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Wherever I found the living,
There I found the will to power

--Nietzsche

Power tends to corrupt and
absolute power corrupts absolutely

--Lord Acton
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Interpersonal relationships are complex, complicated and diverse; yet, these relationships are a part of everyday life for all people, from birth until death. They form the basis for actions and reactions between individuals, family members, communities, governments, and even nations. Political relations and foreign policies can often hinge on the interpersonal relationships between negotiators and/or national leaders. Interpersonal relationships are an integral part of our lives and as such, are worthy of examination.

There are many components involved in a relationship of any kind between two or more individuals. A central, yet often subtle, component is that of power, which is a pervasive and significant element in most relationships. Power refers to the ability or capacity to induce change in the actions or beliefs of another individual. A substantial amount of literature in the areas of organizational development and industrial psychology has focused on the construct of power (Ghiselli, 1971; Tedeschi, 1970; Korman, 1971; Tannenbaum, 1968). In studies examining organizational structure, power is usually a function of position (Stogdill, 1959; McCall, 1978), e.g., higher position being associated with greater power. In interpersonal relationships among peers, it is the power that creates position, e.g., the stronger person
assuming the more powerful position (Emerson, 1962).

Social psychologists, as well as philosophers and political scientists, have discussed the concept of power to only a limited degree throughout the last four decades. Russell (1938) believed that power was the fundamental concept in social science in the same sense in which energy was the fundamental concept in physics. Lasswell and Kaplan (1950) viewed power as a special case of influence to obtain a particular end result. Cartwright (1959) postulated a theory of power following Lewin's field framework theory and described power as the ability of O "to perform acts which activate forces in P's life space" (p. 193). The Lewinian concept of a "force" referred to an induced tension to change (Johnson, 1974). In one of the most substantial and influential writings on power, French and Raven (1959) devised a typology of bases of social power. Power has been examined as the property of the social relationship, not as an attribute of the actor (Emerson, 1962; Jacobson, 1972), and also as the function of the individual, as part of the social relationship (Minton, 1967; Heider, 1958). It has been found that power is used differently by men and women (Johnson, 1974), and the way in which power is used may have psychological implications for the individual (Marecek, 1976).

There are many significant factors affecting power, all of which appear to contribute in some way to an individual's perception of powerfulness or powerlessness. These factors may be found within both the individual attempting to demonstrate her/his power, the influencer, and the person receiving the power attempt, the influencee. Johnson (1974) documented the relationship between sex and type of power
messages. In addition, she found that subjects who increased in feelings of competence also changed the type of power message used. Therefore, sex and self-esteem can be linked to type of power messages.

Goodstadt and Hjelle (1979) examined locus of control and types of power, and found a relationship between internal control and direct power messages. It appears consistent to investigate these same variables of sex, self-esteem, locus of control and sex-role stereotyping, with perceptions of power.

Sex-role identity together with psychological androgyny is one of those factors which may have an impact on perceptions of power. The feelings and beliefs one has toward identifying with the characteristics associated with one's own or opposite sex, called sex-role stereotyping, has encouraged much theorizing (Wesley & Wesley, 1977) and investigation (Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Some limited work has been done in the areas of sex-role stereotyping and power (Johnson, 1974; Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, in press). Johnson (1974) concluded from her doctoral research that women use power strategies differently than men, and are expected to do so. Women tend to use more indirect types of power, which may be related to less knowledge and reasoning and greater manipulation (Johnson, 1976). Weak types of influence are generally used by people "who lack the requisite concrete resources, status, expertise and/or self-esteem to use stronger power sources" (Johnson, 1976, p. 2). Furthermore, Marecek (1976) stated that women are more likely to feel powerless and to lack control which may then lead to negative psychological and behavioral consequences. Finally, Jakubowski (1977) found that "when women are
non-assertive, they usually feel a loss of personal power and self-esteem and an increased sense of anger and hurt" (p. 154).

Recently, an interest in research has emerged with regard to sex-role stereotyping and self-esteem (Wetter, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Sex-role stereotyping refers to the process by which certain characteristics are ascribed to an individual based upon the person's biological sex (Fromuth, 1978). Tolor, Kelly and Stebbins (1975) learned that "women low in sex-role stereotyping had more positive self-concepts than men low in sex-role stereotyping" (p. 157). In other words, women who did not ascribe many feminine characteristics to themselves had more favorable self-concepts than men who did not ascribe many masculine characteristics to themselves. Sex differences in self-evaluation revealed that female self-evaluation comes from different sources than male self-evaluation and that women tend to derive their self-evaluation from "social certainty," while men rely on other sources (Berger, 1968). Spence et al. (1975) found that androgynous and masculine-typed individuals in comparison to feminine-typed or undifferentiated individuals have higher levels of self-esteem. Johnson (1974, 1976) and Marecek (1976) believed that sex, sex-role stereotyping and self-esteem may be considered influential factors in an individual's feelings of power.

Individuals who view themselves as having an impact on their lives, and as creating their own destinies are described as having an internal locus of control. Hence, it is possible that the orientation of an individual, internal or external, i.e., one's locus of control, will be associated with the degree of power which one believes one
possesses. Locus of control and self-esteem, or confidence, have been examined, and Crowne and Liverant (1963) determined that individuals who are externally oriented tended to be less confident and more conforming. The conformer had a high need for approval and affection, but a low belief that these can be gained through her/his own abilities and efforts. He had a "low evaluation of himself and his fear of social rejection results in a strong disposition to conform" (p. 554). Lefcourt, Hogg, Struthers, and Holmes (1975) learned that low-confident externals were more uncomfortable when encountering adversity than high-confident internals. This suggested that individuals who were low in feelings of self-confidence and control over their lives were more likely to have difficulty dealing with problems than were people who were high in feelings of self confidence and control.

Purpose of the Study

The central purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between perceptions of power and 1) self-esteem, 2) sex, 3) sex-role stereotyping, and 4) locus of control, as measured by self-report instruments. A second purpose of this study was to determine the predictability of perceptions of power based on knowledge of self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control.

Specifically, the following questions were addressed: (1) How is self-esteem related to perceptions of power? (2) How do perceptions of power differ for men and women? (3) How is sex-role orientation related to actual perceptions of power? (4) How is locus of control orientation related to perceptions of power? (5) What are the
interactive effects of the variables of self-esteem, sex, sex role stereotyping, and locus of control on perceptions of power? (6) With what degree of certainty can perceptions of power be predicted, either singly or in combination, from self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control?

Research Hypotheses:

1) Persons with high self-esteem will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than persons with low self-esteem.

2) Men will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than women.

3) Individuals who are androgynous or masculine sex-typed will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than individuals who are feminine sex-typed or undifferentiated.

4) People who are internally oriented will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than people who are externally oriented.

5) Perceptions of power may be predicted from a subject's level of self-esteem and locus of control, as well as sex and sex-role stereotyping.

Need for the Study

Although power has been of interest since at least the time of ancient Greece (Dahl, 1957), and had been widely examined by organizational psychology, the study of power in relationships and individual psychology has not been researched as widely until the last few
decades (Cartwright, 1959).

Specifically, in the past decade, more studies have focused on power and the individual than at any previous time. In fact, power has become such a widely discussed topic that it has reached the "pop psychology" bookshelves (Korda, 1975). Scanzoni (1972) found that power plays an integral and important part in marriage and the continuation of the family, while Winter (1973) reported that the need for power appears to be a central component in families, organizations and individuals. Intrigued by his observations, Winter (1973) developed an instrument to measure need for power. McClelland (1976) believed that there is a motivation for power in all persons and that this effects our interpersonal relationships. Sex-role identity effects the type of power strategy chosen by individuals (Johnson, 1974), with women often selecting less direct methods based on less knowledge and reasoning. Men generally use the power strategies considered to be expert, legitimate and informational (Johnson, 1974; Falbo & Peplau, in press).

Yet, even with the growing interest in power, research still remains focused primarily in organizational development and industrial psychology. Nevertheless, recent studies on interpersonal power have concentrated heavily on types of power (Johnson, 1974, 1976; Falbo & Peplau, in press), and need for power (Winter, 1973). Only one study has been conducted on the joint concepts of locus of control and power (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973), and its focus was on types of power. There has been little research reported in the area of perceptions of power, from the point of view of the individual. Falbo (1977) used a
multidimensional scaling technique to determine the specific strategies used by an individual based on a brief paragraph written by the subjects on "How I Get My Way." By using the Thematic Apperception Test, Winter (1973) devised a projective measure to determine a person's need for power. Both of these measures are somewhat subjective in that the rater must evaluate the individual's intent or strategy by means of content based information analysis. Finally, Johnson (1974) constructed an intricate observational computer based method for her doctoral research, to determine types of power used in relation to sex.

The instrument (Self-Perception Questionnaire) used in the present study is the first self-report measure of power to provide information on an individual's perceptions of power with regard to interpersonal relationships (Thomas, 1980). The Self-Perception Questionnaire (SPQ) provides the researcher with the opportunity to obtain an objective measure of the individual's beliefs about her/his own powerfulness. For the purposes of this study, the SPQ was also used to determine if relationships existed among perceptions of power and other psychological variables. This work, with the use of this new instrument, was a forward development in the research of power and thus in psychological research as well.

Definition of Terms

Power--

It is essential to distinguish between control and power. Control refers to the exercise of authority over someone or something, with the connotation of restraint and of command. Power refers to the
ability, capacity or capability of producing or performing (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1966). The definition of power in interpersonal relationships employed in this study was the "ability to get another person to do or to believe something he or she would not have necessarily done or believed spontaneously" (Johnson, 1976, p. 100). However, this study focused primarily on the individual's perception of her/his power. The definition of perception of power used in this study was the expressed belief by a person regarding her/his present ability to cause intended effects in the behavior or attitudes of another person.

Perception of power was operationally defined as the score obtained on the Self-Perception Questionnaire (SPQ). An individual scoring above the median was considered as perceiving her/himself as powerful. A score below the median indicated a person who perceived her/himself as powerless.

Self-esteem--

Korman (1968) hypothesized three ways to view self-esteem, one of which was a continuous level of self-esteem which is "a relatively persistent personality trait that occurs relatively consistently across various situations" (p. 485). Fry (1976) defined self-esteem as "the value or importance attributed to the self in comparison with others" (p. 45). For the purposes of this study, the definition of self-esteem employed was a combination of Korman's and Fry's: a continuous level of importance and perceived competence the individual holds for the self in comparison to others (Wells & Maxwell, 1976).
Self-esteem was operationally defined as the score obtained on the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI). A person with high (positive) self-esteem was defined as one who obtained a score above the median, and a score below the median indicated an individual with low (negative) self-esteem.

**Sex-Role Stereotyping**

Sex-role stereotyping has been defined previously as the process by which certain characteristics are ascribed to an individual based upon the person's biological sex (Fromuth, 1978). Psychological androgyny is the process wherein a person ascribes to her/himself characteristics associated with both sexes. It is an integration of both masculine and feminine attributes, and depending on the situation an androgynous individual may display either masculine and/or feminine behavior (Bem, 1974).

An individual's sex role identity was categorized into one of four classifications: masculine, feminine, androgynous or undifferentiated. Masculine was operationally defined as a high score on the masculinity scale and a low score on the femininity scale of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). Feminine was operationally defined as a high score on the femininity scale and a low score on the masculinity scale of the BSRI. Androgyny was operationally defined as high scores on both the masculinity and femininity scales of the BSRI. Finally, the sex-role group termed "undifferentiated" was operationally defined as low scores on both the masculinity and femininity scales of the BSRI, using the median split method.
Locus of Control--

Rotter's (1966) definition of locus of control was utilized for this study. He stated

When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control. (p. 1)

Essentially, an individual who believes s/he has the ability to control her/his life is considered to have an internal locus of control, while an individual who believes that her/his life is controlled by luck, chance, fate or powerful others is considered to have an external orientation. For the purposes of this study, the external locus of control was further differentiated to indicate a belief in chance (external-chance) and/or powerful others (external-powerful others).

Internal locus of control was operationally defined as the score on the Internal Scale of the General Attitudes Inventory (GAI). An external-chance orientation was operationally defined as the score on the Chance Scale of the GAI. The external-powerful others orientation was operationally defined as the score on the Powerful Others Scale of the GAI.
Limitations of the Study

The population of this study was limited to college undergraduates at a large public midwestern university. In addition, the sample was limited to students enrolled in Psychology 100, an introductory level course that requires participation in experiments or a written paper.

The average age of the subjects was 19 and most subjects were in the freshman class. The generalizability of this study may be diminished as a function of the age of the subjects and their stage of development. It may be possible to obtain different results with a sample of older individuals who are in another, more stable stage of development.

The study was also limited conceptually by the specific variables chosen, self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. These variables were primarily intrapersonal and were thus, obtained only through self-report. In the same context, the instrumentation is limited to self-report measures, which has inherent the problem of subjectivity and nonobservability.

Finally, the statistical analyses contributed to the limitations of the study. Correlation t-tests, and multiple regression were the only types of analyses performed on the data. The median split method was also used to determine specific categories.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

A review of literature is found in Chapter II, which includes theoretical concepts and research on power. This chapter also contains
a review of research on joint areas of power and self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control.

Chapter III includes information on selection of subjects, instrumentation and methods for data collection and analyses. The data were analyzed in Chapter IV, and Chapter V contains conclusions and implications for future research.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study examined the construct of individual perceptions of power in interpersonal relationships and its relation to self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. The amount of literature in each of these areas is voluminous, with the number of studies on locus of control alone totaling over 200. The review of literature focused upon the most relevant research in each area for this particular study. In addition, a more detailed explanation is provided on the research presented in Chapter I, which served as the theoretical basis for this study.

Power

The review of the literature on power takes the form of examining the development and theoretical conceptions of power. The second section reviews the wide variety of definitions of power and types of power. Finally, the relevant research performed on power is reviewed, along with the research associated with power and the other constructs examined in this study.

Developmental and Theoretical Conceptions

The English word "power" comes from the Old Latin root "potere," which means "to be able." However, the ancient Greek philosophers,
Plato and Aristotle, were interested in power as it related to the study of group behavior and politics. The writings of the early Western European scholars laid the foundation for the study of power pertaining to the individual. Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1940) and Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651) are two classic sources examining power and the social consequences of its application. The early twentieth century literature on power was advanced by significant contributions from Nietzsche (1912) and Russell (1938), stressing power in political, economic and military institutions. Power was seen in terms of force or coercion, and its application was examined in relation to governmental control, revolution, military effectiveness, and diplomacy (Jacobson, 1972). Until the 1930's, power was studied more often and in greater depth from the political science view than from the social science arena. Beginning in the 1930's, when much of social science research was developing, power began to be studied in depth by the social scientists. Following World War II, research in social science in general increased, and thus, studies in power also increased in number and scope.

The theorists in this century writing on power in individuals have stressed several different themes. Adler (1927) was the first psychologist to refer to power, and specifically delineated the "will to power" where he equated power with masculinity. He believed that this striving for power could be found in women also and, that in all people, strivings for power come from feelings of inferiority. In his view, in order to become powerful, one must overcome her/his inadequacies. Attainment of power, then, became a way to effectively prove
that one's weaknesses were now one's strengths, or at the very least, no longer disabilities. In later writings, Adler (1930) broadened his theory of a will to power, to a striving for superiority. Horney (1942) believed that attaining power is a way to cope with anxiety. She agreed with Adler by stating that power is compensation for felt inadequacies. Veroff and Veroff (1972) believe that the need to control or influence others is also similar to Adler's concept of compensatory behavior designed to overcome feelings of inadequacy or powerlessness. After almost one-half century, since Adler's writing, the conceptions originally proposed are again found to be valid (Veroff & Veroff, 1972) following the introduction of a variety of other theoretical formulations.

Another theoretical theme of power is a concept similar to Maslow's (1954) theory of self-actualization. Sullivan (1947) distinguished between two conceptualizations of power, one being similar to Adler's (1930), and the other similar to Maslow's need theory. He termed power drive "a compensatory striving resulting from the frustration of the need to be capable" (p. 72); that is, any need to be adequate. This conceptualization once again parallels Adler's striving to overcome inadequacies, and hence is seen as often leading to behaviors designed to dominate and control others. The power motive compels a person into an activity where the individual would accomplish or satisfy her/his needs (Sullivan, 1947). The behavior of the power motive appears to be one of personal satisfaction with oneself by getting the need met, rather than domination or control of others.
Rollo May (1972) conceived of power as a healthy and necessary attempt to achieve psychological well-being. This view uses power to emphasize Sullivan's (1947) concept of the power motive and Maslow's theory of self-actualization. Power is seen as the midway point in the hierarchy of human needs, between survival and sensual satisfaction, and the need for meaning and moral integrity (Clark, 1971). May (1972) felt that people need to use power to be pleased with themselves. Those individuals unwilling to do this may be unhappy throughout life. Power has a positive connotation for May (1972), indicating "a mixture of conceptualizations including the ability to prescribe behavior, influence decisions, have impact on actions, be satisfied with self, and be happy" (Greenwood, 1979, p. 54). It is the abuse of power that causes negative reactions, since power is often closely related to control (May, 1972). Greenwood (1979) summarizes the controversy of power as a positive or negative force by delineating two major components of power: power for oneself and power over others. McClelland (1975) further defines these as two components of need for power calling them social power and personal power, respectively. Social power involves a motivational force impelling leaders to the unselfish task of guiding their fellow humans. Personal power is the motivational force behind those who want to control others for selfish personal advantage.

A prominent view of power expressed by many theorists is power's integrated and entwined nature in human relationships. Russell (1938) believes that the "fundamental concept in social science is power, in the same sense in which energy is the fundamental concept in physics"
Jacobson (1972) strongly believed that power is inseparable from interpersonal relations. He also expressed the belief that power is not static; it is constantly involved in our changing roles either as power agents (influencer) or power recipients (influencee). Usually a person changes her/his role as power agent or recipient depending upon the situation. Jacobson (1972) further stated that we "need relations with others to determine our power potential" (p. 2), and that "if we ignore power, we cannot expect to be successful in our interactions" (p. 149). Clark (1971) concurs with both Jacobson (1972) and Russell (1938) by stating, "A realistic view of social power requires that it be seen as a pervasive and integrative force, operating in relationship to other forces in the dynamic constellation of the human personality" (p. 1053).

This section briefly reviewed the development of the study of power and focused on several theoretical conceptions of power. The controversy regarding the connotation of power as a positive or negative force continues to exist today. Adler's (1927) and Horney's (1942) views of power as a means of overcoming or coping with inadequacies is still accepted (Veroff & Veroff, 1972). Sullivan's (1947) viewpoint of power as satisfaction of needs and Rollo May's (1972) concept that power is necessary for psychological well-being demonstrates the positive connotation of power, which remains as a prevalent belief in Humanistic Psychology. Finally, this section discussed the integrated and pervasive nature of power in all human interactions.
Definitions and Types of Power

Many of the definitions of power vary as a result of their focus on the connotation of the positive or negative view of power. However, some definitions express a neutral view of power and some are not at all focused on the positive-negative aspects of the situation.

Russell (1938) conceived of power as the production of intended effects, and as such, is a quantitative (measurable) concept. A has more power over B if A achieves many intended effects and B achieves only a few (Russell, 1938). Winter (1973) defines social power as "the ability or capacity of O to produce (consciously or unconsciously) intended effects on the behavior or emotions of another person, P" (p. 5). A similar explanation is presented by Dahl (1957); "A has power over B to the extent he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do" (p. 202). A slightly different conception of power is that of Zander, Cohen and Stotland (1977) who define perceived relative power as "the ability of P to influence O or to determine O's fate indirectly, as P perceives the situation" (p. 17). Power is seen as "a special case of influence" (Lasswell & Kaplan, 1950, p. 76) and as such, is defined as "any process in which a person or group...determines, that is, intentionally affects, the behavior of another person, group, or organization" (Tannenbaum, 1968, p. 5).

As seen in the previous definitions, a central theme in definitions of power is the focus on the individual's ability or capacity to affect behavior change. Weber (1946) describes power as "the ability of an individual or a group to realize its will in a communal action.
despite resistance from others participating in that situation" (p. 117). Power has also been examined as the capability one person has of affecting another's outcomes in an interpersonal relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). A similar view expressed by Greenwood (1979) is "the ability to influence and to have impact upon actions and decisions, therefore, to make things happen." This view is congruent with May's (1972) belief in the use of power toward attainment of psychological well-being. Johnson (1976) has integrated, to some degree, the beliefs of individual ability and impacting on actions by including not only the change of behavior but also the change of beliefs. She defined power as "the ability to get another person to do or to believe something he or she would not have necessarily done or believed spontaneously" (p. 100). It is important to note that social power can be viewed as the capacity as well as the action (Winter, 1973).

Several authors differentiate between power and control. "Control means that power is activated to effect the other's outcomes, causing him to alter his behavior" (Gruder, 1970, p. 114). Greater power does not necessarily imply easier and more effective control of another's behavior. Hesketh (1974) sees the need for power or power motivation as "the individual's willingness to control or exert influence over other's behavior or even over the environment" (p. 3).

Emerson (1962) defined power as a commodity relationship when he stated:

If we want or need certain things, material or nonmaterial, that another person possesses, we are dependent upon that person in proportion to the strength of our desires for those
things. Further, our dependence upon another is simultaneously related to whether we can get those same things from sources other than the person on whom we are originally dependent. (p. 32)

The supply and demand characteristics of a relationship create a dependency situation as well. Jacobson (1972) concurred with Emerson by stating:

Whatever the nature of our position, it is not the interchangeability of the roles that determines our power; it is the degree to which we are able to minimize or maximize dependency in our relationships. (p. 150)

Therefore, power may be the result of dependency in a relationship, and the more dependent a person is on another, the more power the other individual has and may exercise with respect to the dependent individual. In this supply and demand situation, "power, then, has to do with altering systematic conditions in ways that increase the likelihood of certain events happening and decreasing the likelihood of other events happening" (Oshry, 1976, p. 3). Power is related to controlling resources (Oshry, 1976), and the ability to exert power is based on personal resources (Jacobson, 1972). High power is seen as being associated with such resources as 1) social status, 2) self-confidence and 3) expertise (Johnson, 1976).

In discussing resources of power, Jacobson (1972) states

Our success or failure in using and reacting to power is largely determined by realizing the bases of power available to us, knowing how to use them, and being able to anticipate their probable effects. (p. 19)

The bases of power, types of power and resources of power are used interchangeably in the remainder of this study. Power can be
classified by the manner in which individuals are influenced. A person
can be influenced by 1) physical power, 2) rewards and punishments,
and 3) influence of opinion (Russell, 1938). If one uses Russell's
(1938) conception of power in social science as the same as energy in
physics, then "power, like energy, must be regarded as continually
passing from any one of its forms to any other" (p. 13). These forms
of power can be considered to be such items as wealth, armaments,
civil authority and influence of opinion (Russell, 1938). "No one of
these can be regarded as subordinate to any other, and there is no one
form from which the others are derivative" (Russell, 1938, pp. 12-13).

In an influential paper, French and Raven (1959) outlined five
bases of power, to which Raven later added a sixth (1965). They are:
1) reward power, 2) coercive power, 3) legitimate power, 4) referent
power, 5) expert power, and 6) informational power. Reward power stems
from the influencing agent's ability to mediate rewards, i.e., a parent,
a supervisor, a peer. The strength of the reward power increases with
the magnitude of the reward that the receiver believes the influencer
can impose (French & Raven, 1959). Coercive power arises from the
influencing agent's ability to mediate punishments. Again, it is the
receiver's belief or perception that the influencer is able to impose
punishments. "Coercive power may be used to increase self-esteem, to
give one person a feeling of superiority over the other" (Raven &
Kruglanski, 1970, p. 85), and may also raise the self-esteem of others
who identify with the influencing agent. Zipf (1960) found that reward
power provided greater feelings of internal control than coercive power,
and that reward power produces less resistance than coercive power.
Legitimate power refers to a situation where an influencing agent is permitted or obliged to prescribe behaviors to a receiver who is required to accept the prescriptions. The power of the agent, in this situation, rests solely upon the receiver's belief that the agent "has the right to" influence her/him. A common example of legitimate power would be that associated with a social structure, (e.g., employer-employee, teacher-student, social obligation, or social responsibility) (Johnson, 1974). Referent power describes a situation wherein the receiver identifies with and tries to model the behavior of the influencer. "The appeal to go along with someone because 'I'm just plain folk like you' would be an overt example of referent power" (Johnson, 1974, p. 12). Expert power refers to social influence situations in which the source of the power is based on the attribution of superior skills or knowledge in the influencing agent, (e.g., an attorney's advice, directions from a native of the town). The feelings on the part of the person exposed to the influencing agent with expert power will tend toward external control, believing that powerful others control her/his life and environment (French & Raven, 1959). Informational power involves the ability of the influencing agent to provide the receiver with explanations why the receiver should believe or behave in a particular manner (Johnson, 1974). This has often been termed "persuasion," trying to convince a person to do or believe something.

It is evident from examining these six bases of power that power attempts involve two or more individuals, both of whom must believe in the use of power. The receiver must acknowledge the influencer's
ability to use power with her/him, and the influencer must believe in her/his own ability to use it. Therefore, "power is a property of the social relation...not an attribute of the actor" (Emerson, 1962, p. 32). It is important to recognize that power attempts are dependent upon the perceptions and judgments of the individual or group (Winter, 1973). As beauty lies in the eyes of the beholder, power lies in the receptivity of the receiver.

**Research Findings Concerning Power**

The research on the construct of power is extremely limited, with the major focus being concentrated on theory. However, several major studies will be discussed.

Stotland's (1959) research with low power individuals revealed that they displayed withdrawal responses, showed little aggressive behavior toward the supervisor, and acceded to unreasonable demands by him. High power men tend to offer information and state opinions while low power men solicit these kinds of responses (Bales, 1952).

In an investigation of how subordinates' behavior influences a leader's use of rewarding powers, Kipnis and Vanderveer (1971) found that the presence of a hostile worker caused the leader to allocate more rewards to all compliant workers, as well as to a confederate who had "charmed" the leader. Another study examining power in a working situation found that subjects given the role of supervisors with power believed that their workers were under their control (Kipnis, 1972). Subjects given no power believed that their workers had control over themselves, with their own motivation to achieve. Therefore, people with power believe that those under them are externally oriented
and those people without power view those under them as internally oriented and as having control over themselves (Kipnis, 1972).

Kipnis (1972) stated:

> Power increases the likelihood that the individual will attempt to influence and manipulate others. ...the control of power appears to facilitate the development of a cognitive and perceptual system which serves to justify the use of power. That is, the subjects with power thought less of their subordinates' performance, viewed them as objects of manipulation, and expressed the desire to maintain social distance from them. Interestingly enough, the more the subjects with power attempted to influence their workers, the less they wanted to meet them socially. (pp. 39-40)

He has suggested a chain of events in control of power following the sequence of, influence of other people's behavior, belief that behavior is controlled by the powerholder, which causes a devaluation of the other individual, and finally leads to psychological and social distance (Kipnis, 1972, 1976).

However, later research discovered that when a powerholder used strong means of influence, such as threats (coercion) and promises (rewards), s/he generally believed that s/he was the cause of the target's compliance (Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, & Mauch, 1976). If the powerholder used weak means of influence, such as dependency (referent), then s/he believed that the target complied voluntarily. In a study on conjugal power, the powerholder believed that s/he controlled the target person's behavior by using authoritarian or accommodating types of influence (Kipnis et al., 1976). The more convinced the spouse was of controlling the power in the family, the more s/he relied on influence means that required compliance and avoided means that tended
toward equality (Kipnis et al., 1976). The powerholder was found to devalue the spouse during decision-making, and subsequently evaluated her/himself more favorably. A study investigating the attitudes of employers of domestic maids found similar devaluation and social distancing from the maid (Kipnis et al., 1976).

Power has also been investigated in relation to self-concept, and it was determined that the "individual's relative power in his or her small group is a significant predictor of the direction of changes in his or her self-concept" (Archer, 1974, p. 214). The study consisted of six groups of seventeen members each (102 subjects) that met for approximately forty sessions over four months. The groups were members of a Social Relations course at Harvard University. Archer hypothesized that individuals in powerful positions would have positive changes in self-concept while powerless members would experience negative changes in self-concept. The study supported the hypothesis, concluding that "differential power can be used as a predictor or index of the self-concept changes likely to occur" (Archer, 1974, p. 216). The higher the individual's power rating, the more likely the changes toward openness, leadership, attractiveness, success and confidence that occurred.

This section of the review of the literature focused on power, concentrating on the development and theoretical conceptions, the definitions and types of power, and the relevant existing research. Power is examined in later sections as it relates to the specific construct being investigated in the current study.
Power and Self-Esteem

Self-esteem (self-confidence) has been associated with successful, well-liked individuals, who are often considered to be powerful. Our effectiveness in interpersonal relations is frequently enhanced by a relatively strong degree of self-assurance (Jacobson, 1972).

The more confident we are of our opinions the more we will exert power as well as resist power attempts directed toward us. Thus, self-confidence can be of considerable benefit to us as either a power agent or power recipient. (Jacobson, 1972, p. 77)

In terms of gaining a leadership position, Russell (1938) found that the person "must excel in the qualities of authority: self-confidence, quick decision, and skill in deciding upon the right measures" (p. 23). Weak types of influence are generally used by people who lack the necessary concrete resources of status, expertise and/or self-esteem to use stronger power sources (Johnson, 1976). Findings indicated that people who use helplessness as a means of power also suffered from a lowering of self-esteem (Johnson, 1976; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970).

In an early study on dominance feeling, Maslow (1939) found that dominance feelings were associated with good self-confidence, self-assurance and feelings of general capability or superiority, and high evaluation of the self. Low dominance feelings are seen as lack of self-confidence, self-assurance and self-esteem. "There are extensive feelings of general and specific inferiority, shyness, timidity, fearfulness, and self-consciousness" (Maslow, 1939, p. 3). If a person is low in dominance-feeling, s/he is more likely to value another person's opinion over her/his own (Maslow, 1939). This is especially true with low-dominance women who usually admire and respect others more than
they do themselves (Maslow, 1942). Jakubowski (1977) found that women's socialization lowers the likelihood that they will act in an assertive manner, and when women are non-assertive, they usually feel a loss of personal power and self-esteem.

Bardwick (1971) believed that a close relationship exists between self-esteem and achievement, since "the striving for success is the striving for self-esteem" (p. 166). According to Hesketh (1974), "Self-esteem moderates the effects of both initiative and need for power, and that self-esteem can also be used as a predictive factor" (p. 171). Both authors believe that achievement, motivation, and need for power are strongly related to self-esteem.

Much research has been conducted on the topic of persuasability (Hovland & Janis, 1959), which has been considered as one aspect of power. "Self-esteem protection can be a motivating factor leading to opinion change for some subjects in some circumstances" (Dinner, Lewkowicz, & Cooper, 1972, p. 412). Cohen (1959) theorized that high self-esteem people are more easily influenced by "optimistic, gratifying and potentially self-enhancing communications than by pessimistic, threatening ones" (p. 387). Low self-esteem has been demonstrated to have the opposite effect (Leventhal & Perloe, 1962). Individuals with high self-esteem are more easily influenced by positive messages that confirm their sense of high self-esteem; whereas, people with low self-esteem are more easily influenced by threatening, devaluing messages, which also confirm their self-esteem. High self-esteem individuals use avoidance-type defenses, such as denial, if their self-esteem is threatened, whereas, low self-esteem individuals use
expressive-type defense mechanisms, such as projection (Cohen, 1959). In general, high self-esteem people are less likely to believe devaluing stimuli than low self-esteem people, and more likely to believe self-enhancing stimuli (Silverman, 1964; Nisbett & Gordon, 1967). High self-esteem subjects are also able to deny threats to their self-worth by presenting themselves as completely unpersuadable (Dinner et al., 1972). They may, on occasion, change their opinion prior to the attacking message, so as not to deal with information that is inconsistent with their self-esteem (Dinner et al., 1972). Another view suggests that self-confident individuals are more likely to believe logical thinking and resist emotional thinking (Jacobson, 1972).

Korman (1971) hypothesized that powerful figures are likely to be more effective among low self-esteem groups than among high self-esteem groups. The ability to influence a high self-esteem person may depend on the perceived similarity between the influencer and the receiver, and whether the influencer is viewed as having power (Korman, 1971). Low self-esteem individuals are not concerned with similarity, but only that the influencer has power. Jacobson (1972) concurred with Korman by stating:

If we require high social approval and have little self-confidence, we will generally accept power attempts more easily in our relatively low status position than someone with high needs for ascendance and independence, who usually has already acquired a higher status and will resist power attempts. (p. 81)

In an extensive study on self-esteem and opinion change, Levonian (1968) administered self-esteem and opinion questionnaires to 540 UCLA
students. One week later, 216 students who were in the no-communication control condition were readministered both instruments. At the same time, 324 subjects were exposed to "persuasive communication." Of these 324 students, 216 were immediately given the opinion questionnaire and 108 were given the questionnaire after another one-week interval. The message and no-message groups were found to be only slightly different in initial levels of self-esteem. The correlation between self-esteem and opinion change for the subjects exposed to the persuasive message was significant such that the higher the self-esteem, the less susceptible the person was to "communication-induced opinion change" (Levonian, 1968, p. 258). It has also been learned that opinion change, or persuasibility, is dependent on the content area to which the opinion refers (Nisbett and Gordon, 1967; Silverman, 1964), and that self-esteem may also vary within the structure and demands of a given situation (Coopersmith, 1959).

Self-esteem may also vary as a function of sex. In a study designed to investigate relationships among self-esteem, autonomy and moral behavior in college students, it was found that self-esteem was an important predictor for these variables with women, but not so much with men (Dickstein and Hardy, 1979). "The woman's self-esteem may be more strongly linked to the effects of her actions on others than is the man's" (Dickstein and Hardy, 1979, p. 55), suggesting that a woman's self-esteem may be a function of her moral behavior. However, Eagly (1969) found no significant relationship between self-esteem and opinion change for women, but a significant relationship appeared for men. Bedeian and Touliatos (1978) tested 85 women undergraduate
business students in upper level courses in order to examine the relationship among self-esteem and work-related motives. They found that women with favorable self-esteem scored high on need for achievement (nAch) and need for power (nPow). However, they also scored high on need for affiliation (nAff), which was not anticipated (Bediair and Touliatos, 1978).

Self-esteem is affected by and affects many aspects of interpersonal relationships. Specific situations can affect self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1959), as well as difficulty of the communicated message (Silverman, Ford, & Morganti, 1966), and the sex of the individual (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Dickstein and Hardy, 1979). Persuasibility and opinion change can be affected by self-esteem (Korman, 1971; Jacobson, 1972), and self-esteem is also viewed as an important component of power (Jacobson, 1972).

Sex and Sex-Role Stereotyping

Personal relationships are an area of reduced power for women (Marecek, 1975). Women are socialized to exhibit "warm and expressive traits" such as gentle, tactful, sensitivity to others (Dickstein and Hardy, 1979; Safilios-Rothschild, 1977; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz, 1972; Weinrich, 1977). Women also evaluate their behavior, and thus themselves, within the context of how their behavior effects others (Dickstein and Hardy, 1979), and are socialized to be accepted when their behavior conforms to what others want them to do (Safilios-Rothschild, 1977). Men are encouraged to have "competency traits" such as being logical, aggressive, independent,
competitive, and successful (Broverman et al., 1972). Men evaluate themselves on the basis of success without dealing with the emotions of another person (Dickstein and Hardy, 1977; Weinrich, 1977). It is believed that the different socialization for men and women contributes significantly to the subordinate, powerless position of women (Safilios-Rothschild, 1977; Archer, 1977).

Men, in American culture, are viewed as having a higher value than women (Archer, 1977; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman, 1968). The characteristics, traits, and activities associated with the male are believed to have more importance and greater value than those associated with the female (Archer, 1977; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). "When women do well, it is more likely to be attributed to luck or special effort, rather than skill or ability" (Weinrich, 1977, p. 20). Safilios-Rothschild (1977) believes that because of these attributions, women lose their self-identity and only see themselves from a man's viewpoint. Consequently, there may be negative psychological consequences for women as a result of the present stereotypic sexual situation (Marecek, 1975; Safilios-Rothschild, 1977).

Women are at heightened risk for disorders involving low self-esteem, passivity, guilt, depression, and social withdrawal. Feelings of inadequacy and passivity can easily lead to helplessness and behavioral paralysis. Guilt can lead to self-abasement and inhibition of assertiveness. Thus, the 'feminine' psychological disorders exacerbate, rather than reduce, powerlessness. (Marecek, 1975, p. 5)

Women are more frequently diagnosed as mentally ill than men, and upon admission to a hospital are more often diagnosed as depressed,
psychoneurotic, and psychotic than are men (Lipshitz, 1977). Lipshitz (1977) believed that women turn their feelings inward rather than expressing them, and are thus characterized by states of retreat-like psychosis.

Scanzoni (1972) found that, across socioeconomic status, husbands consistently seem to have more power than their wives. This is particularly true in both agrarian and urban societies, because men possess greater access to resources on which power is based (Scanzoni, 1972). "So long as husbands keep the provider role to themselves—as uniquely their possession—there will continue to be differentiation of power within the conjugal family, and wives will continue to possess lesser amounts of that power" (Scanzoni, 1972, p. 69).

A common assumption made regarding women is that they are more susceptible to social influence and less "rational" than men (Archer, 1977). Studies have reported different findings in this area. Archer (1977) found that in his recent work this was not substantiated. However, in earlier research, Eagly (1969) learned that a significant relationship existed between sex-role identity and acceptance of influence among women, but not men. She believed this suggests that influencibility is "governed by sex-specific role expectations" for women only (p. 587). It may also indicate that women who have a high score on a femininity scale are more likely to accept a fairly "traditional" definition of the feminine role (Eagly, 1969), which may include being easily influenced.

Women generally use indirect expressions of power (Marecek, 1975). However, this may be relative to how one feels about oneself (Johnson,
1976). A relationship exists between a woman's feelings about herself and the type of power message selected as more favorable to her (Johnson, 1976). A strong, dominant, independent woman will choose an informational power message, whereas a less competitive or less powerful woman will choose a more helpless power response (Johnson, 1976; Weinrich, 1977). Feminists and professional women are more independent, assertive and autonomous than traditional women and thus more willing to use stronger types of power (Weinrich, 1977). They also have "high self-esteem, a sense of control of their own destiny, and have less need to define themselves in terms of how others see them" (Weinrich, 1977, p. 26).

Using the Dominance scale (Do) on the CPI, Megargee (1969) compared four groups on a task involving a leader and a follower to examine the influence of sex roles on leadership. He found that sex-role identity conflicted seriously with leadership by high dominant women, since low dominant men still acted as leaders when paired with high dominant women. In other words, women acquiesced to the social norm of allowing men to become the leaders (Megargee, 1969). Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) learned that in general self-concept follows along stereotypic lines; that "the self-concepts of men and women are very similar to the respective stereotypes" (p. 295). This would imply that women view themselves as exhibiting the expressive traits and men view themselves as demonstrating the competency traits. In addition, it would suggest that women see men as more valuable than they view themselves. Elman, Press and Rosenkrantz (1970) also examined self-concepts and sex-roles. They concluded that
Individuals are content neither with the sex roles nor with the relative position of self with respect to the sex roles as they are perceived to exist at present. The conceived ideal sex roles showed a shift toward a more flexible sex typing in which both males and females may possess similar desirable traits. (p. 456)

**Locus of Control**

Internal control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being a consequence of one's own actions and thereby under personal control; external control refers to the perception of positive and/or negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviors in certain situations and therefore beyond personal control. (Lefcourt, 1966, p. 207)

The earliest writings on locus of control (or I-E) from the social learning viewpoint come from Phares (1957). However, the first attempt to measure the I-E dimension appeared in Phares' (1955) doctoral dissertation. He developed a Likert type scale with thirteen items as externally oriented and thirteen items as internally oriented. James' (1957) dissertation developed another scale, which has come to be known as the James-Phares scale. However, the most widely used instrument is that developed by Rotter (1966) called the I-E scale.

The basic hypothesis of the social learning theory related to locus of control involves the individual's belief about expected reinforcements. If a person believes a reinforcement to be contingent upon her/his own behavior, then the type of reinforcement, positive or negative, will strengthen or weaken the potential for the behavior to recur in the same situation again (Rotter, 1966). If a person believes
the reinforcement is outside her/his control then the preceding behavior is less likely to be strengthened or weakened (Rotter, 1966). This belief can be situationally specific (Phares, 1976), since a measure of locus of control describes an individual's "average" attributes over a variety of situations. The wider the range of situations, the less predictive the concept will be (Phares, 1976).

Davis and Phares (1967) found that internally oriented individuals tend to seek information to a greater degree than externally oriented individuals. A classic study by Seeman and Evans (1962) has also supported this conclusion. In a study of 43 matched pairs of white male tuberculosis patients, nurses and doctors were asked to rate the patients' knowledge of their disease. In addition, patients were asked to express their belief and knowledge about their condition. Seeman and Evans (1962) found that internals knew more about their condition, asked more questions of the staff about their disease and their own condition, and indicated less satisfaction with the amount of information they were getting from the hospital personnel than externals. Generally, internals attempted to achieve a greater degree of control over their life situations than externals. This also suggests that a person who believes that s/he has no control over the environment will also reduce the acquisition of information; it is not seen as being productive or capable of impacting on another person or the environment (Seeman & Evans, 1962).

In a similar study with reformatory inmates, Seeman (1963) learned that information retention may be related to locus of control. He gave the inmates three types of information and six weeks later
assessed their retention of the information. Only one of the three types of information was relevant for this population, and this had to do with obtaining parole. Seeman (1963, 1967) found that internals recalled significantly more relevant information (regarding parole) than externals. However, this was not substantiated on the nonrelevant information. He suggested that an individual's sense of powerlessness controls her/his attention and acquisition processes. Levenson (1974) found that males who felt that chance or fate controlled their lives (externals) had significantly less information than those who believed chance did not control their lives (internals). Phares (1968) examined utilization of information, and learned that internals more correctly associated information, or better utilized information, than externals. The use of, attention to, and acquisition of information is related to the fact that the internal individual believes s/he has greater potential for effectiveness in the environment and information is one means of effecting one's environment.

Persuasion or influence attempts may vary with individuals of different I-E orientation. Internals are more resistant to some influence attempts than externals (Getter, 1963; Gore, 1963; Strickland, 1963). Lefcourt, Lewis and Silverman (1968) found internals more willing "to believe or to be influenced by directions emphasizing skill determination when there is some hope for mastery in the task" (p. 676). Experimenters in research studies who were internally oriented were able to produce more attitudinal change in the subjects than were externally oriented experimenters (Phares, 1965). In fact, the amount of influence shown by external experimenters was no greater than the
control group where no influence was exerted. Phares (1965) believed that this finding strongly suggests that the major variable in social influence is the I-E control dimension.

Strickland (1970) examined the awareness of influence attempts in an experiment on verbal conditioning. She learned that internals tend to deny having been influenced more than externals. "Internals are not simply resistant to influence, but are discriminating about what influences they will accept" (Lefcourt, 1976, p. 44). Authority alone does not have much impact on the acceptance of another person's viewpoint for internals (Lefcourt, 1976). However, when internals change in belief, they generally change in behavior as well. Lefcourt (1976) reported that

When a person believes that he is the responsible agent or source of his own life's fortunes, he will resist influence attempts which aim to by-pass his own sense of moral justice, and will respond to those appeals that address themselves to his own beliefs and values. (p. 50)

Ritchie and Phares (1969) wanted to know if the status or prestige of the communicator would have differential effects on internal or external individuals. They predicted that externals would demonstrate greater attitude change when a high-prestige source was communicating than when a low-prestige source was giving information, and that externals would show more attitude change than internals when both are getting information from the high-prestige source. They reported that externals demonstrated less change than internals in the low-prestige condition and more change than internals in the high-prestige condition. This suggests that externals are influenced by the source
of the communication, and perhaps internals are influenced by the content of the communication (Ritchie & Phares, 1969).

Conformity may also be related to locus of control, in that people who conform are usually externals and believe in luck, fate or powerful others (Crowne & Liverant, 1963). Conformers tend to be less confident than independents and have a high need for approval and affection, but a low belief that these can be gained through their own abilities and efforts (Crowne & Liverant, 1963). Internals are less conforming than externals.

Minton (1967) suggested that locus of causality, viewing oneself instead of others as responsible for one's behavior, is inherent in feelings of powerfulness. Internals appear to enjoy greater "potential for power" (Phares, 1976).

It certainly seems that one major component of power must be an internal locus of control. It is difficult to understand how individuals could consistently seek power or control over their environment without an accompanying belief in the efficacy of their own behavior. (Phares, 1976, p. 176)

If individuals don't believe they can control reinforcements, then they are not likely to act in ways to attain power or influence the environment (Phares, 1976). A person who exercises power is likely to be one who has an internal belief, but being internal is not sufficient to acting in a powerful manner (Phares, 1976).

Finally, internals use different types of power than externals (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973). When examining what happens when power is given to powerless, external, people, Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) found that externals tend to use more coercive types of power, such as
punishment, than internals, who would use personal persuasion.

Summary:

Relevant theory and research on the constructs of power, self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control have been reviewed in this chapter. Integration and synthesis is made difficult by the fact that these constructs have rarely been examined together. The need for research which attempts to investigate these constructs is evident.

Power has both positive and negative connotations associated with it. The viewpoint has been presented that attainment of power was the accomplishment for having overcome inadequacies and anxiety. The positive aspects of power were supported as contributing to psychological well-being and self-actualization. Definitions of power were examined from a quantitative outlook, a capability perspective, and a supply and demand focus. Types of power were presented and explained, and finally specific research was viewed stressing the relationship to theory and to the other variables in the current study.

Self-esteem was found to be an important concept in the literature associated with power, and possibly considered to be a resource in any power relationship. Individuals with high self-esteem tend to exert more power and at the same time, resist more power than individuals with low self-esteem. Self-esteem has been found to impact on influencibility, with high self-esteem individuals less persuadable than low self-esteem.
Sex and sex-role stereotyping were found to be related to both self-esteem and power. Cultural socialization has a significant effect on an individual's self-esteem, and on her/his perceptions of power. Women often base their self-esteem on what others think of them, whereas men are not so concerned about others' opinions. Men tend to use direct expressions of power, while women use indirect, subtle power messages.

Finally, locus of control was associated with power, since it is difficult to feel powerful without also having an internal orientation. Internals tend to seek and retain information more than externals, which can have an influence on ability to exert power. Internals also tend to be more resistant to subtle influence attempts than externals. Different types of power messages are used by internals and externals, with externals being more coercive.

This chapter reviewed the literature on power, self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. A discussion of the methodology used for this study is presented in Chapter III.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between power and the variables of self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. This chapter presents the setting for the study, the population, the sample, the instrumentation, and the methods for data collection and analysis.

Setting

This study was conducted at the main campus of The Ohio State University, a large midwestern university. The Ohio State University is a publically funded university with the majority of the undergraduate student body coming from within the state of Ohio. The Ohio State University offers degree programs in a wide variety of fields, including bachelor and graduate degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, in agriculture, and in the health sciences.

Population

The population was comprised of student volunteers enrolled in an introductory psychology course (Psychology 100) during the latter
part of Winter Quarter, 1980. Most of the students enrolled in Psychology 100 are undergraduate students from University College (UVC), which is the college of entry for all freshman and transfer students. There are approximately 17,000 freshman and sophomores enrolled in UVC each quarter. Fifteen curricular academic programs (CAPs) exist within UVC. Each CAP area represents a group of majors that have in common a curricular academic program, such as all Engineering majors as one CAP. However, the additional CAP area of General Baccalaureate Curriculum (GBC) is for those students who have yet to declare a major, and the central focus within this CAP area is advisement toward a career choice.

Students remain in UVC during their freshman and sophomore years, or until they have completed the prerequisites for their chosen major field of study, whichever comes first. In addition to the prerequisites for a particular major, all students are required to complete specific university requirements. The Ohio State University requires all undergraduate students to take Basic Education Requirements (BER's), which are comprised of courses in Humanities, Natural Science, and Social Science.

Psychology 100 is one of the courses available to choose as part of the Social Science requirement. The course requires either a written paper or participation in psychological experiments. A variety of experiments are available from which to choose for those students who select to participate in experiments. It should be noted that a basic introductory psychology course is offered at almost every college or university in the country. Also, a great many studies nationwide use
this population as the normative data base for theory and instrument research.

Sample

Approximately two thousand three hundred students enrolled in Psychology 100 during Winter quarter, 1980, with the majority being freshmen, ages eighteen and nineteen. One hundred ninety-one subjects participated in this study, 91 women and 100 men. The mean age of the participants was 19.22 for both men and women, and the range of ages was from 17 to 36. The sample for this study appeared to be consistent with the general Psychology 100 population during Winter quarter, 1980. The study was available for participation during the second one-half of the quarter, and was offered without financial incentive.

Instrumentation

Self-Perception Questionnaire:

The Self-Perception Questionnaire (SPQ) was used to measure perceptions of power (Thomas, 1980). This instrument was designed to measure individual perceptions of powerfulness or powerlessness in interpersonal relationships. This instrument is the first known self-report measure of feelings of power (see Appendix A).

Subjects were instructed to rate how well each of the twenty items on the SPQ describes her/himself. A six-point Likert scale, varying from one (1), "strongly disagree" to six (6), "strongly agree," was used to rate each item. On the basis of these responses, each
subject's score for perceptions of power was obtained by summing the responses.

Subjects from The Ohio State University, who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course, served as the sample for the normative data (n = 310; Thomas, 1980). Thomas reported that the perceptions of power scale has a high internal consistency reliability as measured by the Kuder-Richardson formula, .86. The test-retest reliability for a three-week period was also high (γ = .75, n = 84).

**Texas Social Behavior Inventory:**

The short form of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) was used to measure individual self-esteem. The Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI) was used to measure individual self-esteem (see Appendix B). The TSBI, devised by Helmreich, Stapp and Ervin (1974), contains items designed to determine the individual's self-confidence, social competence and social dominance. However, the scale appears to measure an overall social self-esteem (Helmreich, Stapp, & Ervin, 1974).

The short form was designed from the original form consisting of thirty-two items. The need for retesting and rapid administration was the impetus for the development of the short form. The selection of items for inclusion in the short form was based on administering the preliminary test to students at the University of Texas at Austin (248 males and 282 females). The factor analysis of the short form was similar to the original scale and based on a second sample of 238 male and 262 female undergraduates. The correlation of the short form used in this study with the original form was .973 for males and .974
for females. A sample of college students were used to demonstrate the low correlations of the original TSBI with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (.12 in women and .29 in men; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1978).

The TSBI short form consists of sixteen items, of which the subject is asked to rate each one on a six-point Likert scale, from one (1), strongly disagree, to six (6), strongly agree. The possible range of scores is from sixteen to ninety-six.

**Bem Sex-Role Inventory:**

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) was used to measure individual sex-role identity (Bem, 1974). This instrument was designed to determine the degree to which a person ascribes traditionally masculine or feminine characteristics to her/himself. The BSRI contains three scales, Masculinity, Femininity, and Social Desirability, each of which consists of twenty items. A sample consisting of male and female college students, judged the items on the Masculinity and Femininity scales to contain personality characteristics more desirable for males and females, respectively. The Social Desirability Scale, which contains neutral items with respect to sex, was originally used to insure that the inventory would not be measuring a general tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. It is now used as a neutral context for the Masculinity and Femininity scales (see Appendix C).

Students from Stanford University and Foothill Junior College in California served as the samples for the normative data (Bem, 1974). Bem reported that the scales have high internal consistency reliability
(Masculinity scale \( \gamma = .86 \); Femininity scale \( \gamma = .80 - .82 \); Androgyny scale \( \gamma = .85 - .86 \)). Masculinity and Femininity scores are empirically independent (\( \gamma = -.02 - .11 \)). The test-retest reliability over a four-week interval was particularly high (\( \gamma = .90, .90, .93 \) for masculinity, femininity and androgyny, respectively).

Subjects were instructed to rate how well each of the sixty items on the BSRI describes her/himself. A seven-point Likert scale, ranging from one (1), "Never or almost never true," to seven (7), "Always or almost always true," is used to rate each item. On the basis of these responses, the subject receives two scores, a Masculinity score and a Femininity score, which are the mean of the ratings assigned to the masculinity and femininity items, respectively. Scores on each scale can range from one to seven. The Social Desirability Scale was not used in this study.

The subjects were classified into sex-role categories according to the median split method described in the administration and scoring guide of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The total group medians for the Masculinity and Femininity scales were obtained. Subjects who scored above the median on the Masculinity scale and below the median on the Femininity scale were classified as "masculine"; those who scored below the median on the Masculinity scale and above the median on the Femininity scale were classified as "feminine." The "androgynous" category was determined by those subjects who scored above the median on both the Masculinity and Femininity scales and those subjects who scored below the median on both scales were classified as "undifferentiated."
The General Attitudes Inventory (GAI) was used to measure individual locus of control (see Appendix D). Levenson (1974) devised this instrument as a further refinement of Rotter's (1966) I-E Scale. She did not believe that Rotter's scale was unidimensional, particularly with respect to the external orientation. Levenson wanted to differentiate between chance expectancies as a separate orientation from the expectancies of powerful others. There are three scales, Internal, Powerful Others, and Chance, which were administered as one total instrument. The division into the three distinct areas, I, P, C, comes from the logic that "people who believe the world is unordered (chance) would behave and think differently from people who believe the world is ordered but that powerful others are in control" (Levenson, 1974, pp. 377-378). It is further reasoned that an individual who believes in a chance orientation, a high C score, is one who would act and think differently from an individual who believes s/he is not in control, a low I score.

The GAI consists of three scales, Internal, Powerful Others, and Chance, each containing eight items. There are several items adapted from Rotter's I-E Scale, in addition to a set of statements written exclusively for the new scales. The subject is asked to rate each of the twenty-four items on a six-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The possible range of scores on each scale is from eight to forty-eight. Ninety-six male and female adults from a Southwestern metropolitan area served as the original sample for normative data (Levenson, 1974). Levenson reports moderately high
internal consistency, with the Kuder-Richardson reliabilities, coefficient alpha, yielding $\gamma = .64$ for the I scale, .77 for the P scale and .78 for the C scale. Split-half reliabilities, Spearman-Brown, were: $\gamma = .62, .66$ and .64 for the I, P, C scales, respectively. The test-retest reliabilities for a one-week period were: $\gamma = .64, .74$, and .78. In a second study, the GAI was administered to 329 undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory chemistry course at Texas A & M University. Results obtained from this administration were factor analyzed and supported to insure the independence of the three factors.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale:

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SD) was used to determine the degree to which a subject was responding to any of the previous scales in a socially desirable manner (Marlowe & Crowne, 1967). Subjects were asked to rate each of the thirty-three (33) items either true or false (see Appendix E). Of the thirty-three items, eighteen were keyed true and fifteen were keyed false. Therefore, a score above the median indicated that a subject was responding to what s/he believed to be socially appropriate, rather than responding to how s/he may actually behave. The Kuder-Richardson internal consistency coefficient was .88. Test-retest reliability for a one-month period was .88 (n = 57; Marlowe & Crowne, 1967).

Data Collection

The students who participated in the study signed up for an experiment entitled "Attitudes, Beliefs and Perceptions." At this time, they
were instructed to report to a classroom at a specified time to be administered the research instruments. The instruments were administered in a specific order within each packet, and each packet had a random order. The measures took approximately fifty minutes to complete.

After all subjects were seated, and the examiner had passed out the test packets, the following set of instructions were read:

You are being asked to fill out five questionnaires. Complete the questionnaires in the order in which they were given to you. As you finish each questionnaire, including the last one, please raise your hand and I will collect it from you. When you have finished the last one and it has been collected, please remain seated. When everyone has completed all the questionnaires, I will give you a brief explanation of my research and answer any questions you might have. Please answer the questionnaire 'as it describes you, or as you believe it to be true of you,' not an ideal person.

When all questionnaires were collected, the examiner explained the process by which the subjects were able to obtain the results of their questionnaires. Each packet had a number on it from one to two hundred, designating the subject's number. A three by five card was available with the examiner's name and phone numbers, as well as a space provided for the subject's number. The subject was asked to contact the examiner to arrange a specific time to review the results of the questionnaires.

The explanation of the research was as follows:

I am interested in how people view themselves, and how this view relates to feeling powerful or powerless with others.
Analysis of Data

The analyses used in this study were conducted to examine the relationships among the variables of perceptions of power, self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping, and locus of control. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients, student's t-tests, one way analysis of variance and multiple regression analyses were employed. In order to determine the bivariate relationships between the variables being studied, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (r) were obtained. Student's t-test comparisons were performed to investigate the differences between males and females, externals and internals, and high and low self-esteem subjects on the perceptions of power variable. One-way analyses of variance were conducted to determine the significance of the relationship between perceptions of power and sex-role stereotyping. Post hoc tests of significance were conducted to clarify the significance of particular groups.

Multiple regression analyses were performed using perceptions of power as the dependent variable. An overall total group multiple regression analysis was conducted with perceptions of power as the dependent variable and self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control as the predictor variables. Separate multiple regression analyses were conducted for both male and female subjects.

The level of statistical significance of each correlation coefficient, t-test, analysis of variance, and multiple regression analysis was determined and provided the basis for accepting or rejecting each hypothesis.
Chapter IV
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses of this study. Section one reports the descriptive statistics of the population used in the study. Section two, which contains two parts, presents the results of analyses used to determine the relationships among the individual variables as well as the analyses of between group differences. This section reports the data relevant to hypotheses one through four. The third section presents the results of the multiple regression analyses, which are pertinent to hypothesis five. A brief summary is contained in the final section.

Descriptive Statistics

Statistics describing the number of cases, means, medians and standard deviations of the five instruments used in this study are presented in Table 1. Age and class rank are also reported. Separate analyses were conducted for men and women, as well as a total population analyses.

As shown in Table 2, 52% of the sample were male and 48% of the sample were female. A total of 191 subjects participated in this
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Sample on Psychological Variables, Age and Class Rank by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Power</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76.84</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>77.41</td>
<td>77.13</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>68.88</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role Stereotyping</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (I)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>35.61</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> class rank = 1 (freshman), 2 (sophomore), 3 (junior), 4 (senior).
study, with one subject omitting her/his sex on the questionnaire.

Table 2
Description of Sample by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the order of administration of the instruments had any significant effect on any of the variables. The order of the instruments was varied five different ways. Due to unequal n's, Scheffe's post-hoc test was chosen to determine the significance between the means of each order for each variable, power, self-esteem, locus of control and social desirability. Scheffe's method revealed no significant difference among the five orders of administration for each variable (p < .01).

Bivariate Analyses and T-Tests

In order to investigate the relationship of all of the variables under investigation, Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were computed. Table 3 presents these results and includes the analyses of social desirability. As demonstrated in Table 3, perceptions of power was significantly correlated with self-esteem, as measured by
Table 3

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of Perceptions of Power, Self-Esteem, Locus of Control and Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Social Desirability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td>0.31*** 0.07</td>
<td>-0.04 0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37*** -0.15**</td>
<td>-0.25*** 0.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Control (I)</strong></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16** 0.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(P)</strong></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C)</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Desirability</strong></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  **P < .01  ***P < .001
the TSBI ($p < .001$). A positive statistical relationship was reported from the analyses, providing explanation for research question one. A statistically significant positive relationship was also found between perceptions of power and internal locus of control, as measured by the GAI ($p < .001$). This correlation explained research question four and lend support for hypothesis four. It also suggested that as internality increases, so do perceptions of power. Social desirability was significantly related in a positive direction with perceptions of power, although the relationship was a weak relationship.

Table 3 responded in part to research question 5, and indicated statistically significant positive relationships between self-esteem and internality ($p < .001$), and between self-esteem and social desirability ($p < .001$). Research question five asked: What are the interactive effects of the variables of self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control on perceptions of power? Statistically significant negative relationships were found between self-esteem and a belief in chance ($p < .001$), and between self-esteem and powerful others ($p < .05$). Although statistically significant, these relationships are low. This implied that as the belief in powerful others and/or chance increases, self-esteem decreases. Of further interest was the negative statistically significant relationship between internal locus of control and chance ($p < .01$), indicating that internality decreases as a belief in chance increases. Again, this is a weak relationship. Finally, powerful others was significantly correlated in a positive direction with chance ($p < .001$), which suggested that as a belief in chance grows, so does a belief in powerful others.
In order to test hypothesis 1, persons with high self-esteem will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than persons with low self-esteem, t-tests were computed for high and low self-esteem for the psychological variables being examined, and for sex. Table 4 presents the number of cases, means, standard deviations, for each variable, and the t-values, degrees of freedom, a p-values for each test in the comparison of high and low self-esteem groups. The high and low self-esteem groups were formed using a median split on the Texas Social Behavior Inventory scores. As found in Table 4, the results of the Student's t-test comparison indicated a significant difference between the mean scores for perceptions of power (p < .001). High self-esteem subjects felt more powerful than low self-esteem subjects, thus supporting research question one and hypothesis one. In addition, statistical significance was found for the variables of locus of control, on the internal (p < .0001) and chance (p < .01) scales, social desirability and sex-role stereotyping (p < .006). High self-esteem subjects were more internally oriented and felt a stronger need for socially approved behavior than did low self-esteem subjects. Low self-esteem individuals had a greater belief in chance, and self-esteem varied as a function of sex-role stereotyping.

Hypothesis two stated that men will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than women. This was investigated by performing a t-test comparing sex and perceptions of power. Results reporting these t-test group comparisons are presented in Table 5. In addition to power, the other examined variables of self-esteem, locus of control and social desirability were included in this table. Table 5 presents
Table 4

T-Test Comparisons of High and Low Self-Esteem on Power, Locus of Control, Social Desirability, Sex-Role Stereotyping and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Power</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (I)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Rule</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. A median split on the TSBI was used to form high and low self-esteem groups.

Note 2. Separate variance estimates were used in the calculation of these t-tests.

*P < .01  
**P < .001
Table 5

T-Test Comparisons of Males with Females on Power, Self-Esteem, Locus of Control and Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Power</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76.84</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (I)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.77</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25.54</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  
**P < .001
the number of cases, means, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, and probability values for each test. The results of the Student's t-tests indicated no significant difference between the mean scores of men and women on the variable of perceptions of power. Males and females did not significantly differ on their scores on the SPQ. Thus, hypothesis two was not supported.

Table 5 also includes t-test comparisons of males and females on self-esteem, locus of control and social desirability. Statistically significant differences were found between the group means on the Powerful Others and Chance Scales (p < .001). Men scored significantly higher on the P and C scales of the GAI than did women, which indicated that college age men believe that other powerful people and chance factors have a great influence in their lives. Women do not believe this as strongly. Social desirability was statistically significant in a negative direction between the group means for men and women (p < .02). Women scored significantly higher on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale than did men, suggesting that women are more concerned about presenting themselves in a socially approved manner than are men. The t-test comparisons for the variables of self-esteem and internal locus of control did not yield significant differences for men and women.

The results of t-test comparisons of internals and externals on the variables examined are presented in Table 6. The number of cases, means, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, and p-values are reported for each test. Internal and external locus of control groups were formed using a median split on the Internal Scale of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Internals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Externals</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Power</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81.16</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73.54</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70.12</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64.65</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. A median split on the Internal Scale of the GAI was used to form Internal and External groups.

Note 2. Separate variance estimates were used in the calculation of these t-tests.

*p < .001
General Attitudes Inventory. Hypothesis four stated: People who are internally oriented will score higher on the Self-Perception Questionnaire than people who are externally oriented. As found in Table 6, statistically significant mean differences were found for perceptions of power at the .001 level of significance. This significance demonstrated that internal individuals felt more powerful than externals, which supported both research question four and hypothesis four. Of further interest were the statistical significances of self-esteem ($p < .0001$) and sex-role stereotyping ($p < .002$) as compared with internal locus of control. Internals had higher self-esteem than externals, and internality varied as a function of sex-role category. Subject sex and social desirability were not statistically significant for the locus of control variable.

Table 7 presents the results of t-test comparisons of high and low perceptions of power on the variables of interest. The number of cases, means, standard deviations, t-values, degrees of freedom, and probability values are reported for each test. High and low power groups were formed using a median split on the Self-Perception Questionnaire. As found in Table 7, statistically significant mean differences were found for self-esteem at the .0001 level of significance. This result indicated that high power, powerful, individuals have a higher self-esteem than low power, powerless, individuals. In addition, statistical significance was found for the internal ($p < .0001$) and powerful others ($p < .006$) scales on the GAI, sex ($p < .03$) and sex-role stereotyping ($p < .006$). High power subjects were more often internal with a belief in powerful others than were low power subjects. Significantly more women ($p < .03$)
Table 7

T-Test Comparisons of High and Low Power on Self-Esteem, Social Desirability, Locus of Control, Sex and Sex-Role Stereotyping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Power</th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71.89</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (I)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1. A median split on the SPQ was used to form high and low perceptions of power groups.
Note 2. Separate variance estimates were used in the calculation of these t-tests.

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001
were in the low power group than were in the high power group. Finally, perceptions of power differed as a function of sex-role stereotyping.

Analysis of Variance

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the dependent variables of perceptions of power, self-esteem and locus of control by the independent variable of sex-role stereotyping. These analyses were performed to investigate hypothesis three, which stated that individuals who are androgynous or masculine sex-typed will score higher on the SPQ than individuals who are feminine sex-typed or undifferentiated. These results are presented in Tables 8 through 12 and include the degrees of freedom, mean squares, F ratio and probability values for each of the variables.

Table 8 presents the results of the analysis of variance of sex-role categories as a function of perceptions of power. As shown in Table 8, statistically significant effects were found between the means of the four sex-role categories for the variable of perceptions of power ($p < .001$). Scheffe's post hoc procedure ($p < .01$) was performed to determine which sex-role categories were significantly different from each other. The results of this computation revealed that the mean scores of sex-role category one, masculine, were significantly different from the mean scores of sex-role category four, undifferentiated. Masculine sex type, category one, was also found to be significantly different than feminine sex type, category two,
Table 6
Analysis of Variance of Perceptions of Power by Sex-Role Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3860.50</td>
<td>29.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>131.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .001

for perceptions of power, with men attaining a higher mean score on the SPQ. The group of feminine sex-typed individuals were found to obtain a significantly different mean score than the group of androgynous individuals, who obtained the highest mean score of all four sex-role categories. Finally, the group of androgynous sex-typed people had a significantly different mean score than the undifferentiated sex-typed people, with the undifferentiated having the lowest mean score of all four sex-role categories. These results support research question three, which asked, How is sex-role orientation related to perceptions of power?, and confirm hypothesis three. Masculine and androgynous sex-typed individuals scored higher on the SPQ than feminine and undifferentiated sex-typed individuals.

Table 9 presents the results of the analysis of variance of self-esteem as the dependent variable and sex-role stereotyping as the independent variable. Statistically significant effects were
revealed for sex-role stereotyping with self-esteem ($p < .00001$).

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of Self-Esteem by Sex-Role Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1176.28</td>
<td>17.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>67.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S* $p < .001$

Scheffe's post hoc procedure ($p < .01$) was performed to determine the comparisons between means of category. Masculine and feminine sex-typed individuals were found to differ significantly in the mean scores on the TSBI. The masculine sex-typed group demonstrated a higher mean ($\bar{X} = 72.14, SD = 6.61$) than the feminine sex-typed group ($\bar{X} = 65.11, SD = 7.74$), which suggested that those individuals who were scored masculine on the BSRI have greater self-esteem than those who obtained a feminine score. The masculine group also scored significantly higher than the undifferentiated group for self-esteem, with the masculine group attaining the highest mean score ($\bar{X} = 72.14, SD = 6.61$) and the undifferentiated attaining the lowest mean score ($\bar{X} = 61.61, SD = 9.04$). The androgynous sex-typed group obtained a significantly higher mean score ($\bar{X} = 71.29, SD = 9.60$) than both the feminine and undifferentiated groups. These
results indicated that individuals who were masculine or androgynous have higher self-esteem than individuals who were feminine or undifferentiated sex-typed.

Table 10 presents the results of the analysis of variance for the Internal Scale of the GAI by sex-role categories. Statistically significant effects were found for internality as a result of sex-role stereotyping (p < .0001). Scheffe's post hoc comparison test demonstrated that the mean for the masculine sex-typed group ($\bar{X} = 36.81$, $SD = 3.65$) was significantly different than the mean for the undifferentiated sex-typed group ($\bar{X} = 33.40$, $SD = 4.37$). In addition, the androgynous group had a significantly higher mean score ($\bar{X} = 36.40$, $SD = 4.25$) than the undifferentiated group, which had the lowest mean of all four groups. These results suggested that masculine and androgynous individuals were more internal than were feminine and undifferentiated sex-typed groups. The median split performed on the Internal Scale placed both the masculine and androgynous groups
in the internal section and the feminine and undifferentiated groups in the external section.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Powerful Others Scale by Sex-Role Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents the results of the analysis of variance for the Powerful Others Scale of the GAI by sex-role categories. As shown in Table 11, no significant effects were found between the four sex-role categories for powerful others. Table 12 presents the results

Table 12

Analysis of Variance of Chance Scale by Sex-Role Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.21</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the analysis of variance of the Chance Scale of the GAI by sex-role category. No significant effects were found between the four sex-role categories for chance.

**Multiple Regression Analyses**

Results pertaining to the multiple regression analyses used to predict perceptions of power are presented in Table 13. These analyses were done to investigate hypothesis five, which stated that perceptions of power may be predicted from a subject's level of self-esteem and locus of control, as well as sex and sex-role stereotyping. These tables present the multiple regression coefficient, $R^2$, degrees of freedom and the $F$ test of significance for the obtained $R$. In addition, the tables include the independent variables used in the multiple regression analysis, the standardized regression coefficients for each of the independent variables, the degrees of freedom and the $F$ test of the beta weights for each of these independent variables.

As shown in Table 13, the multiple regression analysis used to predict the criterion of perceptions of power for the entire sample include the predictor variables of self-esteem, locus of control (I, P, C), sex, sex-role stereotyping and social desirability. The multiple regression coefficient of .74 was statistically significant at the .001 level of significance. This $R$ accounted for 54% of the variance in predicting perceptions of power. The predictor variables of self-esteem and powerful others were found to significantly affect the multiple regression at the .001 and .05 level of
Table 13

Multiple Regression Analysis of Perceptions of Power, as a Function of Sex, Sex-Role, Self-Esteem, Locus of Control and Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total group (n = 176)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>78.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex-Role</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>6.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1, 167</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
**P < .001

significance respectively. Thus, in this multiple regression equation, 54% of the variation in perceptions of power was determined by self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping, locus of control and social desirability, with self-esteem and powerful others reflecting statistically significant contributions to the variance. These
findings confirmed research question six and hypothesis five, indicating that it was possible to predict perceptions of power with the independent variables being examined.

Table 14 presents the results pertaining to the multiple regression analysis for male and female subjects. As shown in Table 14, the multiple regression coefficient for the prediction of perceptions of power for men was .68, which was statistically significant at the .01 level. The independent variables accounted for 47% of the variance, with self-esteem ($p < .01$) and internal locus of control ($p < .05$) contributing significantly to the equation. For women, the multiple regression coefficient for predicting perceptions of power was .82, which was also statistically significant. The independent variables accounted for 69% of the variance, with self-esteem ($p < .01$), powerful others ($p < .01$) and social desirability ($p < .05$) contributing significantly to the equation. The results of these analyses revealed that sex differences exist in predicting perceptions of power with the independent variables of self-esteem, locus of control and social desirability.

**Summary**

The major findings presented in this chapter indicated that self-esteem and internal locus of control were significantly correlated with perceptions of power. High self-esteem and internality were significantly related in a positive direction, indicating that as self-esteem and internality increase, so do perceptions of power. Men and women were not found to differ significantly on perceptions
Table 14

Multiple Regression Analysis of Perceptions of Power as a Function of Self-Esteem, Locus of Control and Social Desirability by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1, 85</td>
<td>13.94***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (I)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1, 85</td>
<td>5.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (P)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1, 85</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (C)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1, 85</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1, 85</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of power, although sex-role stereotyping was found to have a significant effect on perceptions of power.

The major results regarding the predictive relationship of perceptions of power by the variables of self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control revealed a significant prediction of 54% of the variance. Self-esteem and powerful others were significant contributors to the total prediction, which varied according to sex.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains three sections. The first section is a summary of the research study, followed by the second section, which presents the conclusions of the study. In the third section, recommendations are presented for further research.

Summary

This section reviews the purpose of the study, the procedures used for data collection and analysis, and the results.

The central purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among perceptions of power, self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. A second purpose of this study was to determine the predictability of perceptions of power based on knowledge of self-esteem, sex, sex-role stereotyping and locus of control. This research project was also intended to further investigate the construct of individual's perceptions of power.

Subjects in the study were undergraduate students from The Ohio State University who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course during Winter Quarter, 1980. As part of the requirements for successful completion of this course, students were asked to participate in a total of four hours of psychology experiments or write a
term paper. A variety of experiments were available from which to choose, and students were expected to attend more than one experiment. One hundred ninety-one subjects participated in the study, 91 women and 100 men. The mean age of the entire population was 19.22, and the age range was from 17 to 36. The majority of the students were freshmen undergraduates.

Subjects in the study were expected to respond to five self-report measures, which took them between thirty to fifty minutes in total time. The instruments included the Self-Perception Questionnaire, to examine perceptions of power, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory, to investigate self-esteem, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the General Attitudes Inventory, to determine locus of control, and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, known as the Personal Reaction Inventory. Each questionnaire, except the Marlowe-Crowne was based on a six-point Likert Scale, where the subject was asked to rate her/his response to each item on a scale from one, strongly disagree, to six, strongly agree. The subject was asked to answer each item as it was reflective of her/himself. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was based on a true-false format. Each instrument generated a single score, which was then used in the analyses.

In order to determine relationships among the variables, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were computed. Student's t-test comparisons were performed to investigate the difference between groups of 1) men and women, 2) high and low power, 3) high and low self-esteem, and 4) internals and externals. One-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the order of
administration of the instruments significantly effected any of the variables. In addition, analyses of variance were computed with the independent variable of sex-role stereotyping and each of the other variables as dependent variables. Finally, multiple regression analyses were performed for the total group, as well as for men and women.

The results of the Pearson Product moment correlation coefficients responded to research questions one, four and five. Perceptions of power were highly correlated in a positive direction with self-esteem and internal locus of control. Social desirability approached significance in relation to perceptions of power. Thus, as perceptions of power increased, so did self-esteem, and a belief in an internal locus of control. The findings indicated that self-esteem is positively correlated with social desirability and with internal locus of control, which was an interesting combination. These results suggested that as self-esteem increases, internal locus of control also increases. However, a desire to present oneself in a socially accepted manner appeared to increase as self-esteem and power increase. A belief in powerful others and chance factors was negatively correlated with self-esteem, which implied a decrease in these types of locus of control with an increase in self-esteem. Finally, internal locus of control was negatively related to a belief in chance, and powerful others was positively related to chance.

Students' t-test comparisons were computed to determine the difference between men and women on the variables of interest, and between internal and external groups. Sex was found to have a significant
effect for the variables of social desirability, powerful others, and a belief in chance factors. Women obtained a higher mean score than men for social desirability, but not for the powerful others and chance scores.

The findings of the t-test comparisons for internal and external locus of control groups indicated that internals scored significantly higher for perceptions of power and self-esteem than did externals. In addition, sex-role stereotyping had a significant effect on internality.

T-test comparisons were also performed to determine significance between high and low self-esteem groups, and high and low power (powerful and powerless) groups. Self-esteem was found to differ significantly for the variables of perceptions of power, social desirability, internal and chance locus of control, and sex-role stereotyping. High self-esteem individuals felt more powerful and internal than low self-esteem individuals, and also had a greater need to respond in a socially appropriate manner than did the low self-esteem group. Sex-role stereotyping also had a significant effect on self-esteem.

The last set of t-tests were conducted to determine the differences between powerful and powerless individuals. Perceptions of power was found to differ significantly for the variables of self-esteem, sex, internal and chance orientations of locus of control and sex-role stereotyping. Powerful individuals had a higher level of self-esteem, were more internal with a strong belief in powerful others, and varied according to sex and sex-role stereotyping.
Analyses of variance were computed with sex-role stereotyping as the independent variable, and perceptions of power, self-esteem and locus of control as the dependent variables. These analyses were performed to investigate research question three. The results indicated that self-esteem, perceptions of power, and internal locus of control varied as a function of sex-role stereotyping.

The multiple regression analysis for the total population revealed that the independent variables were able to predict 54% of the variance for the criterion of perceptions of power, which was statistically significant. The major contributing variables were self-esteem and powerful others. Separate multiple regression analyses were performed for men and women. The analyses of the male sample population found that 47% of the variance for perceptions of power was explained by the independent variables of self-esteem and locus of control. Again, significant contributors to the prediction were the variables of self-esteem and powerful others. Finally the regression analyses for women produced a 69% explanation of the variance for perceptions of power by the predictor variables, with the variables of self-esteem, internal locus of control, and social desirability as the major predictors.

Conclusions

This section presents the major conclusions drawn from this study. The first conclusion reached is that since there is a strong relationship between self-esteem and perceptions of power, individuals with favorable self-esteem will believe themselves to be more powerful than individuals with unfavorable self-esteem. The reverse may
also exist, where powerful people will be ones who have favorable self-esteem. It is also possible to suggest that individuals who do not feel positively about themselves, i.e., low self-esteem, will feel a lack of power or powerless in regard to their interpersonal relationships.

A person who feels powerful, and has high self-esteem may be one who uses direct power messages, such as information and expertise (Johnson, 1976). S/he may be a strong group member or perhaps a leader among her/his peers. It is also possible to encourage a person with favorable self-esteem to examine her/his perceptions of power and make full use of these abilities. Conversely, a person with low self-esteem and low perceptions of power may feel negatively about her/his abilities, but may be encouraged to deal with these issues through work with either perceptions of power or self-esteem building.

Secondly, it is possible to conclude that since perceptions of power are strongly related to internal locus of control, people who believe they have control over themselves in their environment also feel more powerful than those who don’t believe they have this type of control. It is suggested that powerful people are more likely to believe that they have control over their environment, and thus their lives, than powerless people.

These conclusions suggest that a person who perceives her/himself as powerful, will also believe s/he has control over her/his life and environment. S/he would be more likely to be an independent individual who may be more discriminating about what influences s/he will accept and would be less influenceable (Lefcourt, 1976; Strickland,
A powerful and internal individual may seek to obtain information, thus helping to maintain a sense of power, control over her/his life, and independence. S/he may also influence others more easily than a powerless, external person. In addition, a powerful, internal individual can be encouraged to risk, to explore and to expand her/his world with greater success and ease than a powerless external individual.

The third conclusion reached from this study is that no major differences exist for perceptions of power, self-esteem and internal locus of control according to sex. Since a relationship exists between sex and social desirability, it is possible to suggest that women are more concerned than men about presenting themselves in a socially desirable manner. This may imply that the scores on the instruments of perceptions of power, self-esteem and locus of control were inflated to reflect socially appropriate answers, and thus subject to some question. Because of the lack of relationship between sex and perceptions of power and self-esteem, it is possible to suggest that women can feel equally powerful and have an equally high level of self-esteem as men.

A fourth major conclusion of the study stems from the findings that sex-role stereotyping effects perceptions of power, self-esteem and internal locus of control. It is suggested that androgynous individuals will believe themselves to be powerful, have favorable self-esteem and feel they have control over their environment. Masculine sex-typed individuals may also experience the same beliefs and feelings. It is not possible to suggest that powerful people are
Usually androgynous or masculine sex-typed.

The way in which, and the degree to which, a person attributes characteristics associated with men and/or women has an impact on their perceptions of their own power. A person who attributes both masculine and feminine characteristics to her/himself, is one who is likely to feel more powerful than a person not strong in either masculine or feminine characteristics. An androgynous person is flexible and adaptable to more situations than a masculine or feminine sex-typed individual, and can thus feel powerful in a variety of settings. The masculine sex-typed individual tends to feel more powerful than the feminine sex-typed individual partly because of societal expectations and socialization. Feminine sex-typed individuals feel less powerful than androgynous and masculine sex-typed people partly as a result of the traditional female role of submissive, subservient behavior, and thus less powerful.

The fifth and final conclusion drawn from this study is that since perceptions of power can be predicted from knowledge of a subject's self-esteem, sex, sex-role category and locus of control, it is possible to suggest that factors contribute to one's perceptions of power. These independent variables explain a significant amount of the total contribution of perceptions of power and can be considered factors involved in perceptions of power. Knowledge of these factors, and others as they become available, can aid in selection of individuals for particular academic or organizational programs, for job selection, and for promotions. Specific counseling methods may be chosen once information is provided on these variables. It is also suggested
that the counseling focus can be approached from either self-esteem, locus of control, or perceptions of power.

Recommendations for Further Research

It is recommended that to improve the generalizability of these findings, further research be conducted with other populations. The stage of development of freshman and sophomore undergraduate students may have had an impact on the findings. In addition, the subjects were limited to students enrolled in an introductory Psychology course, all of whom attended the same university. It is suggested that additional investigation be conducted with other groups of the same age, as well as other age groups.

It is recommended that future research be undertaken in a manner so as to obtain objective information for each of the variables. A performance task required of the subject, with an observer rating the process, may produce the type of behavioral observation necessary for objective evaluation. The present project was conducted with subjective, self-report measures.

An additional recommendation is that further investigations be performed on the Self-Perception Questionnaire, which was used to examine perceptions of power. This is a new instrument that has not yet been included in a variety of studies, which would provide further information and support for its use. In conjunction with this aspect of the study, it is recommended that in further research, other measures be used to examine self-esteem, locus of control and sex-role stereotyping. This is suggested for two reasons: 1) should
the same results be obtained with different instruments, it would 
further substantiate the findings of this study, and 2) some disadvan-
tages exist in each of the three instruments used in this project.

Social desirability remains a factor to be considered in further 
validation of these results. It is recommended that the Self-Percep-
tion Questionnaire be subjected to further investigation with regard 
to social desirability. It is essential to learn whether social desir-
ability can be separated from the construct of perceptions of power.

It is recommended that further research be conducted on the con-
struct of perceptions of power in interpersonal relationships. This 
is a new area, since the majority of past work has been conducted in 
organizational or social psychology. With this in mind, it is suggest-
ed that an examination be pursued for additional factors that may 
contribute to perceptions of power.
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APPENDIX A

Self-Perception Questionnaire
Self-perception Questionnaire

Today's Date: ____________________________

* * * * *

Please make sure you fill out both sides of each sheet.

* * * * *

Circle one: Male       Female

Age: ________

Class: Freshman       Sophomore       Junior       Senior       Other

Marital Status:       Single       Married

Instructions: Please make sure you fill out each item in the following booklet. Take your time and try to be as accurate as possible.

* * * * *

Please make sure you fill out both sides of each sheet.

* * * * *
Self-Perception Questionnaire

Instructions: Using the scale below, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement below by circling the appropriate number.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

Answer each statement and try to be as accurate and as honest as possible.

* * * * *

1) I would probably make a good entertainer.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

2) I prefer very vigorous activities.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

3) In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

4) I would like to be a better communicator of my ideas.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

5) I keep any feelings of impatience to myself.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

6) I feel a bit awkward in the company of strangers.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

7) People like me more than I like myself.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

8) When caught doing something I shouldn't, I feel guilty.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

9) I always try to control any strong feelings I might have.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

10) In a group of people, I wish I could be more forceful than I am.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree

11) I enjoy playing games with a lot of rough physical contact.
    Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree  
2 = disagree  
3 = somewhat disagree  
4 = somewhat agree  
5 = agree  
6 = strongly agree

12) I'm constantly examining my motives.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

*13) People are very attracted to me.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

14) I get angry very easily.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

15) I often put on a show to impress other people.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

16) I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

17) When someone swears at me, I'm generally not offended.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

18) I look to the behavior of others for cues when I am unsure what to do.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

19) I always try to control any feelings of hostility I might have.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

*20) People are very fond of me.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

21) I'm always trying to figure myself out.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

*22) I am a very aggressive person.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

23) I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

24) I treat other people better than I treat myself.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree

25) I am very sensitive to criticism.
   Strongly disagree  1 2 3 - 4 5 6  Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

26) If I'd hit someone on purpose, I'd feel guilty later.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

27) I try hard to get other people to like me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

28) It is better to make others happy than be happy myself.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

29) I reflect about myself a lot.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

30) When anger builds up inside me, I try to control it and not let it show.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

31) I'm concerned about the way I present myself to others.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

32) I would probably make a good actor or actress.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

33) After an argument, I'm generally sorry for my actions.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

34) Almost everyone likes me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

35) I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

36) In a group of people, I am rarely the center of attention.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

37) I am a very popular person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

38) I always try to keep my anger in check.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

39) I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

40) I am a very competitive person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*41) I am a very social person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

42) I usually worry about making a good impression.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

43) After an outburst of anger, I feel worse instead of better.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

44) I am sometimes friendly to people even when I really dislike them.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

45) I am an inhibited person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

46) With a group of friends, I wish I could talk more.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

47) I'd like to be more of a leader.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

48) I often act or talk in ways to impress other people.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

49) I have a lot of friends.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

50) In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than be myself.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

51) I would like to be a more forceful person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

52) I would like to be a friendlier person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

53) I am very sensitive to the feelings of others.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

*54) I am a very assertive person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*55) I am a very dominating person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

56) I would like to have more people attracted to me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*57) I am a very talkative person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

58) I always try to act the way I feel.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

59) I am a very shy person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

60) Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to have a
good time.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

61) I like competitive games and activities.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*62) I am a person very much in demand by others.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

63) I am very sensitive to my own feelings.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

64) I would like to be more of a leader than I am.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*65) I am a very active person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

66) I get embarrassed very easily.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

67) I am a very confident person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree  
2 = disagree  
3 = somewhat disagree  
4 = somewhat agree  
5 = agree  
6 = strongly agree

68) I am a very introverted person.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

69) I wish more people would look up to me.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

70) I am a very religious person.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

71) I generally leave big decisions up to others.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

72) I try to convince people that my way of doing things is the best way.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

73) I am always very aware of my own feelings.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

74) I get angry very easily.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

75) I would like people to need me more.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

76) Often I feel that I have no real purpose in life.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

77) I wish I could be more outgoing than I am.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

78) I rarely advise people what to do.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

79) I suppress most of my anger.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

80) I much prefer going to a party than reading a book.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

81) I try to keep most people at a distance.  
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

82) I always try to express any feelings of hostility I might have.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

83) I wish I could be a more powerful person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

84) I am generally a very tense person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

85) I try to keep the w- I feel to myself.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

86) I have never told a very big lie.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

87) I generally like to be the person in charge.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

88) Lately I have been in a sad mood most of the time.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

89) I do a lot of favors for people.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

90) I wish I could be an actor or actress.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

91) I don't try to keep my anger bottled up.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

92) I have often considered going into a political career.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

93) I always try to forget bad events that happen to me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

94) It upsets me when people don't like me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

95) A lot of people come to me for advice.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

96) I try to repress any bad thoughts I have.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

*97) When I first meet someone, I generally do most of the talking.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

98) I wish I could be a more competitive person.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

99) I wish I could be more the center of attention than I normally am.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*100) When with my friends, I generally come up with the best ideas of what to do.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

101) I wish I could be a more assertive person.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

102) I always act towards others as I feel towards them.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

103) I'd like to have a job where I am my own boss.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

104) I am very sensitive to my feelings towards others.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*105) In most situations I wish I could be the person in charge.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

106) Deep down, I am a very lonely person.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

107) I go to church at least once a week.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

108) I wish I could be an entertainer.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

109) I rarely get angry.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

110) I wish I could be a more dominating person.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = somewhat disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = agree
6 = strongly agree

*111) I am a very effective communicator of my ideas.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

112) I rarely get impatient with people.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

113) I like to have people look up to me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

114) I would like to be a more talkative person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

115) I wish I could be a powerful politician.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

116) I feel I have little control over the events that happen to me.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

117) In a group of people, I often try to be the center of attention.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*118) People turn to me to plan and organize social events.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

119) I wish I could be a more aggressive person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

120) Recently I have been getting depressed often.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

121) I would like to be a more social person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*122) I always try to be the person who makes the final decisions.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

123) I wish I could be a more popular person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

124) Most of the time I feel powerless to help other people.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

125) I wish I could do more talking when I first meet a person.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree
126) I am interested in political activities.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*127) I am a good leader in most situations.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*128) In most settings with my friends, I'm the one who talks the most.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 - 4 5 6 Strongly agree

*Actual items used for the Perception of Power Inventory.
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