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ABSTRACT

Conventional program planning models do not account for power and influence tactics in the planning process. The purpose of the study was to describe Ohio State Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. A theoretical framework developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994) and later clarified by Yang (1996) was used as a guiding framework for this study. Relationship between planning political context (power base and type of interests) and seven influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, appealing, networking, bargaining, pressuring, and counteracting) were investigated. A multiple regression analysis was carried out to identify whether influence tactics and political context can predict perceptions of program success. The Power and Influence Tactics Scale developed by Yang (1996) was used to measure OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics.

A random sample of 263 OSU Extension personnel from the state (n= 80), district (n=28), and county (n=210) level completed a mailed questionnaire. Most participants indicated consensual interest and symmetrical power relationships with the target person. Participants were middle-aged (M= 46 years), male (51%), and employed by OSU Extension for 12 years on average.
Consulting, reasoning, appealing, networking, and bargaining were perceived as the most effective tactics in consensual interest and symmetrical power relationships. Significant correlations were found between sex and consulting. There were many significant correlations among the seven influence tactics. Planner's power base associated significantly with bargaining tactic only. Type of interest was correlated significantly with consulting, counteracting, pressuring, networking, and reasoning, but when the influence of power base was partialed out, it correlated with consulting, appealing, reasoning, pressuring, and counteracting. Type of interest, sex, age, bargaining, and consulting were the most important predictors of program success. None of the four hypotheses that were generated to specifically test different uses of influence tactics under different relationships of power and interests in the planning situations were on the direction implied by the study’s theoretical framework. One of the three hypotheses that were generated to predict program success by different influence tactics under different power and interest relationships in the planning process was supported by the study’s findings.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Program planners must work with situation-specific institutional and human interests, which are often in conflict, are constantly changing, may be invisible, and may be at variance with planners' own values and intentions. Yet these interests define for planners what is possible, desirable, and at times, imaginable (Cervero & Wilson, 1992, p.28).

Program planning involves four major approaches: classical, naturalistic, critical, and realistic (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a). The first three approaches focus on the technical aspects of program planning process. These approaches provide prescribed steps that planners need to follow such as identifying objectives, contents, methods, and evaluation. A large body of knowledge supports the appropriateness and usefulness of these approaches in program planning for adult education. Recent studies conducted by Cervero & Wilson (1994a; 1994b) reveal, however, that the nature of the program planning process goes beyond the mere application of the technical steps that each model suggests. They argue that program-planning situations involve power relations among planners. Their contention is that program planning is a social activity in which educators negotiate interests in organizational contexts structured by power relationships. Therefore, Yang (1996) developed the realistic approach in response to this issue.
Generally, in any organizational context, power relationships affect planners' actions and raise the issue of effective accountability. The realistic approach simply asks planners to be more realistic while planning programs. The realistic approach deals with these questions: How can program planners be responsible for the program they construct? How can planners satisfy program stakeholders, participants, the leadership of the institution they work with, or the people who teach the program? Who will decide the program’s purpose, content, and format, and whose interest will be satisfied? In contrast, the classical, naturalistic, and critical approaches do not provide effective answers to such questions. Simply, they do not account for power and interest relationships. The realistic approach supports Forester’s (1989) concerns, “Planning while ignoring the opportunities and dangers of an organizational setting is like walking a crowded intersection with one’s eyes closed” (p. 7). So, in order to survive crossing such intersections, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) proposed a sound theory of program planning process based on four concepts: power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. Understanding such theory helps program planners to plan without power abuse and to deliver unbiased educational programs.

In their search for new insights in program planning theories, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) conducted three case studies and reported that power and interests are integral to adult education program planning practices. They emphasized that program planning is a social activity, and planners’ action is contingent upon the social and organizational context in which the program is shaped. Focusing on planners’ actions in the face of organizational power relations and personal interests, shifts program planners’ attention from the technical dimension into the human dimension of the program planning process.
Program planners are human beings in the first place. They have their own interests, values, beliefs, and judgments that affect their planning decisions. Former planning theories have ignored this social reality of the planning process. Consequently, to plan responsibly, adult educators should take into account the social nature of the planning process, and they should be able to identify the role of power relations in their planning actions. Unfortunately, adult educators do not have enough knowledge about how planners really exercise their power in the program planning process. It is critical, therefore, to uncover what power and influence tactics program planners use in practice. According to Cervero and Wilson (1994a):

All planners know they are not free agents able to translate their own interests directly into the purpose, content, and format of a program. Rather, their planning is always conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational, and social relationships of power among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting sets of interests regarding the program. The planners' responsibility, and the central problem of their practice, center on how to negotiate the interests of these people to construct a program (p.4).

Having recognized the complexity of the negotiation process, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) adopted Foster's idea of bounded rationality and developed a conceptual scheme that describes four different ways in which relationships of power and associated interests can structure the planning situation. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) attempt to manifest the political boundedness of rational action into a social theory of program planning in the field of adult education. They hope to create a more democratic planning practice as well as politically just theory. They believe, "Being rational means anticipating how existing
relationships of power are likely to support or constrain in a substantively democratic planning process and acting in ways to nurture such a process” (p. 127). In order to be effective politically and maintain a high level of rationality, planners need to dig deep into the planning situation to understand its nature and structure well.

The literature in the field of management reveals that planning has been treated as a technical process for a long time, and few theories have treated it as a social activity. Power is a core concept of organizational theories, and it has been ignored by adult education program planning theories for decades (Yang, 1996; Cervero & Wilson, 1994a & b). In this regard, a study is needed to document three emerging concerns in the field of adult education: a) program planning is no longer a technical process, but, rather, a social and political process; b) program planners are facing power relations while they plan adult education programs; c) how program planners can manage power relations in a positive way that lead to high quality programs. Such studies should explain how adult educators exercise power in program planning practices and what are the profound effects of power on the designed program.

Rationale of The Study

The literature review suggests that current program planning practices do not account for power and influence tactics. This lack of recognition results in the misconception that the program planning process is technical in nature, probably due to the step-by-step program planning models that have dominated the practices of adult education. Traditional planning models suggest that program planners are problem solvers, who should follow prescribed planning steps.
To the contrary, Cervero and Wilson (1994b) said:

The problem is that while much planning theory is helpful in prescribing the technical process of practice, it generally falls short of saying how to accomplish these processes in the world of power relations and interests. In short, most planning theory does not provide adequate depiction of the messy, though normal, world in which adult educators must act (p.251).

This dissertation attempts to fill the gap between program planning theory and practice. It provides evidence that the program-planning process is not a linear process that could be extracted from its political context, as most models suggest, but, rather, a process that involves power and interests negotiation among program planners. This dissertation also attempts to reinforce the realistic approach to program planning, in contrast to the established planning models that suggest a weak relationship between planner action and social context. This study attempts to help educators take responsible actions that will foster democratic and ethical planning practices. According to Cervero and Wilson (1994b), “...being responsible means anticipating how existing relations of power are likely to support or constrain a substantively democratic planning process and then acting in ways to nurture such a process” (p.260). The study gives program planners a practical agenda that helps them develop effective planning strategies and understand the social context of their organizations.

Cervero and Wilson’s (1994a & b) work is worth pursuing because it not only expands the understanding of adult education but also provides practical guidelines for a more responsible planning experience. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) agree that program planning is not a mere technical process but is, rather, a political and ethical one. Forester
(1989) elaborates, “The vocation of planning has often been misunderstood in two ways, ... planning has sometimes been understood either as a technical problem-solving endeavor or as purely a matter of the hustle, bustle, and nastiness of politics” (p.4). Planners need to go beyond the current program planning models (classical, naturalistic, critical) into a new array of humanized and responsible planning practices. Humanized means “Theories do not plan programs—people do” (Cervero and Wilson, 1996, p.5) or as Sork (1996) critically states, “People with theories plan programs” (p.81).

Practical Implications

Cervero and Wilson’s (1994a) program planning theory offers promising practical implications for program planners. First, their theory allows planners to apply it in as many different ways they would apply any planning theory because “any theory about planning in adult education must remain essentially a human creation that can sensitize planners to what must be paid attention to and how their actions and program can make a difference in the world” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b, p.265). Therefore, the theory allows planners to focus on what is critically important in the planning process by bridging their planning actions with the ethical and political consequences resulting from their actions. Second, the theory of planning responsibly allows practitioners to develop a sense of understanding about what is going on in planning situations. Their theory suggests that negotiations are a daily life process that people usually practice in modern organizations such as informal conversations, public planning meetings, telephone calls, memoranda, letters, and faxes. It accounts for the daily social activities as well as the ethical and political dimensions of planning. Therefore, their perspective reduces the gap between
theory and practice that is produced by traditional planning theories. Third, the theory of planning responsibly is practicably appropriate. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) contend, “By situating planners as social actors in a context of power and interests, our theory directly addresses this criterion [speak to the working interpretations that planners have of the practical situations and problems they face (Forester, 1989, p. 17)]” (p. 266). Fourth, the theory of planning responsibly illuminates the ethical questions that planners face in their practice. It “... locates practice in a world of influences that support or threaten the vision of good planning” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b, p. 266). If planners can predict power relations and interests, they will be able to plan responsibly and effectively, a democratically planned program. Program planners usually bring their own beliefs, understandings, and values to the planning situation without predicting the political relationships that tie them with other planners; therefore, they produce programs that serve their interests. This theory of planning defines clearly the ethical responsibilities of the planners while they are trying to negotiate the interests of all possible actors in the planning situations. Finally, the theory of planning responsibly needs to be tested further in terms of whether it helps educators be more politically astute and ethically sensitive during the planning process.

Definition of Problem

Program planning models come in different forms and steps and require different planning strategies and techniques. Extension agents have been using various program planning models in their daily practices, but few have documented how power is exercised in the planning process. There are recent studies (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a...
& b; Forester, 1989 & 1985; Sork, 1996 & 1991; Hendricks, 1996; Maclean, 1996; and Yang, 1996) that document the significant effects of power and interests on the practice of program planning.

Little is known about the critical effects of the political, social, and ethical dimensions of the program planning process as implemented by the Ohio State Extension program planners. Based on the results produced by the above-mentioned studies, it is expected that Ohio State Extension personnel are encountering or dealing with the influence of power and negotiated interests while planning programs.

The central claim of this dissertation is that program planning “... is a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, p.4). A gap of knowledge exists between theory and practice, produced by the lack of sufficient information about the role of power in planning needed by Ohio State Extension personnel to predict conflicts and to learn how to deal with such power and interests relations. The Extension personnel need not only to improve the quality of their program planning practices, but also to attain a good power exegesis. Program planning is not a social manifestation, but, rather, a social integration of planners’ interests and other peoples’ interests. According Cervero and Wilson (1994a), “Practitioners must deal regularly with political and economic issues, topics that much of the planning literature considers irrelevant to good program design ... yet theoretical writing about program planning in adult education rarely addresses this issue” (p.20). Program planning in the OSU Extension is an area of political storms requiring - highly skilled and knowledgeable planners, who are able to identify and negotiate the various interests involved as they guide the planning process. In the case of the OSU Extension
division, the main goal is to produce high quality programs and to maintain effective cliental relationships. If program planners strive to reach those goals, they must adopt effective planning practices that take into account the power and interest relationships and the interest of the program stakeholders.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study is to describe OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. Additionally, this study seeks to determine the common power and influence tactics Extension personnel tend to exercise in planning programs. This study also seeks to discover which other factors, especially the perceived effectiveness of influence tactics (pattern of influence behavior), the nature of power bases, and the type of interests relationships that are influencing the OSU Extension program planning decisions and perceptions.

Research Questions

1. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel’s demographic factors (sex, age, educational level, length in organization, length in position, major program area of responsibility, and planner’s job title) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics according to their power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and type of interests (consensual or conflictual)?

2. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel’s power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics?
3. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for type of interests?

4. What are the relationships between type of interests (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics?

5. What are the relationships between type of interest (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for power base?

6. What are the relationships of program success to OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for political context (power base and type of interest)?

7. To what extent can variability in the OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of program success be explained by political context (power base and type of interests), by power and influence tactics, and background variables?

Research Hypotheses

Research hypotheses have been developed to guide data analysis for answering research questions two, three, four, five, six, and seven. These hypotheses were derived from the literature review of the theoretical background of the study. Many researchers (Yang, Cervero, Valentine, & Benson, 1998; Yang, 1996; Cervero & Wilson, 1994a & b; Hendricks, 2000; and Mabry, 2000) have found that different power and influence tactics are linked to different power bases and different types of interest relationships. Therefore,
the following research hypotheses have been developed to reflect the implied theoretical directions and to help simplify the statistical analysis of the obtained data:

1. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using reasoning and consulting.

2. In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a subordinate) in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using appealing and networking.

3. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using bargaining.

4. In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a supervisor) in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using pressuring and counteracting.

5. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report perceiving the program as successful.

6. Perceived program success is predicted by symmetrical power base and by power and influence tactics (bargaining, reasoning, and consulting).

7. Perceived program success is predicted by consensual type of interests and by power and influence tactics (bargaining, reasoning, and consulting).
Definition of Terms

Planning Program: “A social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, p.4).

Planning Situation: The planning situation is the medium in which the program is planned and developed. Planning situation is characterized by a “complex set of personal, organizational, and social relationships of power among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting sets of interests regarding the program” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a, p.4).

For the purpose of this study, the planning situation is operationally defined as mean score of the first eight items (Section I on the instrument), on a six-point Likert-type instrument (See below).

Type of Interests: Interests are “a complex set of dispositions, goals, values, desires, and expectations that lead people to act in certain ways and to position themselves in a particular manner when confronted with situations in which they must act” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a, p. 122). There are two types of interest relationships: conflictual and consensual relationships. Conflictual relations “...refers to situations where the people involved in the program have different interests and thus tend to act differently” (Yang, 1996, p. 73). Consensual relations “...indicate that two or more parties involved in the program have similar understandings and concerns about the program and share the same interests” (Yang, 1996, p. 73).

In this study, type of interest is operationally defined as a summated, mean score reported on five items (Items # 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) measured on a six-point Likert-type
scale. High scores represent political situations, which are involving conflictual interest relationships, and low scores represent political situations, which are involving consensual interest relationships. Each of the five items contains a statement relevant to each type of interest relationships.

**Power:** “Power is the capacities of intended social interaction in which one subset of people effectively influences others and resolves the social dispute and conflict, given constrained resources and social relationships” (Yang, 1996, p.41).

**Power Base:** Power base is the interpersonal sources by which the target person has more capacity to act over other people involved in the planning process. There are two power bases: symmetrical and asymmetrical. Symmetrical power relationships refer to the “type of power relationships in which the planner’s capacity to act is equivalent to other relevant actors in the situation” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994b, p. 261). Asymmetrical power relationships refer to the “type of power in which the planner’s capacity to act is not equivalent to other relevant actors” (Cervero & Wilson, 1994b, p. 261).

For the purpose of this study, symmetrical power relationship refers to a situation where the education program planners have equal capacity to conduct their plans as well as others in the organization. Asymmetrical power relationship refers to a situation where the education program planners have lesser or higher capacity to conduct their plans than others in the organization.

In this study, power base is operationally defined as a summated mean score reported on three items (items # 6, 7, and 8) that measured on a six point Likert-type scale. High scores represent a power relationships, which are involving asymmetrical power relationships, and low scores represent power relationships, which are involving
symmetrical power relationships. Each of the three items contains a statement relevant to each type of power relationships.

**Power and Influence Tactics:** “Adult education planners’ social interaction patterns in organizational politics to carry out educational programs” (Yang, 1996, p. 89).

In this study, tactics are operationally defined as “techniques, or the specific means, by which people attain their power goals” (Fairholm, 1992, p. 52). For the purpose of this study, the construct of power and influence tactics was measured on the following subscales:

**Reasoning:** “Reasoning refers to the planner’s utilization of factual evidence in order to persuade the target that a request is logically congruent with common interests and is also viable” (Yang, 1996, p. 80). Reasoning is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on five items (Items # 11, 18, 24, 30, and 33) on a six-point Likert-type scale. High scores indicate greater levels of reasoning and low scores indicate lesser levels of reasoning. Each of the five items contains a statement that relates to reasoning as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning situation.

**Consulting:** “Consulting reflects the planner’s effort to seek the involvement of the target to generate a viable plan in order to meet common concerns” (Yang, 1996, p. 81). Consulting is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on four items (Items # 9, 15, 20, and 27) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument. High scores indicate greater levels of consulting and low scores indicate lesser levels of consulting. Each of the four items contains a statement related to consulting as implemented power and influence tactic in the planning
Appealing: "Appealing is the planner's use of praise, flattery, friendly behavior, or appeal to target values, ideals, and aspirations for the purpose of passing a message to the target that a request is not at the expense of the target's interest" (Yang, 1996, p.81). Appealing is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on five items (Items # 25, 31, 34, 36, and 38) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument. High scores indicate greater levels of appealing and low scores indicate lesser levels of appealing. Each of the five items contains a statement related to appealing as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning process.

Networking: "Networking happens when the planner involves other people who have information and authority to gain support from the target" (Yang, 1996, p. 82). Networking is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on four items (Items # 10, 16, 22, and 39) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument. High scores indicate greater levels of networking and low scores indicate lesser levels of networking. Each of the four items contains a statement related to networking as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning process.

Bargaining: "Bargaining reflects certain actions where the planners negotiate with the target to reach an agreement that meets their needs" (Yang, 1996, p.83). Bargaining is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on four items (Items # 12, 14, 19, and 26) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument.
High scores indicate greater levels of bargaining and low scores indicate lesser levels of bargaining. Each of the four items contains a statement related to bargaining as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning process.

Pressuring: “Pressuring refers to the planner making direct and forceful demands or threats to the target in situations where resistance is present” (Yang, 1996, p.83). Pressuring is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on five items (Items # 13, 21, 32, 35, and 37) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument. High scores indicate greater levels of pressuring and low scores indicate lesser levels of pressuring. Each of the five items contains a statement related to pressuring as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning process.

Counteracting: “Counteracting is a tactic by which the planner blocks the efforts of the target or acts in the opposite direction” (Yang, 1996, p.85). Counteracting is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on four items (Items # 17, 23, 28, and 29) on a six-point Likert-type measurement instrument. High scores indicate greater levels of counteracting and low scores indicate lesser levels of counteracting. Each of the four items contains a statement related to counteracting as an implemented power and influence tactic in the planning process.

Program Success: Program success is defined as a program that produces favorable outcomes, attains its established objectives, and meets its clientele expectations (Seevers et al, 1997); therefore, it makes planners satisfied about its final outcomes.
Program success is operationally defined as a summated, mean score on seven items (items #40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46) measured on a six-point Likert-type scale. High scores indicate greater levels of program success and low scores indicate lesser levels of program success. Each of the seven items contains a statement related to program success. Planners were asked to rate their satisfaction about the final outcomes of the program.

Limitations of the study

This study was descriptive/correlational in nature and was limited to Extension personnel employed by Ohio State University Extension. Therefore, the generalizability of the results was limited only to Ohio State University Extension personnel.

The study was limited by individual respondents and their willingness to express their perceptions of power and influence tactics. It was also limited by the individual perception and understanding of the concepts of power and politics and the effects they have on their personal approach to program planning.

Money and time were major obstacles to conducting this study with a larger sample or the entire population.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were established prior to carrying out the study:

1. Respondents would provide honest and truthful answers and replies to the instrument items.

2. Program planning is a social activity in which planners negotiate power and interests relationships and reconstruct them.
3. It is assumed that any planning situation is characterized by political and social relationships that affect planners' planning actions.

4. Power and influence tactics are normally distributed variables in the population of this study.

5. It is assumed that planners' behaviors (influence) can be adequately reflected by their responses to the items in the instrument.

6. It is assumed that each planning situation is relatively stable and comprehensible to the planner and thus reflects a different degree from the other situations along the proposed three dimensions: power relationship, interests relationships, and planning action.

7. It is assumed that the seven proposed influence tactics indicate certain behavioral patterns of the planners under different planning contexts. This assumption differentiates this study from the previously conducted studies of power and influence tactics because it explores the concept of power and influence tactics across different extension planning contexts.

8. This study is an early attempt at operationalizing some complex concepts such as type of interests, power base, and power and influence tactics in the program planning process. Therefore, it is assumed that the operationalization of such concepts may or may not have represented these concepts fully.

9. The study variables were selected based on theoretical constructs, case studies, and research findings from other disciplines that appeared relevant. This approach may not have resulted in the best variables for consideration but did provide a useful way to begin and suggest strategies for more focused studies.
Figure 1.1: A conceptualization of variables and their relationships influencing Ohio State University Extension personnel's power and influence tactics.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature related to the power concept in the field of management science and program planning for adult education. The first part of the chapter reviews the literature on business and management science. This review provides a description and explanation of power implementation in social organizations. It identifies power sources, definitions, influence tactics, power and decision-making, and political behaviors within social organizations.

The second part of the chapter reviews the literature on adult education program planning and how adult education literature dealt with the concept of power. The second part is divided into two sections. The first section reviews three major program planning approaches: classical, naturalistic, and critical approach. The second section reviews the realistic approach as a theoretical framework for power and influence tactics in this study. It provides a comprehensive review of power dimensions, influence tactics, and the relationships between them.

The third part of the chapter reviews studies of power in the adult education program-planning field. Also, it tries to provide any power studies conducted in the field of extension education.
PART 1
Power in Social Organizations

Whenever one hears the word power, the mind jumps to some negative perceptions such as strong or weak, rich or poor, ordinate or subordinate, authority or control, etc. As humans, we tend to perceive power as negative due to past experiences or cultivation. If someone has been oppressed, the word power evokes the image of the oppressor. Regardless of perceptions, power also has a positive side. Power can be used in an effective and productive way.

Many authors have defined the term. Hook (1979) defines power as “The ability to influence the behavior of others in order to further our desires and purposes” (p. 4). Also, Griffin (1984) provides a similar definition. Griffin (1984) says, “Power is the potential ability to affect the behavior of others. Potential means that one can have power without actually using it” (p. 417). Hellriegel, Solcum, and Woodman (1987) consider power “The capacity to influence the behavior of others” (p. 423). From the previous definitions, one can say that power is a means or something that people use to influence others’ behavior. These definitions may imply a negative perception of power. They relate power to behavioral change without specifying whether negative or positive. Also, the above definition implies a deliberate use of power to change other people’s behavior.

A difference exists between the “capacity to influence” and “the influence” itself. The capacity to influence means who can do what and the influence means what to do. For example, in real life, people tend to influence the behavior of others in normal everyday living. People tend to reinforce the good behaviors of family members and friends. Also, they tend to punish undesirable behavior in a variety of ways.
Power is shaped by social interaction and relationships between two or more individuals, organizations, groups, or countries. In order for the term “power” to exist, two or more parties need to interact with each other. There should be a social context that allows power to fully exist and be successfully practiced. According to Hellriegel et al (1987) “Power is never absolute or unchanging. It as a dynamic relationship that changes as situations and individuals change”(p.424). For example, a manager may strongly influence a subordinate today, but he or she may not have the same influence tomorrow if the relationship between the manager and subordinate changes for any reason. The subordinate may be transferred to another department that is far away from the manager’s influence zone. According to Kreitner (1998), power affects organizational members in the following three areas:

1. Decisions. A packing engineer decides to take on a difficult new assignment after hearing her boss’s recommendations.

2. Behavior. A hospital lab technician achieves a month of perfect attendance after receiving a written warning about absenteeism from his supervisor.

3. Situations. The productivity of a product design group increases dramatically following the purchase of computerized workstations.

Kreitner’s three conditions: decision, behavior, and situation are the most important elements for power to be exercised in any given situation. It is clear that any job situation involves these three conditions, in relation to time, people, and organization type. Kreitner draws our attention to another useful way to discover the positive side of power. He wants us to distinguish between “power over” (ability to dominate), “power to” (ability to act freely), and “power from” (ability to resist the demands of others).
Power requires two important factors in order to be exercised successfully (Cox, 1998): First, the power has to be recognized by the other party. If the person that you are trying to influence does not identify your source of power as important or credible, then that power is irrelevant. Second, power is rarely confined to one side in a relationship. It may be very unbalanced between the two sides. The ability to influence is based on the balance of power.

Cox clarifies the importance of identifying power sources. He states (1998), “Identifying the sources of power will help us identify those which will have most positive effects in different situations” (p. 1192).

Sources of Power

It is critical to identify power sources to better understand the real reasons for using or abusing power by any person. Power sources are the only visible treasures of the motive for using or abusing power. Identifying power sources will not only help us understand where power comes from but also will help us diagnose power in order to increase the positive and productive use of power. The previous section discussed how power must be dependent on social context and social actors in order to be exercised in any given situation; therefore, it is relevant to know where power comes from and who has it. Pfeffer (1992) pointed out that,

Knowing where power comes from also helps us to build our own power and thereby increase our capacity to take action ... but to be effective, we also need to know how to develop sources of power and how to employ that power strategically and tactically. (p. 71)
People have the desire to be powerful and effective. They tend to take care of their physical appearances, social status, and educational level. We need to ask the question: What gives certain individuals in a given organization the ability or the capacity to influence others in the direction they desire?

Scholars in the field of management science and social organization provide many theories that attempt to explain why some managers have the power to influence their subordinates. Scholars (Kreitner, 1998; Mondy, 1990; and Pfeffer, 1992) provide three major sources of power. They believe one can acquire power from the position in an organization. Position power is a form of power given to a certain person in a certain organization by way of job title, job description, and prescribed responsibilities (Greiner and Sehein, 1988). Position power includes legitimate power, centrality power, reward power, and coercive power. Legitimate power is derived from the position or job an individual holds in an organization. Centrality power is the degree to which the activities of the position are linked and important to those of other individuals or subunits. Reward power emerges from one’s abilities to control reward or punishments. Coercive power is power derived from the ability to punish or to recommend punishment.

It is critical to differentiate between power and authority. Power as defined by many scholars is the ability to marshal resources to get something done (Kreitner, 1998). As Kreitner pointed out the word ability differentiates authority from power, where authority is the right to direct other people’s activity. In our point of view, authority implies order and the privilege to direct other people’s activity in a formal situation that occurs when a parent disciplines a child or a sergeant commands the troops. Power is the ability to get results. As illustrated in Figure 2.1, one may have the authority, but have no
power to get other people do whatever he or she wants them to do, nor have the authority and power to make others obey his or her orders, nor have the power to make them obey orders without authority to do so.
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Figure 2.1: The relationship between power and authority

Other authors (Greiner and Schein, 1988; Hellriegel et al, 1990) classify power bases into individual and departmental (structural). Individual bases of power emerge from one's personal attributes or character. These power bases are the unique character attributes that are carried on from one situation to another by the manager. Departmental power bases are nontransferable and grounded in the work itself.

Greiner and Schein (1988) classify individual power bases into three broad categories: knowledge, personality, and others' support. Knowledge power includes expertise, information, and tradition. Expert power refers to the possession of a specific body of knowledge acquired either through formal academic training or job experience.
One knows more about a particular subject; therefore, he or she can influence others’ behavior. Information power is the ability to create, withhold, distort or redirect the information flow toward selected recipients. One can influence others if he or she has relevant information about the subject being discussed. Tradition power is the power that older or senior workers possess in an organization due to their extensive historical knowledge about the organization and their use of it as a base to influence others. Older or senior employees can evoke stories and myths to control new employees' behavior.

The second individual power base is personality. It includes charisma, reputation, and professional credibility. Charisma is the ability to inspire devotion and enthusiasm from others. Reputation is a power base that emerges from others who have a favorable opinion of your work and capabilities. Objectives such as hard worker, winner, or thought leader describe people with a power base of reputation. For example, managers who have a good reputation usually have a great impact on getting other people to follow their recommendations. Professional credibility refers to the ability to participate in industry meetings and professional association through professional activities such as speeches and articles. These professional activities increase your exposure and reputation among others outside and inside your organization.

The third source of power is others’ support. It includes political access and staff support. Political access is the ability to call upon networks of relationships within the organization. Political access allows managers to increase their information base and keep them updated. In other words, a person in an organization may have access to key decision makers and can deal with them and impact their decision to reinforce power.
Greiner and Schein (1988) described departmental power bases as a “significant source of power.” They argued that departmental power can change over time depending on economic conditions, technological breakthroughs, and governmental legislations. They classify departmental power into three types: ability to cope with uncertainty facing the total organization, low substitutability or not being easily replaced, and centrality in the workflow of the company.

Ability to cope with uncertainty is the ability for each department to cope with changing environments and technologies. Organizations are striving to minimize uncertainty. For example, organizations or departments need to assure future orders and demands on their services and products. Departments may seek information to reduce uncertainty and increase their power. In this rapidly changing world, departments need to analyze current trends in order to forecast their future. Departments who have such information increase their power base.

Substitutability refers to the fact that no other department in an organization can function as the current department. At the beginning of the computer revolution, many departments gained extensive amounts of power, for example data processing departments, due to the fact that few people understood its activities or technical language. Today, these departments have lost their power base because there are many departments that can replace them.

Centrality refers to the dependency of many departments on a single department in the work’s flow. For instance, a claims department in an insurance company has centrality. If it stops producing, large numbers of other units whose work follows from this group cannot function.
Power and Influence Tactics

We need to understand not only the meaning of power, but also the influence tactics that are used to exercise such power. Many managers consider power as a means to enhance their ability to reach organizational goals. Power is useful and people constantly strive to hold a power position in organizations. We are right if we say that the world of management is all about power. It is the fundamental element of management. Those who know how to use it will stay at the top of their organizations, and those who lack it will be at the bottom. There are many means by which managers may secure power. According to Mondy et al. (1990) power can be secured by networking, coalescing, co-opting, and accepting the right projects.

Networking is establishing relationships with the right people for the purpose of obtaining power. To build an effective network, one can ask the following questions:

1. Who has relevant information?
2. To whom does that person communicate the information?
3. How many others have access to it?
4. What potential sources of power exist in the team?

Coalescing as defined by Mondy et al. (1990) is the process of individuals or groups combining their resources to pursue common objectives. It is clear that two brains are better than one. By forming coalescing resource groups, individuals will get what they want from their managers more likely than if they seek that need individually.

Co-opting is a method of increasing power and creating alliances. In co-opting, individuals or groups whose support is needed are absorbed into another group. Co-opting is usually exercised to increase the power base in case there is an intensive
opposition. For instance, if manager A wants project X to be implemented, but manager B has some strong reservations, Manager A, of course, will invite manager B to participate on project X team discussion. This will make manager B act neutralized.

Accepting the right projects means that individuals can participate in projects that are highly visible, extraordinary, and related to accomplishing organizational objectives. These projects form the right environment for exercising power and practicing it effectively. For example, a faculty member may participate in preparing a very important accreditation report. This activity allows the faculty member to work with the president, vice-presidents, deans, department heads, and other administrators across campus. This participation allows the faculty member to show up in different places and exercise different skills and tasks to accomplish the final desired accreditation results. Faculty member involvement will give him or her the power of accomplishment and success. Also, if the project fails, everyone on campus will know who was in charge, and the faculty member may have less power than before.

**Role of Power In Decision Making**

Decision-making is living your possibilities. To be able to decide, you have to have possibilities to choose from. Making the right decision is not a problem, but making the decision right is the real problem. It is the question of “how” instead of “what” decision need to be made. The “how” part involves applying power strategies to reach the decision (Greiner & Schein, 1988). The following study provides an explanation of how power strategies affect the decision-making process as reported by Greiner and Schein in 1988. Ned is a corporate planner in a large electronics products company. Last
year, he successfully introduced the concept of market segmentation into a major corporate division. Ned explained how he did it:

   Since the day I entered this company I have tried to maintain an image of a winner. I had many good job offers and the company’s efforts to lure me here were active and well known. I tried to keep the “hotshot” image going as long as possible. For one thing, I went around the company offering expert assistance to people. These favors helped to play up my positive image. When I was ready to implement market segmentation, I went back to many of these same people. As I heard later, they felt, “He must know what he is talking about. I better get on his bandwagon, even if I don’t understand it.”

   In seeking acceptance for my plan, I would get information from others and then use only their positive comments in discussing ideas with others. When I would hear of problems, I would often blame them on our past failure to do market segmentation. Finally, I developed a good rapport with the CEO and two of his key executives. I was able to cut across lines of authority and go directly to them to present my plan.

   Jane describes another situation. Jane is the publications coordinator for a large university where she has been for five years after previous experience in a publishing firm. A year ago, the university decided to hire an outside design team to produce all of its publications, and a university committee was selected to recommend a design team to the vice dean, who had the final say. It was very important to Jane that her first choice be selected, and she explained how she accomplished that objective:
First of all, I made sure I was involved in the selection of the committee members. I put as many of my allies—those who would go along with my ideas—on the committee as I could. I prescreened all the design teams. This gave me more information about the teams than any of the other committee members had. I made a point of finding out what criteria for selection were important to most of the committee members. In discussing the team of my choice, I made sure to highlight these factors. Finally, I delayed the committee process. As the deadline got closer, the vice dean became anxious that a decision be made by the committee. Everyone recognized that I had more background and information in these matters. The committee members, especially the vice dean, were quite willing to listen to my opinions (Greiner & Schein, 1988).

We can see from the above two situations that managers use power strategies to attain their objectives. Both Ned and Jane used power strategies, such as establishing positive image, expertise, information, and locating allies long before a definite need was established.

Then, they relied on a range of strategies evolving from specific power bases, such as political access and professional credibility. These strategies were used effectively to impact the decision-making process in both departments. Decision-making is a political process that involves who decides what, and how, and when.

Conclusion

The previous section defined the term power and identified its sources and tactics. Power is a complex concept used to stimulate the social context to fit the power holder’s preference.
The literature review of textbooks in management science reveals a disagreement among scholars about the true meaning of power. Swingle (1976) maintains that, "Power is a very complex issue. We have many definitions and much disagreement. However, all managers talk about power" (p.46). We agree with such a statement because we recognize the changing nature of power. We believe power is contingent upon the social context and power relationships among the social actors. Pfeffer (1981) agrees that,

Power characterizes relationships among social actors. A given social actor, by which we mean an individual, subunit, or organization, has more power with respect to some social actors and less power with respect to others. Thus, power is context or relationship specific (p.3).

The literature review uncovered the fact that power is a structural phenomenon, in Pfeffer’s (1981) words, "Created by the division of labor and departmentation that characterize the specific organization or set of organizations being investigated" (p.4). Furthermore, power in social organization is a major issue that has been neglected by social science scholars for long time (Pfeffer, 1981; Swingle, 1976; Griffin, 1984). Power has been neglected for several reasons. First, the concept of power is itself problematic in much of the social science literature. Second, power is not everything; there are other factors that impact the decision-making process. And third, the concept of power is troublesome to the socialization of managers and to the practice of management because of its implications and connotations (Pfeffer, 1981) as well as ambiguity of its definition.

Therefore, social organizations are facing and exercising power in their daily activities. Managers and subordinates are seeking more power any chance they may have. One critical feature of power is that those who hold it, want more from it, and those who
don’t, strive to get it. Swingle (1976) affirmed, “Power holders try to retain as much power as long as they can. This can produce conflict, challenge, and confrontation over power transition” (p. 344).

Because it is the prime means of influence in both formal and informal organizations, power is critical to aspects of organizational existence. The typology of power developed by Ravan and French (1959) reveals five sources of power: reward, coercive, referent, charismatic, and expert power. It is clear that power exists in adult education organizations as social organizations that involve decision-making activities and influence. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) confirmed:

Planning programs is a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests. The educational programs constructed through these practices do not just appear fully formed on a brochure or in a classroom. Rather, they are planned by real people in complex organizations that have sets of historical traditions, relationships of power, and human needs and interests. The planners construct educational programs from the judgments they make in this messy everyday world (p. 4).

The above statement gives further inspiration for examining the concept of power in the adult education field since the major part of adult educators’ time is spent in planning programs, workshops, etc.
PART 2

Power in The Field of Adult Education

Power in Program Planning Approaches in Adult Education

Thomas (1964) stated, “No term or idea in adult education is quite so widely used, nor quite so elusive in meaning, as the term program” (p.241).

Today we can say the term “program” is widely abused more than ever in adult education. This abuse results from the broad nature of the term. Scholars in the field of adult education tend to give the term different meanings, yet a line of consensus does exist among them. Boyle (1981) defines program as “The product resulting from all the programming activities in which the professional educator and learner are involved” (p.5). Boyle views the term “program” as an outcome of certain actions conducted by the learners and educators. Boyle’s definition lacks precision because his definition does not specify either the types of activities or the quality of such activities. One cannot say that any programming “activities” between educators and learners will produce a program!

The other interesting point is who is going to select the activities or direct them to produce a program. Boone (1985) realizes such lacks in Boyle’s definition, therefore, he defines program as,

[Program is] the master perspective for behavioral change toward which adult educators direct their efforts. The planned program consists of (1) a statement of broad-based educational needs, (2) a statement of objectives keyed to those needs, (3) specification of teaching strategies for achieving the objectives, those needs, and (4) specification of macro outcomes of the planned program (p.16).
Boone’s definition considers “program” as a process or system that consists of steps to form the final program. Cookson and Rothwell (1997) define the term program as “A set of organized learning activities that are systematically designed to achieve planned learning outcomes in a specified period”(p.4). Some other scholars use the term “curriculum” to describe a course of planned learning activities. The term “curriculum” is related to educational settings more than the term “program” (Cookson and Rothwell, 1997).

From the previous review of scholars’ definitions of the term “program,” it is obvious that there is no single and specific definition of what the term “program” means. It is important to understand the meaning of “program” because the term itself is very general and can be attached to many things at the same time. However, most definitions agree that program is a set of “activities” practiced among educators and learners to reach specific outcomes. These definitions suggest a context of interaction among program developers and/or program receivers, among which final useful outcomes emerge.

Program developers, according to Cervero and Wilson (1994a) are “Administrators and program or curriculum developers in for-profit and nonprofit businesses, community agencies, and public school and higher education institutions” (p.6). They usually try to reach an agreement upon five general program planning steps: 1) needs assessment; 2) objectives definitions; 3) learning activities identifications; 4) organizing activities, and 5) evaluation based on program objectives attainment (Boyle, 1981; Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Many scholars in the field of adult education consider the above five steps as core components for any attempt for planning a program. Furthermore, there are some
universal components that any program development process should include. Boone (1985) points out:

These components include a description of the needs of individual adult learners and learner groups, a statement of program objectives, and a description of educational strategies to achieve the stated objectives and to fulfill the stated needs. Moreover, this planned program reflects the nature and capabilities of the adult education organization, the nature of the learners and learner groups, the content area(s) involved, the support structure(s) to be used in program design and implementation, and a description of evaluation and accountability strategies (p.5)

Having recognized these components of program planning, we find it critical for program success to understand the social context in which the program developers are working. It seems there is a concrete agreement among professionals in the field of adult education upon the social nature of the planning process. However, few scholars have mentioned the political context of program planning. As stated earlier in this part, most definitions of the term “program” suggest an existence of interaction among program developers and learners. Yet, the program planning steps described by many authors failed to account for the political interaction among the program developers with regard to their power relationships and how power relationships affect their planning decisions (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Therefore, Cervero and Wilson state (1994a), “Planning programs is a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests”(p.4). Also, Forester (1989) points out some critical questions:

In a world of poor information and limited time to work on problems, how are careful analyses of alternative futures possible? In a world of conflicting
interests—defined along lines of class, place, race, gender, organization, or individuals—how are planners to make their way? In a society structured by a capitalist economy and a nominally democratic political system, how are planners to respond to conflicting demands when private profit and public well-being clash? --- When planners are mandated to enable “public participation” even as they work in bureaucratic organizations that may be threatened by such participation, what are planners to do? When “solving” problems depends in large part on the interests, perceptions, commitments, and understanding of others, how can planners best convey their ideas, show what is consequential, expose dangers, and open up fruitful opportunities for action (p.5).

Cervero and Wilson (1994a) uncovered the reality of the practice of the program planning process. They repeatedly make the point:

All planners know they are not free agents able to translate their own interests directly into the purpose, content, and format of a program. Rather, their planning is always conducted within a complex set of personal, organizational, and social relationships of power among people who may have similar, different, or conflicting sets of interests regarding the program. The planners’ responsibility, and the central problem of their practice, center on how to negotiate the interests of these people to construct a program. (p.4)

The above statements call for more democratic planning. Those authors are trying to shed some insights on the question: “What do program planners really do?” Mills et al. (1995) states,
Over the past decade adult educators (Cervero and Wilson, 1994; Griffin, 1983) have theorized the ways that program planning actually brings programs into existence in concrete social and political contexts and have called for research that provides evidence for these processes (p.2).

The next section of the literature attempts to answer the question: “What do program planners really do?” A critical proposition is going to be taken as to whether the current program planning approaches in adult education fail to account for power relationships and the political context in which these programs are carried out. A comprehensive review of the current literature that documents the current program planning approaches is necessary to arrive at a satisfactory answer. Furthermore, the existence and impact of power in the practice of program planning need to be documented and supported by the available studies to bear witness to its existence. Therefore, the next section starts with a critical analysis of the current program planning approaches and concludes with a complementary review of research related to power and influence strategies.

Program Planning Approaches in Adult Education

In 1994, Cervero and Wilson, in their book Planning Responsibly for Adult Education, identified three major planning “views” of planning theory, which they labeled the classical, naturalistic, and critical.

The Classical Viewpoint

The classical viewpoint was developed by Ralph Tyler (1949) in his four-questions typology of program planning. Tyler’s model is based on the following four
questions: What are the educational goals? What are the educational activities that will help satisfy the educational goals? What are the appropriate ways to organize the educational activities? And what is the appropriate evaluation strategy that will help us know whether the educational goals are attained? Tyler’s (1949) program planning questions have been the cornerstone upon which current program planning models are built. Brookfield (1986) agrees that, “The Tylerian mode of program development has retained a conceptual preeminence in adult education since it was first adopted in the 1950s” (p. 204). Furthermore, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) point out, “Tyler’s four questions have been translated into the prescriptive steps of the program planning process as described in nearly all theories” (p. 14). Also, Pennington and Green (1976) conclude, “Planners use the language of the classical model to label their planning actions” (p. 22).

It seems that many adult educators reached the same assumption about the critical role of Tyler’s approach in program planning theory. Many educators (Sork and Caffarella, 1989; Sork and Buskey, 1986; Houle, 1980; and Cervero & Wilson, 1994a) have expressed, however, a concern about whether the classical viewpoint really provides a comprehensive description of what program planners do in reality. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) appraised Tyler’s four questions for planning a program, but they state:

Although it does not account for the dimensions and variability of planning contexts, the nature of practical judgments, or the values that influence how judgments are made, the classical viewpoint has clearly identified some characteristic questions that must be addressed by any planner (p. 17).

Cervero and Wilson’s observation shifts the attention from the technical nature of program planning practice into the social and political context in which these programs
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are planned. Program planners are not following a linear step-by-step procedure while they are planning, but, rather, they face social and political tensions. It is clear that classical program planning models (Beal et al., 1966; Boone et al., 1971; Boyle, 1981; and Knowles, 1970 &1980) do not reflect the reality of the planning process and “Anyone who claims that a planning model accurately represents how planning occurs in practice...has a naive understand of what planning involves”(Sork and Caffarella, 1989, p.234).

The Naturalistic Viewpoint

The naturalistic approach to program planning argues that program planners are no longer following linear step-by-step procedures, but, rather, they are trying to make a real judgment about a real planning situation. As Cervero and Wilson (1994a) put it, “Planning practice is rarely a matter of knowing unambiguously what is right; it is more a process of choosing from among competing alternatives”(p.18).

Several scholars, including Walker (1971); Reid (1979); Houle (1972); and Brookfield (1986) have advanced the naturalistic approach. These educators’ contention is that the classical approach to program planning does not adequately reflect the complexity of program planning practices. Therefore, they developed the naturalistic approach to program planning as an attempt to fill in the gap left by the classical approach. Followers of the naturalistic approach advocate the notion that the realities of practice do not necessarily follow a set of steps or universal principles and that the realities of shifting priorities vary. This is a fair position since “planners make judgments in a specific context because an educational design is a complex of interacting elements...and the quality of program planning depends in large measure upon the
wisdom and competence of the person making the choices” (p. 39). Simply stated, the naturalistic approach consists of the following planning points: formulation of decision points, devising alternative choices at these points, considering arguments for and against various alternatives, and choosing the most defensible alternative based on what is possible and desirable (Walker, 1971). The clearest example that describes the naturalistic approach can be illustrated by Houle’s two-part system of program planning (1972). The first part of Houle’s model includes seven decision points, each of which is based on situation complexity and the number of available alternatives (Houle, 1972). He acknowledges, however, that these points are not linear. The second part of Houle’s model focuses on the planning context; therefore, it provides eleven planning contexts that need to be examined thoroughly. Knox (1982) elaborates about the decision-making steps:

Although choosing among alternative courses of action seems to be the focus, the process includes attention to the context in which decisions are made and implemented, mastery of technical procedures, interpersonal relations, consideration of both individual and organizational values, and concepts about organization and administration (p. 8).

The naturalistic approach stresses the major role that values and ethics play in making the planning decisions.

The Critical Viewpoint

Unlike the classical and naturalistic viewpoints, the critical viewpoint argues that “Planners can make best judgments in everyday practice...only if they clearly understand that education is a political and ideological activity intimately connected with the social

It is clear that the critical approach is questioning the neutral position of the planner’s values and beliefs in the planning process within a given political context. How can planners eliminate their biases from the planning process? According to the critical view, planners are negotiating their interests with other people’s competing or conflicting interests, values, and goals. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) say, “Educators must always have an interest in emancipation that is guided by the values of [social justice]”(p.21).

Indeed, to assure social justice, the critical view claims that planners should have a set of clear moral standards that prevent them from oppressing the socially oppressed. The critical viewpoint considers planners responsible to liberate the oppressed and create a better world for them.

The critical viewpoint calls for producing socially active citizens who can raise their voices in the face of socially unjust systems. This is what Hart (1990) calls “Consciousness raising, which includes the actual experience of power on the individual level, a theoretical grasp of power as a larger social reality, and a practical orientation toward emancipatory action”(p.71). The critical viewpoint stresses the important role of establishing a dialogue, democracy, individual freedom, social justice, social change, and ethical responsibility in developing any educational program. The classical and naturalistic viewpoints provide a clear acknowledgement of deliberation and practical.
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judgments as well the technical nature of the planning process. Yet, they failed to account
for the fact that program planners make judgments based on personal, institutional, and
social interests. Forester (1989) calls it the process of “attention shaping.” Planners
collect information and data, and they communicate it to the public, but how, when, and
where are totally determined by them. Therefore, they have the power to shape other
people’s attention to what the planners’ perceive as important. Cervero and Wilson
(1994a) argue:

   Planners’ practical judgments are social, not only with regard to envisioning
   feasible and desirable alternative courses of action in their specific organizational
   context but also with regard to negotiating with others, choosing among
   conflicting wants and interests, developing trust, locating support and opposition,
   being sensitive to timing, and knowing the informal ropes as well as the formal
   organizational chart (p.25).

The Integrative (Political) Viewpoint

In their search for a sound and useful answer to the question “What do program
planners really do?” Cervero and Wilson (1994a), based on Forester’s work (1989),
advocate the integrative approach and observe that the classical, naturalistic, and critical
viewpoints regard the planner as a shaper of the planning situation (classical,
naturalistic), or the controlling power of the planning environment (critical). They
introduce a planning theory that involves and integrates critical elements from each of the
three viewpoints, and further extends them by articulating the interactive nature of
planning practice with respect to the interaction between the planning context and the
planners. Based on practical evidence, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) define planning as a
social activity, consisting of ongoing negotiations of multiple interests and judgments on technical, political and ethical levels. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) expostulate:

Planners are not free agents able to choose any course of action they want. Nor, however, are their actions utterly determined by the social and institutional structures in which they work. Although this dichotomy between discretion and structural constraint may be distinguishable in theory, any planning practice must integrate it. Yet none of the three planning viewpoints focuses on this necessity (p.26).

The problem is that the other three planning viewpoints focus on either the planner’s discretion or the structural constraints. For example, the Tylerian model (classical) suggests that planners need to answer the four planning questions, and, then, the program will exist. This viewpoint ignores the reality of structural constraint and acknowledges only the existence of planners’ discretion, which means denying the social context of the program (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). On the other hand, the naturalistic advocates argue that planners’ actions are fundamentally “bounded” by the constraints of a situation. From the previous section, one can expose the real practices that the naturalistic approach calls for such as discussion, deliberations, and arguments through which planners decide and develop the program. The naturalistic viewpoint, by appraising deliberation, tends to ignore the structural constraint.

According to Cervero and Wilson (1994a), “The critical viewpoint...proposes that educational programs are largely determined by structural forces, namely, the dominant ideologies and interests of social, cultural, and political institutions” (p.27). From this argument, one can discover that by considering social factors such as ideologies,
interests, and politics, one can conclude that these social factors decrease planners’
discretion. Planners have limited choices but broad area of interests that need to be
satisfied. The critical viewpoint, however, alerts planners to fully understanding the
social context, the planning situation, and the organizational interests that shape their
planning decisions.

The major claim of the Cervero and Wilson’s theory is that the three viewpoints
are incomplete because people cannot act in accordance with what these viewpoints
claim. Forester (1989) considers that ignoring the planning context is like walking across
an intersection with closed eyes. So, what Forester and Cervero and Wilson declare here
is the importance of considering the practical, not theoretical, nature of the planning
process. As walking across a busy intersection requires paying attention to different
things at different times and directions, so do planners need to pay attention and negotiate
the interests of other people. Therefore, planners need to view the planning situation as an
active social activity. The integrative viewpoint is theoretically old but practically new.
The integrative or political viewpoint is worth the effort for more investigation and
research. As a new program planning approach in adult education, it needs more
empirical evidence to sufficiently document its existence.

Critical Reflection on The Four Planning Viewpoints

“By paying attention to those around us, we learn about character and our own
possibilities at the same time”(Forester, 1999, p.39). Planning, in general terms, means
preparing for the future, anticipating challenges, seizing opportunities, and promising a
better world. When planning programs, educators seek perfection and quality; they, in
fact, want many people to participate and, after all, to be satisfied with the program outcomes. Program participants will be satisfied only if the delivered program satisfies their needs. Consequently, it is critical for program developers to identify learners’ needs and to design programs based on identified needs. Program planners are change facilitators. A major concept of the rationale underlying the program planning is a desire for change. In order to produce effective change, program planners need a planning framework that will help them understand how to put programs together and what steps need to be taken to effectively design them. Therefore, many program developers adopt certain approaches or planning viewpoints to guide their practical work. Classical, naturalistic, critical, and integrative (realistic) viewpoints have been adopted as a mental rationale to develop programs in adult education.

The four planning viewpoints suggest different ways for planning, but they fail to account for power relationships in the planning situations. The realistic approach is an exception to such generalizability. As Brookfield (1986) suggests, “Years of experience dealing with organizations [reveal that] personality conflicts, political factors, and budgetary constraints alter neatly conceived plans of action” (p. 202).

The classical approach advocated by Tyler’s program planning model advises planners to follow linear step-by-step planning strategies. The classical or institutional approach does not count for power relationships in the planning situation (Brookfield, 1986). Day and Baskett (1982) contend:

There are a variety of intervening factors such as work climate, motivation and organizational structure which suggest that educational input in the form of programs is far too simplistic a solution and is based on a linear, unidirectional
cause-effect model which does not realistically reflect the complexity of the world of the professional as a learner and doer. It may well be that no matter how careful we are in developing need-oriented programs which meet all the criteria of program planning, the exercise will be irrelevant because it will be unable to take into consideration the contextual variables of professional practice which are not under the educator's control. (p.146)

Day and Baskett do not mention power in their captious statement. They do mention organizational structure and work climate that one can call the political arena of program planning. As Cervero and Wilson (1994a) view program planning as a social activity in which programmers negotiate interests within a defined set of power relationships, one can uncover the shortage of the classical approach to planning. Yang (1996) reveals, “[Classical] planning models rarely talk about the power and social relations under which an educational program is planned and conducted”(p.11). This statement provides some critical points about the classical approach.

First, the classical approach fails to depict what program planners do in practice. According to Brookfield (1986), “Educational programmers rarely acknowledge the severe disjunctions that frequently arise who espoused theories (in which behavior is justified and explained) are tested against theories in use (actual behaviors that are effective in real life)”(p.209). The classical approaches leave practitioners on the “espoused” terminal and ask them to continue their journey to the “theory in use” terminal. Put simply, there is a gap between theory and practice.

Second, the classical approach fails to account for the dimensions and variability of planning contexts, the nature of practical judgments, or the values that influence how
judgments are made, but it has clearly identified some important planning questions that
must be addressed by any planner. Program planners are people who try to develop
educational programs in a complex social context that need to be acknowledged by any
program planning theory (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a).

Third, the classical viewpoint considers learners as dependent on the instructors. They have to achieve the prescribed objectives. This notion of control and authority extends its privileges to instruction method selection, content selection, and evaluation criteria specification. It focuses on the technical nature of program planning and ignores the interactive nature of learning. The classical viewpoint labels knowledge as "official knowledge" and learners are supposed to seek that knowledge, and therefore, change their behavior accordingly.

It is concluded that the classical viewpoint fails to account for other social dimensions of the program planning process, such as power relationships, negotiating interests, competing goals and values, and ethical assumptions.

The naturalistic viewpoint assumes that planners need to make the best judgments and decisions in certain planning situations. Unlike the classical viewpoint, the naturalistic viewpoint considers the value and belief systems of the planners that help them reach the best decisions among attractive possibilities. The naturalistic viewpoint is planner oriented instead of planning model (steps) oriented. Planners use their experience to make decisions and modify the program. Knox (1982) writes, "[when planners make decision, they] rely heavily on their intuition, which is based on tacit (or private) knowledge distilled from past experience, common sense, and familiarity with people and the local situation" (p. 13). But, how do planners know that they have reached the best
Cervero and Wilson (1994a) write, "This process of deliberation, or practical reasoning, appears to be too rational, for it does not address the situations in which unequal relationships of power exist between the educators and others involved in the planning process" (p.20). This is a very strong argument because when educators have power such as position or expertise power, they tend to make the final judgments and decisions on behalf of the learners who lack such powers. Furthermore, the naturalistic viewpoint does not address real life situations where it will be difficult or impractical to make judgments or decisions based upon planners' value and belief system. Reid (1979) speculates that in order to consider a problem as an uncertain one, there are conditions that need to be met. First, there should be no clear criteria for decision-making. Second, there should be conflicting aims. Third, problems should relate to a unique context. And four, people with varying wants and desires are affected by solutions to the problem. If the above conditions emerge, then, the problems can be called uncertain and the judgments can be called practical.

The naturalistic viewpoint gives educators the power to make judgment because they are the best knowledgeable and experienced persons who can know and make the best decisions in developing effective programs. Also, it gives them power to use their tacit knowledge to reach what they consider effective judgments. The naturalistic approach gives planners the power to classify knowledge validity because their practice will affect theory to produce a valid knowledge (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Yang (1996) contends, "The naturalistic perspective of education also acknowledges the value of practical knowledge and thus places the learners in a relatively more powerful position than does the rational approach" (p.17). The naturalistic viewpoint, however, does not
provide any insights about power relations in program planning situations or any explanations of how interpersonal relations affect planner's decisions and judgments. As Yang (1996) points out, "Given the dominant emphasis on unique characteristics for each situation and non-transferable knowledge across situations, the naturalistic philosophy may imply social relations of anarchy" (p.17).

The critical viewpoint acknowledges the important role of politics and ideology in program planning, but it neglects the technical nature of planning practice. It calls for emancipation through equity and freedom. The major shortcoming of this viewpoint is the difficulties of applying the critical viewpoint in real life planning situations. For instance, how can educators emancipate learners using individual freedom or social justice? The principles exist more in abstract terms than in practical realities. Another major criticism of the critical viewpoint is that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that this approach actually alters the cultural, economic, or political relationships of power, either inside or outside schools (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). It is documented that the critical viewpoint provides a sound theory of program planning but a fragile everyday practice.

The critical viewpoint addresses the concept of power very well by emphasizing the role of social structure in shaping a learner's ideology. Hence, to produce change, planners need to intervene in preexisting power relationships within a given society through the use of consciousness raising strategy. The critical viewpoint strives for more democratic planning practice by empowering people to reflect on their experiences, concerns, and perspectives. The critical viewpoint gives minority or marginal groups the
power to raise their voices in the face of unjust social systems. It allows them a more
humanized position based on their existing society’s standard of living.

The previous three program planning viewpoints have their unique contexts and
philosophies that might work in some places and not work in others. Therefore, it is
irrelevant to underestimate their strength or overestimate their weakness. The three
planning viewpoints have been developed based on solid experiences and practical
studies and no one can ignore their tremendous impact in the field of adult education.
Yet, they do not account for all program-planning dimensions, and, therefore, they are
incomplete. Each of the three viewpoints has its unique planning characteristics, either
towards the rational planning platform or the political planning platform. Cervero and
Wilson (1994a) attempt to develop the realistic viewpoint for program planning in order
to overcome the weakness of the previous three planning viewpoints. Cervero and
Wilson (1994a) define program planning as “A social activity in which educators
negotiate with others in answering questions about a program’s form, including its
purposes, content, audience, and format” (p. 28). They base their argument upon the point
that the social and organizational contexts in which the program is designed influence a
planner’s action.

The integrative (realistic) viewpoint integrates planners’ discretion and structural
constraint (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a; Yang, 1996). A basic assumption underlying this
planning viewpoint is the social and political nature of the planning contexts. In this
viewpoint program planners are people who come to the planning table to negotiate their
personal and organizational interests. They acknowledge power relationships and
political strategies that they use to increase or decrease power pressure in planning
situations. The integrative approach to planning incorporates the other three viewpoints to produce a new planning viewpoint. From this point of view, the realistic approach incorporates four questions of program planning: 1) what is the purpose of a programs? 2) What is the content? 3) What are the instructional methods? And 4) How will the program purposes be evaluated? From the naturalistic approach standpoint, it includes the deliberation process that is used to negotiate interests and power relationships. It borrows the social nature of planning from the critical viewpoint. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) contend, “Interests direct the actions of planners and other people in the planning process...[and] are motivations and purposes that lead people to act in certain ways when they must decide what to do or say”(p.29). Therefore, it is worth the effort to dedicate the next section to introducing the realistic approach to planning as a theoretical framework for this study.

The Realistic Approach to Program Planning for Adult Education

The main purpose of the study is to identify power and influence tactics as perceived by Ohio State Extension Personnel. In order to obtain useful responses, one must use a method that has a well-documented theory to support it. The power and influence tactics instrument used in the study developed by Yang in 1996 and based on Cervero and Wilson theory of program planning documented in their 1994 book, Planning Responsibility for Adult Education. The theory was originally developed by Forester (1989) in his book Planning in The Face of Power and was further improved by Cervero and Wilson in 1994. The following sections provide a comprehensive review of Cervero and Wilson’s theory of planning responsibly.
Assumptions Underlying Theory Of Planning Responsibly

Cervero and Wilson (1994a) maintain that program planning is a social activity in which people negotiate personal and organizational interests to construct adult education programs. They contend that programs as a final product do not reflect the reality of the practices that produced them. In other words, program planners might say or do something that alters the program format, content, or purposes. Program planning as a "social activity" means shifting the planning focus from the technical dimension into the human dimension. Program planners are humans who try to develop a useful program, but who cannot ignore their personal or organizational interests while shaping their judgments or decisions. They interact with each other and negotiate for and between their own and other people's interests.

Cervero and Wilson (1994a) define interests as follows:

[Forces] that direct the actions of planners and other people in the planning process and are defined as complex sets of predispositions embracing goals, values, desires, expectations, and other orientations and inclinations that lead a person to act in one direction or another (p.29).

Put simply, interests are the reasons or motives that justify why a person does or say something. They are the purposes that guide social actions. Every human has an interest in something, but how can he or she satisfy it? The answer is that there should be a power that helps him or her satisfy the interest, but every person has a different volume of power to use. Some people are powerful and others are powerless. So, when the powerful meet the powerless, who will have the final word? Of course, the powerful will with
regard to the social relationships. All in all, program planners have certain interests and power relationships with each other that affect their planning practices.

Power is the capacity to act, distributed to people by virtue of the enduring social relationships in which they participate (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Power has different shapes and kinds, and it is not the dominating one. “Power relationships exist in all human interactions and define what people are able to do in a particular planning situation” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Thus, power relations define planners’ actions as related to their institutional and social contexts.

Cervero and Wilson’s (1994a) intention is that negotiation is the connective rope between planner “discretion” and “structural constraint.” Planners have formal obligations and duties in the planning situation, but they also have the freedom of decision and choice to serve their best interests. Therefore, to establish a balance or common grounds in the planning situation, they use negotiation to influence those whom they have conflicting interests with. So, a planning theory should link a planner’s actions to the social context in which they negotiate or practice planning. Cervero and Wilson’s contention is negotiation involves two separate actions. First, the conventional usage of negotiation is “To confer, bargain, or discuss with a view to reaching agreement” (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1976) with others. Regarding the conventional usage, planners always negotiated with specific interests and power to construct a program. Second, planners also negotiate among the interests of other people in any planning process. The negotiation concept provides a promising view of the planning practices, which are negotiation between planners’ interests and people’s interests as well as negotiation of power relationships.
Consequently, planners also negotiate about the interests and power relationships that shape their planning practices. This ongoing process of negotiation affects planners’ interests or power relations by reconstructing them. Negotiation may lead them to reduce or to keep that power relationships or to transform them. “Power relationships and interests always both structure negotiations and are reconstructed by these same practices” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a, p.30).

The theory of planning responsibly provides the following practical implications (Adapted from Cervero and Wilson, 1994a, p.31).

1. It makes sense of much of the apparent noise of daily work.
2. It identifies planning as a political activity. It is simply impossible to plan an educational program without attending to the interests of the institution or its relationships of power.
3. It defines the ethical responsibilities of planners. It defines whose interests will be represented and by which people in constructing the educational program.

In addition, this theory helps planners improve their planning practices by better understanding whose interests are being served by the educational program. It also provides a strong ground for accountability questions and success to gain public support and approval. Understanding people’s interests leads to satisfying them and obtaining their support of the program providers.

Theory of Planning Responsibly

Cervero and Wilson’s (1994a) contention is “Planners construct educational programs, and, through their practices, they reconstruct—either maintaining or transforming the power relations and interests that make planning possible” (p.253). This
is what the traditional program planning literature in adult education has ignored. Program planning is a social activity that involves action and interaction among planners and that interaction will be transformed into the program. The theory of planning responsibly suggests that planners face four central concepts in the world of planning: power, interests, negotiation, and responsibility. The next sections show how the four concepts from the theory of planning responsibly are integrated in the planning process.

**Power as A Social Gift**

Power is the capacity to act in a given social situation. The social actors in a given situation announce who is powerful and who is powerless based on their social relationships. Social relationships mean a power distribution process. Isaac (1987) proposes, “Action only exists when an agent has the capability of intervening, or refraining from intervening in a series of events so as to be able to influence their course” (p. 256). Planners have formal mandates or obligations given to them by their formal positions or titles that allow them to exercise power or hold it in the planning situations. This choice is important because it differentiates between the capacity to act with "structural constraint" or to act with the" discretion" that social relationships define for the planners in the planning situation. The planning context gives the planners the opportunity to either exercise power or hold it.

Any social organization has an organizational chart that clearly distributes power among people. Cervero and Wilson (1994b) write, “The planner’s capacity to act is rooted in sets of historically-developing social and organizational relationships and is not a consequence of individual attributes” (p. 254). Thus, power could be given to a person by external sources such as formal positions and job descriptions. Whenever there is a
human interaction, there is power. Power does not exist at a particular situation in a particular place, but, rather, it is at the center of our everyday social interactions. It takes different forms in relationships. It is not possible to forecast when a given person will exercise power in a given situation because exercising power is context-specific and depends on the negotiation’s outcomes. Also, the result of exercising power is not easy to forecast.

**Interest**

If power is the capacity to act in the planning situation, then particular interests provide the reason to seek a specific action or direction in influencing the program development process. As defined earlier, interests are a complex set of predispositions, embracing goals, values, desires, expectations, and other orientations and expectations that lead a person to act in one direction or another (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b). Interests answer “why” and power answers “how” planners do or say something. Planners make judgments based on their interests to shape the program, and they use power to satisfy their interests, but power exercising does not assure interest satisfaction because power is context-specific. Cervero and Wilson maintain that interests shape planners’ planning direction, and power relations set the stage for that direction. Simply, power triggers the intention to act, and interests relations foster that intention.

Cervero and Wilson identify three types of interests: expressed, ideal, and real interests. Expressed interests are the declared preferences that are acknowledged by people in the planning process. Other authors call it “subjective” interests. Thus, planner’s preferences and power relations within an organization determines the outcomes of exercising power in the planning situation.
Ideal Interests or "Objective" Interests are what is good or what makes a person think consciously or unconsciously that something is good. Ideal interests operate within the exercise of power. Hence, they do not determine power relations. Cervero and Wilson (1994b) add, "In contrast to subjective interests, however, these interests cannot be determined simply by asking people about their preferences. Rather, they are a function of a person’s ethical belief about what forms of social life are just and morally legitimate (Isaac, 1987, p.107)."

Real interests are the actual norms, values, and purposes implicit in what planners do. In a simple way, real interests are the planner's practical strategies that he or she uses to exercise power. Unlike ideal interests, real interests are related to practical activities. Ideal interests are related to the purposes to which planners should ascribe. For example, a planner of human resources development program may have had an expressed interest in making the program follow an approach that calls for learner interaction. Also, he or she may have had an ideal interest to introduce new leadership style through the planned program. Yet, he or she had a real interest in gaining more power by increasing the capacity of his or her department.

Negotiation

Negotiation is the core component of planning actions. It is "The central form of action that planners undertake in planning programs" (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b, p.256). In earlier sections, a distinction between two-negotiation dimensions was made. Planners negotiate with their own interests and other people's interests in the planning process. Also, planners negotiate power relations and interests among themselves. Program planners in the planning situation communicate with each other and try to convince and
influence others in a way that satisfies their interests. While planners interact in the
planning situations, they reshape their power relations and interests. Cervaro and Wilson
(1994b) maintain, “We argue that power relations and interests always both structure
planner action (negotiation) and are reconstructed by these same practices” (p. 257). But
how do planners’ practices reshape their power relations?

Program planners try to make the program appear in a certain form or image for
the naked eye, but, behind the stage, planners try to reshape power relations and interests
in regard to “Knowledge (who knows what), consent (who exercises power and who
obeys), trust (who cooperates with whom), and the formulation of problems (who focuses
on or neglects which problems)” (Forester, 1989, p. 80). Planners usually act socially and
politically to shape the program form. The planning context needs to be well understood
by the planners because negotiated power relations and interests in the planning situation
will determine who decides what in terms of the planned program. Program planners tend
to consider reshaping power relations and interests as important as the program itself.

Responsibility

Planners as well as participants have real and expressed interests in the planned
program; therefore, whose interest should be included in the program? The response is
planners need to be rational as well as political. Planners do not have the freedom to
decide upon program contents or formats by themselves, but, indeed, they are working in
a complex organization that is characterized by personal and organizational power
relations as well as political tension. This complex of relations and tensions result from
the fact that there are many people who have similar, different, or conflicting sets of
interests regarding the program (Cervero and Wilson, 1994a). Therefore, planners’ main
task is to negotiate interests and facilitate the available possibilities to develop an
acceptable program. Responsibility is being able “To answer for one’s conduct or
obligation, [to be] politically answerable” (*Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*,
1976). Cervero and Wilson (1994a) propose the question: To whom is the adult educator
ethically and politically answerable? Or, in other words, who will be satisfied the most by
the program? And how? Program planners need to learn how to satisfy different interests
by using politically effective skills.

The program planners’ goal is to reach a more democratized planning process. The challenge is how planners can avoid satisfying the interests of the most powerful at the expense of the interests of the least powerful. To reach such a democratic dream, planners need to clarify their values and beliefs to build a shared vision. In other words, planners need to establish ethical standards for their planning practices. Building a shared vision of democratic planning requires that planners manifest people’s ideal interests into the planned program. A vision of democratic planning means the involvement of all program participants in the “Deliberation of what is important” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b) and the integration of the outcomes into the planned program equally. Democratic planning means satisfying people’s interests by collective actions in developing the program. Social norms are critical factors in fostering democratic planning practices because American society, raised by democratic principles in everyday life and driven by political forces, shapes the final decisions. Any society has conflicting interests as well as asymmetrical power relations that govern the decision-making process, a democratic agenda that has been promoted and validated by the everyday practices of American society through history (Cervero & Wilson, 1994a). The contention is that reaching a
democratic decision is less challenging than making a democratic decision because it is hard to find problem solvers among the public population. In other words, certain skills, not easily possessed by public citizens, are needed to solve political problems in society. Therefore, “Democratic politics should be primarily a process of our choosing those who will make decisions rather than making decisions ourselves” (Beyer and Apple, 1998, p.179).

People in a democratic society have the right to vote. The argument is that people affected by the planned program have the right to participate in developing it. However, “Knowing which people should be involved and how to create conditions for their substantive involvement is almost always an uncertain, ambiguous, and risk-taking activity” (Cervero and Wilson, 1994b, p.259). The challenge is how to select the right people for the participation process. Cervero and Wilson propose the following schema to select people: There are five group of people whose interests always matter in planning programs: learners, teachers, planners, institutional leadership, and the affected public. They contend that the interests of these five groups of people are always negotiated. Yet, the concept of participation is promising, but it leads to the issue of representation. Who will represent whom? How can planners make sure the selected representatives are the best available people? This is the ethical challenge for program planners that they need to overcome if they want to plan responsibly.

Political and Rational Thought in Planning Situations

In order to achieve a democratic planning process, planners need to organize or disorganize their action according to the politics of the planning situations. Forester
(1989) stresses that planners’ decision to use or not to use power in the planning situation “Can make that process more democratic or less, more technocratic or less, still more dominated by the established wielders of power or less so” (p.28). Furthermore, a key source of power in the planning situations is who controls the needed information. He or she who has information, has power too. Forester (1989) elaborates that planners could use information as a source of power if they possess one or more forms of the following knowledge bases or expertise (adopted from Forester, 1989). Planners may hold technical information that allows them to control information such as knowing where the data can be found, which questions to ask, how to perform the relevant data analysis. So, if the planning situation requires technical information, the technical planners will be under the spotlight. The technical planners may decide to ignore the political context of the planning situation because they believe that the technical work will dominate the planning situation. Another type of planner is the incrementalist. The incrementalist planner believes that information is a source of power because it responds to organizational needs. For instance, people need to know where to get information, how to get a project approved with minimum delay, and what sorts of design problems to avoid. Put simply, planners hold information that must be obtained through social channels such as informal networks and steady contacts. Regular communication keeps planners informed. Therefore, planners hold information as a source of power in the planning situation. A third type of planner is called the liberal-advocate. These planners use information as a source of power because they believe it responds to a need created by less popular or less organized groups—to allow them to participate in the planning process. It is an old strategy that suggests bringing marginalized groups into the planning
situation both to stir up the political tension and to give them equal chance, equal information, and equal technical resources. A fourth type of planner is called the structuralist. They believe that information is a source of power because it helps to legitimize the maintenance of existing power structures and ownership and helps to perpetuate public inattention to fundamental issues. In other words, planners perpetuate their power at the expense of people's freedom by shifting their attention from the important issues to irrelevant matters. Finally, the last type of planner is called the progressive. Progressive planners view information as a source of power because it allows people to participate in the planning process and to avoid perpetuating their power bases. The progressive planners use information to call attention to the structural, organizational, and political barriers that distort the information citizens rely on to act. It also uses misinformation systematically through the effective use of economic power to influence the public action.

Having said that, Cervero and Wilson (1994a) adopted Forester's idea of bounded rationality and developed a conceptual scheme that describes four different ways in which relationships of power and associated interests can structure the planning situation. Cervero and Wilson attempt to manifest the political boundedness of rational action into a social theory of program planning in the field of adult education. They are hoping to create a more democratic planning practice as well as politically just theory. They surmise, "Being rational means anticipating how existing relationships of power are likely to support or constrain in a substantively democratic planning process and [suggest] acting in ways to nurture such a process"(p.127). In order to be effective politically and maintain a high level of rationality, planners need to dig deep into the
planning situation to understand its nature and structure well. Unlike the traditional
planning models, the theory of planning responsibly considers the practical reality of the
planning situation, which is structured by asymmetrical power relations and negotiation
of interests. In real life planning situations, planners face unequal power distribution and
conflicting interests that require equal attention and consideration by them. However,
asymmetrical power situations provide a fertile ground for more democratic planning
practices. This political planning fabric requires planners to improve their responsibility
to reach ethical planning standards. Therefore, it is important to explain Cervero and
Wilson's (1994a) conceptual scheme that describes four planning situations characterized
by power relations and interests. Table 2.1 indicates Cervero and Wilson's (1994a)
conceptual schema.

The table offers opportunity to understand the planning situations and the
appropriate strategies to reach more democratic planning responsibility. Furthermore, the
table clarifies when planners should exercise power (and in which planning situations) in
regard to power relationships and interests of the actors in each specific situation.
Sources of The Power Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensual Relations Among Legitimate Interests</th>
<th>Socially Ad Hoc</th>
<th>Socially Systematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensual</td>
<td>Individual Limits</td>
<td>Social Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Satisfice</td>
<td>Strategy: Networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflictual</td>
<td>Bounded rationality 3: Pluralist Conflict</td>
<td>Structural Legitimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Bargain</td>
<td>Strategy: Counteract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: The political boundedness of nurturing a substantively democratic planning process (Cervero & Wilson, 1994, p. 128)

By reviewing the classical and naturalistic planning viewpoints, one can discover that they failed to account for the politics of the planning situations. For example, the classical viewpoint suggests that planners should follow predetermined planning steps to overcome the political climate of the planning situations. In the same way, the naturalistic viewpoint regards the planning context, but it does not clearly provide a useful consideration of the politics of the planning situations. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) and Forester (1989) stress the importance of the existence of a political theory in the planners’ mind to guide their planning efforts. Forester (1989) proposes “An attempt to reformulate a comprehensive social theory of rationality. The task of any critical and social theory is to be able to distinguish the necessary and the unnecessary, and the ad hoc from the systematic constraints on social action so that appropriate responses will be
possible" (pp. 215-216). Forester (1989) implies that planners' political theory is going to shape their planning practical strategies and to forecast any obstacles or opportunities.

From Table 2.1, when crossing the sources of power relations, which are socially ad hoc versus socially systematic, and the relations among the interests of the legitimate actors in the planning process, which are consensual versus conflictual, one can understand how the four-cell table is produced. As seen in Table 2.1, symmetrical power relations means that the planner's capacity to act is equivalent to other relevant actors in the situation, while asymmetrical power relations means that a planner's capacity to act is not equivalent to other relevant actors. Regarding types of interests, there are consensual interests, which means all actors in the planning situation share the same interests, and conflictual interests, which means all actors in the planning situation hold different interests. So, the link is between conflicting interests and power. When planning actors have conflicting interests, those who hold more power will use it to satisfy their interests. In conflicting situations planners need to use strategies that will help them nurture their power as well as allow more democratic planning by giving all actors an equal chance to participate in building the program. One can apply the same theme upon the other three planning situations identified by Table 2.1.

Considering the four planning situations depicted by Table 2.1, planners need to adopt different planning strategies. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) persistently hold the position:

Planners must condition their actions on the basis of the boundedness of the situation is fundamentally different from most planning models in adult
education. These models make strong assumptions about the planning situation and then offer a single best set of actions to undertake (p.262).

A critical point is that planners need to understand that power relations exist in any planning situation; therefore, they need to know how power relations affect their judgment in the planning process. Indeed, traditional models assume an idealized planning context and require a comprehensive rationality to plan a program, but Table 2.1 suggests following a bounded rationality to plan a program.

As indicated by Table 2.1, cell one suggests that planner's interests are in harmony with each other and everyone has the same volume of power. In cell one, planners no longer use the classical viewpoint rationale, but, rather, they are digging deep in the planning situation. It is not a perfect world; planners must act quickly due to limited resources and time. They also have symmetrical power relations. Yet, they must make judgments quickly and efficiently. They satisfice as a working strategy to build the program. In this situation, the classical models suggest using the optimal strategy that is impractical for such situation. Thus, planners use satisfactory alternatives instead.

Cell two suggests a more complex planning situation where people hold asymmetrical power relations but consensual interests. In this situation, people are cooperative and willing to share, but planners must negotiate the program building steps. Power distribution results from the division of labor. Planners use networking to overcome the issue of asymmetrical power relations because using a satisfice strategy is not enough. Networking requires identifying those actors who have more information relevant to the program as well as legitimate stakes. Cell three provides a situation where planners encounter conflicting interests and must deal with divided participants. Power
relations are somewhat symmetrical, but participants have competing interests. In this pluralist situation, actors try to use bargaining as a strategy to satisfy part of their interests, but each actor uses any available resources to support his or her position. Also, there is a trust issue among the planning actors, while they are developing the program. Planning actors could use compromise as a short-term strategy, but others may use integration or manifestation to reduce the tension resulting from conflicting interests.

Cell four is the most complex planning situation, where participants face conflicting interests as well as asymmetrical power relations. In this situation, those who hold more power are the most satisfied. Planners are forced to take action regardless of how many resources or how much time they have to carry out the planning tasks. Planners need to read the situation carefully and anticipate how power relations will impact the planning situation, and, then, contract them in a way that give all interests an equal chance to be satisfied.

Finally, to be able to plan responsibly, planners need to master different negotiation strategies and develop a comprehensive understanding of how social power affects the planning situation. Table 2.1 provides planners with important negotiation skills that need to be used wherever there is a conflicting planning situation that is characterized by asymmetrical power relationships.

Studies Of Power and Influence Tactics in Program Planning

The purpose of the study is to develop a comprehensive understanding of how power relations and interests affect planners' planning actions, and, therefore, force the planned program to take specific directions that it otherwise will not take. Power relations
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and interests posed by program planners are the central part of the negotiation process in the planning situation. Planners tend to negotiate their interests and reshape power relationships that foster their tactics used to satisfy their interests. Program planning is a social activity in which planners negotiate their power relations and interests. To support the existence of such concepts, a review of previous studies related to power and influence strategies is a must. Therefore, the following sections provide a descriptive analysis of studies of power conducted in different organizations. The major aim of such a review is to document and explore various power tactics and planning situations that exist in these organizations.

Studies of Power and Influence Strategies in Social Organizations

In their search for what substitute decision-making criteria were used by managers, Bacharach and et al. (1995) surveyed 962 public sector managers. Bacharach et al. (1995) asked respondents about the logics of justification underlying their decision criteria. Simply, they want to know how managers justify their decisions. The authors argue that managers tend to follow strategic and tactical logics of justification. Strategic logic is a set of objective ends, and tactics are the means to these ends. Bacharach and et al. (1995) conclude:

Although managers may indeed use decision criteria based on two different underlying logics of justification, power-related characteristics individuals and roles explain only a limited proportion of the variance in the use of decision criteria based upon strategic logics of justification, and explain an even smaller proportion of the variance in the use of decision criteria based upon tactical logics of justification (p.467).
Therefore, it is important to understand the logics behind planners’ decision-making process. Planners as managers tend to use specific strategies and tactics not only to justify their decision, but also to satisfy their interests. The previous study identified four bases of power which are the internal status of the manager in the organization, the manager’s depth and breadth of experience, the degree to which the manager is involved in boundary-spanning activity, and his or her own personal characteristics.

Stevenson and Bartunek (1996) explore the relationship between power and interrelationships and how those variables affect cultural views in organization. They argue that differences in formal power and informal influence affect cultural viewpoint. In other words, the more powerful the organization becomes, the more shared the cultural viewpoint of its members become. Those who hold power positions have more stories to share than those who lack such power. The point is that powerful members had a good atmosphere of assistance and support than less powerful members (Stevenson and Bartunek, 1996).

In 1995, Pettigrew and McNulty conducted a pilot study of the power and influence of part-time board members in the top 200 U.K. industrial and commercial firms. These members hold multiple roles, either chairman or non-executive director of these organizations. Pettigrew and McNulty (1995) conclude that structural and contextual factors interactively shape the power and influence of part-time board members. Factors such as position, skill in mobilizing constellation of power sources, and skill and will in converting potential power into actual influence are the major determiners of part-time board members’ power and influence capacities.
A study conducted by Galang and Ferris (1997) investigates the question of how human resource departments in organizations gain power. Two hundred forty two organizations responded to the previous question by way of mailed questionnaires. They found that symbolic actions—actions that enable the HR department to acquire power despite the absence of favorable conditions found in the context or situation within which it is operating—are stronger predictors of HR department power than unionization, HR performance, and top management attitudes.

Cervero and Johnson-Bailey (1998) studied the role of power relations in the teaching and learning dynamics of adult education classrooms. They discovered that power relations, which are based on race, class, gender, disability and sexual orientation, affected the teaching and learning process. For example, the positionality of the teachers and learners in regard to their race mediated the teacher-learner interaction. Cervero and Johnson-Bailey (1998) conclude that the current models of teaching and learning do not provide enough consideration of the role of societal power relations as related to the teaching-learning interaction and how adult educators can deal with such issues. They also wrote:

This study showed that the adult education classroom is not the neutral educational site referred to in the literature. Instead, it is a duplication of the existing societal relations of power replete with hierarchies and privileges conferred along lines of gender, race, class, sexual orientation and other status markers (p.398).

Archie-Booker, Cervero, and Langone (1999) used the Cervero and Wilson theory to reach an explanation as to the question of what organizational and societal factors in
the program planning process have influence and whether these programs are culturally relevant to African-American Women. They designed a qualitative case study of an AIDS community services agency. Interviews with staff and board members, participant-observations of three programs, and analysis of agency documents were used to collect data for the study. The researchers uncovered the fact that the overall AIDS programs were not culturally relevant for African American women. They interpreted this lack of relevancy as a result of three factors: a) the organizational image and financing were directed toward the interests of its white gay male leadership, b) the internal interpretation of the agency’s educational mission did not include a focus on African-American woman, and c) the organizational structure did not support substantive representation of the interests of African-American woman in regard to programmatic decisions. Therefore, it was concluded that power relations played a major role in shaping planners’ decisions regarding African-American woman. The researchers maintained that “... program planning does not occur on a neutral stage, but in the real world of power relations in which planners and potential learners bring with them the hierarchies that order the world, including race, gender, class, and sexual orientation”(p.174). They also implied that program planners face the challenge of understanding learners’ experiences and how these experiences are shaped by societal power relations in regard to the fact that learners are different in many social characteristics.

Another study conducted by Rees et al. (1997) attempted to explore the influence of language as a way to exercise power in three program-planning situations. The researchers’ contention is that literature of adult education neglected two important aspects of the program planning practices: the use of language as a planning strategy and
a feature of planning action, and planning discourse as a frame which indicates how
power is exercised, by whom, for what reason, and with what effect. Simply, program
planners’ talk while planning, in fact, determines the program’s content, objectives, and
learners educational framework. Rees et al. (1997) conclude that “Program construction
is contingent upon communicative action”(p.63) because planners are facing political and
social power relations in the planning situation. The researchers implied that adult
educators should learn the appropriate skills to politically utilize language to increase
their capacity to act responsibly and ethically in the planning situation.

Using a qualitative multi-case study method, Mills et al. (1995) explored the
relationships between personal and organizational interests of adult educators that were
causally related to the planning of educational programs. The multi-case study involved
six county extension agents and four district program development specialists in the
Cooperative Extension System. The researchers found that extension agents’ planning
practices were enabled by organizational structure and culture, available resources, and
power relationships. These factors affected both the planning steps used and the needs
addressed. The researchers suggested that “Instead of prescribing adherence to the
classical models of program planning. The Cooperative Extension System would have to
address and counteract the traditionalist interests in the social and political context that
affect planners’ practices” (Mills et al., 1995, p.14).

In his 1995 dissertation, Carter tried to determine the factors that impacted the
planning process and the ways different stakeholders were affected by the planning
process within the context of a PATCH empowerment health promotion coalition. Carter
(1995) used semi-structured interviews to collect the study data and analyzed it using the
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constant comparative method. Carter’s (1995) study findings were (a) the stakeholders’ different social characteristics, differing levels of coalition-building skills, interests, socio-structural worldviews, as well as their various personal, professional, and organizational relationships and roles were significant factors in the planning environment, (b) budgetary matters influence the planning context, (c) stakeholders’ characteristics, interests, perspectives, roles and relationships influence or impact the planning process and decision, and (d) stakeholders and others were empowered by and benefited from the planning process. Carter’s study provides other recommendations that call for further studies of power relations and interests, and their influence in the program planning process.

Another promising study was conducted by Maclean in 1996. The focus of Maclean’s study was to look at the process of program planning in a health care setting and how contextual interests and power affected planning practice. Maclean used a series of qualitative interviews to collect the study data. Maclean (1996) found four major factors that affected the planning process: topic selection, referrals, commercial support, and educational awareness training of faculty and staff. Also, Maclean identified three personal categories: personal skills, managerial skills, and creative skills.

Miller (1997) researched the program planning process used for planning technology programs for the South Consortium of Schools and of two member schools. The study’s purpose was to understand power and interests of the planning community and how they influence the program planning process. A qualitative multi-case study design was used and the primary sources of data were interviews, document analysis, and researcher-participant and non-participant observations. Miller’s major finding was that
the program planning process is influenced by three factors: a) having adequate time and information, b) developing viable planning models addressing considerations of power and interests relationships, and c) having effective managers and leaders.

In 1999, Hewson wrote a dissertation about the extent to which technical, contextual, and social-political dimensions of planning were represented in the planning process. She conducted four in-depth interviews with four programmers. She concludes that all three dimensions of planning were evident in the programmers’ practice. Furthermore, the program’s structure, process, timing, and organization of planning, as well as the selection and development of programs, were all influenced by external and internal contextual factors. Hewson (1999) states, “When examining planning as a social-political process of negotiation, it was evident that planning practice was characterized by power relationships, interests, and negotiation” (p. 4498). Hewson (1999) concludes that the program planning process involves interaction among three planning dimensions, which are technical, contextual, and social-political carried out with negotiation of interests and power relations.

Umble (1998) reports a case study from public health. The case study was used to provide some insights about why theories for planning and evaluating continuing education for health professionals failed to account for stakeholders’ roles, and why they ignored important social, political, and ethical dimensions of practice. Umble (1998) reports that the program planning process for public health was influenced by a series of negotiations of personal, organizational, and societal interests within relationships of power and negotiations about the power relationships themselves. Yet, some stakeholders were not able to bring their interests to the planning table.
Cervero and Wilson (1994a) report three cases where power relations and interests played a major role in the planning situation. The first case was the Phoenix company. Planners in the Phoenix Company were asked to plan a management education program to fix an organizational problem, which was the lack of communication throughout the company. The planners in the company faced three important interests in planning the educational program. The major interest was to improve the way management of the company communicated with the rest of the company’s employees. All planners shared the same interest in general terms, but two particular planners, at the same time, shared two other interests. These two planners wanted to change the approach of management education in the company to a more problem-based and experiential mode and to strengthen support for the company’s human resource function. It was clear that the lack of communication was producing conflicts and threatened the company’s effectiveness and efficiency. The three planners negotiated about the program’s purposes, audience, content, format, and evaluation. When the planners negotiated the purposes of the program, there was no conflict at all because all actors shared the same interest. All actors agreed that the overall purpose was to improve the managers’ communication practices. No other interests were involved in the negotiation process; thus, there were no competing interests and the top management people defined the purposes of the program. So, planners experienced little conflict. The planners needed to make two decisions about the audience: who the members of the audience would be, and whether there would be a need to differentiate the roles of top management and middle management at the program. The planners answered the first question by inviting as many people as possible from middle management because the more middle management people involved in the
program, the better the communication would be in the company. One planner was the head of the human resource department and involving more middle management people in the program meant less conflict that he would have to deal with and would, therefore, strengthen support for human resource function. Regarding the second question, planners faced two conflicting interests: the primary interest of improving organizational communication as defined by top management and the planners' interest in using an interactive approach to management education that creates a temporary equality among the participants. This equality could lead some employees to carry the same interest after the program. The planners decided that people were randomly assigned to small group activities and they made it clear that no one should dominate the group because they all were in the same, yet equal position.

Based on the Phoenix Company historical activities, the planners decided to use the same objectives to improve communication among department managers, to focus on team building, and to introduce the concept of executive adventure. All in all, the objectives went through multiple revisions, but the final version served the two primary interests, which were to improve organizational communication and to reorient management education at the company.

The planners negotiated about the program format in terms of location, schedule, instructors, and learning activities. The major decisions were about where, when, who, and what. Each planner introduced his or her interests, but they all shared the same interests: Out-of-town site, Thursday-Friday time frame, human resource head and external facilitator, and group activities. In order to evaluate the program, the planners observed and asked the participants about their feelings after the program.
All people provided positive feedback. The only winner was the human resource head, who had gained power and more support to do what he wanted to do in the future.

In the Pharmacy Continuing Education Program at a state university, the planners negotiated three interests in developing a program for pharmacists. The first interest was to maintain and enhance the College of Pharmacy’s domain as a leader in the pharmacy profession. The second interest was to produce a market-driven education program. The third interest was to make the pharmacy profession meet regulatory requirement such as accreditation requirements and licensing requirements of the state. All these interests were satisfied through expert-driven presentation by pharmacy faculty, through sufficient numbers attracted to generate a profit, and through sufficient hours provided for practitioner re-certification.

Cervero and Wilson’s (1994a) third case was related to developing a program that would increase awareness among employees about the American with Disabilities Act. The planners negotiated three critical interests. The major interest was to champion for better social perception of persons with disabilities in order to improve social treatment. The second interest was to allocate more funds for the program. The third interest was to improve the image of the agency in its institutional context and in the community. Due to the limited number of participants and lack of funds, the program was canceled. But, the planners felt that the program enhanced their role in the community and organization.

Conclusion

The review of literature related to the concept of power in the previous sections reveals a new territory that needs to be explored. The new territory is the concept of
power as related to program planners’ actions. The concept existed in management science for a long time, and in 1989 was introduced to the city-planning arena by Forester in his book, *Planning in the Face of Power*. Cervero and Wilson introduced the concept of power into the field of adult education, and particularly into the program planning arena in their 1994 book, *Planning Responsibly for Adult Education*. It seems that the concept of power has not reached its final destination because the literature review reveals that there are ongoing attempts to introduce the concept of power into fields such as strategic planning, technology in school, human resource development at universities, environmental education, health, nursing, continuing medical education, and many other fields (Cervero and Wilson, 1996).

Classical, naturalistic, and critical program planning viewpoints failed to account for power relations and interests held by program planners in the planning situation. Therefore, a new viewpoint needs to be introduced into the field of adult education. Cervero and Wilson (1994a & b) took the initiative to introduce the integrative viewpoint or what Yang (1996) called “The realistic approach to program planning.”

The previous literature review provides a comprehensive overview of the current practices in the field of adult education program planning to enhance what is already known about program planning. It also opens a new window in planning practices that planners are actually negotiating and reshaping their power relations and interests. Planners tend to use different strategies and tactics to satisfy their interests. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) argue that planning is a social activity driven by negotiation of interest and power relations in a political context. The motivated force of pursuing this study is the need to find a new practical theory that guides not only planners action, but also
fosters their ethical and social responsibility to plan useful programs. What inspired this study is what Cervero and Wilson (1996) propose:

As planners, we construct educational programs that change the way people think and act. By acting in the world to somehow make it different, planners use their power to negotiate interests, to directly produce the concrete features of educational programs. Which programs get constructed is a direct result of whose interests dominate the planning. This is why we continually say that because the actual form and content of educational programs depend upon the interests of those who construct them, the central responsibility of planners is to determine whose interest they will negotiate in the planning process. So it really matters whose interests are represented in the planning process. With this ethical responsibility in the foreground, planners can begin to see how the "people work"—that is, the politics—affects their planning and how they represent interests (p. 92).

Therefore, it is critical that a theory of planning responsibly should work as the underlying factor of this study. The next section provides the theoretical frame of the study that is based on the work of Cervero and Wilson (1994a) and Yang (1996). The former roles are clearly covered in the previous sections, while the latter role will be covered in the next section.
Extension Education as the Context of the Study

When the world is changing very slowly, you don’t need much information. But, when change is rapid, then there is a premium on information to guide the process of change (Brown, 1992).

Extension is a useful tool for facilitating effective change. There is no single accepted definition for the word “extension,” but there is an accepted historical development process. The term “extension” first appeared in Britain in the 1840’s as a part of ‘university extension’ service (van den Ban, 1996). James Stuart in 1867 gave lectures to women’s associations and workingmen’s clubs in the north of England. In 1871, Stuart suggested that Cambridge University should establish centers for extension lectures under the university’s supervision. Cambridge formally adopted the system in 1873, followed by London University in 1876, and Oxford University in 1878. By the 1880’s, the work was being referred to as the “extension movement.”

The historical roots of agricultural extension in both Europe and North America can be traced to the agricultural societies. Organizations such as the Society of Improvers in The Knowledge of Agriculture (Founded in Scotland in 1723), The American Philosophical Society (Founded in 1744 under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin) and The Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture (Founded in 1785) were formed to improve agriculture, to establish agricultural organizations, and to disseminate agricultural information through their publications, newspapers articles, and lectures (Swanson & Claar, 1984,pp.3-4).

In the United States of America, the 1862 Morrill Act was the most important social legislation that influenced extension work in the US (Boyle, 1977). It emphasized
that education should be made available for all people without any exception.
Furthermore, it established the Land-Grant Colleges. Five years later, the Hatch Act
established the State Experimental Stations and fostered the relationship between the
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Land-Grant Colleges. The
major turning point in the US Extension work emerged after the approval of the 1914
Smith Lever Act that created the Cooperative Extension Service (Now, Cooperative
Extension System). The Morrill, Hatch, and Smith Lever Acts helped the Land-Grant
Universities to become the perfect arena for well-organized extension work, and helped
the extension system to attain its main objective: “To aid in diffusing among the people
of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture
and home economics, and to encourage application of the same” (Boyle, 1977).

The Extension mission has changed over time due to rapidly changing world. The
latest mission of the Cooperative Extension System says, ”Extension shall enable people
to improve their lives and communities through learning partnerships that put knowledge
to work” (Seevers et al., 1997, p.8). The question remains: How is Extension going to
meet this mission?

Extension work is all about program planning (Mills, 1995). There are four major
program-planning areas through which Extension satisfies people's needs: agriculture,
home economics, 4-H youth, and community development (Seevers et al., 1997). In this
new era of globalization and open-market strategies, the demands on food and fiber
production increase the pressure upon the United States’ resources to feed the world.
Also, there is an increased concern about the environment and its natural balance among
the public that leads to shifting production technology from environmentally unsafe practices into environmentally feasible tactics in this rapidly changing world.

As the public educational level increases, their food choice varies accordingly. In the US, the public becomes more concerned about nutrition and good diet strategies; these concerns create another pressure upon food producers to satisfy people’s food selection. Also, the current technological revolution in the US helped people to get more affordable jobs in urban cities and left few others in rural areas. Therefore, Extension played a vital role in helping rural families through home economics programs that aim to improve families’ income, health, and nutrition awareness. Also, they focus on low-income families, youth at risk, senior citizens, and young homemakers.

4-H Clubs established by The United State Extension System meet the challenge of diversity. 4-H programs provide a learning environment in which different cultures and youth learn and understand each other. 4-H programs aim to produce productive citizens who are equipped with the necessary life skills for surviving in a highly competing society.

The last area of Extension programming is community development. Extension fosters community development through programs that aim to improve the physical, economic, social, cultural, and institutional environment (Seevers et al., 1997).

According to many authors (Boyle, 1981; Seevers et al., 1997; and Gamon, 1995) there are three major conceptual models through which Extension meets its mission: The technology-transfer model, the problem-solving model, and the decision-making model. In the technology transfer model, research centers discover new technology or practices that will help people improve their current practices. Here, Extension works as a link...
between research centers and the people who benefit from research centers’ outcomes. In this model, Extension’s role is to help people understand the needed facts about the improved discovery and how can they use it effectively.

In the problem-solving model, program facilitators try to identify problems based on clients need. They offer many suggested solutions and careful evaluation is carried out by both extension agents and clients until they reach a final solution or action.

The last model is the decision-making model. Program planners are, in fact, decision-makers. Program planners tend to make decisions about the program objectives, activities, methods, and evaluation plans. The decision-making process involves simple and complex decisions. In this rapidly changing world, extension agent needs to follow systematic rational thinking in order to reach fair and high quality decisions.

According to Baker et al. (1994):

We face more complex decisions, in organizations like an Extension Service, charged with providing meaningful and effective programs for citizens, all with different experiences, leading to different values, and needs, and thus different expectations as to what Extension programs should be.”(p.87)

Therefore, systematic thinking or planning helps program planners meet participants’ expectations and satisfies their needs. Also, it helps planners to be ready for an effective accountability process. Systematic program planning is important in Extension for many reasons as stated by Baker et al. in 1994:

1. Considering the changing society and communities in which we live, it is well known that client problems are increasingly multifaceted. In other words, current problems require collaborative efforts to solve them.
2. No one type of organization holds the secret to effective social, environmental, economic, or physical development. An increasing effort is required to coordinate the roles of Extension organizations and other agencies to improve the education for people.

3. The continuously rising educational levels of the people with whom extension agents work create both demand and potential for more effective program planning.

4. Increasing competition among the various program efforts, not only among Extension programs, but also between Extension and other programs, such as politics, religion, and entertainment means we are accountable for results.

5. Systematic Extension program planning is important because it can contribute to relevant and effective Extension programs.

Today, Extension agents are dealing with needs and issues that require systematic planning and collaborative efforts to respond effectively. Extension personnel are facing a rapidly changing society with advanced technological innovations. As the issues become more complex, the solutions demand more cooperation among Extension organizations and other social organizations. Solutions require more knowledge, research, and different viewpoints to solve them. This collaborative approach requires more accelerated thinking and involvement to critically examine the proposed decisions and choose the appropriate actions. This collaborative approach requires not only high quality communication and cooperation, but also a deep understanding of power relations and interests contradictions. Power relations and interests negotiations are key factors in any organized social relationship that positively or negatively influence the final outcomes.
The Cooperative Extension System (CES) is the most valuable source for program planning activities. As described in the previous sections of this chapter, program planning is a social activity in which planners negotiate their power relations and interests. In Extension, program planners face the same political circumstances. The CES is a unique field of study that is characterized by political interactions and power influence. Political influence in Extension evolves from its unique organizational structure and engagement levels. There are, indeed, many power sources in Extension such as program funders (County commissioners, state legislators, or grant providers), local leaders, and religious leaders or community leaders (Seevers et al., 1997).

According to Mills et al. (1995):

The CES has been engaged for some time now in a formidable policy debate about what kinds of programs ought to be offered. One of the most profound struggles within that organization has been waged over the question of whether traditional organization and rural family interests should continue to be the dominant influence on educational programming (p.2).

The rural-urban paradox fosters the political atmosphere of the planning process in Extension. Program planners face political tensions due to encounters related to whose interests should be served and by whom. Dealing with the previous question leads to another challenging question that is who are the appropriate audiences for Extension programming? What is the mission of the CES? Answering these questions requires political tactics or strategies that Extension personnel need to comprehend in order to plan effective programs.
Extension personnel are dealing with the previous questions in their daily work. The question of whose interests should be served is not only a political challenge, but also a power-motivated factor. Those who attempt to answer that question must exercise their potential power to get their interests through the planned program. Therefore, Extension personnel's planning practices are translated into strategies or tactics through which Extension personnel negotiate their organizational interests and power relations (Mills et al., 1995). The previous view shifts the emphasis from whose interests should be brought to the planning table to whose interests are actually brought to the planning table. This dissertation aims to improve Extension personnel planning practices by drawing their attention to the vital role of power and influence tactics in the planning process.

Buford et al (1995) mentions some contemporary issues and paradoxical challenges that face the Ohio State Extension System as part of the CES. Two of the most important issues are the financial exigency and the Extension culture, and two of the most important paradoxical challenges are the identity crisis and a proactive versus reactive role of Extension. These arguments are critical to the program planning process because they reflect a political tension and power manifestation. Financial exigency exists due to some national initiatives such as President Clinton’s National Performance Review and the Republican Members of the House of Representative’s Contract With America. Both initiatives are calling for funding reduction of governmental departments including Extension, a less intrusive government, and a financially responsible government.

Buford et al. (1995) argues that

At the state level, Cooperative Extension is one of many programs competing for a share of a revenue pie that is either shrinking or not getting any larger. County
governments have seen federal revenue sharing diminish and disappear, while citizens routinely vote down proposed tax increases for well-conceived programs. These same citizens still demand increasing levels of service from local governments (p.312).

The issue here is not of financial exigency per se, but how the State, County, and District management will respond to such pressure. These managers are going to respond in a reactive way, such as program reductions and elimination of professional development opportunities, or negative downgrading (diminishing in effectiveness) instead of positive downsizing (diminishing in size) (Buford et al., 1995). These reductions and eliminations have critical influence on the quality or kind of the planned programs. Also, they affect the extension personnel’s decision-making process in terms of how much resources are available, what priority should be served, and whose interests should be included or excluded. These are political challenges created by financial exigency.

Another issue is that of the Extension culture. Improving rural life is a major purpose of the Extension programs, which are based on traditional assumptions that the primary role of Extension is to deliver information through county staff. Another profound assumption is that Extension is the primary source of information for people in rural areas. The previous two assumptions and others have influenced the Extension culture for a long time, and, as a result, the Extension decision-makers produce decisions that only serve their interests as Buford et al. (1995) point out, “This leads to the conclusion that the answers to today’s problems are the same as the answers to yesterday’s problems. Things that conform to one’s frame of references are overvalued
while those that do not, are undervalued” (p.314). The last part is a political position related to whose interests should be satisfied. Program planning in Extension involves politics and power manifestation as Seevers et al. (1997) state:

Although Extension will continue to work with commodity groups and other special interests groups to help them become politically aware, Extension’s role will continue to be one of facilitation and education and not promotion of any one political position (p.233).

This statement is calling for more democratic planning processes, which means a fair representation of the interest of the people affected by the designed program.

Extension is facing an identity crisis that is centered on serving the traditional needs of production agriculture in rural areas or the contemporary social and community development issues. In other words, is Extension a rural organization or one that serves the broader public? Extension, today, is playing a broader role than it used to do.

Extension’s mission is no longer limited to rural people, but Extension offices are still in rural areas serving rural people. The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service is now the Ohio State University Extension System. The name change reflects an identity crisis because it gives Extension a broader university image instead of a rural image (Buford et al, 1995).

The other challenge is whether Extension should play a proactive or reactive role. The first view claims that Extension is a proactive organization that satisfies the educational needs of the public through research and programs (Buford et al, 1995). The second view claims that Extension should react quickly and adequately to people’s needs or they will go elsewhere for help. In other words, Extension must be ready for both long term and short-term issues. Program planners are dealing with questions of whether to be
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proactive or reactive in designing educational programs. Many researchers have established the link between Extension and politics (Abell, 1981; & Butt, 1961). Nef (1989) reports the following five points that explain how political practices affect Extension work:

1. Political ideology, or, more specifically, political values, attitudes and beliefs affect the overall goals of, and set constraints over, Extension work. In this sense, Extension work is not value-free. It reflects and reacts to existing ideological practices and the political culture.

2. Extension work operates in a climate of public opinion, which is reflected in varying degrees in the government's public policy. These polices, as well as the over-all development model, set the formal parameters within which Extension work operates. Extension activities are normally carried out by government agencies. Thus, governmental policy orientations directly affect the extent and direction of Extension work.

3. Extension activities within a county are affected not only by the internal or domestic political environment but are also affected by international politics, which set important ideological, financial and technological parameters within which national development and Extension programs operate.

4. Extension processes are often affected by the pressure power of their recipients, for instance, farmers who tend to create interest groups with varying degrees of clout. This is especially true in the United States, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Japan where farming lobbies are quite powerful and influential. These interest groups might establish corporate arrangements with government
Extension services, create their own services, or exercise their influence at formal policy-making levels.

5. The training, socialization and formation of Extension personnel will produce a distinct “political brand name.” With the growing professionalism and sophistication of Extension personnel, the issue of alma mater and schools of thought becomes more relevant.

The above practical implications and experiences influence the program planning process in terms of deciding the purposes, content, delivery methods, and evaluation of Extension programs. Planners tend to deal with political pressures, political culture, public opinion, public policy, international factors, clientele or institutional pressures, and the ideological make-up of those who teach, conduct research, and carry on professional work at all levels. According to Nef (1989), “When there is conflict, these potential influences become quite apparent. However, under conditions of consensus more often not, political preferences remain implicit or latent.” (p.44)

In the OSU Extension, no research-based evidence exists about how power and influence tactics exercised by personnel in the planning process affect the planned educational programs. It is not clear how power tactics shape Extension personnel’s planning decisions. The theoretical framework of this study suggests that power and influence tactics will be used to influence the planning decisions in various educational programs offered by OSU Extension. OSU Extension personnel are “... not free agents able to plan whatever program they want, but rather are part of a social and political context that delimits what is possible and desirable in educational planning” (Mills et al., 1995, p.14). In other words, planners are “... performing a practical activity according to
certain understandings and reasons" (Isaac, 1987, p. 76). Also, OSU Extension personnel are expected to possess power in relation to their implemented planning actions.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

The theory of planning responsibly as proposed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a) and further clarified by Yang (1996) focuses on three critical dimensions of the planning practices. The first dimension is the political context characterized by symmetrical or asymmetrical power relations in which the planners must act, and the second dimension is the related interests characterized by conflictual or consensual relationships. The third dimension is the planning tactics through which planners transform the politics of the planning situation. Figure 2.1 depicts the three dimensions of power and influence tactics as clarified by Yang (1996).

Yang (1996) defines power and influence tactics as "constructs which indicate certain behavioral patterns in organizational political process" (p. 78). Therefore, as indicated on Figure 2.1, by crossing the three dimensions, one can find that there are eight different power and influence tactics: reasoning, appealing, exchanging, pressuring, consulting, networking, bargaining, and counteracting (Yang, 1996). Figure 2.1 provides a graphical representation of when substitute planners' power and influence tactics.
Cervero and Wilson (1994a) define power as the "capacity to act, distributed to people by virtue of the enduring social relationships in which they participate" (p. 29). Yang (1996) states, "A heuristic approach to organizational power should examine both behavior and structure, agent and political area, influence tactics and organizational contexts" (p. 78). Planners are acting in complex situations made more complex by conflicting interests and asymmetrical power relations. Power is the outcome of planner actions and interactions in the planning situation. The eight power tactics result from the interactions among power relations, interests relations, and planning actions. Table 2.2 is adopted from Yang (1996), and identifies the origin of the eight power tactics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics to be Studied</th>
<th>Similar Constructs In Previous Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuki et al., 1992. IBQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Influence Behavior Questionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kipnis et al., 1980. POIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profile of Organizational Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Rational Presuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Legitimate Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Ingratiation, Personal Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>Sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimate Tactics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: The relations between proposed power and influence tactics and previous instruments (adopted from Yang, 1996, p.79)

Yang (1996) asserts some reservations and asks for more care in interpreting the relationships between the three dimensions of power. Although the eight tactics depict certain planning actions, they do not assume that this is the case in every planning situations because the planning context is changeable and the planners’ perception of the context is non-static too. Therefore, one should not expect that Figure 2.1 is always reflecting the reality of the planning situation. Yang’s assumption meets the researcher’s assumption, which is that each planning situation has its unique features that are perceived to some extent by the planners to the point that he or she can comprehend it clearly.
Definition of Power and Influence Tactics

Yang (1996) developed an instrument to measure the eight power tactics in the planning situation. To focus his work, he proposed the following definitions to serve two purposes: the first clear definitions lead to clear understanding of the measured constructs. The second, clear definitions lead to assist scale developers to be clear about what to include in a measure. Following Yang's insights, the eight power tactics need to be defined in order to further enhance our understanding responsible planning theory.

Reasoning and Consulting

Reasoning refers to the planner's utilization of factual evidence in order to persuade the target that a request is logically congruent with common interests and is also viable. Consulting reflects the planner's effort to seek the involvement of the target to generate a viable plan in order to meet common concerns.

In a planning situation where all planners have shared interests and equal (symmetrical) power bases, planners tend to use reasoning as a rational way to justify action with the help of available facts and data. In this perfect situation, planners tend to understand each other and optimize the total gain. Under limited time and resources situations, however, planners tend to reach satisfactory solutions rather than optimized gain. Planners tend to consult the target person who shares symmetrical power relationships and consensus interests with the planners, but due to individual limitation, they consult the target person. According to Yang (1996), "Reasoning is an assertive tactic and is more likely to be used in the situation of symmetrical power relationships and consensual
interests, while consulting is a unassertive planning strategy which tends to be used in the same situation (p.81).

**Appealing and Networking**

Appealing is the planner's use of praise, flattery, friendly behavior, or appeal to target values, ideals, and aspirations, for the purpose of passing a message to the target that a request is not at the expense of the target's interests. Networking happens when the planner involves other people who have information and authority to gain support from the target (Yang, 1996).

When planners share the same interests with the target person, but they have unequal (asymmetrical) power relationships with him or her, they tend to appeal to the target because they lack the power to act as a result of time limitation, resource shrinkage, or division of labor. Due to unequal power bases, planners tend to appeal to the target to overcome power inequality. But, only if planners have a clear understanding or concept about the program content and format (assertiveness). So, if planners lack such understanding, they tend to use networking to cover up such a lack. Furthermore, planners reach target support or agreement by bringing other respected or informed figures such as persons who have more technical knowledge or legitimate authority. Cervero and Wilson, (1994b) define networking as “knowing who has what information to the program, who has a legitimate stake in the outcome, and how to involve them in the relevant of the planning. The network strategy works in these situations because of the similar interests among the people who need to be brought together to construct a program” (p.263).
Exchanging and Bargaining

Exchange refers to the behaviors that can be used by the planners to offer an exchange of favors to convince the target that a proposal can satisfy the needs of both sides. Bargaining reflects certain actions where the planners negotiate with the target to reach an agreement that meets their needs (Yang, 1996).

In situations where planners share symmetrical power relations, but hold conflicting interests, planners tend to be more protective. They tend to use their leverage to defend their interests and use exchange tactic to make the target go with them by offering acceptable solutions. If the planners are under any pressure, however, and must act quickly, they tend to use bargaining tactic to reach a quick, yet acceptable, solution. Yang (1996) argues, “Exchange reflects an assertive planning action while bargaining represents an unassertive behavior” (p.83).

Pressuring and Counteracting

Pressuring refers to the planner making direct and forceful demands or threats to the target in situations where resistance is present. Counteracting is a tactic by which the planner blocks the efforts of the target or acts in the opposite direction (Yang, 1996).

Planners could face a planning situation where the planning actors hold conflicting interests as well as asymmetrical power relations. The target person holds conflicting interests as well as an asymmetrical power relationship with the planner. In this situation, planners tend to practice a proactive action where their persistence could lead the target person to think that his or her position is against the program will. If the planners are unclear about the planning situation,
however, they tend to use counteracting tactics. Planners tend to block the target effort by on-going persistence to what he or she might propose. Counteracting usually is used when planners are less motivated to take a proactive role in the planning.

Chapter Summary

This chapter depicts the meaning of power in management science in order to better understand the concept in this study. Then, it provides a comprehensive review of program planning theories in the field of adult education. Three traditional approaches to program planning are examined in relation to the concept of power. The three approaches (classical, naturalistic, critical) have failed to account for the role of power relations and interests in the planning situation. It appears that the three approaches focus on rationality, or incrementalism, or radical political action. They have not provided enough descriptions of how program planners plan programs in the real world. Therefore, a different integrative planning approach needs to be introduced. The different approach developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a) is called the theory of planning responsibly. The new approach considers program planning as a social activity in which planners negotiate their personal and organizational interests within specific power relations and social context.

In order to further support the theory of planning responsibly, one needs to review well-documented studies of power relations and interest and how negotiation affects planned programs. The reviewed (power relations, interests relations) relations play an important role in shaping the planners' action and the final program.
An argument can be made that Extension is a fertile ground for studying the role of power and influence tactics in the planning process due to the long history and tradition of developing educational programs that, related to different subject matters, make Extension a unique field of study. A multilevel-political organization that evolves from federal, state, district, and county divisions characterizes the extension system. Those reasons are enough to foster an effective political arena that pushes Extension personnel to their highest limits of exercising power and influence tactics in the planning process.

Finally, a theoretical framework developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a), and later enhanced by Yang (1996) was used to guide the study and to justify the logic behind the research instrument. The framework identifies eight power and influence tactics in relation to organizational and political contexts. It is assumed that the eight planning tactics will be used to explain planning behaviors or implemented planning actions. Political contexts and planning action are assumed to explain the logic behind using specific power tactics in relation to being either consensual or conflictual. Conflict of interests and power relations are two important variables that influence how planners’ exercise power.
Figure 2.3: Conceptual Scheme of Power and Influence Tactics
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This chapter provides an overview of the following sections of the study: the research design, the population and sampling methods, the instrumentation, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis methods.

The study design was descriptive-correlational. Correlational studies serve one of two purposes-either to help explain important human behaviors or to predict likely outcomes (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1996).

Population and Sampling

Permission was secured from the OSU Extension Administrative Cabinet to conduct the survey. OSU Extension personnel names and addresses were obtained from The Ohio State University Extension Personnel Online Directory in order to obtain the most updated list. The target population for the study was drawn from the county, district, and state program professionals in OSU Extension (N=606). County Extension Agents, Program Assistants, and County Chairs provided the frame for the county level. At the district level only District Specialists were examined. At the state level, State Specialists and State Extension Associates provided the frame for the state level.
A random sample was drawn from the study population for county, district, and state based personnel. A simple random sampling procedure was used to draw the study’s sample. A list of all OSUE personnel was obtained and each subject was assigned a distinct identification number. Then the numbers were written on small identical pieces of paper and mixed in a small box. Then a number was drawn from the box and matched to the corresponding name on the population list. The box was flipped over after each selection in order to give a fair chance for all subjects to be selected. First the pilot sample was drawn and followed by the sample of the study. The random samples consisted of the following: County Extension Agents, Chairs, and Program Assistants (N = 471, n= 210); State Specialists and State Extension Associates (N =105, n = 80); District Specialists (N= 30, n= 28). The total study’s sample consisted of 318 OSU Extension personnel. The sample sizes were determined using Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) table of random samples.

External Validity

External validity means the degree to which results may be generalized beyond the sample. In survey research, external validity can be affected by four possible errors: frame error, sampling error, selection error, and a non-response error. Following is a description of how these errors were treated in this study.

**Frame error** occurs when there is a discrepancy between the list of names in the population (the intended target population) and the actual population from which the sample is drawn. In this study, using a complete, up-to-date listing of all OSU Extension personnel controlled frame error.
Sampling error, a second threat to external validity, occurs when inappropriate sampling procedures are used and a non-probabilistic sample is obtained. To reduce the sampling error in this study, the sample was drawn randomly.

Selection error is the possibility that some subjects may have a greater chance of being selected than others. The list was carefully reviewed. Multiple listings of any names were removed so that an individual’s name appeared on the list once. Then, respondents were randomly selected.

Non-response error is the final threat to external validity. Non-response error occurs when subjects selected to participate do not respond or refuse to participate, thereby raising the question of the results being representative of the entire sample (Miller, 1992). Non-response error was controlled by drawing a random sample of non-respondents as recommended by Miller & Smith (1983). After the deadline for the return of the questionnaire had past, a sample of fifteen percent was randomly selected from the population of non-respondents. As a major characteristic in this study, perception of power and influence tactics was chosen as the characteristic by which to compare respondents to non-respondents. Also, the comparison included demographic and the dependent variable program success. Differences between respondents and non-respondents on the independent-interval variables of influence tactics and the demographic interval variables were examined through the use of a t-test. The demographic nominal variables were examined using crrostabulation and measures of association statistics such as Chi-square, Phi coefficient, and Cramer’s V as described in Chapter 4.
Instrumentation

In order to meet the study's objectives and answer the research questions, a valid and reliable instrument was required. Therefore, the researcher utilized an instrument developed by Yang in 1996 and secured Yang's permission to use the instrument by way of e-mail (Appendix B). The mail questionnaire had three sections.

Section I was designed to collect information about the program-planning situation. Section I starts with a question to identify type of power and interest relationships that the target person holds in relation to the planners. It is intended to identify whether the planners were facing conflictual or consensual situations in terms of their relationships with the target persons. Planners were asked to recall a recent adult education or training program planning meeting that they had participated in with at least one other person, and identify their relationship with that person. They were asked to identify the target person's position as their supervisor, subordinate, colleague, or someone outside their organization. After they had identified the target person (referred to as <the person> on the instrument), they were asked to rate their responses on the six Likert-type statements. For example, "<the person> and you clearly had different visions for this program." Respondents were asked to circle the statement that best describes their agreement or disagreement with the statement. The following scale was used:

- Strongly Disagree = 1
- Moderately Disagree = 2
- Mildly Disagree = 3
- Mildly Agree = 4
- Moderately Agree = 5
The scale consists of eight items related to type of interest relationships and power base as described in Table 3.1. Items #1-5 were statements related to conflictual-interest relationships. The respondents were asked to rate the degree of conflict they were facing with the identified target person on a six-point Likert-type scale. The scores were utilized in a way that the greater scores indicate high degree of conflict and the lower scores indicate lower degree of conflict. The last three items (Items #6, 7, & 8) were utilized in a way that the greater scores (4, 5, & 6) indicate asymmetrical power relationships and the lower scores (1, 2, & 3) indicate symmetrical power relationships.

In Section II of the instrument, the statements related to the respondents' perceived effectiveness of power and influence tactics in the planning situation. From Yang's study (1996), 31 selected power and influence statements were used to measure the respondents' power and influence tactics. OSU Extension personnel were asked to rate 31 power and influence tactics on the criteria of effectiveness using a six-point Likert-type scale. The subscale of the construct of power and influence tactics consisted of 31 items related to the seven proposed influence tactics as indicated by Table 3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power &amp; Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Related Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>Items# 11, 18, 24, 30 and 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Items# 9, 15, 17, 20 and 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Items# 10, 16, 22 and 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>Items# 12, 14, 19 and 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>Items# 13, 21, 32, 35 and 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>Items# 17, 23, 28, and 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>Items# 25, 31, 34, 36, and 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political Context**

Power Base: Symmetrical or Asymmetrical  
Items# 6, 7, 8

Type of Interest: Consensual or Conflictual  
Items# 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Table 3.1: The seven power and influence tactics, political context, and their descriptive items (Appendix B)

For example, the respondents were asked how effective would each of the tactics have been in influencing the target person. Then, the respondents were asked to rate statements such as “Asking <the person> for suggestions about your plan” on a six-point Likert-type scale. Each statement of power tactics was followed by a six-point Likert-type scale with “1” being “Very Ineffective,” “2” being “Ineffective,” “3” being “Somewhat Ineffective,” “4” being “Somewhat Effective,” “5” being “Effective,” and “6” being “Very Effective.” The respondents were asked to circle the number that most closely described their perception for each statement, for a total of 31 items. The values of each item were summed and a mean was then determined.
Section III of the instrument, added by the researcher, examines program success. The theoretical framework of this study suggests that power and interest relationships among planners play a key role not only in the quality of the program outcomes but also influence the effectiveness of the implemented program planning practices. Consequently, program success was included in this study to identify which power and influence tactics were the best predictors of program success in regards to planners' power base and type of interests in the planning situation.

In Section III, planners were asked to rate their agreement on seven six-point Likert-type scale items (items# 40-46). Each item includes a statement that describes the program outcomes. For example, planners were asked to rate their agreement on statements such as “Overall, the program was successful” on a six-point Likert-type scale. Each statement of program success was followed by “1” being “Strongly Disagree,” “2” being “Moderately Disagree,” “3” being “Mildly Disagree,” “4” being “Mildly Agree,” “5” being “Moderately Agree,” and “6” being “Strongly Agree.” The respondents were asked to circle the number that most closely described their perception for each statement, for a total of seven items. The values of each item were summed and a mean was then determined.

Section IV of the instrument was used to collect demographic information such as sex, age, highest degree earned, number of years of experience, position, number of current years in position, number of current years in organization, and major area of responsibility. The researcher made some minor changes to the demographic questions in order to fit the Extension context. Section III in the original questionnaire was designed to obtain background information for adult educators from outside the Extension System.
For example, the original questionnaire asked respondents to select answers from high school to a Ph.D. degree, but extension agents hold no less than a Bachelor’s Degree; therefore, the question about the highest level of education was modified to reflect that fact.

Sex was measured as 1) Male or 2) Female. Age was measured as self-reported years of age. Highest degree earned was measured either: 1) Bachelor degree; 2) Master degree; 3) Doctoral degree; and 4) Other. Number of years of experience was determined by the question “You have been working as an education or training professional for --- years.” Position was measured as either: 1) State Specialist; 2) State Extension Associate; 3) County Extension Agent and Chair; 4) County Extension Agent; 5) Program Assistant; 6) District Specialist; and 7) Other. Number of years in current OSU Extension was measured by “You have been working in OSU Extension system for --- years.” Numbers of years in current position were measured by “You have been working in your current position in the OSU Extension system for --- years.” Major program area of responsibility was measured as: 1) Agricultural and Natural Resources; 2) Community Development; 3) Family and Consumer Sciences; 4) 4-H Youth Development, and 5) Other.

Instrument Internal Validity

Internal Validity Established By Yang (1996)

Some researchers recommend using ready-made instruments to collect data. According to Fink and Kosecoff (1998), “One way to make sure that you have a reliable and valid survey is to use one that someone else has prepared and demonstrated to be reliable and valid through careful testing” (p.34). Also, Ary et al. (1996) say, ”If an 108
instrument is one already established, the proposal should include reported evidence of its reliability and validity for the purpose of the study” (p.504). Based on Kink and Kosecoff, and Ary et al. recommendations, the researcher reported the validity evidence from Yang’s (1996) study. According to Yang (1996):

Some evidence of construct validity for the instrument was obtained in three ways: (1) construct validity evidence was obtained as the proposed seven factor structure of power and influence tactics accounted for most of the item variation among several alternative measurement models; (2) convergent and discriminate validity evidence was provided because the inter-correlations among the seven proposed dimensions were congruent with what were implied by the theory for different political situations; and (3) nomonological validity of the instrument was shown as most of the relations between organizational political contexts and planning behaviors measured on the refined instrument were reasonable, and in the direction implied by the planning theory (p.177).

Yang concluded that the research instrument is valid in measuring adult educators’ power and influence tactics during program planning process. The sample used to validate the research instrument as reported by Yang (1996) consisted of the Georgia Society for Healthcare Education and Training (n=47), the Georgia Adult Education Association (n=47), the Georgia Society for Association Executives (n=24), and the Academy of Human Resource Development (n=106). Also, a research team reviewed the instrument to assess its content usefulness and accuracy.
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Field Test Conducted By Yang

The instrument was field tested to examine the clarity of the items and the directions for completing the instrument. Six adult educators reviewed the instrument. According to Yang (1996):

The expert review and the preliminary tryout enabled the researcher to conclude that the instrument was appropriate for the target population and that the time for completion of the instrument was within the desirable range. Based on the results of qualitative evaluation, the instrument was revised and made ready for a pilot study to conduct a quantitative evaluation (p. 124).

Pilot Test Conducted By Yang

Yang conducted a pilot study to test the instrument adequacy for determining adult educators’ power and influence tactics in the program planning process.

Yang used a convenience sample in the pilot study. He used 143 students enrolled in the Department of Adult education at The University of Georgia. Yang’s pilot study concluded that the reliability coefficients ranged from .733 to .885.

The internal consistency of the instrument was established by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients. Table 3.2 reported by Yang in 1996:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>19, 33, 40, 47, 52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>15, 29, 36, 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>41, 48, 53, 61, 67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>17, 31, 38, 73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>21, 28, 35, 42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>23, 37, 50, 55, 62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>32, 39, 45, 46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Reliability estimate for the refined measures of power and influence tactics (Yang, 1996)

Also, Yang (1996) reported the following reliability evidence related to measuring the political contexts and planning behaviors as indicated on Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Reliability CFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Measures</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Measures</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>8, 9, 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Reliability estimate for the original measures of political contexts (Yang, 1996)
Instrument Internal Validity Established By The Researcher

The researcher piloted and field tested the instrument to further enhance its reliability and improve its suitability for the target population. In order to avoid duplicate participation in the study, the researcher first drew the study sample and, then, selected individuals for pilot and field tests from those who were not selected for the study sample.

Field Test Conducted by The Researcher

A panel of experts in the field of Extension Education was asked to review the questionnaire for content and face validity. The questionnaire was given to 25 individuals at the OSUE Administrative Cabinet; only 9 individuals returned the questionnaire along with their comments. The field test group made comments on the item clarity, wording, complexity, and length of the questionnaire. A major revision suggested by most of the panel was to write the answers of the Likert scale vertically. Also, they suggested that the direction paragraphs for each part of the instrument should be written in double space form. Some minor changes were made to the instrument, such as omitting spaces between the instrument sections and replacing few words. The researcher made the recommended changes. The revised instrument was pilot tested to establish the reliability of the instrument in the Extension setting.

Pilot Test Conducted By The Researcher

The pilot test consisted of 35 persons from OSU Extension program professionals who were not in the sample and only 17 returned their questionnaires. (County Extension Agents and County Chairs, n= 5, State Specialists and State Extension Associates, n=4, County Extension Agents = 5, Program Assistants = 2, and Other = 1). Reliability, the
internal consistency of the results generated by the instrument, was calculated using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients. A Cronbach’s Alpha of .70 was established as an acceptable alpha level. The instrument used in this study focuses on planners planning actions. This level supports the argument that human behaviors are less consistent and stable than cognitive and affective activities because behaviors tend to be strongly influenced by internal and external factors (Yang, 1996). Therefore, the internal consistency was estimated for each of the sub-scale with a goal of coefficient alpha of .70 or above.

The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient for type of interests in planning situation was .69. The Cronbach’s Alpha for power base was .62. The Cronbach’s Alpha for the seven power and influence tactics ranged from as low as .51 for bargaining to as high as .78 for consulting. The data on instrument reliability are summarized in Table 3.4. The reliability levels did not reach the .70 Alpha level for all the subscales, but the findings meet Nunnaly’s (1967) recommendation that a reliability of .50 to .60 would suffice for predictor tests in early stages of research. This is because the POINTS scale (Appendix B) is newly developed and its reliability will differ under different situations and conditions. Reliability levels as low as .50 or .70 have been judged to be acceptable by some researchers such as Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991), and Nunnaly (1967 & 1978). From Table 3.4, one can see that the POINTS scale reached a high level of reliability based on the study sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Pilot Alpha n= 17</th>
<th>Study Alpha n= 263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 1,2,3,4,5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymmetrical Power Base</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 6,7,8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 9,15,20,27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 13,21,32,35,37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 17,23,28,29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25,31,34,36,38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10,16,22,39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 11,18,24,30,33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 12,14,19,26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Success</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items 40,41,42,43,44,45,46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Summary of internal reliability of power and influence tactics scale

Data Collection Procedures

The study data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire. A mailed questionnaire was deemed appropriate for the study because of low cost, ease of organization, possibility of collecting a wide scope of information from a large population, ease of statistical analysis, and the concept of power and influence tactics had never been studied by a mailed questionnaire in the OSU Extension system.
Approval of the study by The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Board was given on February 2, 2001 (Appendix C). Data collection steps outlined in the Total Design Method For Mail and Telephone Surveys by Dillman (1978) were followed. On June 26, 2001, a letter co-signed by Dr. Nikki Conklin, Team Leader, Training and Development OSU Extension and the researcher was mailed to each subject (n=263) with the questionnaire (Appendix C). The letter requested their assistance in the study. Included in the letter were: the purpose of the study, the importance of subject's input, assurance of confidentiality, and the general procedure for the study. A self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire to state, district, and county personnel to use when returning their questionnaire. Also, a pen and a chance to enter a $25 gift certificate lottery were provided as incentives for participating in the study. The initial deadline for returning the questionnaire was August 20, 2001.

Each questionnaire had an identification number on the upper right corner of the front page. This number was used to identify and follow up with non-respondents. On July 3, 2001 a postcard reminder was mailed to non-respondents. On July 21, 2001 a second full packet, including an instrument, cover letter, and return envelope, was mailed to non-respondents. On July 29, 2001 an e-mail reminder was sent to all non-respondents asking them to return the questionnaire. Table 3.5 identifies the response rate as a result of the comprehensive strategy that was followed to improve the response rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Returned Instruments</th>
<th>Usable Instruments</th>
<th>Unusable Instruments</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ext. Agent</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis. Spec.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Spec.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Response rate obtained from the study's samples

From Table 3.5, there was a low response rate at the state level (65%). Since the population consisted of 14 non-respondents only, Miller and Smith's (1983) strategy for handling non-response error was deemed inappropriate. Therefore, comparing early to late respondents statistically by way of t-test for independent samples (Miller and Smith, 1983) was used as an alternative for handling non-response error. Dealing with non-response error is described in Chapter 4.

Data Analysis

Version 10.1 of the SPSS for Windows computer program was used to analyze the data. The alpha level was set a priori at .05 for all significance tests. Item scores were added for each variable and a total score was determined, then the total score was entered in the statistical test required for each question. Descriptive statistics of frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency, standard deviations, were first used to
summarize and organize the data. Partial correlation, Pearson coefficient correlation, point-biserial correlation, and multiple regressions were used for data analysis. This study used Davis’ (1971) conventions for describing measures of association, as seen in Table 3.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: Convention for measures of association (Davis, 1971)

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study.

1. What are the relationships among OSU Extension personnel’s background factors (sex, age, educational level, length in organization, length in position, major program area of responsibility, and planner’s job title) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics according to their power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and type of interests (consensual or conflictual)?
2. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics?

3. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for type of interests?

4. What are the relationships between type of interests (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics?

5. What are the relationships between type of interest (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for power base?

6. What are the relationships of program success to OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for political context?

7. To what extent can variability in the OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of program success be explained by political context (power base and type of interests), by power and influence tactics, and by background variables?

Table 3.7 presents the variables of the study, scale of measurement, type of data, and statistics used to analyze each question.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL DEFINITION</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POSSIBLE STATISTICS TESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Self Reported</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Pearson-r Mean, %, sd, Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2Categories</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Frequency, Person, sd, Pointbiserial, Mean, %, Phi coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>5Categories</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Mean, %, Frequency, SD Cramers’V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length in Organization</td>
<td>Self Reported</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Mean, %, Frequency, Pearson r, sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length in Position</td>
<td>Self Reported</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Mean, %, Frequency, Pearson r, sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Position in Organization</td>
<td>7 Categories</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Mean, %, Frequency, sd, Cramer’s V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Position in Organization</td>
<td>4 Categories</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Mean, Frequency, sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and Influence Tactics</td>
<td>Mean Sum of 31 Items(9-39)</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Partial correlation, Multiple regression, t test, Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>Mean Sum of 3 Items(6- 8)</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Partial correlation, Multiple regression, t test, Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interest</td>
<td>Mean Sum of 5 Items (1-5)</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Partial r, t test, Pearson r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program success</td>
<td>Mean Sum of 7 Items (40-46)</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Multiple regression, t test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Area Of Responsibility</td>
<td>5 categories</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Mean, %, Frequency, sd, Cramers’ V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Description of variables, including operational definitions, type of data and statistical tests applied
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Chapter four presents the findings related to OSU Extension professionals’ perceptions of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. The study’s purpose was to describe OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in program planning process. Also, the study attempted to determine the common power and influence tactics Extension personnel tend to exercise in planning programs. Influence of personnel’s power bases, and the type of interests relationships are affecting their program planning decisions and perceptions.

The random sample of this study consisted of 318 OSUE personnel from the state, district, and county levels. The study’s population consisted of 606 personnel without the pilot sample (n= 35). The total response rate was 82 % (n= 283). There were 263 usable questionnaires of the 283 returned questionnaires. The findings are presented in the following order: dealing with low response rate at the state level, description of respondents, and findings pertained for each research question described in Chapter 1. Statistics used in this study were means, standard deviation, frequency, percentages, t-test, multiple regression, partial regression, Pearson r, partial correlations, and point biserial correlation.
Dealing With Low Response Rate

Many steps were taken to improve response rate. Miller and Smith (1983) claimed that late respondents are similar to non-respondents. Therefore, 25% of the last respondents to the survey were statistically compared to 25% of the early respondents on all the variables. T-test for independent samples was used to perform the comparison between early and late respondents on dependent and independent interval variables.

Table 4.1 shows the t-test between independent samples conducted with interval demographic variables of age, years in current position, years employed, and years as educator. Table 4.1 shows that early and late respondents were not statistically significantly different on these demographic interval variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean score</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as Educator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>48.62</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$

n= 13 for Early & Late Respondents

Table 4.1: T-test between early and late respondents on demographic interval variables
Table 4.2 shows that early and late respondents did not differ on the score obtained for the interval dependent variable program success, or on the interval independent variables of power base, reasoning, consulting, appealing, networking, bargaining, pressuring, counteracting, and type of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>35.69</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>37.46</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Base</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appealing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bargaining</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressuring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counteracting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* $\alpha < .05$  
\text{n = 13}

Table 4.2: T-test between early and late respondent and independent variables
Table 4.3 shows that respondents were not statistically significantly different on nominal demographic variables of sex, program area of responsibility, reported position, and educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>34 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog. Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at α = .05
a = Phi coefficient   b = Cramer's V

ANR: Agricultural & Natural Resources
CD: Community Development
FCS: Family & Consumer Science
4-H: Youth & Development
SS: State Extension Specialist
SEA: State Extension associate

Table 4.3: T-tests between early and late respondents in nominal demographic variables
Based on the previous data, it was concluded that there were no statistically significant differences between early and late respondents in any of the dependent and independent interval variables, as well as in any of the demographic interval and nominal variables.

Sample Description

Sex and Age

Table 4.4 shows that 135 (51%) of respondents were males, and 128 (49%) were females. The plurality (37%) of the respondents were between the ages of 41 and 50, thirty percent were between 51 and 60, nineteen percent were between 31 and 40, and six percent between 20 and 30. Only five percent were between the ages of 61 and 70. Nine respondents refused to report their ages. The mean age of respondents was 46.5 years (SD = 9.30).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Sex and age of respondents

Respondents' Reported Position and Years in Current Position

Table 4.5 shows that 87 (33%) were county extension agents, 49 (19%) of the respondents were county extension agent and chairs, 40 (15%) were program assistants, 36 (14%) were state extension specialists, 25 (9%) were district specialists, 16 (6%) were state extension associates, and 10 (4%) were holding other positions such as administrator, academic position, and program coordinator.

From Table 4.5, one can see that 109 (41%) of the respondents were in their reported position between 1 to 5 years, 63 (24%) were in their reported position between 6 to 10 years, 37 (14%) were in their reported position between 11 to 15 years, 20 (8%)
were in their reported position between 16 and 20 years, 17 (6%) were in their reported position between 21 to 25 years, and 12 (5%) were in their reported position between 26 to 30 years. Three respondents (2%) did not report the number of years of their current position. The mean of number of years in current position was 8.93 years with a standard deviation of 7.49.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agent &amp; Chair</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Extension Agent</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Specialist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Extension Specialist</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Extension Associate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Current Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 8.93  SD 7.49

Table 4.5: Respondents' reported position and years in current position
Years Employed by OSUE, Education Level, Program Area of Responsibility

Table 4.6 shows that 161 (61%) respondents hold a master degree, 51 (19%) hold a doctorate degree, 31 (12%) respondents hold a bachelor degree, 18 (7%) hold other degree such as technical diploma. There were 2 missing responses (1%).

From Table 4.6, the mean for years of employment by OSU Extension was 12.5 with standard deviation of 9.1. One hundred thirty three (51%) respondents were employed by OSU Extension between 1 to 10 years, 66 (25%) were employed by OSUE between 11 and 20 years, 52 (20%) were employed between 21 to 30 years, 9 (3%) were employed by OSUE between 31 to 40 years, and 3 (1%) did not report their years of employment by OSUE.

Table 4.6 indicates that 98 (37%) of the respondents were practicing agricultural and natural resources responsibilities, 72 (28%) planning programs related to family and consumer sciences, 57 (22%) planning programs related to 4-H youth development, 22 (8%) of the respondents were planning programs related to community development, and 14 (5%) planning other programs such as agricultural technical training programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Of Employment By OSUE</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four H Youth Development</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Respondents’ reported education level, years of employment by OSUE, and program area of responsibility

**Years as Educator**

Table 4.7 shows that 87 (33%) of the OSU Extension personnel worked as educators between 1 to 10 years, 83(32%) worked as educators between 21 to 30 years, 63 (24%) worked as educators between 11 to 20 years, 25(9%) worked as educators
between 31 to 40 years, 2 (1%) worked as educators between 41 to 50 years, and 3 (1%) did not report the number of years that they worked as educators. The mean of number of years working as educator was 17.76 with standard deviation of 10.37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Educator</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Respondents’ reported number of years as educators

Description of power and influence tactics, power base, and type of interests

On the POINTS instrument, participants rated the perceived effectiveness of each influence tactic on a six point Likert-type scale, with low scores indicating relatively unfavorable perceptions and high scores indicating favorable perceptions. Table 4.8 indicates the means and standard deviations for each sub-scale.

Consulting was rated favorably by the participants most often, with a mean of 4.79, indicating that participants rated items such as “Asking the person for suggestions
about your plan” and “Indicating your willingness to modify your plan based on input from the person,” as effective. Reasoning was also rated as an effective tactic quite often, with a mean of 4.42 (between somewhat effective and effective). So, participants rated items such as “Presenting the person with facts, figures, and other data that support your plan,” and “Using logical arguments to convince the person to support your plan,” as effective or somewhat effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interest</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Participants’ means and standard deviations for the POINTS sub-scales

Participants, with a mean of 3.95, rated appealing somewhat effective. Participants rated items such as “Saying that the person is the most qualified individual for a task you want done” and “Making the person feel that what you want done is extremely important,” as somewhat effective. Networking and bargaining were rated as
somewhat effective with means of 3.43 and 3.00 respectively. A bargaining item such as “Offering to do some work for the person in return for his or her support” was rated as somewhat effective. A representative networking item was “Obtaining support from other people before making a request of the person.”

Pressuring was rated, with a mean of 2.25, as ineffective tactic by participants. Item such as, “Repeatedly reminding the person about things you want done,” was perceived unfavorably by participants. Also, counteracting was rated, with a mean of 1.83, as very ineffective or ineffective by participants. Item such as, “Taking action while the person is absent so that he or she will not be included in the planning process,” was perceived as ineffective by participants.

Power base had a mean of 2.24, indicating moderate disagreement. For power base, participants tended to moderately disagree with statement such as, ”Overall, the person had more power than you during the planning process.” This indicates that participants, in general terms, were relatively involved in symmetrical power relationships with the target person(s). Participants moderately disagreed with statement such as, “The person and you were pursuing different goals for this program,” indicating that participants, on average, were involved in consensual interest relationships with the target person(s).
Research Question 1

What are the relationships among OSU Extension personnel’s demographic variables (sex, age, educational level, length in organization, length in current position, major program area of responsibility, and planner’s job title) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics according to their power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and type of interests (consensual or conflictual)?

Partial correlations between influence tactics (interval variables) and selected demographic variables controlling for power base and type of interest

Table 4.9 indicated the results of partial correlations of selected demographic variables and influence tactics and type of interests. Table 4.9 shows that sex had a low statistically significant correlation with consulting (r = -.14, p < .05). Age had a low statistically significant negative correlation with networking (r = -.12, p < .05). Length in current position had a low statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest (r = -.16, p < .05). Demographic variables of educational level, program area of responsibility, length in organization, and reported position had no statistically significant correlations with any of the power and influence tactics or with type of interests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Length Org.</th>
<th>Length Position</th>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Planner’s Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Confictual + r)

\[ \text{a=Point bi-serial} \quad \text{b=Pearson r} \quad \text{c=Cramer’s V} \quad \text{d=Eta coefficient} \]

\[ n=263 \quad *p<.05 \]

Sex: F = 1; M = 2

+ r : Higher scores mean conflictual type of interest relationships

Table 4.9: The results of partial correlation between selected demographic variables and influence tactics controlling for power base

Table 4.10 indicates the results of partial correlation between selected demographic variables and influence tactics according to type of interests. From Table 4.10, one can see that sex had a low statistically significant correlation with consulting tactic \((r=-.13,p<.05)\) and age had a low statistically significant negative correlations with bargaining and networking \((r=-.12,p<.05)\). Demographic variables of educational level,
length in organization, length in current position, program area of responsibility, and
planner's position had no significant correlations with both influence tactics and type of
interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex (a)</th>
<th>Age (b)</th>
<th>Education (c)</th>
<th>Length Org. (d)</th>
<th>Length Position (e)</th>
<th>Program Area (f)</th>
<th>Planner's Position (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Asymmetrical +r)

n=263
*p<.05
Sex: F= 1; M = 2
+ r : Higher scores mean asymmetrical power relationships

Table 4.10: The results of partial correlation between selected demographic variables and
influence tactics controlling for type of interest

From the previous Tables, one can see that program area of responsibility and planner's
position with organization had from low to moderate, but not statistically significant,
correlations with influence tactics. This may indicate that both variables are important, but they did not surface significantly in this study may be because the variables were not normally distributed in this sample.

Research Question 2

What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base and their perceptions of power and influence tactics?

Table 4.11 shows that OSU Extension personnel's power base had a low statistically significant positive correlation with bargaining ($r=.14, p<.05$). Power base had negligible negative correlation with consulting and negligible positive correlations with pressuring, appealing, reasoning, and counteracting. Power base had low positive correlation with networking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Base (Asymmetrical $+ r$)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$  

n = 263

Table 4.11: Partial correlation between interval power base and interval influence tactics
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Research Question 3

What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base and their perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for type of interests?

Table 4.12 shows that power base had a low statistically significant positive correlation with appealing \((r= .15, p< .05)\). When type of interest was not controlled (Table 4.10), power base had a low statistically significant positive correlation with bargaining \((r= .14, p< .05)\) instead of appealing. Power base had low positive correlations with reasoning and bargaining and negligible positive correlations with networking, counteracting, pressuring, and consulting.

Power base had no statistically significant correlation with pressuring, consulting, counteracting, networking, reasoning, and bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Base (Asymmetrical + r)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(p<.05\)  

\(n=263\)

Table 4.12: Partial correlation between OSU Extension personnel's power base and influence tactics while controlling for type of interests
Research Question 4

What are the relationships between type of interests and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics?

Table 4.13 indicates that type of interests had a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with consulting tactic ($r = -0.36, p<0.01$). Also, type of interest had a low statistically significant positive correlation with counteracting ($r = 0.25, p<0.01$), with pressuring ($r = 0.20, p<0.01$), and with networking ($r = 0.13, p<0.05$). From Table 4.13, one can see that type of interest had a low statistically significant negative correlation with reasoning ($r = -0.19, p<0.01$). No other statistically significant correlations were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interest (Conflictual + r)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05  **p<0.01  n=263

Table 4.13: Correlation between OSU Extension personnel’s type of interests and influence tactics
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Research Question 5

What are the relationships between type of interest and OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for power base?

Table 4.14 shows that type of interest had a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with consulting ($r = -.36, p < .01$) and a low statistically significant negative correlation with appealing ($r = -.13, p < .05$) and with reasoning ($r = -.22, p < .01$). Type of interest had a low statistically significant positive correlation with pressuring ($r = .17, p < .01$) and with counteracting ($r = .23, p < .01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interest (Conflictual + r)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  n = 263

Table 4.14: Partial correlation between OSU Extension personnel’s type of interests and influence tactics while controlling for power base
By comparing Table 4.13 with Table 4.14, one can see that type of interest had a low statistically significant positive correlation with networking ($r = .13, p < .05$, Table 4.13), but after controlling for power base using partial correlation, conflicting had a negligible correlation with networking ($r = .09$, Table 4.13). Controlling power base did not produce any significant correlations except the previously mentioned change.

**Research Question 6**

What are the relationships of program success to OSU Extension personnel’s power and influence tactics while controlling for political context?

Table 4.15 indicates that program success had a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest ($r = -.47, p < .05$) and a low statistically significant negative correlation with power base ($r = -.17, p < .01$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Base (Asymmetrical + $r$)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interest (Conflicting + $r$)</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p < .01$**

n = 262

Table 4.15: Pearson correlations between program success and type of interest and power base
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Controlling for type of interest, program success had a moderate statistically significant positive correlation with consulting \((r=.42, p<.01)\) and a low statistically significant positive correlation with reasoning \((r=.27, p<.01)\), with appealing \((r=.16, p<.01)\), and with bargaining \((r=.15, p<.05)\) as indicated by Table 4.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Program Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base (Asymmetrical + r)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  *p<.05  n=261

Table 4.16: Partial correlations between program success and power base and power and influence tactics while controlling for type of interest

Controlling for power base, program success had a substantial statistically significant positive correlation with consulting \((r=.52, p<.01)\) and a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest \((r=-.45, p<.01)\) and a moderate
statistically significant positive correlation with reasoning. Program success had a low statistically significant positive correlations with appealing \((r=.20, p<.01)\) and with bargaining \((r=.19, p<.05)\), and a low statistically significant negative correlation with counteracting \((r=-.19, p<.01)\) and negligible correlation with networking \((r=.02)\). Table 4.17 indicates the correlations between program success and type of interest and power and influence tactics while controlling for power base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interest (Conflictual + r)</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressuring</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

n=261

Table 4.17: Partial correlations between program success and power base and power and influence tactics while controlling for power base
Research Question 7

To what extent can variability in the OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of program success be explained by political context (power base and type of interest), by power and influence tactics, and by demographic variables?

The dependent variable program success was statistically-significantly correlated with independent variables sex ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$), age ($r = 0.14, p < 0.05$), type of interest ($r = -0.45, p < 0.01$), power base ($r = -0.14, p < 0.01$), consulting ($r = 0.51, p < 0.01$), appealing ($r = 0.15, p < 0.01$), reasoning ($r = 0.28, p < 0.01$), counteracting ($r = -0.19, p < 0.01$), and bargaining ($r = 0.14, p < 0.01$) (Table 4.16). These variables were simultaneously entered into the regression model.

Stevens (1996) has noted, “It is important for the investigator to be judicious in his/her selection of predictors. Far too many investigators have abused multiple regression by ‘throwing everything in the hopper,’ often merely because the variables are available” (p. 78). Therefore, the variables were selected based on their significant correlations with the dependent variable.

Multiple regression analysis was performed to specify which independent variables explain the greatest amount of variance in program success (dependent variable). The independent variables included in the regression model were sex (dummy coded), age, type of interest, power base, consulting, appealing, reasoning, counteracting, and bargaining.

All independent variables were entered into the regression equation in a single step because there is no theoretical justification for entering them otherwise (Stevens, 1996). The standardized partial regression coefficient (Beta) and partial correlation were
used to determine the magnitude and relative importance of the independent variables' influence on the dependent variable. Also, $R^2$ value is an indication of the model's goodness in explaining the variance in the dependent variable. The higher the value of adjusted $R$ square (closest to 1.00), the better the model is in explaining variance of the independent variable in the population (Black et al., 1995).

One issue to be aware of in multiple regression analysis is multicollinearity. It refers to a situation where all or some of the independent variables have substantial intercorrelations (Stevens, 1996). Table 4.18 indicates intercorrelations among the independent variables. Multicollinearity was examined by checking the correlation matrix to see whether it was of concern. The correlation matrix (Table 4.18) indicates that there were some substantial and moderate intercorrelations. Therefore, the researcher suspected that multicollinearity could be present at the analysis. Bargaining was correlated with appealing ($r = .40, p < .01$). Reasoning was correlated with appealing ($r = .58, p < .01$), and with consulting ($r = .59, p < .01$). Consulting was correlated with appealing ($r = .43, p < .01$). type of interest was correlated with consulting ($r = -.36, p < .01$), and power base ($r = .29, p < .01$).
### Table 4.18: Inter-correlations of perceptions of program success on selected independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success (Y)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (X1)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (X2)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barging (X3)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering (X4)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning (X5)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing (X6)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting (X7)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base (X8)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (X9)</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sex: 1 = Female; 2 = Male  
2 Power base (Asymmetrical = + r)  
3 Type of interest (Conflictual = + r)

To examine multicollinearity, one must examine the variance inflation factors (VIF) for independent variable. If VIF values do not exceed 10, multicollinearity is not of concern (Stevens, 1996). In this study, VIF values ranged from as low as 1.1 and as high as 1.9.
Another important concern in multiple regression is the three assumptions of residuals in the linear model: residuals are independent and not correlated with independent variables, have a mean of zero, and follow a normal distribution with constant variance (Stevens, 1996). It is important to test for any violation of any of the residuals assumptions. The dependence of residuals was checked by Durbin-Watson statistic. If the test values were close to 2.0, then, the residuals are independent. In this study, the Durbin-Watson value was 1.79, which was closer to 2.0. Also, Stevens (1996) suggested plotting standardized residuals against predicted values. If the assumptions are tenable, the standardized residuals should scatter randomly about a horizontal line.

Stevens (1996) also suggested that 15 subjects per independent variable are needed for a reliable regression analysis in social science. The subject variable ratio for this study was 28:1. 263 subjects completed the survey and 253 subjects actually completed both the demographic and power and influence tactics sections of the questionnaire.

**Multiple Regression Model**

The purpose of multiple regression analysis was to predict the dependent variable from a set of independent variables.

Table 4.19 shows that the regression model significantly explained about 39% of the variance in the dependent variable program success at alpha level of .05. Sex ($p=.02$), age($p=.003$), bargaining($p=.03$), consulting($p=.001$), and type of interest($p=.001$) explained significantly the variance of program success. Beta and partial correlation values were compared to determine the relative importance for each independent variable. It was found that consulting tactic was the most important variable ($\text{Beta} = -.36$, 145
r = .33) in explaining the variance of program success. Also, it was found that type of interest (Beta = -.29, r = -.31) was the second most important variable in explaining the variance of the dependent variable. Age (Beta = .15, r = .19) was the third most important variable in explaining the variance of the dependent variable program success. Sex (Beta = -.11, r = -.13) and bargaining (Beta = .11, r = .13) were the fourth most important variables in explaining the variance of program success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p=.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>8.480E-02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counteracting</td>
<td>-8.476E-02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>6.309E-02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>-4.323E-02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interest</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-5.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex: 1 = Female; 2 = Male

n = 253

Full Model: R² = .39; Adjusted R² = .37; F = 8; p < .001

Table 4.19: Regression model for program success on sex, age, bargaining, counteracting, reasoning, appealing, consulting, power base, and type of interest
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Adjusted $R^2$ is the measure of goodness of fit of the model. The Adjusted $R^2$ for this model indicated that 37% of the variation in program success in the population could be explained by the significant independent variables. It was also found that counteracting, reasoning, appealing, and power base were not providing significant explanation in this model.

In this multiple regression analysis, the four assumptions about the residuals were not violated. The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.79. This value was closer to 2.0 and it meant that residuals were not correlated with each other. The second assumption is the mean of residuals equal zero. The histogram of the regression of the standardized residuals indicated that the mean of the residuals was zero (Appendix A). The third assumption about the normal distribution of residuals was met and observed in the histogram of regression of the standardized residuals (Appendix A). The fourth assumption about the constant variance of residuals was examined by plotting the residuals in a scatter plot of observed $Y$ and predicted $Y$. The result was the points scattered randomly along a horizontal line (Appendix A).

The Tolerance values of the model ranged from .50 to .94, meaning that multicollinearity was not a problem because all values were closer to 1 (Appendix A). Also, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.1 to 1.9 and all of them were below 10 (Appendix A). Many authors (Black et al, 1995) considers large values (above 10) show a concern for multicollinearity. It was concluded that multicollinearity was not a problem in this model. In sum, for a sample of (n=263) of OSU Extension personnel, 39% of the variance in their perceptions of program success was predicted by
consulting and bargaining tactics as well as sex and age with respect to type of interest. Generally, the more consulting and bargaining tactics were used in the planning situation, the more planners' perception of program success increase. Also, the older the age of planners were in the planning situation, the more planners' perception of program success increase. Planners who faced lower level of conflicted interest had perceptions of higher levels of success in the program planning process.

Research Hypotheses

For type of interest, the negative correlations indicate consensual type of interests relationships and positive correlations indicate conflictual type of interests relationships. For power base, negative correlations indicate symmetrical power relationships and positive correlations indicate asymmetrical power relationships.

Hypothesis 1: In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using reasoning and consulting.

Reasoning had a negligible, but not significant, positive correlation with power base ($r = .02$) and a low statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest ($r = -.19, p < .01$). Therefore, reasoning was not perceived as an effective tactic in symmetrical power relationships (positive correlation), but when there is a consensus regarding interests, reasoning perceived as an effective tactic (negative correlation). Therefore, in symmetrical power relationships in which there is a consensus regarding interests, program planners did not report using reasoning. Consulting had a negligible, but not significant, negative correlation with power base ($r = -.07$) and a moderate
statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest ($r = -.36, p < .01$). Consulting perceived to be as an effective tactic only in consensual interest relationships, not in symmetrical power relationships. Yang’s (1996) hypothesized theoretical framework suggested that in symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships, planners would use reasoning and consulting. Based on study’s findings, this claim was not supported due to the negligible correlations between power base and both reasoning and consulting, but OSU Extension personnel perceived reasoning and consulting as effective tactics while they engaged in consensual interest relationships with the target person. Hypothesis one was not accepted.

Hypothesis 2: In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a subordinate) in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using appealing and networking. Appealing had a negligible positive correlation with power base ($r = .09$) and negative correlation with type of interest ($r = -.08$). Networking had a low positive correlation with power base ($r = .11$) and a low statistically significant positive correlation with type of interest ($r = .13, p < .05$). So, networking was perceived as an effective tactic in conflicting planning context. The more conflictual were planners’ interests relationships, the more they perceived networking as an effective tactic. Yang’s (1996) hypothesized theoretical framework suggested that in asymmetrical power and consensual interest relationships, planners would use appealing and networking. Planners power base was not correlated significantly with any of the hypothesized influence tactics. Appealing was not correlated significantly with both power base and type of interest while networking correlated significantly with only type of interest, but in the
direction implied by the planning theory. Hypothesis two was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 3:** In symmetrical power relationships in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using bargaining. Bargaining had a low statistically significant positive correlation with power base ($r = .14, p < .05$), and a negligible correlation with type of interest. Bargaining was not perceived as an effective tactic in symmetrical power relationships or when planner’s interest relationships were conflictual. So, in symmetrical power relationships in which there was conflict regarding interests, program planners did not perceive bargaining as an effective tactic. Yang’s (1996) hypothesized theoretical framework suggested that in symmetrical power and conflictual interest relationships, planners would use bargaining. This claim was not supported by study’s findings. Thus, hypothesis three was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 4:** In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a supervisor) in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using pressuring and counteracting. Counteracting tactic had a negligible positive correlation with power base ($r = .09$) and a low statistically significant positive correlation with type of interest ($r = .25, p < .01$). So, counteracting was perceived as an effective tactic in planning situations that characterized by conflicting interest regardless of the planner’s power relationship.

Pressuring had a negligible positive correlation with power base ($r = .08$) and a low statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .20, p < .01$) with type of interest. When planners were supervisors, they reported using pressuring as an effective tactics regardless of their power base, but with respect to conflictual type of interest. The more
the planners' interests were conflicted, the more they perceived pressuring as an effective
tactic regardless of their positions. Therefore, planners did report using pressuring and
counteracting as effective tactics, but only when they involved in conflictual interest
relationships, not asymmetrical power relationships, with the target person. Yang's
(1996) hypothesized theoretical framework suggested that in asymmetrical power and
conflictual interest relationships, planners would use counteracting and bargaining. Using
bargaining and pressuring in conflictual interest relationships was supported by the
study's findings, but regardless of type of power relationships. Therefore, hypothesis four
was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 5:** In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus
regarding interests, program planners will report perceiving the program as successful.
Program success had a low statistically significant negative correlation with power
base ($r = -0.17, p < .01$), and a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with
type of interest ($r = -0.47, p < .01$). So, planners perceived the program as successful when
involved with a planning situation that characterized by symmetrical power and
consensual interests relationship with the target person. Therefore, hypothesis five was
accepted.

**Hypothesis 6:** Perceived program success is predicted by symmetrical power base
and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining). The multiple
regression model (Table 4.19) indicated that power base ($p = .53$) and reasoning ($p = .50$)
were not a significant predictors of program success. However, consulting ($p = .001$) and
bargaining ($p = .02$) were significant predictors of program success. Here the null
hypotheses (H₀: βₖ = 0) was tested at an alpha level of .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that perceived program success is not predicted by asymmetrical power base and reasoning was accepted. The null hypothesis that perceived program success is not predicted by consulting and bargaining was rejected at an alpha level of .001 that is less than alpha level of .05. So, program success can be predicted from program planning situations in which program planners use bargaining and consulting tactics regardless of their power relationships with the target person. Also, consulting tactic was not associated with favorable perceptions of program success. Hypothesis six was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 7:** Perceived program success is predicted by consensual type of interests and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining). The regression model (Table 4.19) indicated that type of interest (p=.001, r=.31), bargaining (p=.02, r=.13) and consulting (p=.001, r=.33) were significant predictors of program success. But, reasoning (p=.50, r=.04) was not a significant predictor of program success. Here the null hypotheses (H₀: βₖ = 0) was tested at an alpha level of .05. The null hypothesis that perceived program success is not predicted by type of interests, bargaining, and consulting was rejected. The null hypothesis that perceived program success is not predicted by reasoning was accepted. So, when program planners involved in consensual interest relationships (negative partial correlation with program success) and involved in planning situations in which bargaining and consulting were used to influence the target person, they perceived the program as successful. Hypothesis seven was not accepted.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARIES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter provides a summary of the study, conclusions reached based on results, and recommendations for future research. This chapter is organized into the following sections: Purpose and Research Questions, Limitations of the Study, Research Procedures, Summary and Discussion of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to describe OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. Additionally, this study sought to determine the common power and influence tactics Extension personnel tend to exercise in planning programs. This study also investigated which other factors, especially the perceived effectiveness of influence tactics (pattern of influence behavior), the nature of power bases, and the type of interests relationships that are affecting the OSU Extension program planning decisions and perceptions.

This dissertation addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the relationships among OSU Extension personnel’s background factors (sex, age, educational level, length in organization, length in position, major program area of responsibility, and planner’s job title) and their perceptions of
power and influence tactics according to their power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and type of interests (consensual or conflictual)?

2. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics?

3. What are the relationships between OSU Extension personnel's power base (symmetrical or asymmetrical) and their perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for type of interests?

4. What are the relationships between type of interests (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics?

5. What are the relationships between type of interest (conflictual or consensual) and OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for power base?

6. What are the relationships of program success to OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics while controlling for political context?

7. To what extent can variability in the OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of program success be predicted by political context (power base and type of interests), by power and influence tactics, and background variables?

The following research hypotheses were used to answer the above questions:

1. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using reasoning and consulting.
2. In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a subordinate) in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using appealing and networking.

3. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using bargaining.

4. In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a supervisor) in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using pressuring and counteracting.

5. In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report perceiving the program as successful.

6. Perceived program success was predicted by symmetrical power base and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining).

7. Perceived program success is predicted by consensual type of interests and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining).

**Limitation of the study**

This study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was limited to Extension personnel employed by Ohio State University Extension. Therefore, the generalizability of the results was limited only to Ohio University Extension personnel. The study was limited by individual respondents and their willingness to express their perceptions of power and influence tactics. It was also limited by the individual perception and understanding of the concepts of power and politics and the effects they have on their
personal and professional approaches to program planning as well as their planning contexts.

Research Procedures

This study used a mailed questionnaire to collect data about OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics in program planning process. It examined the relationships between planner's power base and type of interests and influence tactics such as reasoning, consulting, appealing, networking, bargaining, pressuring, and counteracting. The following section summarizes the research procedures used in this study.

Research Design

The study design was descriptive-correlational, aimed to describe and explain the nature and strength of relationships among variables. Correlational studies serve one of two purposes-either to help explain important human behaviors and to predict likely outcomes (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1996).

Population and Sample

The target population for the study was drawn from the county, district, and state-level program professionals in OSU Extension (N=606). A random sample was drawn from the study population for county and state based personnel. The random samples consisted of the following: County Extension Agents, Chairs, and Program Assistants (N = 471, n= 210); State Specialists and State Extension Associates (N =105, n = 80); and District specialists (N=30, n=28). The sample sizes were determined using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table of random samples. The total sample size was 318 and only 263 questionnaires were returned usable, meaning that the total response rate was 82%.
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Instrumentation

Yang’s (1996) power and influence tactics instrument (POINTS) was adapted to measure OSU Extension personnel power and influence tactics in program planning process. The questionnaire consisted of four sections, 54 items total. The first section was a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Planners were asked to rate their level of agreement with each item that describes type of interest (items # 1, 2, 3, 4, & 5) and power base (items # 6, 7, & 8). The second section was a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (very ineffective) to 6 (very effective). Planners were asked to rate the effectiveness of influence tactics such as consulting (items # 9, 15, 20, & 27), pressuring (items # 13, 21, 32, 35, & 37), counteracting (items # 17, 23, 28, & 29), appealing (items # 25, 31, 34, 36, & 38), networking (items # 10, 16, 22, & 39), reasoning (items # 11, 18, 24, 30, & 33), and bargaining (items # 12, 14, 19, & 26). The third section was a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Planners were asked to rate their level of agreement with each item (item # 40-46) that related to their perception of the level of successfulness of the planned program. The fourth section was designed to obtain demographic information about each subject.

Content and face validity were established through a panel of experts and field test. The reliability of the instrument was established by a pilot test. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each section of the instrument. The instrument was found to be valid and reliable.

Data Collection

The study data was collected by way of a mailed questionnaire. Data collection steps outlined in the Total Design Method For Mail and Telephone Surveys by Dillman.
(1978) were followed. On June 26, 2001, a self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire and mailed to state, district, and county personnel to use when returning their questionnaire. The initial deadline for returning the questionnaire was August 20, 2001. On July 3, a postcard reminder was mailed to non-respondents. On July 21, a second full packet, including an instrument, cover letter, and return envelop, was mailed to non-respondents. On July 29, an e-mail reminder was sent to all non-respondents asking them to return the questionnaire. Early respondents were compared to lat respondents at the state level and no statistically significant differences were found between them as outlined in Chapter 4.

Data Analysis

The study consisted of seven questions accompanied by seven hypotheses. Items' score were summed and a total score for each variable was, then, determined. The mean for the total score was used in the statistical analysis using the SPSS computer analysis software. Statistics such as correlations, Pearson r, t-test, multiple regression, Cramers’ V, point-biserial correlation, partial correlation, percentage, frequency, and means were used in data analysis.
Demographic Description Summary and Discussion

Age and Sex

There were 135 (51%) males and 128 (49%) females. The average age of respondents was 46.5. Thirty seven percent of the respondents were between the ages of 41 to 50 and twenty nine percent were between the ages of 51 to 60. Nineteen percent were between the age of 31 to 40.

Reported Position and Years in Current Position

Thirty three percent (n=87) of the respondents reported their position as county extension agent. Eighteen percent (n=49) reported their position as county extension agent and chair, fifteen percent (n=40) as program assistant, and thirteen percent (n=36) as state specialist. Nine percent (n=25) of the subjects reported their position as district specialist and three percent reported their positions as other than the given titles.

Forty one percent (n=109) of the respondents reported that they were in their current position between 1 to 5 years and twenty four percent (n=63) reported that they were in their current position between 6 to 10 years. Only fourteen percent (n=37) reported that they were in their current position between 11 to 15 years and seven percent between 16 and 20 years. Four percent (n=12) reported that they were in their current position between 26 to 30 years. The average years in current position was 8.9 (sd=7.49).

Educational Level

The majority of respondents attained a master's degree level (n=161, 61%). Nineteen percent (n=51) of respondents attained a doctorate degree level. Eleven percent (n=31) attained a bachelor degree level. Only six percent (n=18) hold other educational degrees.
Years of Employment By OSUE

Fifty percent (n=133) of respondents were employed by OSUE between 1 to 10 years. Twenty five percent (n=66) were employed by OSUE between 11 to 20 years and nineteen percent (n=52) between 21 to 30 years. Three percent (n=9) were employed by OSUE between 31 to 40 years. The average mean of years of employment was 12.5 (sd=9.18).

Program Area Of Responsibility

Thirty seven percent (n=98) of the respondents were involved in planning programs for agricultural and natural resources area. Twenty seven percent (n=72) of the respondents were planning programs for family and consumer sciences and twenty one percent (n=57) for four H youth development. Only eight percent (n=22) of the respondents design programs for community development.

Years as Educator

Thirty three percent (n=87) of the respondents worked as educators between 1 to 10 years and thirty one percent (n=83) between 21 to 30 years. Twenty three percent (n=63) worked as educators between 11 to 20 years. Only nine percent (n=25) worked as educators between 31 to 40 years. The average years worked as educator was 17.7 (sd=10.3).
Correlations of Power and Influence Tactics and Selected Demographic Variables as Related to Question 1

Sex

Sex had a low correlation with consulting tactic. No other significant correlations were identified. Based on the mean rating, OSU Extension personnel moderately disagreed that the planning context was conflictual in interests or asymmetrical in power relationships with the target person. One can say that the planning context for most OSU Extension personnel was characterized by consensual interests and symmetrical power relationships. Planners in such situations all share the same common ground in terms of type of interest and power relations. There were few studies that investigated the relationship between sex and influence tactics. Hendricks (2000) had avoided sex as a factor for studying influence tactics in program planning. She claimed that “Gender has been studied with regard to the use of influencing tactics..., but significant findings have been lacking” (p.132). In this study, sex was considered as a factor, but no significant correlation was found except with consulting tactic. Yang (1996) found no significant differences in perceptions of males and females with regard to type of interest, power base, and influence tactics. Archi-Booker et al (1999) and Cervero et al (1998) implied that sex was not a neutral factor in power relationships at a classroom setting. Therefore, one can say that sex is a context-oriented factor. In other words, sex would play a significant role in differentiating planners’ perceptions of influence tactics. In this study, the context was not an ideal for sex to play a major role except with consulting. In this study, sex ‘s correlations with power and influence tactics were not influenced by political context of the planning situation.
Age

Age correlated significantly and negatively with networking when the influence of power base was removed and with both networking and bargaining when the influence of type of interests was removed. The older the age of planners, the less they perceived networking and bargaining as effective tactics due to the negative correlations. Younger planners tended to network because of conflictual interest relationships with the target person. Networking had a positive correlation with type of interest. A one unit increase in networking leads to a one unit increases in type of interest towards conflictual interest relationships. When planners had no interest relationship with the target person, they tended to bargain and network in order to influence the target person because their ability to act in the planning situation was limited by the target person’s and their official positions. Power base had positive correlation with bargaining. The more asymmetrical power relationships with the target person, the more the planners tended to perceive bargaining as effective tactic, but as they became older, they perceived it as less effective. Yang (1996) found that age correlated significantly with power base, consulting, and bargaining.

Correlations of Educational Level, Planners’ Position, and Program Area of Responsibility and Power and Influence Tactics

No significant correlations were found between educational level and program area of responsibility and power and influence tactics. Only planners’ position had significant low correlation with bargaining. Hendricks (2000) did not find any significant correlation among these variables. Yang (1996) found that power base correlated significantly with education only.
Bargaining had a low positive correlation with power base. Since the majority of OSU Extension personnel perceived their relationships with the target person as symmetrical and half of them were holding positions such as extension agent or county chairs, it seems logical that barging was an effective tactic in such situations. Planners were engaged in peer relationships with the target person, but there were some disagreement about aspects of the planned program, therefore, they tended to bargain in order to reach a shared ground.

The study’s sample consisted of highly educated subjects. The majority (n=212, 80%) held at least Masters or Doctorate degrees. Also, about 60% of the respondents held positions at the county level with an average of 12(SD=9.16) years working with OSUE and an average of 17(SD=10.37) years as working as educators. This level of homogeneity did not allow for an adequate range to identify the effect of these variables. Glass and Hopkins (1996) stated, “The heterogeneity of the sample has an important influence on r. Other things being equal, the greater the variability among the observations, the greater the value of r” (p.121).

Correlations Between Length in Organization, and Length in Current Position and Power and Influence Tactics According to Their Power Base and Type of Interest

No significant correlations were found between length in organization and length in current position except the low statistically significant negative correlation between length in current position with type of interest when the influence of power base was removed from the correlation. This situation seemed to be true for newly appointed extension personnel because new personnel tended to have less information about new positions’ requirements. Therefore, their interests were still unclear to acknowledge.
descriptions usually stimulate planner’s interests in some aspects and make them become aware of some interests. The longer the planners stayed in their position, the more their interests become consensual with other people. Yang (1996) found that power base correlated significantly with education, length in organization, and length in position. He also found that consulting correlated significantly with length in position.

**Correlations Between OSUE Personnel’s Power Base and their Perceptions of Power and Influence Tactics as Related to Question 2**

It was found that power base had a low statistically significant positive correlation with bargaining only and no significant correlations with the other tactics. Many scholars (Kreitner, 1998; Mondy, 1990; and Pfeffer, 1992) considered position as a major source for power. It was planners’ position that gave them a specific capacity to act in planning situations. Power base was believed to be associated with formal position, but this study provided evidence that this was not the case in OSU Extension.

**Discussion**

The power and influence tactics theory elucidated by Yang (1996) and presented in the theoretical framework in Chapter 2 of this study suggested that power base should be correlated negatively with counteracting, networking, appealing, consulting, and reasoning, and correlated positively with pressuring and bargaining. In this study, power base positively correlated, but not significantly, with pressuring, appealing, networking, reasoning, counteracting, and bargaining, and with the exception of the negative negligible correlation with consulting. Positive correlations meant that the more power base the planners had, the more likely they were to use one of the six tactics. Negative
correlations meant the less power base the planners had, the more likely they were to use consulting. Also, Hendricks (2000) found that power base correlated negatively with consulting, networking, reasoning, and bargaining. So, Yang's propositions were not supported by this study using the simple correlations, and differed in the directions of the correlations.

Power base was not a major factor in this study. It was identified that power base had no significant correlation with planners perceptions of influence tactics. This contradicts both Cervero and Wilson's (1994a), and Yang's (1996) theoretical framework. The simple correlation revealed that it was not important whether the target person you were planning with was a subordinate, colleague, or supervisor. But, if there were conflict, then the desirable tactic was bargaining. Power base relationship with influence tactics was influenced by many other factors such as planners' personality, situational context, interests, interactions, and measurement.

Correlations Between OSUE Personnel’s Power Base and their Perceptions of Power and Influence Tactics while Controlling for Type of Interests as Related to Question 3

After removing the influence of type of interests from the correlation, it was found that power base had a low statistically significant positive correlation with appealing only. Power base had no significant correlations with any other tactics.

Discussion

Yang (1996) hypothesized that power base was linked to appealing, networking, pressuring, and counteracting. He claimed that these four tactics became less effective as planners power base increased. In this study, this claim was not supported because
appealing, networking, pressuring, and counteracting had a low to negligible positive, but not significant, correlations with power base. In other words, the more power bases the planners had, the more likely they were to use appealing, networking, pressuring, and counteracting. Also, it was found that there were no negative correlations between power base and any of the influence tactics. Type of interests was rated at low levels—the mean was only 1.8 for this sample, indicating moderate disagreement when asked about the presence of conflictual type of interests. Controlling the influence of type of interest allowed power base to freely correlate with influence tactics. Appealing was not correlated significantly with power base when power base and type of interest were present in the analysis. Appealing was linked to asymmetrical but consensual planning situation. Bargaining was linked to symmetrical but conflictual planning situation. So, one can say that planners who were facing competing interests tended to engage in a bargaining behavior with the target person in order to satisfy their interests, but when the target person was not cooperative to their expectations, removing the influence of type of interest, they tended to engage in an appealing behavior to satisfy their interests. Bargaining was positively and significantly correlated with appealing. Therefore, specific use of bargaining or appealing was determined by the planning political context. If planners were engaged in symmetrical power relationships and the target person was cooperative, they tended to use bargaining as an influence tactic, but when they were engaged in asymmetrical power relationships, and the target was not cooperative, they tended to use appealing as an effective tactic. In other words, if power relationships were socially ad hoc, use bargaining, but if they were socially systematic, use appealing. Both choices should regard type of interest relationships, but if there were no interest
relationships in the planning situation, planners would use appealing to influence the
target person because the majority was involving in a socially ad hoc relationships (68%
described the target person as colleague).

Hendricks (2000) found that power base was not significant contributor to the
power and influence tactic structure advocated by Cervero and Wilson (1994a) and Yang
(1996). In this study, power base was not a significant factor in planners’ perceptions of
power and influence tactics even while controlling for type of interests.

Correlations Between Type of Interests and OSUE Personnel’s Perceptions of Power and
Influence Tactics as Related to Question 4

It was found that type of interest had a moderate statistically significant negative
correlation with consulting and a low statistically significant positive correlation with
counteracting, with pressuring, and with networking. Also, it had a low statistically
significant negative correlation with reasoning.

Discussion

Yang (1996) suggested that type of interest had a positive correlation with
counteracting and a negative correlation with appealing, consulting, and reasoning.
Hendricks (2000) found that type of interest had a negligible negative correlation with
appealing, a moderate negative correlation with reasoning and consulting, and a low
positive correlation with counteracting. In this study, type of interest had a moderate
statistically significant negative correlation with consulting, a negligible negative
correlation with appealing, a low negative correlation with reasoning, and a low positive
correlation with counteracting. The findings of this study supported the previous study’s
result that reasoning, consulting, and appealing were more less likely to be used when planners' interest were conflicted than bargaining, networking, pressuring, and counteracting. Also, it supported the hypothesis that counteracting was more likely to be used when planners' interests were at a conflict than reasoning, appealing, and consulting. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) pointed out, “Planners who misread the context will miss the chance to plan well” (p. 130). So, if planners were engaging in a conflicted interest relationships with the target person, tactics such as reasoning, consulting, or appealing would not be effective as bargaining, networking, counteracting, or pressuring.

**Correlations Between Type of Interests and OSUE Personnel's Perceptions of Power and Influence Tactics while Controlling for Power Base as Related to Question 5**

Type of interest had a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with consulting and a low statistically significant negative correlation with appealing and with reasoning. It also had a low statistically significant positive correlation with pressuring and with counteracting.

**Discussion**

After controlling for power base using partial correlation, type of interest had a negligible correlation with networking. Controlling for power base did not produce any significant correlations except switching the positive correlation between type of interest and networking into a negative, but negligible, correlation. Also, pressuring and counteracting were assumed to be used in conflictual type of interests. Pressuring and counteracting were hypothesized in the theoretical framework that they were the useful tactics for handling conflictual and asymmetrical planning situations.
Yang (1996) identified a significant and negative correlation between type of interest and power base. In this study, it was found that power base had a moderate statistically significant positive correlation with type of interest. So, the removal of power base influence did not make significant changes in the relationships among influence tactics except the change described in the previous paragraph.

Correlations and Partial Correlations Between Program Success and OSU Extension Personnel’s Power and Influence Tactics While Controlling for Political Context as Related to Question 6

Program success had a negligible negative correlation with power base and a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with type of interests. When the influence of type of interest was removed, program success correlated significantly with consulting, reasoning, appealing, and bargaining, but when the influence of power base was removed, program success correlated significantly with consulting, type of interest, reasoning, appealing, bargaining, and counteracting. Networking and pressuring had a negligible correlation with program success.

Discussion

Cervero and Wilson (1994a) reported that program outcomes were perceived as successful when planners were satisfied about the planning process. Planners usually evaluate their programs by getting feedback from participants. In this study, planners rated their perceptions of program success as moderately agree indicating that the planned programs were perceived as successful on average. Based on mean rating, this sample was facing symmetrical and consensual planning context, which indicates higher
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levels of symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships were associated with higher levels of perceptions of program success. Perceptions of program success were correlated negatively, but moderately, with type of interest (positive correlations mean conflictual interest relationships). The more consensual the interest relationships with the target person, the more successful the program was perceived. Based on study findings, type of interest played a key role in determining OSU Extension personnel perceptions of program success, but power base was not an important factor due to the fact that the majority of OSU Extension personnel were engaging in socially ad hoc (peer relationship) relationships with the target person.

Program success had moderate significant positive correlations with consulting and reasoning, and low significant positive correlations with appealing and bargaining when the influence of type of interest was removed from the correlation. The more consulting, reasoning, appealing, and bargaining the planners were using to influence the target person, the more successful the program was perceived regardless of type of interest and power relationships. In other words, if planners were involved in a consensual or conflictual and symmetrical or asymmetrical relationship with the target person, their perceptions of program success was identical. Consulting was defined as the planners’ effort to reach a viable plan with the target person by involving him or her in the generation process of a viable plan. Consulting had negative correlation with type of interest and the planning context was identified as consensual and symmetrical, which is the ideal context for using consulting tactic. Reasoning was defined as using factual facts and evidence to convince the target person that the plan was viable. When planners consult and reason with the target person, they gained deep information about the plan,
which led to perceiving the program outcomes as successful. Reasoning and consulting seemed to be related to the planners' assertiveness. Assertiveness was defined as planners' desire to satisfy their interest in the planning situation (Yang 1996). OSU extension personnel could be engaged in proactive planning action because the planning objectives and goals were attainable, therefore, they used consulting, but when the planning objectives were not attainable or clear, they used reasoning to become more informative. Yang (1996) considered consulting as an unassertive tactic while reasoning as assertive tactic. Planners' degree of assertiveness tended to influence their perceptions of program success.

When power base influence was removed from the correlation, program success had significant positive correlations with consulting, reasoning, appealing, and bargaining, and a significant negative correlation with counteracting and type of interest. The negative correlations seemed logical because programs planned in consensual interest relationships were more likely to be perceived as successful more than programs planned in conflictual interest relationships. Counteracting was assumed to be an effective tactic in conflictual interest and asymmetrical power relationships. So, when the influence of power base was removed, counteracting freely correlated with program success. The more OSU Extension personnel counteracted the target person, the less successful the program they perceived. Counteracting was an unassertive tactic that planners tended to use in order to avoid satisfying the interests of the target person at the cost of their own interests. Therefore, if they succeeded in blocking the efforts of the target person to satisfy his or her interests, they perceived the program as successful because they satisfied their interests, but if the target was successful in satisfying his or
her interest, then, planners perceived the programs as unsuccessful. It seemed that counteracting tactic was used in unique situation whereas the interests were competing and the planners were not sure or clear about the planning objectives and solutions.

Appealing and bargaining had a low positive correlation with program success. Appealing was assumed to be an effective tactic in planning situations in which planners faced by consensual type of interest. Bargaining was assumed to be an effective tactic in planning situations in which planners faced by conflictual type of interest (Yang, 1996). It is possible that programs carried out in such planning situations were perceived to be more successful because planners got along with the target person. This was supported by the data that program success had a negative correlation with type of interest. When planners involved in consensual interest relationships, they tended to use appealing as an assertive tactic and perceived the program as successful, but when their interest relationships with the target person was conflictual, they tended to use bargaining as an unassertive tactic and perceived the program as successful.

It was found that the magnitude of type of interest was limited by power base in relation to program success because when the influence of power base was controlled, the correlations between program success and consulting increased from moderate to substantial, and between program success and reasoning from low to moderate. This was an indication of how much important was the role of consulting and reasoning in influencing OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of program success. Also, the negative moderate correlation between program success and type of interest was another important indicator of such magnitude. Political context was assumed to be an important factor in the planning process. However, type of interest was the most important factor
within the political context of the planning process. It seemed that OSU Extension personnel’s interests played a key role in the planning process at Ohio State.

Prediction of Program Success by Influence Tactics, Political Context, and Demographic Variables as Related to Question 7

For a sample (n=253, 10 missing) of OSU Extension personnel, 39 percent of the variance in their perceptions of program success in the planning process was predicted by consulting, sex, age, bargaining, and type of interest relationships based on the multiple regression analysis results. Generally, higher levels of consulting, bargaining, and age were associated with higher levels of perceptions of program success, and lower levels of type of interest were associated with higher levels of perceptions of program success. Consulting tactic was the most important independent variable for explaining the variance in program success. This was followed by type of interest, age, sex, and bargaining. Examination of residuals indicated that the assumptions of the regression model were satisfied. Multicollinearity was not a problem. Counteracting, reasoning, appealing, and power base were not significant explanatory independent variables and were excluded from the analysis.

Discussion

According to theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2, consulting was perceived as an effective tactic in planning situations that characterized by symmetrical power relations and consensual type of interests (Yang, 1996). Consulting was correlated negatively with conflicted program planning situations. Consulting was defined as obtaining input and help from another in order to convince the target person about
interests involved in planning situations. One possible justification for the important role of consulting in program success was that planners were consulting with the target person about every planning tasks and decisions in order to meet shared concerns. In such situation, planners and the target person were on agreement about planning process, and, therefore, they tend to be satisfied about their work. This satisfaction was transferred into a perception of program success. Also, when the planning situations were less conflicted, planners were more likely to produce successful programs than if the situations were more conflicted. Furthermore, planners tended to evaluate their programs by obtaining feedback from participants; therefore, if their participants expressed their satisfactions about the programs, even if the program was actually unsuccessful, planners would perceive the program as successful. Cervero and Wilson (1994a) reported many case studies that described the outcomes of the planned programs as successful. These cases implied that if planners' interests were satisfied in the planning process, the planned program perceived as successful. In this study, six influence tactics were not correlated significantly with planners’ perception of program success. Only, consulting correlated significantly with program success. The program planning theory developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994a) and further clarified by Yang (1996) suggested that program outcomes and planning effectiveness are related to planners’ action (Yang, 1996). Little support was found in this study to that claim. Findings from this study considered an early attempt to link quantitatively power and influence tactics to program outcomes since no quantitative study linked the same variables were allocated.

Age was the third most important independent variable in predicting program success. Age correlated negatively with networking and bargaining when the influence of
type of interest was removed. In the multiple regression analysis, age correlated positively with program success. The data indicated that older planners tended to perceive the outcome of their planned program as more successful than younger planners. However, this did not mean older planners designed successful programs more than younger planners. Older planners may have had more planning experience and training, and, therefore, they have a higher confidence level than younger and less experienced planners. Age had a negative correlation with networking when the influence of power base was removed and a negative correlation with bargaining and networking when the influence of type of interest was removed. Older planners tended to use lower levels of networking and bargaining tactics when they worked with the target person with less interest in the planning situation. They also tended to depend on networking only when the target person had an interest in the planning situation because he or she may be from outside the organization or had no power relationship with planners.

Sex had a negative correlation with program success. Females tended to perceive the program as successful more than males (female coded 1; male coded 2). The majority of females tended to plan programs related to youth development and family and consumer science. The majority of males tended to plan programs related to natural resources and youth development. It seemed that the nature of females’ planning contexts were different from their counterparts. Programs planned and evaluated by direct feedback from participants were different from programs evaluated based on technical and scientific results. Natural resources programs were more complicated than family science programs in terms of development and evaluation. In other words, females’ programs were evaluated by humans, but most of males’ programs were evaluated based
on their technical results. It was easy for females to get a direct feedback about their program, which allowed them to conclude that the program was successful in producing positive outcomes.

Bargaining defined as actions taken by the planners to influence the target person in order to reach quick and acceptable solutions, not the best one. If the target was cooperative with the planners, they perceived bargaining as an effective tactic and the program as successful because they reached acceptable solutions. The more bargaining the planners use, the more successful the program they perceived.

Research Hypothesis

For type of interest, the negative correlations indicate consensual type of interests relationships and positive correlations indicate conflictual type of interests relationships. For power base, negative correlations indicate symmetrical power relationships and positive correlations indicate asymmetrical power relationships.

Hypothesis 1: In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using reasoning and consulting.

Reasoning had a negligible correlation with power base and a low statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest. Therefore, Reasoning was not perceived as an effective tactic in symmetrical power relations, but when there is a consensus regarding interests, reasoning was perceived as an effective tactic. However, even the correlation was significant between reasoning and type of interest, it was a low correlation. Cervero and Wilson (1994) suggested that in symmetrical power and consensual interest relations, planners tend to satisfy the target person by considering
satisfactory alternatives rather than the best. Also, Hendricks (2000) identified reasoning as a useful tactic in symmetrical power relations and it was correlated (along with consulting) with consensual planning situations. In this study, consulting was correlated only with type of interest on the direction implied by the planning theory, but not with power base.

Consulting had a negligible negative correlation with power base and a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with conflicting type of interest. Therefore, in planning situations in which there was a consensus regarding interest, planners reported using consulting as an effective tactic, but not in symmetrical power relationship. No correlation between power base and consulting was identified in this study. Yang (1996) proposed that consulting is a useful tactic in symmetrical and consensual situations. Hendricks (2000) found that consulting was a useful tactic in consensual planning situations, but not symmetrical.

In sum, reasoning was perceived as an effective tactic. It was followed by consulting. In this sample, it was found, in general terms, that 68 percent of the respondents were engaging in symmetrical power relationships and consensual planning situations. Type of power base was not an important factor in this study due to lack of correlations with other influence tactics. Therefore, hypothesis one was not accepted.

Hypothesis 2: In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a subordinate) in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report using appealing and networking. In this study, appealing had a negligible correlation with power base and type of interest. Networking had a low positive, but not statistically significant, correlation with power base and a low statistically significant positive
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correlation with type of interest. So, networking was perceived as an effective tactic in conflicting planning context, not consensual one. Yang (1996) found that appealing significantly correlated with type of interest and power base, and networking correlated significantly only with power base. Hendricks (2000) found that appealing and networking were not significantly correlated with both power base and type of interest in the planning situation. However, one can say that in conflicting planning situations, networking was perceived as an effective tactic regardless of the planners’ relationship with the target person. In other words, planners used networking to influence the target person even if the target person was holding a supervisor position.

Overall, appealing and networking were perceived as somewhat effective. One can say that type of interest played a major role in the planning situation more than the role played by power base. Thus, hypothesis two was not accepted.

Hypothesis 3: In symmetrical power relationships in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using bargaining. Bargaining had a low statistically significant positive correlation with power base, and a negligible correlation with type of interest. Bargaining was perceived as somewhat effective in symmetrical power relationships. Yang (1996) found that bargaining correlated insignificantly with both power base and type of interest. Hendricks (2000) reported that bargaining was significantly correlated with type of interest and power base. Bargaining was perceived to be somewhat ineffective tactic in asymmetrical, but not consensual, planning situations identified in this study. In other words, if planners were supervisors, they were more likely to use bargaining than if they were subordinate regardless of type of interest relationships they were holding with the target person.
Yang's previous finding and the suggested theoretical directions were not supported by the study findings. Therefore, hypothesis three was not accepted.

Hypothesis 4: In asymmetrical power relationships (planner is a supervisor) in which there is conflict regarding interests, program planners will report using pressuring and counteracting. Counteracting had a negligible correlation with power base and a low statistically significant positive correlation with type of interest. So, counteracting was perceived as an effective tactic in planning situations that characterized by conflictual type of interest regardless of planners' position. Counteracting was defined as planner's ability to block the efforts of the target person (Yang, 1996). If planners were at a higher position than the target person's position or vise versa, they were likely to use counteracting in planning process to overcome the conflict of interests regardless of power base.

In this study, pressuring had a low statistically significant positive correlation with type of interest, and a negligible positive correlation with power base. Yang (1996) found that pressuring was not correlated significantly with power base and type of interest. Also, Hendricks (2000) reported the same results as Yang. One can say that planners tended to use pressuring and counteracting in planning situations regardless of the target person's position. In other words, if planners were supervisors or subordinates to the target person, in both cases, they tended to perceive pressuring and counteracting as effective tactics. So, hypothesis four was not accepted.

Hypothesis 5: In symmetrical power relationships in which there is consensus regarding interests, program planners will report perceiving the program as successful.
Program success had a low statistically significant negative correlation with power base, and a moderate statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest. So, planners perceived the program as successful when involved with a planning situation that characterized by symmetrical power (positive correlation means asymmetrical) and consensual interests relationships (positive correlation means consensual). Yang (1996) also found that power base had a statistically significant negative correlation with type of interest. It was found that consensual and symmetrical planning situations produced favorable perceptions of program success. OSU Extension personnel perceived planned programs as successful when they worked with colleague or supervisor more than if they worked with subordinate or someone outside the organization in relation to consensual type of interest. Hypothesis five was accepted.

Hypothesis 6: Perceived program success is predicted by symmetrical power base, and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining).

The regression model indicated that power base and reasoning were not significant predictors of program success. However, consulting and bargaining were significant predictors of program success. Power base was moderately and positively correlated with type of interest and reasoning was substantially correlated with consulting. Moderate correlations among predictors reduce the important of their prediction roles in the full model (Stevens1996). Programs were perceived as successful when planned in situations that characterized by consensual interest relationships and the use of bargaining and consulting tactics regardless of the target person and planners' power bases. OSU Extension personnel perceived planned programs as successful if they shared the same interests with the target person and used bargaining and consulting
tactics to influence the target person regardless if the target person was, in fact, their supervisor, colleague, or subordinate. Thus, Hypothesis six was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 7:** Perceived program success is predicted by type of interests and by power and influence tactics (reasoning, consulting, and bargaining).

The regression model indicated that type of interest, bargaining, and consulting were significant predictors of program success. But, reasoning was not significant predictor of program success. Reasoning was substantially and positively correlated with consulting and that prevented it from playing any significant role in predicting the dependent variable (Steven, 1996). Programs were perceived as successful when planned in planning situations that characterized by consensual interest relationships and the use of bargaining and consulting tactics. Based on study findings, type of interest, particularly consensual, played an important role in OSU Extension personnel perceptions of program success. OSU Extension personnel perceived planned programs as successful if their interest relationships with the target person was consensual and they used higher levels of bargaining and consulting tactics. Therefore, hypothesis seven was not accepted.

**Conclusions**

1. OSU Extension personnel were planning programs in situations that can be characterized by symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships. Type of interests’ relationships played a key role in OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in the planning contexts identified in this study while power base played a negligible role in the same planning
contexts. It was concluded that sex, age, and planners' position in OSU Extension were correlated with perceptions of power and influence tactics: consulting, networking, and bargaining. Length in organization was correlated with type of interest.

2. It was concluded that power base was correlated with OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of bargaining tactic only.

3. It was concluded that power base was correlated with OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of appealing only when the influence of type of interest was removed.

4. It was concluded that type of interest was correlated with OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of power and influence tactics: Consulting, pressuring, counteracting, networking, and reasoning.

5. It was concluded that OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of type of interest was correlated with consulting, pressuring, counteracting, appealing, and reasoning when the influence of power base was removed.

6. It was concluded that OSU Extension personnel perceived planned programs as successful when they involved in symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships and used consulting, counteracting, appealing, reasoning, and bargaining tactics to influence the target person. Consulting and reasoning were significant tactics influencing OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of program success when power base was controlled as well as appealing and bargaining.

7. It was concluded that OSU Extension personnel's perceptions of program success was predicted by consulting, bargaining, age, sex, and type of interest. It was concluded that females perceived planned programs as more successful than
males’ perceptions of the planned programs. Also, older planners tended to perceive planned programs as more successful than younger planners. Consensual type of interest was an important predictor of OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of program success.

8. The program planning theory presented in this study suggested that reasoning and consulting are the most effective tactics in symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships. It was concluded that bargaining and consulting were the most perceived effective tactics in consensual interest relationships regardless of power base.

9. Appealing and networking were hypothesized to be used in asymmetrical power and consensual interest relations. In this study, networking was perceived as an effective tactic in conflicted interest relations while appealing was not perceived as an effective tactic in the same planning situation.

10. Bargaining was hypothesized to be an effective tactic in symmetrical power relations, as the theory suggested, but it was not perceived as an effective tactic when interests were conflicted. It was concluded that bargaining was not associated with conflictual type of interest.

11. Pressuring and counteracting were hypothesized to be effective tactics in asymmetrical and conflictual planning situations, but, in this study, it was concluded that they correlated only with conflictual type of interest, not asymmetrical power base.
12. When OSU Extension personnel were involved in planning situations that are characterized by symmetrical power and consensual interest relationships, they tended to perceive planned programs as successful.

13. Power base, counteracting, reasoning, and pressuring were not significant predictors for program success.

14. It was concluded that type of interest played an important role in shaping OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics. In addition, power base was not an important factor in shaping OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of influence tactics.

Implications

The purpose of the study was to describe OSU Extension personnel’s perceptions of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. Based on the study findings, OSU Extension personnel perceived the political context in the planning process as symmetrical power and consensual interests relationships. They also perceived consulting, reasoning, appealing, networking, and bargaining as the most effective tactics in the planning process. It was found that OSU Extension personnel tended to avoid using pressuring and counteracting in the planning process. Pressuring and counteracting were assumed to be effective tactics in conflictual interests and asymmetrical power relationships. The majority of OSU Extension personnel described their relationship with the target person as peer relationships. Therefore, OSU Extension personnel need to understand the social dimension of the planning process, a perspective that is less likely fostered by their training or orientation programs, in order to produce fairly planned programs.
programs. It seems that OSU Extension personnel tended to avoid confrontation tactics in order to reduce conflict or they might be holding a high level of teamwork and cooperation. The traditional program planning models were focusing on technical aspects of the planning process. The program planning courses offered by many universities where extension personnel acquire and develop their planning skills and knowledge are focusing on the technical and logistical information rather than political and social skills. OSU Extension leadership should reevaluate the content and scope of preparation and training programs that designed for improving planners planning skill. The improved content should include a large portion that covers the social dimension of the planning process as well as the mostly perceived effective tactics identified in this study.

This was the first study that investigated the possible existence of power and influence tactics in OSU Extension program planning process. The position that program planning is a social process is relatively new to the extension context. Also, the position that negotiating interests in the planning process is the central role of program planners practices on the planning table is promising in the extension context as found in this study. Previous planning models focused on participants' interests rather than planners' interests. They tended to ignore not only the planning contexts in which programs were constructed, but also interest relationships among the planners themselves. Traditional models failed to answer the question, what program planners actually do in the planning process? This study revealed that OSU Extension personnel were not only practicing technical planning skills but also carrying out influence tactics to satisfy not only participants' interests but also their interests. This study tried to fill in the gap between planning theory and planning practice by attempting to answer the question: What OSU
Extension personnel actually do in the planning process? This study provided supporting evidence for Cervero and Wilson’s social program planning theory outlined in Chapter 2. The study showed that there were certain patterns of planning behaviors as measured by the study instrument. OSU Extension personnel need to identify type of interest relationships with the target persons in order to use the appropriate influence tactic to produce justly planned programs and that selection of influence tactics should be based solely on the political context of the planning situation.

The theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2 suggested a different program planning model that characterized by unique structure of power and influence tactics. This unique structure supported the fact that program planners are planning within not only a technical context but also a political and social context. This unique power structure should work as a foundation or conceptual framework for future studies that will investigate the relationship between OSU Extension personnel’s negotiation style as well as influence tactics. Also, it should work as guiding beacon for developing new training courses or workshops that will account for not only organizational conflict, but also interpersonal conflict and interest relationships.

The study’s findings screened a pattern of power and influence tactics in the program planning process. These tactics were described by OSU Extension practitioners and should be treated as existing forces for more comprehension of the planning process. This comprehension needs to be fostered by more understanding of OSU Extension organizational culture and philosophy. One of the major philosophical principle of extension that the individual is supreme in a democracy (Seevers et. al., 1997). Also, one of the major tenets of Western civilization’s belief is the equality of people and the
reliability of science (Seevers et al, 1997). These beliefs shaped OSU Extension personnel’s planning practices. Democracy and science have been the major foundation for program planning practices for a long time. Therefore, program planning models should articulate equally the concept of democracy and science in the planning process. It has been noticed that science and technical knowledge were the major emphasis of current planning models in extension. The traditional models articulated science more than democracy by focusing on technical rather than political planning practices.

Organization culture was defined by DeSimon and Harris (1998), “A set of shared values, beliefs, norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior that are used as a frame of reference for the way one looks at, attempts to understand, and works within any organization” (p.477). In this study, patterns of planning behaviors revealed that OSU Extension culture was dominated by consensual interest and symmetrical power relationships. OSU Extension personnel value and believe in democracy, cooperation, and credibility. Also, their planning practices are based on the principles of equality, change, science, and education (Seevers et al., 1997). So, the OSU Extension organizational culture is a one valuing democracy and equality. Therefore, OSU Extension personnel need to understand the type of interests involved in the planning process as well as diagnosing the political context in the planning situation in order to allow all type of interest to be present at the planned programs. They need to understand how they can exercise power effectively and represent interest equally.

According to business and management science literature review in Chapter 2, power was believed to be related to authority and official position in organizations. In this study, power was not associated with position or authority, but can be acquired and...
practiced by different influence tactics. Also, it was found that power and influence
tactics existed in many planning situations. The social interactions among planners in the
planning process shaped the planning decisions and outcomes. Particularly, bargaining
and consulting as well as consensual interest relationships were good predictors of
program success. These tactics need to be understood by OSU Extension newly
employed personnel. Training programs should emphasize the concept of power and
influence tactics in general with special attention to tactics identified in this study.

OSU Extension personnel’s age and sex were important predictors of program
success. Older planners need to be involved in the design and development of OSU
Extension programs. Females showed high levels of perceptions of program success more
than males. Females need to guide training workshops or sessions to explain clearly what
they really do in the planning process that would differentiate them from males in
perceiving program success. Studies need to be conducted to investigate the relationship
between evaluation methods for program planned by females and compare it to programs
planned by males.

Recommendations For Practitioners

1. Program planners should understand the planning situation and identify whose
interests should be satisfied. Issues of power, conflict, and influence tactics are
existing and impacting program planning practices; therefore, planners need to
understand their roles in the planning process in order to stabilize the planning
process.
2. Program planners need to recognize that some planning situations are driven by planners' interests and degree of conflict among these interests; therefore, it is recommended that planners need to understand specific use of each of the seven influence tactics studied in this study. Also, negotiation strategies need to be considered as tools for handling competing interest relationships.

3. Planners need to consider high levels of consulting tactics and low level of conflicting interests in the planning process in order to produce successful programs.

4. It is recommended that planners should analyze the political context of the planning process by identifying the target person(s) power and interest as well as organizational culture and resources as Cervero and Wilson (1994a) put it: “Planners who treat all situations as if they were consensual are likely to serve the interests of those who have the most power; whereas planners who treat all situations as if they were marked by conflicting interests are likely to be seen as suspicious and uncooperative” (p. 130).

5. Planners need to develop negotiation skills in order to justly represent all interests involved in the planning process. Planners should always ask the question: Whose interest should be served?

6. The findings of this study screened patterns of influence tactics that existed across different planning situations. The study highlighted important practices and issues to consider such as program planning is a social activity. It is recommended that planners should pay attention to their type of interests relations as well as their position in various power structures because they certainly are not neutral in the
planning process. Planners are structuring and restructuring power and interest relationships in the planning process. Therefore, they need to strive to give all interests involved in the planning process an equal chance to be satisfied.

7. Current training programs and workshops need to incorporate the concept of power and influence tactics and negotiation strategies in their context as a key preparation for future or newly admitted planners in the field of extension education.

8. OSU Extension needs to reconstruct the way programs are developed by balancing the focus not only on technical knowledge but also on political and ethical knowledge. Political knowledge means understanding the formal and informal communications, knowing the interests being negotiated and which tactics will and will not work in their planning situations. Ethical knowledge means knowing whose interests are being addressed and by whom are being represented in the planning process, and knowing how to differentiate these interests from their own interests.

Recommendations For Future studies

1. Forester (1989) noted that:

[Planners] need to be able to work with others, to develop trust, to locate opposition and support, to be sensitive to timing, and to know the informal ‘ropes’ as well as the formal organizational chart” (p.80).

Therefore, it is recommended that future studies should consider other factors such as organizational structure, culture, and political context.
2. The theoretical framework adopted for this study does not capture the different planning situations in which specific tactics were used and other similar situations in which other tactics were used. It is recommended for future studies to include the identified target person in the study and to compare power and influence tactics in terms of influence tactics impact on both the target person and the planner. This would be done by asking both the target person and the planner to respond to the POINTS instrument at the same time, and, then, compare the results in order to identify if there would be any differences.

3. The POINTS instrument is still in its early development and its reliability needs to be improved. However, the instrument was found to be reliable and valid to measure power and influence tactics. Further instrument improvement should focus on the constructs of power base and type of interest relationships. These two constructs need to be clarified and separated on scale development. In other words, there should be separate items related to symmetrical power, asymmetrical power, consensual interest, and conflictual interest relationships. This separation will allow for better statistical analysis and comprehension of the concepts of power base and type of interest.

4. The study supports Cervero and Wilson's theory of planning responsibly and goes on the same direction that Yang suggested. But, the gap between theory and practice remains open. So, in order to narrow that gap, future studies should focus not only on what program planners actually do, but also on why they do what they are doing. In other words, a qualitative analysis should be carried out to interview planners and ask them why they choose to behave this way (as reported in the POINTS instrument) in
planning situations. This will allow for the identification for any other factors that influence planners’ planning behaviors as well as deep understanding of the concept of power and influence tactics.

5. It is recommended that future studies examine relationships between power and influence tactics and respondents’ job descriptions. This will be an attempt to deeply understand what planners are required to do in the planning situations in order to understand organizational formal restraints and limitations.

6. Program-outcome relationship needs to be investigated in terms of obtaining participants’ feedback as well as planners.

7. In terms of extension as a context for future studies, it is recommended that the POINTS scale should be correlated with other scales that measure other important variables such as organizational structure and culture, available resources for extension programs in relation to the needs addressed and program’s objectives.

8. Future studies need to identify the target persons and ask them to respond to the instrument. Then, the target persons’ scores need to be compared with the planners who identified each target person(s). This will help researchers to test hypotheses that related to each planning contexts and power and influence tactics.

9. Researchers need to pay attention to the influence of the instrument terminology in the perceptions of respondents. Words such as pressuring, counteracting, conflicting, etc. triggers negative perceptions. It was observed that some subjects expressed their negative perceptions on the instrument’s margins.
APPENDIX A
MULTIPLE REGRESSION PLOTS
### Collinearity Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Interest</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power Base</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appealing</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Program Success*

### Durbin-Watson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1.793</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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PART L

1. Please recall any recent extension program you planned with at least one other person.

2. Identify one person with whom you have interacted frequently while planning this program. This person will be referred to as <the person> in the following statements.

3. Read each of the following statements and then circle the number that best represents your opinion.

4. Although we will not ask you to identify the person, please indicate the person's relationship to you by checking one of the following:

   [ ] your supervisor      [ ] your colleague in your organization
   [ ] your subordinate     [ ] someone outside your organization

5. Now, keep this person in mind and answer each of the following items.
1. <The person> and you clearly had different visions for this program

2. <The person> and you had competing personal agendas for this program

3. <The person> and you had conflicting interests for this program

4. <The person> and you were pursuing different goals for this program

5. <The person> and you were unwilling to share the resources you each controlled

6. <The person> could offer rewards to you if you cooperated with him/her

7. <The person> had power to apply pressure or penalize you if you failed to cooperate with him/her

8. Overall, <The person> had more power than you during the planning process
PART II.

Directions:

1. Consider the extension program you previously identified.

2. Think about the person you previously identified. This person will be referred to as <the person> in the statements on page 5.

3. Please look at the tactics listed on page 5 and indicate how effective each one would have been in influencing <the person> during the planning process.

4. In reading the statements, please keep in mind that we are not asking what tactics you actually used during the planning process or even whether you believe that a given tactic should have been used. We are simply asking you to judge the likely effectiveness of each tactic if you had, in fact, used it in your dealing with <the person>.

   How effective would each of the tactics have been in influencing <the person>?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Asking &lt;the person&gt; for suggestions about your plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Getting other people to help influence &lt;the person&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Convincing &lt;the person&gt; that your plan is viable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promising to support future efforts by &lt;the person&gt; in return for his or her support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Repeatedly reminding &lt;the person&gt; about things you want done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Offering to do some work for &lt;the person&gt; in return for his or her support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Asking &lt;the person&gt; if he or she has any special concerns about your plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Linking what you want &lt;the person&gt; to do with efforts made by influential people in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communicating your plan in an ambiguous way so that &lt;the person&gt; is never quite clear about it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Presenting &lt;the person&gt; with facts, figures and other data that support your plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Offering to do a personal favor in return for &lt;the person’s&gt; support for your plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Indicating your willingness to modify your plan based on input from &lt;the person&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Simply insisting that &lt;the person&gt; do what you want done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Obtaining support from other people before making a request of &lt;the person&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Taking action while &lt;the person&gt; is absent so that he or she will not be included in the planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Using logical arguments to convince &lt;the person&gt; to support your plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Saying that &lt;the person&gt; is the most qualified individual for a task that you want done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Offering to speak favorably about &lt;the person&gt; to other people in return for his or her support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Indicating that you are receptive to &lt;the person’s&gt; ideas about your plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Withholding information that &lt;the person&gt; needs unless he or she support your plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Telling &lt;the person&gt; that you refuse to carry out those requests with which you do not agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Demonstrating to <the person> your competence in planning the program

31. Waiting until <the person> is in a receptive mood before making a request

32. Raising your voice when telling <the person> what you want done

33. Showing <the person> the relationship between your plan and past practices in your organization

34. Making <the person> feel good about you before making your request

35. Challenging <the person> to do the work your way or to come up with a better plan

36. Making <the person> feel that what you want done is extremely important

37. Demanding that <the person> do the things you want done because of organizational rules and regulations

38. Appealing to <the person’s> values in making a request

39. Asking other people in your organization to persuade <the person> to support your plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PART III.**

Considering the program you just identified, please rate how much do you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Overall, the program was successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. In general, the program reached its established objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The program produced its intended outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. You were satisfied with the program’s final outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. You are willing to participate in planning similar programs in the future with &lt;the person&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. You can describe the planning process of this program as an exciting experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. You enjoyed planning this program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART III.**

*(Please put check mark or write the appropriate numbers)*

47. Your sex is  
   [ ] Female  
   [ ] Male

48. How old are you? _______ years
49. The highest degree you have earned

[ ] Bachelor Degree
[ ] Master Degree
[ ] Doctoral Degree
[ ] Other

50. In general, you have been working as an education or training professional for _______ Years OR _______ Months

51. Your position in the organization can be classified as:

[ ] County Extension Agent and Chair
[ ] County Extension Agent
[ ] District Specialist
[ ] State Specialist
[ ] State Extension associate
[ ] Program Assistant
[ ] Other (please specify): _____________________

52. Please indicate the total number of years you have been employed by OSU Extension. (Fill in the blank) _________ Years

53. Please indicate the total number of years you have been working in your current position in OSU Extension _________ Years

54. Your major program area of responsibility is:

(Please check one)

[ ] Agricultural & Natural Resources
[ ] Community Development
[ ] Family and Consumer Sciences
[ ] 4-H Youth development
[ ] Other. Please specify _________

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope to:

Thani Almuhairi, Ph. D. Candidate
Human & Community Resources Development
P. O. Box # 340037
Columbus OH 43234 - 0037
Telephone # 614-326-3463
E-mail: talmuhairi@yahoo.com

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY
July 3, 01

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about **Power and Influence Tactics in Program Planning** was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of OSU Extension professionals from county, district, and state level.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of OSU Extension professionals it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of OSU Extension professionals.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, (614-284-8933, al-muhairi.1@osu.edu) and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Thani A Al-Muhairi
Graduate Student, HCRD--OSUE
Dear Extension State Specialist,

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about Power and Influence Tactics in Program Planning was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of OSU Extension professionals from county, district, and state level.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of OSU Extension professionals it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of OSU Extension professionals.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now at 614-284-8933 or e-mail me at al-muhairi.1@osu.edu or reply to this e-mail, and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Your response is vital to the success of the study, but if you do not want to participate for any reason, please, reply to this e-mail with the word IGNORE.

Thanks

Sincerely,
Thani A Al-Muhairi
Graduate Student, HCRD—OSUE
Dear Extension State Specialist

Last 4 weeks a questionnaire seeking your opinion about Power and Influence Tactics in Program Planning was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of OSU Extension professionals from county, district, and state level.

If you have already completed and returned it to us please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of OSU Extension professionals it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of OSU Extension professionals.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now at 614-284-8933 or e-mail me at al-muhairi.1@osu.edu or reply to this e-mail, and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Your response is vital to the success of the study, but if you do not want to participate for any reason, please, reply to this e-mail with the word IGNORE. Thanks

Sincerely,
Thani A Al-Muhairi
Graduate Student, HCRD--OSUE
May 18, 2001

Dear Extension Professional,

Enclosed is a mail questionnaire that has been developed for use in a study related to Program Planning Practices used by OSU Extension personnel. The main purpose of the study is to determine the role of power and influence tactics as exercised by OSU Extension personnel to produce programs and how influence tactics affect the quality of the planned programs. Before we can collect data, this instrument needs to be tested and its reliability needs to be established—and that is where your turn comes.

Your name was drawn in a random sample of OSU Extension Personnel. In order to improve the quality of program planning practices and the planned program itself, it is very important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. Responding should take less than fifteen minutes of your time, but it will be critical to the success of the study. We would urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope no later than June 3, 2001 to Thani Almuhairi at P.O. Box # 340037, Columbus, OH 43234-0037. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Thani Almuhairi at (614) 284-8933 or e-mail al-muhairi.1@osu.edu

You may be assured that your response will remain completely confidential. Your name will never be placed on any part of the study.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. Your input will help us improve our programs and satisfy our clients. Your name will be entered in a thank you prize drawing (see attached paper). Six people will be randomly selected as winners. Each person will receive a $25 gift certificate that will be mailed to them immediately. This is our way of saying thank you for your participation in this study.

Sincerely

Dr. Nikki L. Conklin
Team Leader, Training and Development
Ohio State University Extension

Thani Almuhairi
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Human and Community Resource Development

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of / uture, and County Commissioners Cooperating
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June 20, 2001

Dear Extension Professional,

Program planning involves social interaction and applying specific planning strategies to influence others. Understanding these influence tactics leads to planning high quality programs. This questionnaire measures a wide variety of power and influence tactics identified by Yang (1996) and practitioners in the field. There are probably tactics in the questionnaire that you have never used and it is possible that there are some that you would never even consider using. Even if this may be true, we urge you to participate in this study, as you will find that spending a few minutes reading these tactics is worthwhile. The instrument identifies the array of power and influence tactics that various people use in program planning situations.

This questionnaire consists of four parts. The survey should take 10-15 minutes to complete. The questionnaire will be sent to the randomly selected sample of OSU Extension program personnel at the county, district, and state levels. We realize that your time is of value, but your responses will expand the knowledge of educators about the ways in which people exert influence in educational planning. So, your responses are vital and will be kept confidential. A code number has been placed at the upper right hand corner of the cover page of the questionnaire and will only be used for follow-up purposes and to facilitate the data entry process. All questionnaires will be destroyed. Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty for not doing so. We appreciate your honest responses. Please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by August 20, 2001. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Thani Almuhairi at (614) 284-8933 or e-mail al-muhairi.1@osu.edu.

We thank you again for your valuable input. Please return the questionnaire before August 20th. Your name will be entered in a $25 gift certificate drawing (see attached paper). Also, please accept the included pen as appreciation of your valuable feedback. The drawing and the pen are our way of saying thank you for returning your usable questionnaire and participating in our study. Thanks again!

Sincerely,

Dr. Nikki L. Conklin
Team leader, Training & Development
Ohio State University Extension

Thani Al-muhairi
Graduate Student
Human and Community Resource Development

The Ohio State University. The United States Department of Human and Community Resource Development, and County Commissioners Cooperation.
Dear Colleague,

We are conducting a survey of OSU Extension Personnel in order to gather data on perceptions of power and influence tactics used in the program planning process. We are interested in how OSU Extension Personnel use power and influence tactics to influence the final outcomes of the planned program. We developed the enclosed instrument to obtain the needed data from a random sample of OSU Extension program personnel at the county, district, and state levels.

Before the instrument can be used, the content validity for this study needs to be established. The instrument has been sent to several professionals in the area of Extension education for this purpose. Your assistance as an expert in the field of Extension Education is being sought in determining the validity of this instrument in the following ways:

1. Level of motivation to fill-out the instrument
2. Items’ clarity
3. Items’ complexity
4. Reading level of the instrument
5. Length of the instrument
6. Typographical errors
7. Format
8. Threatening items
9. The instrument’s overall appearance
10. Clarity of instructions

Please, use the enclosed feedback sheet to write your responses. Your response to this request is needed by April 26, 2001.

Please return the instrument with your comments to:
Thani Almuhairi
P. O. Box # 340037
Columbus, OH 43234-0037.
Telephone # (614) 284-8933

Your input to this study is very valuable. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Nikki L. Conklin
Team Leader, Training and Development
OSU Extension

Thani Almuhairi
Ph.D Candidate
Department of Human and Community Resource Development

The Ohio State University, The United States Department of Agriculture, and County Commissioners Cooperating
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> I am planning to collect my data on March/2000.
>
You have my permission to use this instrument in your study. I would like
to have your data set and brief results after the study is finished.
I also would like to let you know that it is possible to use newer version
of the POINTS. One doctoral student at Ball State University is
conducting the study using POINTS and we have been working together to add
some items in order to enhance the quality of the instrument. This study
is anticipated to be done by the end of this year or early next year.
Basically, all of the 31 items are kept and a couple candidates are added
to test the possible inclusion to increase both reliability and validity.
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