.* New York: Wiley.