

## INFORMATION TO USERS

**This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.**

**The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.**

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

**University Microfilms International**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA  
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green  
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7900817

ZUCKERMAN, ELEANOR L.  
ATTITUDES TOWARD POWER OF MANAGEMENT AND NON  
MANAGEMENT WOMEN.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, PH.D., 1978

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

---

Attitudes toward Power  
of Management and Non Management Women

Copyright © 1978

by

Eleanor L. Zuckerman

ATTITUDES TOWARD POWER  
OF MANAGEMENT AND NON MANAGEMENT WOMEN

by

ELEANOR L. ZUCKERMAN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy, The City University of New York

1978

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 6, 1978  
date

Florence Denmark  
Chairman of the Examining Committee

August 16, 1978  
date

Florence Denmark  
Executive Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Florence Denmark

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Benjamin Balinsky

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor Laurence Gould

The City University of New York

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2 PILOT STUDIES . . . . .	18
Pilot I . . . . .	19
Pilot II . . . . .	30
Conclusions . . . . .	33
3 METHOD AND HYPOTHESES . . . . .	37
Overview: Definitions and Areas of Investigation . . . . .	37
Major Hypotheses . . . . .	39
Instrument . . . . .	41
Procedure . . . . .	46
Subjects . . . . .	47
Design . . . . .	56
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	57
Introduction: Data Analysis . . . . .	57
Results in Relation to Major Hypotheses . . . . .	58
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	74
Summary of Major Results . . . . .	74
Methodological Issues . . . . .	76
Conclusion . . . . .	79
LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .	81
APPENDICES . . . . .	90
Appendix 1, Pilot Study I . . . . .	91
Appendix 2, Pilot Study II . . . . .	100
Appendix 3, Questionnaire for dissertation . . . . .	102
Appendix 4, Cover letter for top level managers. . . . .	109
Appendix 5, Cover letter for top level managers. . . . .	111
Appendix 6, Cover letter for middle managers . . . . .	113
Appendix 7, Cover letter and introductory ques- tionnaire for non managers . . . . .	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Constructs Relating the Four Part Typology of Power to Items on the Questionnaire . . . . .	43
2	Informal Power Components Incorporated into Direct and Indirect Power Items . . . . .	45
3	Mean Values for Significant Effects: Managers Compared to Non Managers . . . . .	60
4	Comparison of Means for Three Groups for Variables with Significant Differences between Manager and Non Manager . . . . .	63

Abstract

ATTITUDES TOWARD POWER OF MANAGEMENT AND  
NON MANAGEMENT WOMEN

by

Eleanor L. Zuckerman

The present study examined attitudes toward power of women managers and non managers by means of a questionnaire to determine whether there were significant differences between attitudes of the two groups. The Raven and French typology of power was used, with added dimensions of direct and indirect modes, in relation to peers and subordinates. The study sample consisted of secretarial/clerical workers in the non management category and managers at top and middle levels. The results indicated that there were significant attitudinal differences between the managers and non managers in the area of direct power in relation to peers on all five dimensions of power, as well as legitimate and coercive power in relation to subordinates. In all cases, managers had more favorable attitudes than non managers. When the manager group was subdivided, middle managers' attitudes in most cases fell between top managers and non managers.

The data were analyzed within an ANOVA framework, and using Tukey's HSD test to compare means of the three groups. Mean differences in ratings of attitudes toward various components of power were examined as a function of rank within an organization.

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

Although social scientists and philosophers have theorized about power (Dahl, 1961; Etzioni, 1961; Freud, 1922; Nisbet, 1966), only a few have been concerned with power in relation to women. Those who did, considered the quest for power to be compensatory (Adler, 1927; Arnsbacher, 1959; Horney, 1967; Sampson, 1968). More recently attention of social psychologists has turned to this issue, and that of sex stereotypes, so that issues of power are now being explored in relation to research advances in the psychology of women.

Sex role stereotypes in Twentieth-century America define masculinity and the male role as holding power, authority and dominance, in relation to women, whose femininity and role are associated with subordination and deference. Women's "place" is in the private domain; man's, the public. Although she has power over her young children, the image of "femininity" demands that even power in the home not be overt. In the public domain, men, not women, are perceived to have the needed ability and emotional qualifications for power positions (Gordon & Strober, 1975; Schein, 1973, 1975); women having a position of power over men is threatening (Epstein, 1975; Gould, 1975); and women who

enter powerful occupations, which are sex typed as male, are considered deviant. Women are not usually expected to rise to positions of power (Epstein, 1970, a & b).

In the case of the need for achievement and women, continued research rejects the idea of the motive to avoid success (Horner, 1970) as a stable trait, but rather as one influenced by a sense of deviancy from sex role socialization and by external negative situational factors (Lockheed, 1975; Schnitzer, 1977). Although even high dominance women have been shown to avoid leadership (Megargee, 1969), the unsuccessful search for stable leadership traits (Gibb, 1947; Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1949) leads one to assume that situational factors are most important. A recent study of male and female managers which found no sex differences in the motive to avoid success points to changing attitudes and the need to consider women's problems related to achievement in the work setting (Wood & Greenfeld, 1976).

It should be useful, then, to explore women's attitudes toward power, in order to remove possible inhibitions preventing them from assuming their share of leadership positions in which they manage others, make decisions, and have some control of resources. In social psychology laboratory studies (e.g. Megargee, 1969), emergent leadership is a personal ability to influence and lead others in an unstructured setting; in organizations, one's personal leadership is combined with legitimate authority with a specific

structured setting. In this study, power will be defined as that which enables a person to be effective, "potent," (from the Latin root for power), and able to get the cooperation of others and have access to resources needed to implement one's decisions.

#### Women and Need for Power Research in Psychology

Most researchers and theorists have recognized the different dimensions in the word "power" and have tried to clarify the construct. They have separated the need for power for its own sake, often with both its good and bad aspects, from a more goal-oriented need. Goal-oriented needs were then defined as inner-directed strivings, and not power: Uleman (1972) relabelled the construct "influence," and McClelland (1975) put such needs back into the need for achievement (n ach) category. Thus, power for a specific purpose was not considered power; only power for one's own satisfaction could be considered power.

It is understandable that male researchers living the male experience could so conceive of power. Dominance, strength, control and the struggles to attain these, are defined in our society as being an integral part of maleness. The patriarchal world continues this androcentric pattern in politics, business and war, so it seems universal, and power definitions have reflected this component of dominance, not only for its own sake but for the sake of male identity.

From a female stereotyped point of view, such concepts of power have different meanings. Control and dominance in the public domain is considered deviant, non-"feminine," thus arousing fears of loss of female potency or the power to attract, or to maintain favorable relationships with significant others. However, as managerial and other public roles are being regarded as less deviant for women, more women and men are now able to reconcile the coexistence of both kinds of "achievement."

A second factor is also at work. Women, whether or not they marry, conceive, and raise children (and most of them do), are treated as if this were to be their only or primary role. Hence, they are encouraged to take a subordinate role in relation to men, as part of the marriage pattern and a necessity for male definition as superior to female.

There are also moral components which interact with power issues. Females are generally socialized for the private child-rearing role, in which the absolute, explicit moral values of the culture must be perpetuated. Males are socialized for the public domain, where practical considerations must often come first and compromise is often necessary. Such attitudinal differences have an impact on women's attitudes toward power, a force which can be used constructively or destructively. Researchers have taken this "moral" component into account in power research. McClelland's "Two Faces of Power" (1970) ties the

"unsocialized" or exploitative side to an earlier stage of development, and hence incomplete maturity. The "jungle fighter," because of changes in our technological and economic system, is on the way out, and successful only in certain highly competitive industries. The new model is the team playing "gamesman" (Maccoby, 1976). The good manager, however, must still have a higher need for power (but the socialized kind) rather than for affiliation or achievement (McClelland and Burnham, 1976).

Because women do not start with power and dominance as part of their self-definition, such considerations are of lesser importance and perhaps later consideration. As Jean Baker Miller (1976) has pointed out, because women are socialized to value private interpersonal and inner-directed individual achievement, as well as nurturance, they often focus on the whole context in which humans relate ("Field dependence"), rather than the fact of dominance per se. They have not been trained informally and encouraged to achieve and maintain power, using the team and informal tactics men use in the public domain. For such reasons, one cannot simply add female subjects to a male value-oriented research design on power attitudes. One must take into account their different life patterns and work patterns, as well as their special commitment to the obligations and satisfactions in the private domain and the values resultant. But it is important also to assess their reactions to the

business world as it currently exists.

Women, educated along with men to value public accomplishment and recognition, aspire to leadership and status positions which are well rewarded in our society and which afford a sense of psychic as well as financial equality (Andrisani, 1978). However, the business world is organized and conducted on the basis of male oriented values and standards, expressed both formally and informally (Harragan, 1977; Kanter, 1977). Although women managers often have been raised in non-stereotyped ways (Hennig, 1971), many, according to Hennig and Jardim (1977), are not familiar with the informal structures which lead to and are part of the power system and success in the organization. They do not focus on attaining recognition and external rewards (extra status privileges, as well as money), fear risk, do not think in terms of long range career strategy, and continue to pursue the inner-directed achievement-oriented individual strategy that works in the private domain, i.e., work for one's own satisfaction, measured against one's own standards. They wait for their good work to be seen and rewarded, instead of taking action to be noticed. Their accomplishments are not acknowledged inwardly; thus, this "magic slate"<sup>1</sup> phenomenon prevents such managers from building on these experiences to gain confidence for the next challenges.

---

<sup>1</sup>This term was used by Margaret Barbee, Ph.D., in a personal communication.

Instead of the team-oriented male power strategy, they are more oriented to their own individual growth and achievement as well as making contributions to others. Such findings would seem to contradict Hennig's earlier study about the non-traditional rearing of top level female executives, since many of the above characteristics would seem to be derived from stereotyped views of women, expressed in child-rearing and later experiences.

Harragan (1977) also points out that the male team approach is based on models of sports and the military, with which women are largely unfamiliar. However, as more is known and written about these informal paths to management achievement, the subject is becoming one which women feel more able to discuss and think about positively. On the one hand, there are the inhibiting factors of sex stereotypes and cultural conditioning, as well as fears of the risk of desensitization and shallowness of human relationships (Miller, 1976), that results for men, despite their best intentions, when the power game becomes an end in itself (Maccoby, 1976). On the other hand, public attitudes, buttressed by the media, are changing in the direction of expanding roles for women; there are increased opportunities backed up by civil rights legislation; and the pragmatic demands of managerial decision making within a multi-faceted organizational environment become more important than sex differences. The present study focuses on the attitudes of

a rare group of management women towards specific aspects of power, and compares their attitudes to those of women in non-management low level positions.

Research on Women Relating to Power and Authority

There has been research on the factors which make exercise of power difficult for women. Not only is there the internal socialization of women as non-leaders, but there are many external forces as well, both in organizational structures and situations, and in attitudes of others towards women in positions of power.

Attitudes and perceptions often create problems. Women's performance is evaluated differently, usually as inferior (Feldman, Summers, & Kresler, 1974; Strodbeck, James, & Hawkins, 1967). They are judged in a restricted, stereotyped way (Gould, 1975); their performance may be attributed to luck (Deaux & Emswiler, 1973), and their potential for managerial positions is deemed inferior (Bass, Krusell, & Alexander, 1971; Deaux & Taynor, 1973; McKenna & Denmark, 1975; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974 a,b; Schein, 1973, 1975; Shaw, 1972).

Once in managerial positions, they are not backed up (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974) or evaluated as positively as men (Bass et al., 1971; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973). If women do attain status and power, men react negatively to them (Feather & Simon, 1975; Gould, 1975; Pleck, 1973; Steinmann & Fox, 1974; Tresemer & Pleck, 1972). Other competent women

also react negatively (Hochschild, 1973; Schein, 1976; Staines et al., 1973), and being a "token woman" has other negative consequences (Kanter, 1977; Laws, 1975). There are formal structural factors in organizations and situational variables which can affect women negatively such as sex typing of jobs and other control mechanisms related to structure (Acker & Van Houten, 1974; Babcock, Friedman, & Norton, 1975; Hartman, 1976), as well as economic factors, opportunity situations, sex ratios in different hierarchical levels and within levels, and dominance structures (Kanter, 1976, 1977).

There are potent informal structures which also hinder women's exercise of power (Cole et al., 1975; Epstein, 1970, 1973, 1975; Martin & Straus, 1956; Zuckerman, 1975). Since perceived similarity is not only part of the definition but the basis of granting power, women are perceived as deviant and not readily given positions of power (Dalton, 1951; Lipset & Bendix, 1959; Mason, 1957; Pen, 1966). When women are able to acquire the necessary high level sponsorship for high position, the reasons have to do with equal opportunity requirements (Kanter, 1977). In addition, when women do have some power, they are reacted to negatively by peers (Wright, 1972; Wexley & Hunt, 1974; Wolman & Frank, 1975).

Differential perceptions and attitudes toward power are expressed in many different behaviors. There are nonverbal and linguistic expressions (Henley, 1973, a,b; Lakoff, 1973, 1975; Schefflen, 1972; Thorne & Henley, 1975). The dominance/

submission pattern has been eroticized and thus intertwined with a positive pleasurable life force (Morgan, 1975). Thus, there are often dysfunctional symbolic sexual interaction patterns, i.e., stereotyped role playing, carried over to the business world, which limit women's range of power behavior (Bradford et al., 1975; Kanter, 1975, a & b).

Research on Power and Its Relation  
to the Psychology of Women

The psychological research on power as a motive is by no means extensive, and is, with few exceptions, focused predominantly on men. The research of Veroff (1957), Winter (1967, 1973), and McClelland (1975), derived from the classic expectancy-value theory, defined power as a need desired for its own sake, rather than goal oriented; Uleman (1972) felt constrained to call his positive construct "influence" as distinct from power. More recently, Veroff (1977) has fused the need for power (n power) and n ach as did Murray (1938), into "power achievement." He defines this concept, which he says is much like Winter's (1973) construct, as self assertion occurring through achievement, with the self as evaluator, and the focus being on the self-perceived impact of achievement, not the process. Again, it is an inner-directed force, not primarily in an organization-related context.

Another way of dealing with the duality of power has been McClelland's socialized and unsocialized power

concepts, which he has applied to research on male managers (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). Power in managers is defined as "a desire to have impact, to be strong and influential" (p. 103). However, this need must be controlled and disciplined so it is used for the good of the organization and not for exaltation of the self. This maturity was seen as self discipline, which had to be added to the desire for impact, in order to fit the definition of socialized power, which was found to be high in successful male managers. No relationship was found with  $n_{ach}$ , but  $n_{pow}$  was lower than need for affiliation, all assessed by the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). McClelland defines the need for affiliation as the need to be liked, although the relevant functional business equivalent, human relations sensitivity, involves not a need to be liked, but an interest in people (Boyatzis, 1974).

Despite the androcentric bias of most of this research on power (Denmark, Tangri & McCandless, 1977), and the problems inherent in the use of the TAT as a research instrument (Murstein, 1963; Lazarus, 1966), the theoretical formulations, definitions and questions it has presented have been extremely important in trying to explore the phenomenon of power in women. Although they have not been relevant for women, they have provided a basis for consideration of the issues of power.

Other research has also provided frameworks for studying women in the context of power. The indirect aspect of power has been separated from the direct (Johnson, 1976; Tedeschi, 1972); different orientations in women are posited to be an important first step in assessing women, with the "self-defining" woman placing a career in a major position in her values (Stewart and Winter, 1974). Another important dimension is to be found in the distinctions between the public and private domains in relation to the expression of power in women (Janeway, 1971; Sanday, 1974). The socialization of women has been discussed in relation to the male model of leadership and power in organizations (Zuckerman, 1975), and different styles of leadership have been explored in relation to women (Chapman & Luthans, 1975; Denmark, 1978). Defining leadership as a "reciprocal process of social influence" (p. 99), Denmark emphasizes the situational variables which influence leadership styles, as well as the interactional quality of the construct. Using the definition of power as a force that is used only when appropriate and needed, Miller's (1976) concept of power is like McClelland's except that she classifies power over others, which maintains the dominant/subordinate system, as destructive and restrictive. Her work has been done in a clinical, rather than an organizational setting, but it does incorporate the situational variables in its definition. David Kipnis (1974) conceptualizes power motivation only in the context of role behavior in relationship to others, when one must "influence"

others to do what they might not willingly do, in order to satisfy one's needs.

#### The Raven and French Typology of Power

A fruitful conceptualization has been the Raven and French Typology of the five (later amended to six) main dimensions of power (French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959; French & Snyder, 1956; Raven, 1965, 1974; Raven & French, 1959), since it attempts to deal with specific aspects of power itself. According to this theory, the sources of power are described by the authors as follows:

Reward Power is based on the agent's ("O") ability to mediate rewards, as perceived by the person influenced ("P"), within such areas as O can reward P for conforming. This concept was later broadened to include potential approval and acceptance.

Coercive Power stems from the expectation on the part of P that one will be punished by O if one fails to conform to the influence attempt. This was also broadened to include potential dislike, disapproval, etc.

Expert Power stems from the attribution of superior knowledge or ability to O; it is felt to be a more limiting power than referent power.

Referent Power is based on one person using another person or group as a "frame of reference" against which one evaluates some aspect of oneself. The process of identification with the person is a critical factor, because we tend

to adopt opinions, attitudes and behaviors similar to those held by such a person. "I would prefer to be like him or I want to behave or believe as he does" would be the feeling induced in P. P's attraction to O would cause him or her to become closely associated with O or maintain closeness.

Legitimate Power is based on P's accepting the role structural relationship with O, feeling that O has a right to ask him or her to comply and he or she (P) is supposed to do as asked, on the basis of cultural values and acceptance of the social structure, such as designation by a legitimizing agent.

A sixth basis, informational power, was later posited by Raven (1965). It is a dimension involving internalized cognitive change (similar to the Etzioni [1961] concept of successful or inner compliance) and in that sense is less applicable to a business setting. However, control of communication and information can be part of the other sources of power.

Social and industrial psychologists have operationalized the Raven and French bases of power in research, using questionnaires in many settings, dividing the five aspects into two overarching categories: reward, coercive and legitimate power being part of the organizational situation; and referent and expert power being the incremental personal part of power which makes a leader effective and enables him or her to gain the support and cooperation

of the group for effective task performance (Hollander, 1954; Hollander & Julian, 1959; Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1970; Katz & Kahn, 1956; Kipnis & Consentino, 1969; Student, 1958). Research has also been done in nonindustrial settings such as schools (Jamisson, in Raven, 1974), mental hospitals (Rosenberg & Pearlen, 1962), and in the area of marriage relationships (Raven et al., in Raven, 1974), parent-child relationships with disturbed adolescents (Goldstein et al., in Raven, 1974), and to explore sex role stereotyping (Johnson, 1974).

Operationalizing the five bases of power in industrial settings for males, it was useful to separate the powers that were given by the organization (reward, coercive, legitimate) and those (referent and expert) the manager added himself, which "incremental" power being seen as making the leader effective. However, such a scheme does not fit the business world as women find it: often women are not given the same powers by the organization, their actions are interpreted differently, and referent power can have a different meaning in a cross sex relationship. Dividing power into its components seems a useful way to approach the power construct for women. It can relate to specific situations and does not necessarily define power as implying dominance for its own sake, with its concomitant possibilities for personal or destructive exploitation of others. It can be neutral and situationally based. Raven & French (1958)

define social power in terms of influence, in which a person changes another's cognitions, attitudes or behaviors. This leaves room for a constructive and practical application of power, which has application to the organizational world.

Men and women, particularly women, have strong reservations about destructive, personal power for its own sake; the business world has found such "Jungle Fighters" less successful and not in line with new, more humanistically oriented, management trends (Maccoby, 1977). The Raven and French division of the construct into components leaves room for the positive and reality based application of power. This study, then, reaches many of the small group of women with power, and compares their attitudes toward very realistic organizational power situations with those of women who have no decision making power. When equal employment questions raise issues concerning "qualifications" of women for high positions, it is important to have research on women's attitudes toward power, a crucial concomitant of management positions. This research may lay a realistic foundation for future studies examining causes of any differences found, whether individual, culturally conditioned or related to experiences and occupational structure.

The top level management subjects of this study are a large percentage of a very small, hard-to-reach group of women managers rarely sampled before in such numbers for a social psychology study of attitudes. Much research consists

of laboratory studies, or studies in which the sample is not clearly identified women executives. Because of the author's special relationships with women's groups, this study has been able to tap attitudes of women of high rank in the field toward real business situations. Such external validity fills an important gap in a field which itself is new, and not extensively researched. Very little documented psychological research has been done on the attitudes of managerial women themselves to power issues they confront in organizations; rather, attention has mainly been focused on reactions of others to them, or their attitudes toward themselves and their private and public roles (Terborg, 1977).

## CHAPTER 2

## PILOT STUDIES

Two pilot studies were conducted in an attempt to explore the attitudes of achieving women toward power. The basic question was whether the Raven and French aspects of power could be operationalized in a way that was appropriate for women and, secondly, whether positive attitudes toward power could be elicited as well as negative ones. The first pilot study had five preliminary hypotheses:

1. Positive attitudes towards power would predominate in the highly capable and dominant criterion group of subjects, both in the public and private realm.

2. Non-career women would be more likely to approve of indirect forms of power than career women.

3. Career women would have more positive attitudes towards direct power.

4. Positive attitudes towards women's power from sexual attractiveness would be high.

5. Task orientation, role appropriateness and moral judgments about the use of one's capabilities and self esteem would be important factors in attitudes to power.

The second pilot study concentrated on the area to be pursued in the final study: attitudes of career women

in relation to specific reality based work situations. Both studies were largely exploratory and used in the development of the final study.

### Pilot I

In order to test preliminary hypotheses about women's attitudes toward power, and the feasibility of operationalizing the Raven and French bases of power, the first pilot study was conducted using a self-report questionnaire with a criterion group (see Appendix 1). Added to the five elements of power defined by Raven and French was the dimension of sexual attractiveness, a form of indirect power for women. The five elements were put in two contexts, i.e., the public and the private realms, a form of definition for sex-appropriate roles (Janeway, 1971; Rosaldo & Lamphere, 1975). Since power has direct and indirect manifestations, the five dimensions were reflected, whenever possible, in both an indirect and a direct form. It was hoped that by adding these additional aspects and areas of expression of power, one could come closer to assessing women's attitudes.

For example, women's role has been defined as allowing for power in the private realm of the home, not the public realm. Such social definitions must surely affect women's attitudes toward power. We know that such social definitions of what is appropriate for each sex affects the achievement motive (Horner, 1970).

Another dimension was direct vs. indirect forms of power; since power is associated with maleness and masculinity, direct expressions are discouraged in girls' socialization. Also, using the status considerations of sociology, one can think of indirect expression of power as characteristic of subordinate, less powerful groups (Hacker, 1951, 1947; Myrdal, 1944) and apply this to women. This first pilot study used indirect power in the sense it had been used by other researchers: to denote manipulation and hidden sources of power. Michener & Suchner (1972) had discussed indirect forms of power, though not in relation to women: tactics such as blocking outcomes, creation of demand and withdrawal. Johnson (1976) pointed out that such indirect power might have short run but not long run advantages for women.

#### Method

Questionnaires were sent out to women (personal friends and members of alumnae groups) known to be highly capable and dominant both in career and non-career roles. The questionnaire presented direct and indirect expressions of the five kinds of power both in the public and private domain, and in relation to peers and subordinates. Since people respond to the expectations of a role set, it was deemed important to examine attitudes in relation both to equals and to those in a position defined as subordinate. Respondents were asked to assume that they had careers and were

being promoted to the first level of top management. The same was done for the private sphere, where respondents were asked to assume they were happily married and had children. The husband corresponded to the colleague as a peer; the children corresponded to subordinates. Indirect elements of power in the public sphere were behind-the-scenes manifestations such as favors, withdrawal of support, and using outside contacts to strengthen one's position. In the private sphere indirect power corresponded to vicarious power, a socially approved avenue for women's ego enhancement, in which the husband's position provides the wife with status (legitimate power), respect and charisma (referent) and coercive and reward power as well.

Since extensive discussions with women's groups had revealed a strong concern with what they felt were the pragmatic ethics of the business world, questions were added to tap the dimensions of moral judgment as well as other criteria used by respondents for their ratings. A question was asked about sexual attractiveness as a component of power feelings.

Respondents were asked to rate statements on a scale of 1-5, with five being the rating indicating that the factor was very important. At the end there was room for general comments, many of which proved to be quite illuminating. they indicated a strong sense of discomfort some had with the idea of power altogether, particularly in relation to the private domain.

Subjects

Sixty-five percent of the questionnaires were returned, for a total of 43. Twenty-seven of the women had full-time careers, and 18 were housewives or worked part-time. The career women had worked full-time from four to 30 years, with 41% having worked from nine to 12 years and 31% from 17-20 years. Eighteen percent supervised one or two people, 26% supervised from three to five people, 15% supervised from six to 10 people, 7% supervised from 11 to 15 people, 4% from 16 to 25 people, and 11%, 50 or more people (on a regular or project basis).

Subjects were between the ages of 24 and 64, with the median age category between 40 and 44. Two percent were under 25, 7% were between 25 and 29 years old, 7% were between 30 and 34, 12% were between 35 and 39 years, 33% were between 40 and 44 years, 12% were between 45 and 49 years, 16% were between 50 and 54 years, 9% were between 55 and 59 years and 2% were 60 or over. In comparing the career and noncareer women's ages, there were more career women in the 40 to 49 and 50 to 54 age groups, but their percentages dwindled sharply after age 54.

Of the total group, 14% had one child, 37% had two children, 20% had three children and 26% had no children. Comparing the career and noncareer women, only 7% of the housewives had no children, compared to 37% of the career women, and these figures were reversed for those having

three children, with only seven percent of the career women in this category compared to 37% of the housewives. More career women, 14%, had one child, compared to 7% of the housewives. The fact that career women had fewer children and more were childless was not surprising. Obviously a full-time career is more difficult when combined with childrearing.

Of the total group, 65% were married, 21% were divorced, separated or divorced and living with another person; 12% were single. Comparing the two subgroups, 52% of the career women were married as opposed to 85% of the housewives, 33% of the career women were divorced or separated, and 14% were single, as opposed to 7% of the housewives. Such patterns are what one might expect, with a higher percentage of career women needing to be self-supporting. The sample was largely professional and managerial on the middle level. All were white, college educated or beyond, upper middle class women, known by the author to be strong, capable, dynamic, and assertive, whether in career or in the home. They were in a time of life when a woman has usually validated her femaleness by marriage and childbearing, or has attained a position of success in the career area, as in our sample; thus, the pilot study attempted to see whether such accomplished women would have positive attitudes toward various types of power when such power was described in a straightforward manner in relation to the self.

Results and Discussion

Respondents replied differentially to the different aspects of power. Responses 4 and 5 ("somewhat important" or "very important") were grouped as favorable, and responses 1 and 2 ("unimportant" or "very unimportant") were considered unfavorable. There were positive responses to reward power both in the public and private realms, since that aspect is pleasant for most people and particularly part of women's socialization for nurturance and altruism. In the following, figures in parentheses refer to unfavorable responses. In a work situation (public) in relation to subordinates, 63% were favorable (10%) to direct and 58% to indirect (16%) reward power. In relation to peers, 76% (8%) were favorable to direct and 74% (18%) to indirect reward power. In the home (private), 63% (18%) were favorable to direct and 72% (15%) to indirect reward power in relation to children; in relation to husbands, 95% (2%) favored tangible rewards, and 60% (21%) favored indirect reward.

Expert power was another aspect toward which respondents were favorable. In the work area, 92% were favorable (5%) to direct manifestations in relation to subordinates, and 95% (5%) in relation to peers. In relation to indirect expert power, 84% (3%) were favorable in relation to peers and fifty-seven percent (16%) in relation to subordinates. In the private realm, only in relation to children was there a positive attitude toward direct expert power: 74% were

favorable and 15% unfavorable. Sixty-five percent were unfavorable and only 7% favorable in relation to indirect expert power with children. The concept of "expert power" is something that fits in with the ideal of individual achievement for women, evidently not family relationships.

Another area of positive response was legitimate power with peers in the public realm: 84% responded positively compared to 5% negatively; however, attitudes to legitimate power with subordinates were 47% negative, only 15% positive with 37% uncertain. In the home legitimate power was rated negatively by 61% (13%) in relation to children. In relation to husbands, 44% were favorable and 27% unfavorable. Thus, legitimate power for the women was not favorably regarded in the home or with subordinates at work, though it was with peers in the workplace.

Referent power was seen as important in the home, in relation to a husband, since it represented respect for her as a person, and hopefully a personal charisma: 81% (7%) rated this favorably. In the public sphere, 65% (10%) rated referent power favorably in relation to subordinates and 66% in relation to peers (19%).

In order to see whether there were differences between the responses of career and non-career respondents, responses were grouped for all of the power dimensions. In the public realm, career women rated indirect reward power in relation to subordinates higher (60% were favorable, as opposed to

46% of non-career women). A higher percentage was unfavorable to coercive power toward subordinates (60% compared to 40% unfavorable among non-career women). Although responses to legitimate power in relation to subordinates were low for both groups, a higher percentage of career women was negative (52%, compared to 36% of housewives). Career women were less favorable to direct expert power with subordinates (88% of career women were favorable compared to 100% of non-career). Perhaps they had learned some of the limitations of that source of power.

In an attempt to tap the criteria used by the respondents in their judgments, questions were asked about some components of their attitudes. Sixty-three percent replied that role appropriateness had been an important factor; 76% that both their capabilities and their moral judgment about the use of their abilities had influenced their responses; 79% said that their own self-worth had been a factor; and the largest percentage, 81%, said that the requirements of the task had been an influence, with 52% responding with the "very important" score. Capabilities and self-worth also elicited 55% and 40% respectively in the number five "very important") category, one rarely used by respondents in the questions about the aspects of power previously discussed.

Thus in the next study an attempt was made to follow up on the task orientation, by setting forth the aspects

of power in the framework of specific problems that might be encountered in a business situation.

Attitudes toward sexual attractiveness as a form of potential power was important in social situations (87% favorable) and in intimate relations (84% favorable); at work 54% were favorable, while 22% were unfavorable, with more housewives unfavorable (33%) than career women (19%). The less positive reaction in the work situation may reflect the perception that such power is inappropriate in that area, and the correct perception of the reality that such sexual emphasis can backfire when used, and impair a woman's credibility at her task. Nevertheless, the career women's experience seems to have caused them to also be less negative than the housewives. The association of a certain amount of surface attractiveness with success and acceptance in the business world may have influenced the business women to be less unfavorable. Since the question lacked specificity, an attempt was made in the second pilot study to examine this element further.

The one aspect of power that found the respondents consistently negative was coercive power. In the work situation, indirect coercive power was rated more negatively: eighty-seven percent were unfavorable and thirteen percent favorable in relation to subordinates. (Numbers following in parentheses are percentage favorable unless otherwise noted.) Sixty-eight percent were unfavorable (31%) in relation to peers. In the direct manifestations, in relation to

subordinates, 54% were unfavorable (24%) with career women sixty percent unfavorable, compared to housewives, who were forty percent unfavorable; and in relation to peers, direct coercive power was rated unfavorable by 45% (26%). Although few people really like to be the villain and male managers have often delayed firing people, or have given the "hatchet job" to someone else, nevertheless, if a manager does not have the power to fire, his or her power will be significantly diminished.

However, because the wording might have been interpreted to imply liking this kind of power, even though respondents said they were mostly influenced by the requirements of the task, subsequent studies made an attempt to clearly specify the task-oriented aspect of the situation.

Comments revealed more general negative attitudes toward power than were apparent in responses. Many felt such issues were inappropriate in the realm of home and family, where altruism and love should prevail. Others showed they related power to the personal self-aggrandizing type, and said they didn't have such "ego problems." Still others rejected the whole orientation, saying they did not think that way at all and found the concept foreign to them, or had never considered such issues. Some wrote rather lengthy letters, explaining that they had no time to answer the questionnaire, or that such issues were irrelevant (this came from a woman who supervised 10 people), or that they

could not relate to it. These comments were interpreted to reflect their sense of the inappropriateness of the concept of power, and their defensive reactions to admitting any positive feelings about power. Such results would correspond to what Hennig and Jardim (1977) found characteristic of women managers: a tendency to deny the action they had taken or its assertive components, instead attributing their progress to others. The comments also emphasized the inner-directed point of view, focusing on making a contribution to others, judging one's own achievement and achieving fulfillment and personal growth, also found by Hennig and Jardim. One respondent actually said the questions were not sufficiently inner-directed and stressed competitiveness and defensiveness instead of self realization.

In summary, the data were examined only for percentage trends, since the instrument was being used with a criterion group mainly to assess its feasibility for a future study of women's attitudes toward power. Hypotheses were not examined by statistical tests of significance, but trends which seemed to point in certain directions were used in designing the questionnaire for the present study, and guided the direction of the second pilot study. The study had shown that capable women were willing to express positive as well as negative attitudes towards power within the Raven and French framework; thus the area of study was deemed a fruitful one for continued study.

Pilot II

As noted, the first pilot study helped to give direction to the second study, which tried to overcome some of the difficulties and point the direction to the final study. First of all, instead of questions asking directly the respondent's attitude toward each of the five bases of power, each type was incorporated into a specific situation which might occur in a business setting. Instead of rating on a one to five scale, the format was sentence completion (see Appendix 2). This format had some of the features of the projective tests used in power research, in an effort to see what some common responses were for the different items. These responses could then be the basis for the final multiple choice version, used in the final study.

It was decided to focus on public power only. As the first pilot study had seemed to indicate, besides direct reward and referent power, other aspects of power seemed antithetical to the private realm, where love and caring seemed the only acceptable basis. Besides, the issue of power is one of utmost importance for women in the working world, and it was felt the study should concentrate on this crucial public area.

Since women are concentrated at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy and constitute a very small percentage of top management (estimates range from 1%-10% because of lack of statistical standardization), the problem

of equal opportunity for women is largely concerned with entry into and promotion into management. In order to assess the attitudes toward power of women who were career oriented and ambitious, a revised questionnaire was administered to a group of 53 women. With the availability of face to face contact, role models, group support, and commonality of purpose, it was felt that there would be an enhanced opportunity to gather honest, reality based responses.

#### Procedure

A revised questionnaire was administered to women attending a seminar the author was conducting under the auspices of the Adelphi University School of Business Administration. The seminar was entitled, "Women and Managerial Power." The questionnaires were given out at the beginning of the session and were collected as soon as they were completed. The format (see Appendix 2) was sentence completion for 10 situations representing power situations. Each of the 10 specific vignettes related to the five power constructs, in relation to peers and subordinates. During the seminar these concepts were discussed as part of the debriefing.

#### Subjects

The group of 53 women was composed mainly of women who were presently employed: only 8% were not working. Twenty-

eight percent were clerical workers; 20% were professional, research or entrepreneurial; and 44% were first level supervisors, or low and middle managers, with from one to 120 subordinates. It is presumed that all were motivated to advance in management.

Subjects were predominantly in midlife, with 46% between 40 and 49 years and 25% between 30 and 39 years of age. Fifteen percent were under 30 and 13% were between 50 and 59 years of age.

### Results

Responses to the questionnaire clustered around dimensions which had been previously established by researchers; that is, active, power relevant behavior, affiliative, and individual achievement behavior. It was decided to use the first two of these responses as a basis for the response choices in the present study.

For example, in the situation corresponding to direct reward power with a subordinate who has been doing excellent work, action responses were quite varied, since the situation involved a tight budget. Some said they would transfer the employee, fire a less productive employee, or cut the budget elsewhere. Affiliative responses included discussions, explanations, praise, putting a good recommendation in the files, promising a raise next time, and the like. Individual achievement was not retained as a category, although team was included in the power responses.

The new format of specific situations for each item made for more uniformity, and responses were generally oriented in the direction of action, much of it power related. As previously mentioned, the face to face, supportive aspect resulted in almost no defensive responses. Thus the study seemed to point to a promising avenue of responses, which was refined further and pretested before the final administration.

The sexual attractiveness factor, which had a very positive response in the first pilot study, became negative. The majority, given a specific situation, disapproved of using the power of attractiveness, and responded in ways indicating that the task was to be considered uppermost, and one's image was to be strictly businesslike and formal ("tailored clothes"). Perhaps the women realized that to emphasize a non task oriented stereotype could hamper their advancement and their credibility.

### Conclusions

It was decided to use some of the features of the two pilot studies and to eliminate others. As in the second pilot, the private power dimension was eliminated in order to better focus on women in careers. Also in the interests of brevity, essential for tapping attitudes of busy woman executives, the 1-5 attitude response was retained from the first pilot, with one item again corresponding to each construct.

In order to make the power situations of maximum relevance for women in reality based situations, the hypothetical situations for each construct were retained, as in the second pilot. These situations generated much positive feedback in debriefing and discussions after the administration of the questionnaire. Pilot 2 also generated response material on which the three response categories were based. This pilot and followup discussions verified that a large problem for women attempting to advance to higher leadership positions in organizations was their lack of awareness of and inability to adapt to the informal power structure. Women in management find certain things difficult: risk taking, long term career perspective, team strategy, use of the motivating and other effects of external rewards and recognition, flexibility and "value free" judgments, and knowledge of the informal system (Hennig and Jardim, 1977). Therefore, it was decided to incorporate these elements as much as possible into the power response choices and descriptions of the stimulus situations. Thus, indirect power in the multiple choice includes the elements of the informal power system within organizations as well as the indirect or hidden aspect. The direct power response includes such informal elements as teamwork and risk taking.

A third response was added on the basis of responses to Pilot 2. It will be called an affiliative response, defined, however, as a concern for people, rather than a need to be liked (Boyatzis, 1974).

As we have seen, power is not a global concept, nor one that is easily defined. Not only are there different aspects of power, private and public domains, direct and indirect forms, power in relation to peers and subordinates, but there are the important variables of the rank and status of the person who has attitudes towards these aspects of power. The organizational climate and tradition are also variables, as well as individual variations in ability, childhood socialization and adult experience.

The first two pilot studies explored the feasibility of incorporating some of these elements into a questionnaire format. Using a forced numerical choice questionnaire on both public and private power attitudes, a more projective sentence completion on only public power, and discussions with women at various ranks in the corporate hierarchy, a final questionnaire was developed for this present study. Because it was decided to use a sample group of high level women executives, practical considerations had to be taken into account in the final decisions about the instrument, foremost among which were brevity to accommodate very busy people and a strong reality base recognized as relevant to their actual organizational lives.

In this study, some elements were eliminated: organizational climate, attitudes in relation to superiors, most individual variables, the private domain, and projective elements. The direct and indirect dimensions, relationship

to peers and subordinates, the five aspects of power, and a human relations non-power response were retained in a forced numerical attitude choice format. The dependent variable was the degree of positive attitudes to these various combinations of power elements; the independent variable was the rank and power positions within organizations, as exemplified by a high achieving group of women executives and a low status, non management group of secretarial and clerical personnel.

## CHAPTER 3

## METHOD AND HYPOTHESES

Overview: Definitions and Areas of Investigation

For the purposes of this research, women were studied, in relation to power in the public domain, both in indirect and direct power forms. Indirect power includes not only those aspects which are hidden (i.e., the power source may not be clearly known nor the action observable to all, as when a person is influential "behind the scenes"), but it includes the informal power structure, which may not be readily apparent to all, but is understood by many within organizations. A human relations response, and power in relation both to subordinates and peers was included, using subjects employed within an organizational setting.

The five aspects of power defined by Raven and French were incorporated into stimulus vignettes involving a problem within the area of power. These vignettes were followed by response choices in order to test specific hypotheses.

In order to maximize relevance to the reality of the work world, it was decided to use subjects presently employed full time, with few exceptions. Because of the social desirability factor, socialized power, as McClelland

defines it, i.e. for the good of the organization, was not included as a separate response category. The socialized/unsocialized dimensions, it was felt, would be subject to different interpretations when applied to women. Instead, aspects of women's current situation and responses in organizations were incorporated into the items of the questionnaire along with the Raven and French categories.

The general hypotheses about the attitudes of women in the public world of employment must reflect the complexities and counterforces at work. On the one hand there are the socialization processes and sex role expectations for even achieving women; Johnson (1974) found that women were expected to use manipulative power and helplessness, rather than direct power, to mention just one of the cultural stereotypes about women. These forces might suggest an unfavorable attitude on the part of women towards power in the public sphere, usually defined as male and deviant for females. On the other hand, the background of top women achievers has not always been in the traditional mold (Hennig, 1971); discussion of power for women has been removed from the taboo category and is now openly explored and discussed in favorable and socially approved ways for women.

However, since power is not a monolithic concept, it was hypothesized that groups would differ not only on their attitudes toward different components of power, but also in

relation to direct and indirect modes and in relation to peers and subordinates as a function of their positions within an organization.

Basically, the following questions were asked: 1) Can an instrument be constructed to reflect not only different components of power, but also in relation to women in the organizational world? 2) Do successful women executives differ from non-managerial, clerical women on their attitudes toward some of these dimensions of power? 3) Will differences support a situationally based rather than a compensatory derivation of attitudes toward power? If subordinates are more positive toward power, then it would support the compensatory theory that those with less power want it more. If, however, a more favorable attitude is held by those whose situations in an organization are higher status, legitimated and provide experience in power use, then one might look for causality in elements of the managerial situation which can interact with other psychological factors.

### Major Hypotheses

#### Hypothesis 1:

Comparing managers and non managers, managers will have more favorable attitudes toward power than non managers. Managers will rate as more desirable items which occur in the following categories: overall power, non-coercive power, direct power, indirect power only in relation to peers, as well as the five bases of power rated individually.

### Hypothesis 2:

Within the managers' group, higher level managers will have more favorable attitudes to power than lower level managers, on all the dimensions of power in Hypothesis 1, above.

### Hypothesis 3:

Non managers will have more favorable attitudes towards the non power response, labelled affiliative.

The supposition underlying these hypotheses is that an instrument based on realistic situations embodying power concepts can be developed which will distinguish between managers and non managers, thus adding to our knowledge about components of successful management as it relates to women.

### Discussion of Hypotheses

Attitudes toward power are posited to be based on position within the organization and the individual situation involved, rather than based on an internal desire to compensate for lack of power (Adler, 1927, 1966; Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1959). General social desirability would make attitudes toward reward power more positive than toward coercive power, and the indirect made less desirable than the direct. Within this framework, managers, because of their experience in their positions, would rate direct and indirect power more positively, because they would see it as needed for effectiveness as managers. They would be more aware of the informal system of power and be favorable

towards it because of its importance in managerial effectiveness. Because affiliative responses are part of the female stereotype and do not fit the male managerial model of decisive action, it is posited that managers would want to disassociate themselves from nurturant responses.

Secretary/Clerks (hereafter called clerks or non managers), on the other hand, having no managerial power and being in a sex-typed occupation encouraging stereotyped behavior and attitudes, would focus on social factors and rate affiliative responses more favorably.

Thus structural and situational factors within the organization are posited to be the important ones in attitudinal differences between managers and non managers, just as in current achievement research the important variables for women are "situational, social and institutional characteristics which interact with psychological factors (Mednick and Weissman, in Vaughter, 1976, p. 134).

### Instrument

#### Overview

Since there was no existing validated instrument to measure attitudes of women toward power, this research was conducted to see whether an instrument could be constructed using reality based organizational situations, within the framework of the psychology of women and their present situation in organizations. An instrument was constructed to

assess career women's attitudes towards different dimensions of power. This instrument was developed as a derivation of the first two pilot studies, as well as research, and discussions with working women at seminars, symposia, and panels, and with college and high school students in psychology classes discussing power theory.

In the latter case, the source of input was an exercise administered to 20 high school seniors taking a college level psychology course. After a unit on leadership and power, they were asked to write managerial situations for each of the Raven and French aspects of power, both direct and indirect. Using all of these sources, including the aforementioned discussions with career women, vignettes were chosen to represent situations involving different aspects of power, and response alternatives were selected relating to each dimension (see Table 1).

Items relating to peers were grouped together at the beginning for clarity; the order of the three responses for each vignette were chosen at random by two different people. The vignettes themselves were based as much as possible on situations that might be encountered in the business world. Language incorporated current terminology such as "clout" to give a sense of verisimilitude. Not many responses included comments, but one division manager wrote: "The contents of the questionnaire exemplify situations that I have been involved in as a woman manager." An attempt was

TABLE 1  
 CONSTRUCTS RELATING THE 4-PART TYPOLOGY OF POWER  
 TO ITEMS ON QUESTIONNAIRE\*

In relation to:	DIRECT			INDIRECT			AFFILIATION
SUBORDINATES	I	1. Reward Power	( 1 )	1. Reward Power	( 2 )	( 3 )	
	III	2. Coercive Power	( 9 )	2. Coercive Power	( 7 )	( 8 )	
	II	3. Expert Power	( 6 )	3. Expert Power	( 5 )	( 4 )	
	V	4. Legitimate Power	(14)	4. Legitimate Power	(15)	(13)	
	IV	5. Referent Power	(11)	5. Referent Power	(10)	(12)	
PEERS	VI	1. Reward Power	(16)	1. Reward Power	(18)	(17)	
	X	2. Coercive Power	(30)	2. Coercive Power	(29)	(28)	
	VII	3. Expert Power	(20)	3. Expert Power	(19)	(21)	
	VIII	4. Legitimate Power	(24)	4. Legitimate Power	(23)	(22)	
	IX	5. Referent Power	(25)	5. Referent Power	(27)	(26)	

\*Numbers in parentheses refer to corresponding items on the questionnaire. Roman numerals refer to vignettes of the five bases of power.

made to make the situations of relevance to women.

### Responses

The second pilot study was an important basis of the response categories; five categories were prominent, but two were eliminated: inner directed, achievement oriented responses and a passive response. The former was too obviously socially desirable and the latter socially undesirable in the context of managerial decision making; furthermore, the instrument had to be short enough so as not to place undue demands on the time of busy working people. For each of the situations, attitudes toward three types of motivational response were to be rated: direct power, indirect power (including informal organizational elements), and the human relations, affiliative nurturant response (see Table 2 for the relationship of these constructs to numbers of items). Attitudes toward each of the response modes were rated on the 1-5 scale, from "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly."

Since situations are complex and more than one course of action might be used for the same situation, instead of a forced choice format, or even a ranking or response choices, it was decided to have respondents rate each response mode separately.

Introductory statements were included before the questionnaire, to explain in general the purposes of the study.

TABLE 2

INFORMAL POWER COMPONENTS INCORPORATED INTO THE DIRECT  
AND INDIRECT POWER ITEMS

	Type of Power	Item No.	Informal Component	Item No.	Informal Component
SUBORDINATES	Reward	2	Be sponsor; develop loyal protegées	1	Same as 2
	Expert	6	Visibility; enhance image	5	Same as 6
	Coercive	9	Visibility, blocking insubordination	7	Negative use of networks to block insubordination
	Referent	11	Reflected power from sponsors	10	Same as 11
	Legitimate	14	Block insubordination	15	Teamwork with rest of organization
PEERS	Reward	16	Build alliances	18	Non judgmental loyalty
	Expert	20	Visibility, enhance image	19	Use of networks, outside resources
	Coercive	30	Confrontation, block attack on position	29	Block attack on position through alliances
	Referent	25	Credibility from access to inner circle	27	Same as 25
	Legitimate	24	Block infringements on position	23	Use appearance of teamwork to block infringements of position

For clerical workers, an introductory page was added, asking simple questions about the clerical skills and job environment, to facilitate the transition to the questionnaire itself, which required putting oneself into a different role situation.

#### Procedure

The questionnaire was administered by mail to women of high level achievement (see p. 48 for detailed description). Different cover letters were included for each group (see Appendices 4, 5, 6). To maximize response from the Women's Forum group, a notification was placed in the group's newsletter that a questionnaire, part of a member's research project, was forthcoming, and urging its prompt return.

Some questionnaires were given out in person, but as with the mailed questionnaires, return envelopes were provided for mailing returns. They were distributed by managers to clerical and middle level women at various organizations where knowledge of their positions governed the form of the questionnaire they received.

Another group of respondents filled out the questionnaires before seminars in two eastern suburban communities, Garden City, N.Y. and Huntington, N.Y., under the auspices of the Adelphi University School of Business Administration which offers programs in management for women. One program was a panel with a series of 45-minute presentations on

different aspects of "Management Skills for Women." The second program was a three-hour seminar, conducted by the author, entitled "Women and Managerial Power." Discussions were included in both programs. Participants at the second seminar took some secretarial forms and return envelopes to give to clerical workers in their offices, and some of those were returned as well.

### Subjects

#### Introduction

A combination of various criteria was used to group the respondents into categories. There is no exact criterion for a top manager. In the Census Bureau reports, the term "manager" includes secretaries (Business Week, 1976) and there are variations in salary and number supervised as well as job title. Women are paid less than men at the same level of responsibility, different industries and geographical areas vary in the level of compensation; the number of people supervised may not be an important indication of level of decision making responsibility; and titles are not uniform (Harragan, 1977). Therefore, a combination of criteria was used.

First, there was inclusion in two groups which were defined as high achieving. High salary level, predominantly over \$40,000, or high rank and/or subordinates supervised were used in combination. Thus, in fields in which compensation is low, the person's rank would be at top level;

where there was low supervision, salary would be high. Such a combination was necessary because in business a reluctance to give women managers direct supervision over men or access to line positions in the important departments, salary discrepancies, fewer women having been started on the management track and other factors make a straight line category not feasible (Harragan, 1977).

A total of 141 women respondents were used in this study: 53 were in the top level executives group, 35 in the middle level achievement group and 53 in the secretarial/clerical group. Divided into two groups, managerial and non-managerial, the managerial had 88 respondents; clericals, 53.

#### Top Level Women Executives

Top level women managers in two groups were sent questionnaires, 53 of which were returned for about a 25% response. The top level group of women achievers was drawn from the following sources: 100 women cited in an article, "100 Top Corporate Women," in Business Week (1976); 105 women members of the Women's Forum, a group of high achieving women in New York City; and women in an alumnae group from seven top women's colleges (Bryn Mawr, Barnard, Radcliffe, Smith, Wellesley and Vassar) who were known to be at management levels. The Women's Forum criteria (sent to members in a memo) for membership of women who have "attained recognition in their respective fields" included, for managers, "a corporate vice presidency, or division/department

manager's post where such office is directly responsible for policy making decisions. In government, appointment should be as Secretary, Commissioner, or other such title . . . persons with the same qualifications as above managers, except their work will be unremunerated in dollars . . . who have succeeded in starting or heading a successful voluntary organization . . . persons recognized by a reputation and defined constituency outside of one's group" and those who have resources which "are used for major purposes such as philanthropy, policy making political leadership." Thus subjects in this top level group were high middle or top management women, mainly in corporations. If not in corporations, they were of recognized high achievement, and a combination of criteria was used for their inclusion, besides membership in the groups mentioned above. These criteria were salary, title, and number supervised; furthermore, the departments and type of organization data were also taken into consideration.

Subjects in the achieving category were predominantly in mid life, actively working in careers. Fifty-eight percent were between 40 and 54 years of age, with other age groups distributed normally. One woman, a 27-year-old, was included because she was obviously on the "fast track" heading the bank's operation in a foreign country, already earning between \$30,000 and \$35,000. She had come up the line route, starting in a management training course, then

to a first level management job in an operations department. She had been given further training courses and opportunities to attend important conferences, and had strong sponsorship within the organization. Eight percent were between 30 and 34 years, 12% were between 35 and 39 years, 20% were between 40 and 44 years, 18% from 45-49 years, 20% from 50-54 years, 12% from 55-59 years, and 6% from 60-64 years. The fact that these women are older is in line with the fact that becoming a top executive takes from 15 to 25 years (Business Week, 1975).

The largest number worked in communications organizations, 21%; consumer products/manufacturing was the second largest category with 17%; 12% worked in service organizations; finance and social service each had 10%; and advertising and public relations had 6%. Other categories had only one or two respondents: educational administration, law/judiciary, nonprofit institutions, government, retail, utilities, raw materials, and other professionals.

The largest percentage (42%) had titles such as vice president, general manager, assistant director, executive producer. Other categories were small; 3% had top level job titles such as president, commissioner, director; 8% were senior or executive vice presidents; 6% were at the level of department head, director of a function, or assistant vice president; 4% were titled managers.

Importantly, these women were predominantly in the departments which are the most important for companies: production, marketing/sales, finance, and chief administrator. Fifty-nine percent were in these areas; 22% were in traditional women's areas of services or public relations; 8% were in professional staff positions; 6% were in planning; and 4% were in personnel.

The line-staff differentiation was important also, with 62% in line positions and 26% staff, while 12% were self-employed or consultative (i.e., on Boards of Directors).

In their private lives, 29% were single and 45% married. Combining divorced, widowed and single women raised the percentage to 55%. Of the women presently married, 35% were childless; of those presently or previously married, the percentage of childless was 47%, bringing the total percentage of those childless to 61% for the group. Of those who were married with children, the mean number of children was two.

As for salary, the majority (70%) earned over \$40,000, but few were in other lower categories: 11% earned between \$30,000 and \$34,999, 9% earned between \$35,000 and \$39,999, 6% earned between \$25,000 and \$29,999, and 4% earned between \$15,000 and \$24,999. In the lowest category was a woman who was on many boards of directors, and the fees were not considered salary. Another in this group was in an important and visible public affairs post, working in the governmental

hierarchy; still another was in education, another notoriously low-paying field. Two were vice presidents, and were thus included because of the title, as well as inclusion in the Business Week article and other women's group.

### Middle Level Achievers

#### Introduction

Middle level achievers are the hardest group to classify, for within this group of women there are many different categories. There is a sharp disparity between those in middle management who are on an upwardly mobile track and those who are first line supervisors in dead-end positions, supervising low-level employees, in a non-decision making role. All aspects of the job must be evaluated together, since no one by itself is a sufficient indicator. Upwardly mobile middle managers tend to be in line positions, in operating departments, proceeding along the path which provides diversified experience and opportunities for visibility and learning, and being promoted on certain timetables. First line supervisors, on the other hand, are more "head" or "chief" workers in a specialized field from which they usually were promoted. They may supervise large numbers of low level or specialized employees, but they have little decision making power, exposure or experience outside their specialized area, and are not considered promotable (i.e., they are "stuck") (Harragan, 1977; Kanter, 1977). Without specific questions directed more finely to these distinctions,

or firsthand knowledge of each of the individual companies involved and their promotional policies and hierarchies, these two categories cannot be defined with exactitude. Therefore, the middle group was defined as above the clerical/secretarial in terms of title of position, salary, and supervisory responsibility, but below those in the high achieving group, on the variables discussed.

The middle level category varied widely on these criteria. Salary varied a great deal, ranging from between \$10,000 to \$14,999 to between \$25,000 and \$29,000; the number supervised from zero to 50; and job titles from account executive to manager, from corporate secretary to unit or senior supervisor. Many were labelled managers or directors. Salaries for women are lower at the same level, companies are less willing to give women managers large numbers of male subordinates, and titles may not fully represent the actual job. Few women have had access to the operating departments and line positions; there are many factors confounding exact classification within this group. However, this confusion of levels, discrepancies in salaries and degree of supervision characterizes the labor market for women executives at this time.

For example, titles can be misleading. Of 325 women who are officers of the 1,300 top companies, only 25% are truly top level, vice president or higher, and 56% are corporate secretaries or assistant secretaries (Wall Street

Journal, 1977). Two women in the study sample earned between \$15,000 and \$19,999, not munificent sums; one woman attended meetings of the finance committee but was not a member. Since functions in different industries do not correspond, a purchaser of chemicals in a chemical company or a purchaser in retailing who is performing a main production function may be on the first rung of management in an operating department; one who purchases clerical supplies in an unrelated company is in a less important support function. In many industries, data processing is a support function, facilitating the main operations of the company, but in insurance, the product line is generated from just such data itself. Number supervised is not always an indicator of managerial status; the chief executive officer (CEO) may have only one person actually reporting to him or her besides his or her secretary, the president of the company. A first line supervisor may be checking the work of a roomful of bookkeepers and never be promoted. Salary can be misleading as well. An account supervisor is defined as a middle manager in advertising, since she can marshal all the resources of the company for her account, which is what brings revenue into the company, yet the compensation may hinge on other outside factors. Indeed, salaries of first line supervisors and even secretaries may be higher, because of length of time on the job, for example, than first level or management positions. Such discrepancies often make it

difficult for the lower level supervisor to switch to the management track, particularly when she is older. A secretary working for the CEO may earn a premium salary, as much for status reasons as for actual responsibility. One secretary in this position earned between \$15,000 and \$19,999. Other factors are the size of the organization and the organizational type and the climate, as well as the industry. Thus, the middle level of achieving women was defined by a combination of variables.

#### Non Managers

The non manager group consisted of clerks, secretaries and other personnel who had no decision making or supervisory function within the organization. Ordinarily such support clerical positions are predominantly female sex-typed occupations, and regardless of the innate capabilities of the person holding them, are considered low level and are outside the power hierarchy of organizations (Harragan, 1977).

Non managers were drawn from many different types of organizations: consumer products; manufacturing; airline, brokerage, cosmetics, import-export; aircraft manufacturing; publishing; education (high school and college); financial services; electronic manufacturing; retail sales; mental health organization; communications and other businesses not fully identified. These firms were located in New York City, Long Island, New Jersey and Oakland, California.

The group was younger than the management group, with 19% under 25 years of age, 25% between 25 and 29, 13% between 30 and 34, 2% between 35 and 39, 13% between 40 and 44, 8% between 45 and 49, 11% between 50 and 54, 6% between 55 and 59, and 4% between 60 and 64. Twenty-nine percent were single, 60% were married, 9% were divorced, and 2% were separated. The total of divorced, separated, widowed and single non-managers was 40%, compared to 57% for top managers. Forty-six percent of the non-managers were childless, compared to 62% of top managers; 21% had one child; 19% had two children; 8% had three children; 4% had four children; and 2% had five children.

Their salaries were, as one would expect, quite low, with 45% earning under \$10,000, and 51% earning between \$10,000 and \$14,999, and 4% earning between \$15,000 and \$19,999.

### Design

Five different types of power were represented by stimulus descriptions of relevant situations. Each of the five kinds of power was described, not only in relation to subordinates and peers, but in both indirect and direct modes. Respondents indicated their level of response on a one to five desirability scale, to three statements following each stimulus description. Two of the statements represented power responses, the third, an affiliation response.

Means were compared for managers and non managers on these and composite items.

## CHAPTER 4

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction: Data Analysis

A Likert type scale was computed by summing the responses to items, with each taking a value from five (disagree strongly) to one (agree strongly), assumed to be measuring part of the same continuum of attitudes. The dependent or criterion variable was the degree of favorability of attitudes toward different aspects of power in relation to specific situations. The independent variable was organizational rank: managerial or non managerial.

There were 20 items representing different aspects of power and ten items representing affiliation. Items were also combined to form the following composite categories:

- |                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Total Power                | 9. Peer-Indirect Power       |
| 2. Direct Power               | 10. Total Non-Coercive Power |
| 3. Indirect Power             | 11. Reward Power             |
| 4. Peer Power                 | 12. Expert Power             |
| 5. Subordinate Power          | 13. Legitimate Power         |
| 6. Peer-Indirect Power        | 14. Referent Power           |
| 7. Subordinate-Indirect Power | 15. Coercive Power           |
| 8. Peer-Direct Power          | 18. Affiliation Power        |

Demographic variables such as age, title, line/staff category, type of department, salary, etc., were examined by means of ANOVA to see whether any of these factors explained part of the differences that were found.

For each of the 30 individual items and for the combination items, a t-test was used to test for significant differences between the means of the two groups. Then the management group was subdivided into top and middle subgroups. A one way ANOVA was used to test for differences between top managers, middle managers and non managers. The Tukey's HSD Test for multiple ranges at the .05 level was used to determine post-hoc comparisons. Responses to each question for all groups were examined and percentages data was also studied. T-tests and one way ANOVA procedures revealed no significant differences between groups with respect to demographic factors.

### Results in Relation to Major Hypotheses

The instrument, although part of an exploratory and heuristic study, was, as hypothesized, able to distinguish between managers and non managers on several dimensions. Also, the respondents indicated a wide range of responses to individual items, ranging from very favorable to very unfavorable.

#### Hypothesis I

Although not all attitudes toward power were rated more favorably by managers, of the 11 constructs that did show

significant differences, some highly significant, all were in the expected direction, as shown by Table 3. All of the types of direct power in relation to peers were significant; in all cases, managers had more favorable attitudes than non managers. Managers were more favorable toward direct power in relation to peers. Reward, which involved backing up and being helpful to allies ( $p \leq .006$ ); Expert, using expertise to enhance image and power ( $p \leq .002$ ); and Referent, using "clout," or access to the inner circle, to get compliance ( $p \leq .0001$ ). They were also significantly more favorable towards blocking attacks on their power positions: Legitimate, blocking an infringement on one's area of authority ( $p \leq .04$ ); and Coercive, confronting a colleague who had attacked her ( $p \leq .02$ ).

In relation to subordinates, managers were significantly more favorable in regard to two direct aspects of power: Coercive, involving visibility in firing an employee guilty of insubordination ( $p \leq .002$ ); and Legitimate, asserting the manager's right to demand appropriate worker performance ( $p \leq .02$ ).

Reflecting the fact that seven out of a possible ten items in the direct mode were significant, the combined construct, Direct Power, showed a very high level of significance,  $p \leq .001$ , as did Direct Power in relation to peers ( $p \leq .002$ ). Also, significant differences were found in Total power ( $p \leq .01$ ) and Total positive power--not including

TABLE 3

Mean Values for Significant Effects: Managers Compared to Non Managers

Item	Construct	Manager (n=88)	Non Manager (n=53)	Significance (two tailed, pooled variance, df = 139)
9	Coercive/Subordinate Direct	2.94	3.62	T = 3.17, p/.002
14	Legitimate/Subordinate/ Direct	1.73	2.11	T = 2.27, p/.02 *
16	Reward/Peer/Direct	2.19	2.81	T = 2.50, p/.006 *
20	Expert/Peer/Direct	2.50	3.24	T = 3.12, p/.002
24	Legitimate/Peer/Direct	2.35	2.88	T = 1.98, p/.04
25	Referent/Peer/Direct	2.20	3.01	T = 3.76, p/.0001
30	Coercive/Peer/Direct	3.12	3.62	T = 2.26, p/.02 *
	Total Direct Power	2.45	2.86	T = 3.28, p/.001 *
	Peer Direct	2.53	3.35	T = 2.65, p/.002 *
	Total Power	2.60	2.83	T = 2.51, p/.01
	Non Coercive	3.00	3.30	T = 2.56, p/.01

\* Separate variance estimate when variances of two groups not homogeneous

N.B.: The means represent averages based on a one to five rating scale

coercive power ( $p / .01$ ), although these last two and legitimate power with peers must be interpreted cautiously, as the following analysis of three groups will indicate.

These differences were examined to determine whether other variables were causing part of the differences. Age, marital status, rank, salary, line/staff, and type of department (the more influential production and marketing and finance departments were combined and separated from the other departments which are less directly related to profitability), were analyzed by T Tests and ANOVA procedures but no significant effects were found. Educational level and race were not included on the questionnaire, so no data were available on those dimensions.

There were no significant differences in the area of indirect power.

### Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that within the managers' group, higher level managers would have more favorable attitudes to power than lower level managers. In order to determine whether for any of the significant effects, the level of management was an important factor, means for the three groups were compared by using a one way ANOVA and the Tukey HSD Multiple Range test. The management group was divided, as the subjects' section described, into top and middle managers. There was a significant difference between these

groups on one of the significant items (item 9--direct/coercive/subordinate) and on one combined construct (coercive power), an interesting finding, which shall be discussed later.

The first point to note on Table 4 is that the middle managers, in eight of the 11 significant specific items, fall in the expected direction, between the top managers and clerks. In two of the three cases, the degree to which middle managers vary from the expected direction is extremely small: .01 and .02. In only one instance (item 20, Direct/Expert/Peer), is there an important variation, which also shall be discussed, in which middle managers are closer to the clerks.

Item 9, in which middle managers differed significantly from top managers, involved firing an insubordinate employee who was not performing the task for which he had been hired. Although a one-way ANOVA for the three groups found a significant difference ( $F = 8.92$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .0002$ ), the difference was between top managers and the other two groups which did not differ. Examining the data by the Tukey HSD multiple range test, the means of middle managers (3.37) did not differ significantly from that of the clerks (3.62), but the mean of the top managers (2.66) differed significantly from both of the other groups. However, analyzing this item further by inspecting the actual percentage responses for each of the five response categories, we see that the

TABLE 4

Comparison of Means for Three Groups for Variables with Significant Differences between Managers and Non Managers

Item	Construct	Top n=53	Middle n=35	Clerk n=53	Significance df=2, 138 1 way ANOVA
9	Coercive/Subordinate Direct	2.66*	3.37	3.62	F = 8.92, p/ .0002
14	Legitimate/Subordinate/Direct	1.67*	1.82	2.11	F = 3.21, p/ .04
16	Reward/Peer/Direct	2.15*	2.25	2.81	F = 3.97, p/ .02
20	Expert/Peer/Direct	2.67	2.22*	3.34	F = 6.07, p/ .003
24	Legitimate/Peer/Direct	2.28	2.45	2.88	NS
25	Referent/Peer/Direct	2/03*	2.45	3.01	F = 8.35, p/ .004
30	Coercive/Peer/Direct	2.86*	3.51	3.62	F = 4.70, p/ .01
	Total Direct	2.44*	2.46*	2.86	F = 6.19, p/ .002
	Peer Direct	2.43*	2.67	3.35	F = 5.15, p/ .006
	Total Power	2.61	2.60	2.83	F = 3.13, p/ .04
	Total Non Coercive	3.01	2.99	3.30	F = 3.26, p/ .04

\* significantly different from the clerk group at .05 level, using Tukey's HSP procedure of multiple comparisons

difference was not simply one of degree. Sixty percent of middle managers, along with 66% of clerks, rated this firing as undesirable (as defined by the percentage responding with four and five ratings), while 55% of top managers had favorable attitudes (as defined by the percentage responding with one and two scores).

Since firing is difficult for anyone, we can conclude that only with the security and enhanced power of high rank can a person feel able to deal with such a confrontation as that of firing the insubordinate employee. If an employee, as this one was defined, flouts the manager's authority and refuses to do the work, after having been given warnings and a chance to improve, and the manager does not use the ultimate sanction of coercive power, such an omission might impair the manager's future authority as well as the motivation of the workers who are performing responsibly. Also it might indicate the manager's lack of dedication to the company, which is not getting value for its wages and is precluded from hiring a more productive employee. Certainly a task oriented person would see firing such an employee as a step toward the goal of getting the department's work accomplished. In short, an inhibitor may be at work for middle managers, when they are faced with a question of firing an employee. Could it be a question for women of a fear of confrontation, or of hurting someone, both proscribed for females in our culture? Do they have insufficient power or

backup? Women who have reached a top position, in this study, do not show that inhibition. It would be interesting to see whether the level of management would divide male managers in the same way in this area.

There was another interesting result within these three group tests, also in relation to direct coercive power, in relation to peers (Item 30). Although the mean of the middle managers was not significantly different from the top managers' mean, and fell in the expected direction between top and clerk means, in analyzing the percentages of negative responses, the middle managers were found to be closer to the clerks in their proportion of unfavorable responses. Again, responses of the top managers showed the most positive power response. While only 40% of top managers were negative, 63% of middle managers and 66% of clerks rated a confrontation with a hostile colleague to be undesirable. Thus we see the same pattern for middle managers of attitudinal avoidance of confrontations, even when their authority and position are being challenged.

This factor is seen in the combined variable, Coercive Power, in which, using the Tukey test, the mean of the middle manager group (4.10) did not differ from that of the mean of the clerk group (3.99), although top managers' (3.50) responses were significantly different from both groups. In the one way ANOVA for the three groups the significance was .005. This variable did not reach significance

when managers were combined, however ( $p \leq .09$ ).

There was another interesting difference between the two management groups. In item 20, direct expert power in relation to peers, the three groups were not in the expected direction, the only case within the significant items of manager/non manager differences. When it was a question of using one's expertise to enhance one's image and influence by offering to help another manager, the mean scores of middle managers are most favorable ( $\bar{x} = 2.22$ ) and the only group to differ significantly from the clerk group (3.34), while the top managers were less favorable (2.67). Perhaps at top levels enhancing the visibility of one's capability is unnecessary, since research has found people uniformly competent at that level with no sex differences, and such competence is assumed. Also, such an offer may have been seen as presumptuous to other top managers who are presumed not to need such assistance. Since there are more middle managers competing at the same level, they may need such visibility more, to be perceived as worthy of advancement. Since this item goes against the trend and the significance is high ( $p \leq .003$ ), this finding merits careful examination.

Although there were four significant combined constructs in the manager/non manager comparison, two of them did not differ in the Tukey test: Total Non Coercive Power and Total Power. Although they did reach significance in the ANOVA for the three groups ( $p \leq .04$  for both), such

results might have occurred by chance, since there was a large number of variables.

One other effect was rated in examining the three groups. Item 24, legitimate power in relation to peers, showed no significant difference between means of the three groups (top, 2.28; middle, 2.45; clerks, 2.88). Although the means are in the expected direction and significance was achieved when managers were combined ( $p \leq .04$ ), interpretation of this and the above items must be made with care.

To summarize, the three group comparisons gave added dimension to the two group comparisons, pointing out some interesting effects. The main items of significance found managers more favorable than clerks to elements of direct power involving confrontations (top managers only), visibility, use of clout, building alliances; they were favorable to using their reward, expert, legitimate and referent power, and less unfavorable toward using coercive power when necessary to protect their positions. There were more effects with peers than with subordinates.

### Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3, that non managers would have more favorable attitudes towards the affiliative response, was not confirmed. Means for managers (2.54) and non managers (2.58) were almost identical; both were favorable. Because instructions did not require a forced choice, respondents felt free to include the affiliation response with power

responses. We do not know whether the common favorable response is a product of female socialization or simply a socially desirable response, not sex linked. A sample of males at comparable manager-levels might reveal whether sensitivity to people is more characteristic of females or is something about which people have generally favorable attitudes.

However, there are some other interesting data on affiliation. Applying the Pearson product moment correlation to the mean scores, for the total managers group, direct power was significantly correlated with indirect power ( $r = .68, p \leq .001$ ), as well as with affiliation, although the correlation was low ( $r = .27, p \leq .005$ ). However, when one examined the top management group separately, direct power ( $r = .80, p \leq .001$ ), but not with affiliation. The non managers, on the other hand, revealed a significant correlation between direct power and affiliation ( $r = .55, p \leq .001$ ), as well as between indirect power and affiliation ( $r = .44, p \leq .001$ ). There were also significant correlations between direct and indirect power ( $r = .53, p \leq .001$ ).

Thus we see that for non managers, power and affiliation were correlated, but not for top managers. Although the means of the two groups were not significantly different, nevertheless, the pattern of response seems to have differed in regard to the relationships between attitudes toward power and affiliation. Although correlation does not explain

cause and effect, nevertheless, such results merit further study.

Lack of correlation for top managers might have been a result of more differentiated decisive responses than for the non managers' group; a power response is not necessarily congruent with an affiliative one.

There were some other interesting response patterns relating to affiliation. In examining the percentage of responses on the one to five scale, one notes that the affiliative response is high for all respondents in the coercive power items (88% with subordinates, 82% with peers), and the highest percentage in relation to expert power with subordinates. When subordinates needed to be instructed, as in the case of the second vignette, 90% of these women responded in a nurturant way. However, nurturance instead of tangible reward for a deserving employee was rejected by 53% of respondents (item 3).

Item 18 (indirect/reward/peer) which had the most unfavorable means for both groups (managers, 4.63; non-managers, 4.45) and the largest percentage of unfavorable responses (91%), was an item which tapped an important part of informal corporate life: non judgmental loyalty. It seems that the issue of morality, one question asked in the first pilot study, is an important one for women in this study. It would be interesting to study this issue further with more specific questions and administering the test to different groups for

comparisons, to see, for example, whether the degree of negative response would be as characteristic of management and non management males.

There were no significant results in the area of indirect power when comparing means of three groups or two groups. However, in examining the percentage scores, there was significance ( $p < .02$ ) in item 18, non judgmental loyalty to peers. The difference in the unfavorable scores was obscured in the computation of means by the high percentage of the 3, or uncertain score of the lower scoring non managers. Seventy-nine percent of the non managers disagreed, compared to 97% of all managers (including 67% in the "strongly disagree" category for all managers). Subdividing the managers, top managers were in strong disagreement 70% of the time, the highest negative evaluation scored for any item.

Though the difference did not remain in later statistical analysis, it is interesting, nonetheless, to note such a difference. The factor of moral judgment, if, indeed, it is stronger on higher levels of management women, is unlikely to be a cause of greater success because the criteria for managerial success do not usually include a strong sense of moral judgment about one's co-workers. Since the business world is known for its pragmatic emphasis on "the bottom line," the expedient dedication to profits in competitive environment, it is unlikely to be a deciding factor causing

women to seek managerial positions. Experience, then, must be an important factor in this issue of non judgmental loyalty. Why would higher rank make a woman stronger in her moral stance? Perhaps with greater power she had learned that she did not have to compromise her moral principles. If this were the case, it would be reassuring to women and men alike. Another explanation is possible: that such loyalty may be necessary only toward one's superior, not one's peers. At any rate, in this author's experience in seminars, panels and symposia, in college and high school classrooms, and in countless individual discussions with women in various groups, this issue has been a very important one.

Some male managers complain about women managers' "school teacher mentality." Gould (1975) has discussed the male attempt to get away from the first female authority, the mother, as a necessary part of attaining manhood. The woman manager, who is judgmental, is also a reminder of the mother's early role as the first inhibitor of the pleasure principle. Males are later socialized to conform to the pragmatic reality of the adult public domain, both in the army and on the playing fields. As Harragan (1977) and others have pointed out, the male value system in organizations is based on an army and sports model of morality in which the goal of winning is uppermost, and getting away with what you can is legitimized by the rules of the game. Hennig and Jardim (1977) have discussed women's deviance from this "value free" loyalty.

Certainly, women are socialized for their potential role as bearers and enforcers of the cultural values. They are expected to make a clear distinction between right and wrong in their roles as mothers and teachers. Most women have not had the experiences gained by men in team sports and the army. However, it may be that women do not want to change this part of their socialization; they certainly seem to resist this aspect of management the most, whether it is real or imagined. Eighty-eight percent of all the women in this study were unfavorable to item 18, nonjudgmental loyalty to peers. Only two respondents were favorable.

We do not, however, have statistical evidence of men's attitudes in this area; such a comparison would be extremely useful. Such data might be difficult to obtain because of the social desirability factor of having high moral standards. The American dilemma, as Myrdal (1944) has pointed out, is the gap between our expressed ideals (as perpetuated by childrearing), and our real attitudes and deeds. Nevertheless, this attitudinal difference, if it does exist, is a potential if not actual source of conflict between men and women in management, and perhaps also a source of difficulty for some men. Writers (Farrell, 1974; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974; Pleck, 1975) have pointed out that because these values are important to men, when they are split off and delegated to women, men's full development and satisfaction with life is impeded.

Another fruitful area for investigation comparing men and women, and studying more groups of women, is in the relationship between attitudes toward power and affiliation. Not only average scores in the area of affiliation need examination, but also the attitudes to differential application of power and affiliation needs to be further studied.

## CHAPTER 5

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major question guiding this research has been whether or not management women have different attitudes towards power than women who are employed in non management positions. It was hypothesized that women with higher positions and thus more power, would have more positive attitudes toward power. Since power has many components, in order to examine it in the public domain in relation to women, it was broken down into different dimensions. Although the private power dimension is very salient for women, changing conditions and attitudes in society now make it important to examine women's attitudes toward power in the public sphere, where they are now working in large numbers and for long periods of time. Once educated and working, their underutilization in the higher, better rewarded positions of management require that we try to understand more about the phenomenon of power, which goes along with high positions.

Summary of Major Results

We can conclude that there are differences between women managers and non managers, as well as differences between different levels of managers, in their attitudes

toward different aspects of power. The manager group was more favorable towards direct power in relation to peers, and in some areas in relation to subordinates. There were no effects in the area of indirect power or affiliative response.

Specifically, women managers were more favorable towards direct power with peers: confronting when their authority was challenged (but only top level managers), building alliances, making their expertise visible to enhance their image (but only middle managers), asserting their legitimate sphere of authority, and using their "clout" for compliance. In relation to subordinates, they were more willing to fire when necessary (only top level managers) and to assert their legitimate authority.

The question that is not answered is the cause of these differences. Perhaps there is a selection factor which makes women with such attitudes more likely to enter and be successful as managers; certainly male managers are expected to be aggressive and able to have and use power successfully. Perhaps the experience itself taught them about power and how to use it successfully in organizations; structural factors can be very influential. Perhaps, as is my opinion, it is a combination of both factors, which then interact with a woman's personal psyche as well as the influences that society has on her as a woman.

### Methodological Issues

Further examination of the instrument and post hoc discussions with respondents and others who took the questionnaire, revealed some areas that might have been improved. Specifically, some of the wording was ambiguous; some people were unable to identify the items on situations to which they had actually responded within the power framework. Also, when an item included some of the range of behaviors possible within a category, the instructions might have clarified what some were able to assume: that they were to answer according to their evaluation of the majority of the items.

However, the stimulus situations themselves offered a measure of standardization, and as mentioned previously, were generally considered realistic as well as highly relevant to women in an organizational setting. This conclusion was based not only on written comments but on post hoc discussions with seminar participants as mentioned previously.

Coupled with the importance of simplicity and clarity of construct is the need to encompass as much as possible of the complexity of the motivations of working women. The lack of additional background variables made some of the items difficult to answer for some respondents; certainly the complexity of power situations should ideally be reflected in the research. Future studies might deal with

the organizational climate, size, hierarchical system, sex ratios in job level, department and industry, as well as systemic factors such as the prevailing economy and competitive factors. The addition of interviews and other methods for an in-depth understanding of the organizations involved would be very desirable. Also, detailed examinations of each of the types of power in their different modes, by means of many different items for each construct, would greatly help in clarifying attitudes.

Differences between levels of managers also need further exploration, with the first task to be definitive classification, based on a study of discriminant variables. An important variable to include would be the time since the last promotion and raise, in order to distinguish the "comers" from the "stuck" as Kanter (1978) calls them, as well as items on sex ratios of peers and subordinates.

In areas where weak or even no differences were found, further studies with an improved instrument, comparing men and women, might indeed find differences in the area of affiliation and judgmental loyalty.

Furthermore, since this study was exploratory, further research is needed to test the reliability of the means. It is important to note that although high levels of significance were found in the above-mentioned areas, the actual differences between means were not extreme. However, in many areas of life, a small extra ingredient may be a

crucial one; perhaps in organizational life a more positive attitude toward power may be such a case.

This study has attempted a broad examination of the power construct within an organizational framework and in relation to the psychology of women. Whether it is complex enough to encompass all the factors of real situations is a moot point. Some women said they could not answer some of the questions definitively without more background information. Andrisani has stated, in agreement with other researchers, ". . . the motivations of working women are too complex to be characterized in simplistic unidimensional terms" (1978, p. 680). Nevertheless there are the constraints of a study which tries to prevent the problem from becoming too unwieldy to be statistically manageable.

Proponents of the TAT might argue, with some justification, that only a projective test can get to real attitudes, breaking through defenses and conformity to what is socially deemed desirable. Kanter (1977) has said that the Raven and French typology cannot encompass the complexity of organizational life and is not relevant in an organizational setting. Nevertheless, I feel it has been a useful tool in this area, and with improvement, could be much more so.

Most importantly, this study achieved an unusual external validity by its real world sample, particularly of top management women. It is hoped that other researchers will

build on this study, exploring women's attitudes and values in organizational life.

Perhaps this questionnaire, or one like it, could be used to select women with management potential, or to assess the effects of management training programs. The vignettes have proved a valuable stimulus to learning in management training seminars.

### Conclusion

Women themselves are trying to learn more about power as it is exercised by men in the public sphere but it is only partly a question of knowledge of the system; it may also be a question of their attitudes toward what they see. It is important to examine first what women's attitudes are in a context relevant to their experience. We have seen in this study that women managers do have more positive attitudes toward direct power with their peers and in some aspects in relation to their subordinates, which might have been a result of their experience in the managerial world. The fact that top managers in many cases had the most favorable attitudes could argue for the interaction of personal skills dealing with power, which made them more successful.

However, many more questions remain for researchers, in these areas as well as in other aspects of managerial attitudes, such as moral stance and human relations orientations. Do women's attitudes differ from those of men at managerial levels? If so, how do they solve the dilemma of

conforming to get ahead while disapproving of some aspects of the system? Even if many women just fear that men's attitudes are different and do not enter or learn to compete successfully in the ranks of management, we will not know what attitude changes might have occurred.

We do not know what the future will hold, nor the effects of a future in which men and women would be in equal numbers at all levels of organizations. Women's attitudes towards different dimensions of power might then, with the pressures of tokenism removed, be very important in shaping the nature of that power as it affects the direction of public affairs. Hopefully, this study has been a small step toward the understanding of these women's attitudes.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Adler, A. Understanding human nature. Garden City: Garden City Publishing Co., 1927.
- Adler, A. The psychology of power. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1966, 22, 166-172.
- Acker, J., & Van Houten, O. Differential recruitment and control: the sex structures of organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19, 152-164.
- Andrisani, P. Job satisfaction among working women. Signs, 1978, 3, 3, 588-607.
- Ansbacher, H., & Ansbacher, R. The individual psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Babcock, B., Friedman, A., & Norton, E. Sex discrimination and the law: causes and remedies. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1975.
- Bass, B., Krusell, J., & Alexander, R. Male managers' attitudes toward working women. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 2, 221-236.
- Boyatzis, R. The need for close relationships and the manager's job. In D. Kolb, I. Rubin, & J. MacIntyre (Eds.), Organizational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Bradford, D., Sargent, A., & Sprague, S. Executive man and woman: The issue of sexuality. In F. Gordon & M. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Chapman, J., & Luthans, F. The female leadership dilemma. Public Personnel Management, 1975, 4, 3, 173-179.
- Cole, M., Peters, J., & Horman, J. A study of women in management. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1975.
- Collins, B., & Raven, B. Psychological aspects of structure in the small group: Interpersonal attraction, coalitions, communication, and power. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed.), (Vol. 4). Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1969.

- Dahl, R. The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 1957, 2, 201-215.
- Dalton, M. Informal factors in career achievement. American Journal of Sociology, 1951, 56, 407-415.
- Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks; What is skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 80-85.
- Deaux, K., & Taynor, J. Evaluation of male and female ability: Bias works both ways. Psychological Reports, 1974, 22, 261-262.
- Denmark, F. Styles of leadership. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 2, 99-113.
- Denmark, F., Tangri, S., & McCandless, S. Affiliation, achievement, and power: A new look. In J. Sherman & F. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: Future directions in research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc., 1977.
- Epstein, C. Encountering the male establishment: Sex status limits on women's careers in the professions. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 75, 6, 905-982. (a)
- Epstein, C. Woman's place: Options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970. (b)
- Epstein, C. Bringing women in: Rewards, punishments, and the structure of achievement. In R. Kundsen (Ed.), Successful women in the Sciences: An analysis of determinants. Annals of the N. Y. Academy of Sciences, March 1972, 208, 62-70.
- Epstein, C. Institutional barriers: What keeps women out of the executive suite. In F. Gordon & M. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Etzioni, A. Comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Farrell, W. Beyond masculinity. New York: Macmillan, 1974.

- Feather, N., & Simon, J. Reactions to male and female success and failure in sex-linked occupations; Impressions of personality, causal attributions and perceived likelihood of different consequences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 31, 20-31.
- Feldman-Summers, S., & Kiesler, S. Those who are number two try harder: The effect of sex on attributions of causality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 846-855.
- French, J. A formal theory of social power. Psychological Review, 1966, 63, 181-184.
- Hochschild, A. Making it: Marginality and obstacles to minority consciousness. In A. Kundsen (Ed.), Successful women in the sciences: An analysis of determinants. New York Academy of Sciences, 1974. (b)
- Hollander, E. Leaders, groups and influence. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Hollander, E., & Julian, J. Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 387.
- Horner, H. Femininity and successful achievement: A basic inconsistency. In Feminine personality and conflict. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks & Cole Publishing Co., 1970.
- Horner, H. Toward an understanding of achievement related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1977, 28, 157-175.
- Horney, K. Feminine psychology. New York: Norton, 1967.
- Ivancevich, J., & Donnelly, J. Leader influence and performance. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 539-543.
- Janeway, E. Man's world, woman's place: A study in social mythology. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1971.
- Johnson, P. Social power and sex role stereotyping (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978. (University Microfilms No. 74-24, 502)
- Johnson, P. Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 3, 99-110.

- Kanter, R. Women and the structure of organizations: Explorations in theory and behavior. In M. Millman & R. Kantner (Eds.), Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press, 1975.
- Kanter, R. The impact of hierarchical structures on the work behavior of women and men. Social Problems, 1976, 23-24.
- Kanter, R. Presentation VI. Signs, 1976, 1, 3 (pt. 2), 282-291.
- Kanter, R. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 197 .
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- Kipnis, D., & Consentino, J. Use of leadership powers in industry. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 8, 480-466.
- Lakoff, R. Language and woman's place. Language in Society. 1973, 2, 45-79; also New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Laws, J. The psychology of tokenism: an analysis. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 1, 51-62.
- Lazarus, R. Story telling and the measurement of motivation: the direct versus substitutive controversy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 20, 483-487.
- Lipset, S., & Bendix, R. Social mobility in industrial society. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959.
- Lockhood, M. Female motive to avoid success: a psychological barrier or a response to deviancy? Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 1, 33-40.
- Maccoby, M. The gamesman. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1976.
- Mann, R. A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 241-270.
- Martin, N., & Strauss, A. Patterns of mobility within industrial organizations. Journal of Business, April 1956, pp. 101-110.

- Mason, D. Judgements of leadership based on physiognomic cues. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 273-274.
- McClelland, D. The two faces of power. Journal of International Affairs, 1970, 24, 28-47.
- McClelland, D. Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington, 1975.
- McClelland, D., & Burnham, D. Power: the great motivator. Harvard Business Review, March/April 1976, 100-110.
- McKenna, W., & Denmark, F. Woman and the university. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1975, 5, 4, 226-234.
- McMillan, J., Clifton, A., McGrath, D., & Gale, W. Woman's language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionality. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 6, 545-559.
- Megargee, E. Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 5, 377-382.
- Morgan, E. The eroticization of male dominance/female submission. Papers in Women's Studies, 1975, 2, 1, 112-145.
- Murray, H. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Murstein, S. Theory and research in projective techniques. New York: Wiley, 1963.
- Myrdal, G. Appendix 5. A parallel to the negro problem. In An American dilemma. New York: Harper, 1944. 1073-1078.
- Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nisbet, R. The sociological tradition. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Pen, J. Harmony and conflict in modern society. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.
- Pheterson, G., Kiesler, S., & Goldberg, P. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-118.

- Pleck, J. Male threat from female competence: an experimental study in college dating couples. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University microfilms, 1973, No. 74-11, 721.
- Pleck, J. Men's responses to the changing consciousness of women. In E. Zuckerman (Ed.), Women and men: Roles, attitudes and power relationships. New York: Radcliffe Club of New York, 1975.
- Pleck, J., & Sawyer, J. (Eds.). Men and masculinity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Raven, B. Social influence and power. In I. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), Current studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1965.
- Raven, B. The comparative analysis of power and power preference. In J. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine, 1974.
- Raven, B., & French, J. Legitimate power, coercive power and observability in social influence. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 83-97.
- Rosaldo, M., & Lamphere, L. (Eds.). Woman, culture, and society. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. The influence of sex role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 47-48.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. Influences of sex role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 8-11.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. Effects of applicants' sex and difficulty of job on evaluation of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 511-512.
- Sampson, R. The psychology of power. London: Educational Books Ltd., 1956; also New York: Random House and A. Knopf, 1968.
- Sanday, P. Female status in the public domain. In M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere (Eds.), Women, culture, and society. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.

- Schefflen, A., with Schefflin, A. Body language and social order: Communication and behavioral control. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Schein, V. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite managerial characterizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.
- Schein, V. Relationship between sex roles and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 3, 340-344.
- Schnitzler, P. The motive to avoid success: Exploring the nature of the fear. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1, 3, 273-282.
- Shaw, E. Differential impact of negative stereotypes in employee selection. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 333-338.
- Staines, G., Tavris, C., & Jayaratne, T. The queen bee syndrome. In C. Tavris (Ed.), The female experience. Delmar, Calif.: CRM, 1973.
- Starer, R., & Denmark, F. Discrimination against aspiring women. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1974, 4, 65-70.
- Steinmann, A., & Fox, D. The male dilemma. New York: Jason Aronson, 1974.
- Stewart, A., & Winter, D. Self definition and social definition in women. Journal of Personality, 1974, 2, 238-258.
- Stogdill, R. Personal factors associated with leadership. Journal of Psychology, 1948, 25, 35-71.
- Strodtbeck, F., James, R., & Hawkins, D. Social status in jury deliberations. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 713-719.
- Tedeschi, J. The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine, 1972.
- The corporate woman: Up the latter finally. Business Week, November 24, 1975, 58-68.
- Thorne, S., & Henley, N. (Eds.) Language and sex differences and dominance. Rawley, Mass.: Newbury Hours Publishers, 1975.
- Token Tycoons. Wall Street Journal, August 9, 1977, p. 1.

- 100 Top corporate women. Business Week, June 21, 1976,
- Tresemmer, O., & Pleck, J. Maintaining and changing sex role boundaries in men (and women). Paper presented at the Radcliffe Institute Conference, "Women: Resource for a Changing World." Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- Uleman, J. The need for influence: Development and validation of a measure and comparison with the need for power. Genetic Monographs, 1972, 85, 157-214.
- Vaughter, R. Psychology. Signs, 1976, 2, 1, 120-145.
- Veroff, J. Development and validation of a projective measure of power motivation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 5, 1-8.
- Veroff, J. Process vs impact on men's and women's achievement motivation. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 1, 3, 283-293.
- Wexley, K., & Hunt, P. Male and female leaders: comparison of performance and behavior patterns. Psychological Reports, 1974,
- Winter, D. The power motive. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Winter, D., & Stewart, A. The power motives and self definition in woman. Unpublished paper, Wesleyan University, 1972.
- Wolman, C., & Frank, H. The solo woman in a professional peer group. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 1, 164-171.
- Wood, M., & Greenfeld, S. Woman managers and fear of success. A study in the field. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 4, 375-387.
- Wright, F. Sex and style of consultants as variables in self study groups (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 1972).
- Zuckerman, E. Women, leadership, and power: a psychological and organizational perspective. In E. Zuckerman (Ed.), Women and men: Roles, attitudes and power relationships. New York: Radcliffe Club of New York, 1975.

APPENDIX 1

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER  
of the City University of New York  
Graduate Center 33 West 42 Street New York, N.Y. 10036

Enclosed is the pilot study I may have told you about, which explores issues I hope to examine in further depth in my dissertation. I want the study to be as good as it possibly can be; I have chosen you as part of a group of accomplished women who can not only help me evaluate the appropriateness of the instrument, but can offer helpful criticisms as well.

Thus, your response is quite important. Please take the time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and send it back to me promptly, so I can make any necessary revisions.  
DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON IT.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

DIRECTIONS:

Assume that you are married and have children, and that your family life is a satisfying one, incorporating understanding and emotional giving.

For each completion of the sentence below, indicate on a scale of 5-1, the degree to which each factor also contributes or would contribute to your satisfaction with the role of marriage partner.

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral, Neither Important nor Unimportant	Very Unimportant
5	4	3	2
			1

ONE OF THE REASONS I FIND THE ROLE OF MARRIAGE PARTNER SATISFYING IS THAT WITHIN THE HOME IT ENABLES ME TO CONTROL SITUATIONS OR HAVE AN IMPORTANT SHARE IN DECISION MAKING BY DOING THE FOLLOWING:

1. being the one best able to deal with family matters, because of my skills as a marriage partner, parent and homemaker/provider \_\_\_\_\_
2. doing those little extra things that are particularly pleasing to my mate's ego, such as building him/her up in relation to others \_\_\_\_\_
3. being the one best able to resolve family matters because of my access to others very knowledgeable and experienced in this area \_\_\_\_\_
4. being angry and unpleasant if my mate did something I considered bad or unpleasant \_\_\_\_\_
5. being the wife and mother/father and husband who should play the decision making role in family affairs \_\_\_\_\_
6. supplying the practical things my mate needs, such as keeping the home, financial support, child care, extra material things, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

- 7. being looked up to, having my opinions and values and sometimes my personality traits adopted or considered a model 

---
- 8. being or threatening to be withholding or withdrawing, if my mate did something I considered bad or unpleasant 

---
- 9. supplying the emotional needs of my mate, such as nurturance, protectiveness, companionship, loyalty, respect, etc. 

---
- 10. (for husband) being or acting stronger, since it is the duty of the husband to lead the family  
 (for wife) being or acting the dependent role, since it is the duty of the husband to help and protect the wife 

---

I FIND THE ROLE OF PARENT SATISFYING BECAUSE IT ENABLES ME TO DO THE FOLLOWING IN RELATION TO MY CHILDREN (depending on their age):

- 11. be respected for my greater experience and wisdom; be able to serve as a guide in their growing up 

---
- 12. discipline them firmly when they go astray, by such means as scolding, spanking, taking away privileges, or by a disapproving look or tone of voice 

---
- 13. be sure my mate knows when they are doing good things and encourage her/him to give extra praise and attention to them 

---
- 14. be respected and obeyed because I am their mother/father; children are obligated to behave that way to a parent 

---
- 15. give them many things they want, both material and non-material, such as approval for doing right things 

---
- 16. be sure my mate knows when they are behaving badly, so she/he can give appropriate discipline also 

---

- 17. be assumed to know even more than I do because I am an adult and parent (particularly when they are young) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18. be looked up to, and have them want to be like me in many ways \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS:

Assume your mate has reached, in her/his employment, a position in which she/he has acquired respect and considerable earning power.

For each completion of the sentence below, indicate on the same scale of 5-1 the degree to which each factor also contributes to your satisfaction with the role of marriage partner.

ONE OF THE REASONS I FIND THE ROLE OF MARRIAGE PARTNER SATISFYING IS THAT OUTSIDE THE HOME, MY SPOUSE'S POSITION ENABLES ME TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

- 19. be admired and respected, even sought after \_\_\_\_\_
- 20. assume a certain position in society as his/her spouse \_\_\_\_\_
- 21. exclude people from our circle of influence if desirable, fire employees when necessary, take business elsewhere if unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_
- 22. employ people in managing and decorating the home, offer inclusion in social clubs, parties or other privileged places to which we have access; give gifts, etc. \_\_\_\_\_
- 23. feel I share in my spouse's accomplishments because of the contributory role I play as a mate \_\_\_\_\_
- 24. feel I share in my spouse's accomplishments because we have a marriage relationship \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS:

When you were in a situation where it was appropriate, have you ever had a feeling of competence and potency from the realization that you were being found attractive by the opposite sex? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

If YES, how important was it to you, on the same scale of 5-1, in the following situations:

- 25. Social (at parties, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
- 26. At work \_\_\_\_\_
- 27. In intimate relationships \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS:

Assume that you have a satisfactory job, but have just been offered the opportunity for a position at the entry level of top management in a medium-to-large organization. You would, of course, be reporting to the officer directly above you and be responsible for your unit's budget, performance, satisfaction, etc.

Assuming that other related factors were satisfactory, would you take the position? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

If YES, for each completion of the statement below, indicate on the same scale of 5-1 the degree to which each factor would play a part in your comfortable functioning on the job.

I WOULD LIKE THE POSITION BECAUSE, IN RELATION TO COLLEAGUES,  
I WOULD BE ABLE TO:

- 28. get cooperation because of my position within the department, and be able to define the field of operation within my area \_\_\_\_\_
- 29. show direct disapproval or rejection if someone acts unprofessionally \_\_\_\_\_
- 30. make my expertise available to them on their projects \_\_\_\_\_
- 31. do favors, pass along job opportunities outside the organization, gather support from others for their ideas and proposals \_\_\_\_\_
- 32. if someone acts unprofessionally, subtly indicate disapproval, withhold information, get others to react similarly \_\_\_\_\_
- 33. be looked up to, have my opinions, attitudes and behaviors adopted because I was admired \_\_\_\_\_
- 34. support others' positions and decisions at meetings, recommend them for promotions, honors, etc. \_\_\_\_\_
- 35. refer them to other experts whom I know, when they need it for their work \_\_\_\_\_

I WOULD LIKE THE POSITION BECAUSE, IN RELATION TO SUBORDINATES,  
I WOULD BE ABLE TO:

- 36. benefit them in many ways through my access to the right people in the organization \_\_\_\_\_
- 37. provide the skills and knowledge they need and depend on for their work \_\_\_\_\_
- 38. discipline incompetent or disruptive workers when necessary by lack of promotion or raises, firing, unpleasant assignments, negative evaluations, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

39. find ways to get the job done through my own informal channels such as access to other officers in the company, special information, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

40. command their loyalty and respect because I was the kind of person and executive they wanted to be like \_\_\_\_\_

41. make them aware that I could do them some more harm in the company if they did not cooperate \_\_\_\_\_

42. because of my position, have the weight of authority to which they recognize they have to conform \_\_\_\_\_

43. hire, raise salaries, promote, give fringe benefits, good evaluations, choice work assignments to those who are most deserving \_\_\_\_\_

44. In answering the questions about the executive position, did you assume a stance in which you would:

(CHOOSE A NUMBER CORRESPONDING TO THE FOLLOWING):

- Do whatever was the most efficient means for accomplishing your own or the institution's goals (if so, write 5) \_\_\_\_\_

- Do what seems ethically correct whenever self interest is not an issue (if so, write 4) \_\_\_\_\_

- No assumption one way or the other (if so, write 3) \_\_\_\_\_

- Generally do what seems ethically correct, whenever humanly possible (if so, write 2) \_\_\_\_\_

- Do only what is strictly ethical at all times (if so, write 1) \_\_\_\_\_

45-49. While you were answering all of the above questions, did any of the following considerations influence your choices? Please indicate on the same 5-1 scale, from very important to very unimportant, whether the following influenced your answers:

45. your own capabilities \_\_\_\_\_
46. Feelings about your own self worth  
(the kind of person you want to be) \_\_\_\_\_
47. The appropriateness of your behavior  
in that role or position \_\_\_\_\_
48. Possible reactions of others toward you \_\_\_\_\_
49. The requirements of the task \_\_\_\_\_
50. The purpose to which you should put your  
abilities or position (a moral judgement) \_\_\_\_\_
51. SEX:  
Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
52. AGE (check one):  
below 25 \_\_\_\_\_ 35-39 \_\_\_\_\_ 50-54 \_\_\_\_\_  
25-29 \_\_\_\_\_ 40-44 \_\_\_\_\_ 55-59 \_\_\_\_\_ 65 and over \_\_\_\_\_  
30-34 \_\_\_\_\_ 45-49 \_\_\_\_\_ 60-64 \_\_\_\_\_
53. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS (check one):  
single \_\_\_\_\_ living with person of opposite sex \_\_\_\_\_  
married \_\_\_\_\_ widowed \_\_\_\_\_  
divorced \_\_\_\_\_ other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_  
separated \_\_\_\_\_
54. NUMBER OF CHILDREN (if none, write "0") \_\_\_\_\_
55. IF EMPLOYED FOR PAY:  
Current occupation \_\_\_\_\_
56. Full time \_\_\_\_\_ Part time \_\_\_\_\_ (currently)
57. Number of years employed:  
Full time \_\_\_\_\_ Part time \_\_\_\_\_



APPENDIX 2

MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: For each of the following items, please complete the last statement in the space provided. Answer spontaneously, expressing your true feelings, and not omitting any items. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. A male subordinate has been doing extra work whenever necessary and has been creative and productive in carrying out his assignments. However, the department budget has just been cut. The woman in charge of the department should \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. A woman manager's department is working on a difficult project. However, her male subordinates lack her experience and know-how. She should \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. A woman manager discovers that, despite warnings and guidelines for improvement, a male subordinate has continued to flout department rules and has failed to do his assigned work. She should \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. A woman manager is presenting an important proposal to a senior executive. She has a curvaceous figure and knows that he considers her attractive. In planning her attire and her style of presentation for the meeting, she should \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX 3

MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please answer all questions, being as candid and accurate as you can. Do not answer as you think you should, but as you really feel. The questionnaire is anonymous; the background information requested at the end is needed for grouping the responses into categories for data analysis. An incomplete questionnaire cannot be used. Please respond spontaneously; your first response is probably the most accurate.

Below are several situations, in large type, which a manager might have to face in the course of work. Assuming that you were the manager, rate each of the courses of action and attitudes which follow the situation on a scale of 1-5, according to the extent to which you agree or disagree.

AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	NEUTRAL/ CAN'T DECIDE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1	2	3	4	5

I. A SUBORDINATE HAS BEEN DOING EXTRA WORK WHENEVER NECESSARY, AND HAS BEEN CREATIVE AND PRODUCTIVE IN CARRYING OUT HIS ASSIGNMENTS. SINCE THE DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET HAS BEEN CUT, THE WOMAN MANAGER CANNOT GIVE HIM A RAISE.

1. Transfer him to a better job in another department or find something else to cut in the budget and give him a token raise, with a promise of more when conditions permit. \_\_\_\_\_

2. Let him know you will reward his loyalty and help him advance (by going to bat for him in future promotions, showing him the ropes, cutting red tape for him, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Take him to lunch and praise him for his good work; tell him how sorry you are that no raise is possible now; let him express his feelings. \_\_\_\_\_

II. A WOMAN MANAGER'S DEPARTMENT IS WORKING ON A DIFFICULT PROJECT. HOWEVER, HER SUBORDINATES LACK HER EXPERIENCE AND KNOW-HOW, WHICH WOULD HELP THEM DO THE JOB WELL.

4. Train them, not to enhance your own position, but to help them with their careers and make the job more enjoyable and satisfying for them. \_\_\_\_\_

5. Use knowledge you have obtained from outside sources to enhance your image as an expert. It is important to be considered very knowledgeable when you are a manager. \_\_\_\_\_
  6. Give them extra training because if they are reminded how much they need your knowledge and experience, they will give you more respect and cooperation in the future. \_\_\_\_\_
- III. A WOMAN MANAGER DISCOVERS THAT, DESPITE MANY WARNINGS AND GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVEMENT, A SUBORDINATE WHO COULD DO BETTER HAS CONTINUED TO FLOUT DEPARTMENT RULES AND HAS FAILED TO DO HIS ASSIGNED WORK. PERSONNEL HAS BEEN NOTIFIED THAT HE HAS BEEN UNSATISFACTORY.
7. Make things disagreeable for him (give him the worse assignments, move his desk to an unfavorable spot, act unfriendly, etc.) and be sure personnel and other managers know that he is not a good candidate for transfer. \_\_\_\_\_
  8. Talk to him; see if you can find out what is bothering him and causing his objectionable behavior. \_\_\_\_\_
  9. Fire him and let it be known in the department that you have taken the step. To allow him to get away with his actions would undermine your authority. \_\_\_\_\_
- IV. A WOMAN MANAGER IS GREATLY RESPECTED AND ADMIRER BY HER SUBORDINATES FOR HER CAPABILITY AND IMAGE AND CLOUT WITHIN THE COMPANY. ALTHOUGH THE DEPARTMENT IS SHORT STAFFED BECAUSE OF ILLNESS AND VACATIONS, AND HAS MUCH WORK TO DO, THE MANAGER MUST FINISH A BIG PROJECT ON WHICH SHE IS WORKING. THE DEPARTMENT BUDGET WILL NOT ALLOW FOR OVERTIME PAY OR SUPPLEMENTARY PERSONNEL.
10. When announcing the extra assignment, mention the value of their contribution, implying that it will be brought to the attention of those higher up in the company, with whom they know you are well connected. Subordinates will work harder for a manager who is "special" and worth following. \_\_\_\_\_
  11. When announcing the extra assignment, imply that their cooperation would particularly please you, because that will inspire them to work harder and do the job. \_\_\_\_\_

12. Discuss the problem with your subordinates, telling them how much it means to you, and taking their feelings into account. Let them decide whether they feel they can do the extra work. \_\_\_\_\_
- V. A WOMAN MANAGER HAS GIVEN HER DEPARTMENT A WORK ASSIGNMENT WHICH SOME OF THE WORKERS SAY THEY DO NOT FEEL THEY SHOULD BE EXPECTED TO DO. SHE KNOWS THAT THE ASSIGNMENT IS WITHIN THEIR ABILITIES AND APPROPRIATE: FURTHERMORE, HER SUPERIORS WOULD GIVE HER COMPLETE BACKUP.
13. Have a talk with the workers, trying to explain the responsibilities of a manager, so they can see things from your point of view. Explain that if they cooperate, they will be happier, too, since the department will be a friendlier place to work. \_\_\_\_\_
14. Speak to the workers, reminding them that the work is properly part of their responsibility, and you expect them to do the work you have assigned. \_\_\_\_\_
15. Speak with the workers, reminding them that higher management is expecting the department to do its work. \_\_\_\_\_
- VI. A FELLOW MANAGER HAS BEEN QUITE COOPERATIVE TO A WOMAN MANAGER, OFFERING INFORMATION AND OTHER USEFUL ASSISTANCE.
16. Back him up at meetings, speak favorably about him to others, and be comparably helpful to him. \_\_\_\_\_
17. Tell him how much his friendship and support means to you and how grateful you are; friends don't have to "pay back" so exactly. \_\_\_\_\_
18. Always be on his side, not judging him, even when you disapprove of some of his actions. \_\_\_\_\_
- VII. AT A MANAGER'S MEETING, A PROBLEM IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT IS BEING DISCUSSED. A WOMAN MANAGER HAS EXPERTISE WHICH COULD HELP.

19. Offer to get other information and help from your personal sources, knowing that these extra contacts make her a more knowledgeable and important manager. \_\_\_\_\_
20. Let them know of your expertise, and offer to help the other manager because you realize it will enhance your image and make you more influential in the future. \_\_\_\_\_
21. Let the colleague know you will help him because you like and value him; one should help friends and co-workers whenever one can. \_\_\_\_\_

VIII. AT A MEETING OF DEPARTMENT HEADS, ALL WORKING ON A JOINT PROJECT, THE GROUP IS IN FAVOR OF A PLAN WHICH INVOLVES ANOTHER MANAGER BEING IN CHARGE OF A FUNCTION WHICH IS WITHIN HER AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY.

22. It is important to remain friendly with one's fellow managers because it keeps the working environment pleasant. Say that you agree; it is a fine idea. Good working relationships are more important than one's own areas of responsibility. \_\_\_\_\_
23. Offer to work with the manager, planning to work it out in such a way that you retain control of that function. His being in sole charge would damage your authority. \_\_\_\_\_
24. State directly that if this aspect is to be accomplished, you and your department will be happy to be responsible for its being done, making it clear that you intend to keep control of your area of responsibility. Your future position must be protected. \_\_\_\_\_

IX. A WOMAN MANAGER IS WORKING ON HER OWN SPECIAL PROJECT FOR THE COMPANY AND NEEDS SOME ASSISTANCE FROM HER FELLOW MANAGERS. THE PROJECT IS MENTIONED AT A MANAGERS' MEETING. SHE IS RECOGNIZED AS A "COMER," "ONE WHO IS WELL CONNECTED, HAS A GOOD IMAGE, IS QUITE CAPABLE AND CONFIDENT, AND GOING SOMEWHERE" IN THE COMPANY.

25. Ask them directly for help, because you have sufficient "clout" for them to want to be identified as on your side. \_\_\_\_\_

26. Ask them to help as friends, since you would help them, too. Good relationships with co-workers are crucial for the smooth and harmonious functioning within an organization. \_\_\_\_\_
27. Make it clear through subtle means that you expect and should get their help (tone of voice, expression, general attitude, etc.) but do not make a direct request. They know your position in the company will make it to their advantage to help. \_\_\_\_\_
- X. IT HAS BEEN REPORTED TO A WOMAN MANAGER AND CONFIRMED BY A RELIABLE SOURCE, THAT ANOTHER MANAGER HAS UNDERMINED HER BY DOWNGRADING HER IDEAS TO HER SUPERIOR AND IMPLYING THAT SHE IS NOT COMPETENT.
28. Have an exploratory discussion to find out his feeling and see what was bothering him. It is better to make friends than enemies. \_\_\_\_\_
29. Let others know that he is an underhanded player; give him no support, cooperation or information, and indicate subtly to other managers that you do not have a good opinion of him. \_\_\_\_\_
30. Confront him, making it clear that you will not tolerate such behavior. Warn him that if he does something like that again, he will have you as a potentially dangerous enemy. \_\_\_\_\_

## 31. AGE (check one)

Below 25 _____	35-39 _____	50-54 _____	65 and over _____
25-29 _____	40-44 _____	55-59 _____	
30-34 _____	45-49 _____	60-64 _____	

## 32. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS (check one)

single _____	separated _____	other (describe) _____
married _____	widowed _____	_____
divorced _____	living with person of opposite sex _____	

## 33. NUMBER OF CHILDREN (if none, write "0") \_\_\_\_\_

## IF CURRENTLY EMPLOYED FOR PAY:

34. I work full time \_\_\_\_\_ part time \_\_\_\_\_ (check one)
35. Exact job title \_\_\_\_\_
36. Name of Department or category of occupation \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
37. What does your organization do or produce? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
38. Salary range: (check one)
- |                         |                       |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| under \$10,000 _____    | \$15,000-19,999 _____ |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 _____ | \$20,000-24,999 _____ |
| \$25,000-29,999 _____   | \$35,000-39,999 _____ |
| \$30,000-34,999 _____   | \$40,000 & over _____ |
39. Number of people you supervise (if none, write "0") \_\_\_\_\_

## FORMER EMPLOYMENT:

40. Previous exact job title \_\_\_\_\_
41. Previous name of department or category of  
occupation \_\_\_\_\_

## REVISED ENDING FOR MIDDLE AND UPPER MANAGEMENT:

42. Is your job considered (check one):
- |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| First line supervision _____     | Middle management _____           |
| Top management _____             | Staff (not line) management _____ |
| Self-employed professional _____ | Not sure _____                    |

Thanks for your cooperation.

APPENDIX 4

351 East 84th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10028

1977

Dear Women's Forum member,

As you know, research is now being done to clarify needs and problems of women in management. I am now in the final stages of my doctoral dissertation in Psychology and hope you are willing to help by giving me about ten minutes of your time. I know you receive many questionnaires, and some of you have told me the problems you have had with others you have received.

In order to insure privacy, a prime consideration, and still provide the data needed to categorize the results, salary information is requested only within broad ranges. Further, if you prefer, you can have the questionnaire filled out by a female colleague at a reasonably comparable level of professional or business attainment. This, coupled with your knowledge of my research interests in issues of concern to women, should further assure you of total anonymity.

I appreciate your assistance and hope I can find some meaningful results which might in some small way help women get ahead in careers. I shall, of course, share my findings with the Women's Forum when I am finished.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Zuckerman

P.S.: A postpaid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

APPENDIX 5

351 East 84th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10028

Dear Achieving Woman:

As one of Business Week's top 100 women executives, I am asking your help in a scientific research study. To help you decide whether to take the time in your busy day to answer the enclosed questionnaire, I have provided some personal data below.

I hope you decide to take the ten minutes or so to fill it out, comfortable in the assurance that the study is intended to help women reach management. It is completely anonymous and non-commercial. No really personal information is sought; information at the end is merely to categorize the management levels of the respondents.

If you prefer, you can even have the questionnaire filled out by another woman executive who reasonably approximates your level of achievement in the business or professional world.

Thank you for your contribution to this study. When it is completed, a brief summary will be available to those who express interest.

Sincerely,

Eleanor L. Zuckerman

P.S. For Your Information:

Charter Member, Women's Forum  
Past President, Radcliffe Club of N.Y. and Seven Sisters  
Alumnae Organization  
Organizer of three Symposia on Women  
Editor, Women and Men: Roles, Attitudes and Power Relations  
Doctoral Candidate, City University, N.Y.

APPENDIX 6

5 Green Valley Court  
Lafayette, Ca. 94549

Dear Achieving Woman:

As one of a still small group of women executives, I am asking your help in a scientific research study. To help you decide whether to take the time in your busy day to answer the enclosed questionnaire, I have provided some personal data below.

I hope you decide to take the ten minutes or so to fill it out, comfortable in the assurance that the study is intended to help women reach management. It is completely anonymous and non-commercial. No really personal information is sought; information at the end is merely to categorize the management levels of the respondents.

If you prefer, you can even have the questionnaire filled out by another woman executive who reasonably approximates your level of achievement in the business or professional world.

Thank you for your contribution to this study. When it is completed, a brief summary will be available to those who express interest.

Sincerely,

Eleanor L. Zuckerman

P.S. For Your Information:

Charter Member, Women's Forum  
Past President, Radcliffe Club of N.Y. and Seven Sisters  
Alumnae Organization  
Organizer of three Symposia on Women  
Editor, Women and Men: Roles, Attitudes and Power Relations  
Doctoral Candidate, City University, N.Y.

APPENDIX 7

TO: Participants in Psychology research study  
FROM: Eleanor Zuckerman, C.U.N.Y.

You have been given this questionnaire because it was felt you might be interested in contributing to some research on women and careers as part of a project at City University of New York.

Do not sign your name; just answer spontaneously and sincerely, without leaving out any items. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers, and the focus is not on you as an individual but as part of a category of responses. Please do not omit the background information requested at the end, which is needed for grouping responses into categories for data analysis. An incomplete questionnaire cannot be used.

When you are finished, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope. With your cooperation, perhaps our store of knowledge about women's careers and needs will be increased.

Thank you very much for your help.

## CAREER QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A

DIRECTIONS: For each of the questions below, please check the appropriate responses:

1. Do you work for one or more persons or are you part of a clerical pool?

One \_\_\_\_\_ Two \_\_\_\_\_ Three \_\_\_\_\_ Pool \_\_\_\_\_

2. Which of the skills below have you studied or learned on the job? (check those which apply)

typing _____	Other (list)
shorthand or speedwriting _____	_____
stenotypist machines _____	_____
dictating machine operating _____	_____
automatic typewriter _____	
switchboard _____	

3. As part of your job, are you called upon to provide services such as preparing coffee, getting lunch, tickets, etc.?

4. Do you feel the work you are doing is essentially satisfying?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you feel your work environment is a pleasant one?

FOR EACH OF THE STATEMENTS BELOW, WRITE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST CORRESPONDS TO HOW MUCH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE, ON A SCALE OF 1-5 as follows:

AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE	NEUTRAL/ CAN'T DECIDE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1	2	3	4	5

6. The person (people) I work for is (are) efficient and competent. \_\_\_\_\_
7. The person (people) I work for is (are) pleasant. \_\_\_\_\_
8. I am provided with enough time to do the work, and time off to take a break. \_\_\_\_\_
9. I get clear instructions, so I know exactly what is expected. \_\_\_\_\_
10. The person (persons) I work for is (are) fair-minded. \_\_\_\_\_