

**EXCHANGE: THE ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR TEACHING JOURNAL**  
**A Journal of Teaching Theory and Technique**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EDITORIAL ..... 3

“IN MY OPINION”

    “The Need for Theoretical Development in Organizational Behavior”  
    by Henry Tosi ..... 5

ARTICLES

    “Experiential Learning: A Sad Passing Fad?”  
    by Robert J. House ..... 8

    “A Self-Structured Approach to OB: Toward De-Institutionalizing the Classroom”  
    by Warner Woodworth ..... 13

    “One ‘Perspective’ on the Consulting Process”  
    by Allan A. Kennedy ..... 18

    “Simulating an On-Going Organization”  
    by Leonard Greenhalgh ..... 23

    “Consultant Liability to Client’s Employees”  
    by Edwin W. Tucker ..... 28

BOOK REVIEWS

    “IR Textbooks and IR Research”  
    by Daniel G. Gallagher ..... 33

EXERCISES, TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

    “A Simple - But Powerful - Power Simulation”  
    by Lee Bolman and Terrence E. Deal ..... 38

    “The ‘Concept Uncovery’ as a Teaching Device”  
    by J. David Hunger and Henry R. Odell ..... 42

    “Invovling Students in Test Construction and Correction:  
    Making Positive rise of True/False Ambiguity”  
    by Randall G. Sleeth ..... 44

    “Group Decision Making: Combining Two Experiential Exercises”  
    by Stephen A. Stumpf ..... 46

THE BULLETIN BOARD ..... 47

EXCHANGING RESEARCH ..... 50

*Exchange: The Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*, published by the Organizational Behavior Teaching Society, is a quarterly publication devoted to exploring various techniques and theories of teaching organizational behavior in Schools of Business, Public Administration, and Education, and in Departments of Psychology and Sociology as well as in training programs in public and private organizations.

©1979 The Organizational Behavior Teaching Society.

ISSN 0162-1858

The Journal would like to acknowledge the support provided by the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University and the School of Business Administration, The University of Connecticut.

# EXERCISES, TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

## A SIMPLE - BUT POWERFUL - POWER SIMULATION

*Lee Bolman and Terrence E. Deal*  
*Harvard Graduate School of Education*

The longer we study and work in organizations, the more we discover power to be one of the central issues which researchers and students must understand. Researchers who ignore power run the risk of spurious, irrelevant findings. Students who assume administrative positions without a proper understanding of power and how to wield it risk failure and an aborted career. Consequently, we have spent considerable time seeking ways of teaching students about power.

Our search has led us to develop a relatively simple power simulation built around two main constraints.

1. We wanted an experience that could be contained within a two-hour time frame since our class meets twice a week for two hours.
2. We wanted a simulation that would show the dynamics of power at every level – from the individual to the systemic. We hoped for an experience that would enable students to examine the interaction between their personal beliefs about power strategies, on the one hand, and structural aspects of power on the other.

The simulation we developed has been used four times – twice in our introductory OB course, and twice at the 1979 OB Teaching Conference in Cincinnati. Interestingly, the simulation worked more successfully at the OB teaching conference, where we found that participants were able to generate more sophisticated insights and generalization from the experience than students in our introductory class. (As a result, we wanted to limit enrollment in our introductory class to seasoned teachers of OB, but our dean has been uncooperative. Consequently, we have settled for writing about the power simulation for other OB teachers.)

The purposes of this paper are to (1) present a brief description of our introductory course, (2) describe the power simulation, and (3) discuss

some of the issues that are important to consider in deciding whether to use it.

### **Our Introductory Course**

We teach a reasonably large (60-90 students) introductory OB course at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Graduate students make up almost all the class. Most are from the School of Education, with others coming from other schools at Harvard such as the Divinity School, the Kennedy School of Government, the School of Public Health, and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The bulk of our students aspire to careers in administration, policy analysis or consulting in public sector institutions. (Private-sector students usually take organizational behavior courses from the wide array offered across the river.)

One of the distinguishing features of our course is its explicit conceptual pluralism. The two of us were trained in very different disciplines and institutions (Bolman in organizational behavior and psychology at Yale; Deal in educational administration and sociology at Stanford.) In addition, we differ in conceptual predilections, teaching styles, and general orientations to the world. Our “odd-couple” like arrangement has made it possible for us to survive each other. But we also believe that our diverse orientations represent the current pluralism within our field since OB encompasses a number of distinctly different theoretical perspectives. Despite frequent “turf” battles over supremacy, each of these perspectives has something important to say; no one alone is complete enough to fully explain life within organizations. (A brief annotated bibliography of relevant readings on power can be found in this issue's EXCHANGING RESEARCH section.)

Because of this, our course consciously avoids integrating everything into one theory (e.g., we don't offer an ‘Integrated’ Systems Perspective on Organizations). Instead we teach four different

theoretical perspectives (which we call 'frames') – Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic. Each frame highlights different literatures, and each is presented in a way that emphasizes its characteristic strengths and weaknesses. We want students to develop a thorough understanding of each frame, and then to build their own personal theory of organizations from whichever combination of frames makes the most sense to them.

Our teaching methods, which are as diverse as the conceptual underpinnings, include traditional readings, lectures, discussions, and occasional films, as well as experiential activities and group projects. Every student participates in a project group and each individual's grade is based on: (1) the group's final product and (2) an independent analysis of the group's process using the four frames. The lectures and readings cover the four frames and examine also a series of topics that we consider of central importance in organizations (e.g., socialization, communications, decision-making, conflict, authority, evaluation). Simulations and other experiential activities are used in conjunction with the lectures to provide opportunities to experience directly central issues, dilemmas, and paradoxes. The power simulation is one of the most intense of these activities.

### **The Design of the Power Simulation**

This simulation, adapted from the power lab design developed by Oshry (1976), creates a three-tiered organization with stratification built almost entirely on power differences. It unfolds in the following sequence:

1. At the beginning, we collect a sum of money from each individual (based on our assessment of their economic means; the amount has varied from 50 cents with our students up to \$2 with more affluent OB teachers).
2. We divide participants into three groups: a top group, a middle group, and a bottom group. The top one is always a small "intimate" group (as few as four people, and as many as 12). The middle one is approximately twice the size of the top group. The bottom consists of everyone else, and is at least twice as large as the middle. The bottom has always been too

large to function comfortably as a face-to-face group.

3. Assignments to groups are based on some semi-arbitrary criterion. This criterion is one used in the outside world as a basis for distributing status or prestige, but which has questionable relevance for the simulation. With our students we used the accumulated grade-point average or sex and program (male doctoral students in the top group, other males in the middle, and women in the bottom group). At the OBTC, one time we used a rough estimate of institutional prestige (putting professors from high-prestige schools like Stanford, Yale, etc. in the top group, faculty from large state schools in the second group, and everyone else in the bottom group). In the second run, we used age, with the senior citizens in the top group, and "youngsters" in the bottom.
4. We divide the Pool of money by giving two-thirds of the money to the top group, and one-third to the middle, and none to the bottom.
5. We try to provide the top group with a comfortable and commodious space (preferably, a separate room with soft chairs, carpets, etc.). We provide the middle group with a somewhat less comfortable, but adequate space. We put the lower group in a hallway or corridor. Usually, the corridor has no furniture, is ill-suited for group meetings, and has poorly defined boundaries.
6. We inform the groups of a set of rules about communication and movement. Members of the top group are free to enter the space of either of the other groups and to communicate whatever they wish, whenever they wish. Members of the middle group may enter the space of the lower group whenever they wish but must request permission to enter the top group's space (which the top group can refuse). Members of the lower group may not disturb the top group in any way unless specifically invited by the top. The lower group does have the right to knock on the door of the middle group and request

permission to communicate with them (which can also be refused).

7. Each group is given a brief description of its task:

**Top Group:** To be responsible for the overall effectiveness and learning from the simulation, and to decide how to use its money.

**Middle Group:** To assist the Top Group in providing for the overall welfare of the organization, and to decide how to use its money.

**Bottom Group:** To identify its resources and to decide how best to provide for learning and the overall effectiveness of the organization.

8. The members of the top group are given the authority to make any change in the rules that they wish, at any time, with or without notice.
9. We state in advance that the simulation will run for one hour and explicitly establish in advance our “power” to bring things to a close whether or not the groups agree.

## What Happens?

As noted, we have run the simulation four times. Each has been unique in certain respects, but similar in others.

1. Generally, the top group is likely to focus on ideological or “big picture” issues. Usually, they spend a long time debating philosophy and goodness, with little or no attempt to find out what is happening in the other groups. A major conflict within most top groups occurs around whether to use their power or to share it with the other groups.
2. Most middle groups are ambivalent and split by too much internal conflict to take effective action. One common conflict is over whether to ally with the top or bottom group.
3. The bottom group is united by strong shared we have feelings that their position is unfair and that something should be done. But they are rarely able to agree on what to do about it. A major split is around violation of the rules by direct

coercive action – keeping the top group from using the toilet or barricading both groups in the building. The bottom group rarely takes collective action as an entire group, but subgroups or individuals often take a variety of activities – making demands on the middle group, sitting in the top group's space, even in one case, stealing the money from a top group which, occupied with important conversations about Machiavelli and Mayo, had taken no security precautions. Even OB professors who champion humanistic ideas are quick to entertain thoughts of coercion, duplicity, and disobedience when assigned to the bottom group.

4. Almost everyone becomes very involved in the simulation despite the fact that it is short-lived and much more obviously artificial than established organizations. It becomes a significant opportunity for individuals to look at their own approaches to power and how they use it when they have it or try to get it when they don't. It also helps people to see some of the ways in which social structures can channel behavior. The impact of social structure on human behavior can be easily observed – and felt.

## De-Briefing

The simulation is so involving and its dynamics so complex that it encourages considerable reflection, for which sufficient time needs to be provided for debriefing. During the simulation, the teaching staff takes the role of “itinerant anthropologists” – moving through the system from group to group, observing and taking notes. (Our teaching staff is large enough for us to assign an individual to track each of the three groups, and have one or two others roving at large.) None of our anthropologists have been physically abused, although some have been threatened. And none has turned “native” or otherwise been cooped.

It takes us at least three hours to de-brief the simulation; indeed, once it required five hours. To capitalize on the intensity of emotions and immediacy of the experience, the de-briefing begins in the same class in which the simulation is run. We have had the greatest success by

beginning with meetings of small groups which have representatives from each of the three levels in the simulation. We ask them to focus on such questions as:

1. What can we learn about power from this experience? Does it remind us of events seen in other organizations?
2. What did each of us learn individually? How did we think about what power is? Were we satisfied with the amount of power we had? How did we try to exercise or to gain more power?

In the following class, which is usually two days after the simulation, we begin with “objective” reports from the anthropologists, who try to summarize what occurred within and between groups. We then convene small meetings of people from the same group and ask them to react to the anthropologists' reports.

The range of issues raised by the simulation is quite broad. Its simple, ink-blot character seems to encourage a variety of behaviors, observations, interpretations, and conclusions. Although it is impossible to catalogue many of the personal lessons that individuals gain about themselves around how their orientation toward power and conflict influence their ability to deal with power and powerlessness, we can describe some of the lessons that are frequently reported:

1. The simulation often produces strong in-group out-group dynamics, with inter-group attributions, misunderstandings, and mistrust. The differential power positions encourage the development of myths and stories which are used to interpret the behavior and intentions of others. Participants learn how difficult it can be under such conditions to create effective communications and decision-making, even with the best of intentions.
2. Many participants experience first-hand many of the dilemmas and conflicts of power. For example, some top group members learn that they are mistrusted whether they try to use their power, share it with others, or deny that they have it. Many middle-group members feel the conflicts of being caught in between.
3. Many participants develop a more profound appreciation for structural

injustice, and the effects it can have on individuals. People who have always been on the top find themselves in a bottom group where they feel rage, hopelessness, and powerlessness. They learn that individual efforts and good will can be distorted and wasted in the absence of a social system that permits their expression. They learn how easily frustration and rage can lead to strategies of coercion and brute force.

4. Many individuals begin to realize how narrowly they have thought about power and authority. Some realize that they are conditioned to follow any rules, no matter how senseless. Others realize that they focus exclusively on the bases power that they cannot use (e.g., money), and ignore other forms of power (numbers, control of desired resources) that are available to them.
5. Most important, individuals learn about the complex interplay between individuals and structure. They learn that regardless of individual beliefs and make-up, being on top is very different from being on the bottom. (Top groups worry about preventing chaos and building a just society; bottom groups worry about getting their money back.) But they also see that there are enormous individual differences within each group. Some top group members are so conflicted and guilt-stricken as to become ineffectual, losing the trust of both their own and other groups. Some bottom group members simply assume they are helpless, and drop out psychologically. (One bottom group entertained the possibility of leaving the building for a beer until the simulation was over.) Other bottom group members work steadily and constructively to accomplish other purposes they have defined for themselves – finding some justification and merit of being on the bottom or creating a coalition with the middle group.

### **Teaching Considerations**

As noted, we have used the simulation both with graduate students and with professionals in the OB field. From these diverse experiences, it is

clear that the value of the simulation to an individual depends very much on the individual's ability to learn experientially. Like any activity which is both involving and potentially disconcerting, it is possible for individuals to reject the simulation as "unreal" and "just a game"; and some of our students have viewed it that way. The simulation is probably most effective with students who have already participated in several prior experiential learning activities. The more the students can see the value of such experiences, the better they are at reflection and observation. Likewise, the more skill they have in giving and receiving feedback, the more likely they are to learn from the simulation.

We have always followed a "hands-off" policy during the simulation – until, that is, we announce that the exercise is over. The beauty of the exercise is that from a learning standpoint, it makes little difference what the groups or individuals do: whether they follow the rules, stay in the simulation, or try to learn from the experience. Furthermore, our inaction supports the norm that authority (however weak and ill-gotten) lies with the rules and the top group. We would intervene – quickly and forcefully – if we saw the possibility for serious harm – physical or psychological – occurring to anyone. The level of conflict and hostility has been high on a number of occasions, but we have never seen any risk of physical conflict.

We are active in the analysis after the simulation. Not only can our observations enhance participant learning but there are occasions when we need to intervene to protect people. Individuals can be made scapegoats for their actions. An example was the case of two bottom group members who, despite instructions from the bottom group's self-appointed leader, stole the top group's money. The two were branded as unconscionable renegades by many in the class. During the de-briefing, this incident became part of the discussion - both the original action and the class's reaction. If learning is the primary goal of the simulation, then individuals must feel free to experiment with new behaviors in order to learn from the results. The two individuals in question received ample feedback about the consequences of their behavior but it was important that the de-

briefing prevent them from being branded as "thieves" for the remainder of the semester.

Another reason for providing support during the de-briefing is that some individuals have strong emotional reactions to the experience. As an example, one member of the top group, overcome with guilt and remorse from being in a position of power without the ability to help the powerless, burst into tears at the end of the simulation. By focusing attention during the de-briefing – and afterwards – on the underlying dynamics of the feelings and behavior, the emotional reactions became a learning experience.

Teachers who use the simulation should also be prepared to deal with hostility, mistrust, and anger that are directed toward them. For example, anger in one simulation shifted from the top group to the teaching staff who had created the conditions in the first place. In the de-briefing we acknowledged the validity of the perception, and asked what could be learned from that observation. In this case, the discussion surfaced ways in which organizations and societies are often structured so that the dispossessed focus their anger on the nearest and most visible target (the top group), rather than on the people or institutions that actually wield most of the power (the experimenters).

The de-briefing can also lead to an examination of power within the university and within the class – who has it, and how do they use it. In one instance, an individual left the de-briefing and was later handed a note by a member of the teaching staff offering the opportunity for a face-to-face discussion. It turned out the individual was upset by the misuse of power by the teaching staff in designing a "negative experience" and "forcing" individuals to participate. The offer was perceived as another order. The individual stopped by our office to let us know that she was on her way to the dean to register a complaint. The subsequent discussion examined her reaction, and led to her writing an interesting paper contrasting power with authority and noting the dilemmas created when super-ordinates and subordinates are operating from different perspectives.

In sum, the power simulation is most likely to be successful for teachers who are comfortable with conflict within their own classes, are willing to be challenged and confronted by their students,

and are excited about joint inquiry into the organizational processes of their own course.

We have run the simulation with groups varying in size from 30 to 80. Although we think 30 approximates the lower limit "we do not yet know where the upper the upper limit is. The top group probably needs to be large enough to have a range of resources, ideas and ideologies. We also

## **Conclusion**

Our simple but intense simulation provides an opportunity for students in OB classes to experience the complex individual and structural aspects of power. Thus far we have used the simulation with two categories of participant; each had comparable and relatively favorable results. We are very interested in the experiences that others have with similar simulations. Do MBA students or undergraduates react differently? Do

think it is preferable, though perhaps not essential, for the bottom group to be too large to function comfortably in a face-to-face way. As the class gets larger, we hold the top group at about 12 people, and the middle group at 24, and let the bottom group get as big as necessary to include everyone.

executives in training programs feel more comfortable about exercising power given to the top group? How does more time affect the outcome of the simulation? Does more time encourage inter-group bargaining and coalitions? We would be more than happy to discuss these issues with anyone. In the meantime, we're looking forward to seeing how the simulation unfolds in our class next year.

## **EXCHANGING RESEARCH: POWER AT THE OBTC: TEACHING OLD DOGS NEW TRICKS**

Among the highlights of a very successful Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference last June in Cincinnati, in my view, was a power simulation run by Lee Bolman and Terry Deal of the Harvard Education School. Lee and Terry succeeded in of thoroughly energizing a whole roomful of OB teachers – to the point of “rebellion,” “high-handed authoritarianism,” and chicanery!

A more detailed description of the exercise and its background is provided elsewhere in this issue by its perpetrators. This column will recount my personal experience with the exercise, and then present a brief bibliography of materials on power. But now, the exercise.

### **Simulating Organizational Power: The Arrangements**

After a brief introduction, participants were asked to indicate name, and academic affiliation on a sheet of paper, which was collected, along with two dollars. Amidst many jokes about how Bolman and Deal might be battening on their profits from the OBTC, Terry spoke very briefly about their course, and invited us to participate in the simulation. Meanwhile, Lee quickly sorted out the collected information and divided the funds. An executive committee (about half a dozen), a middle group (one third of the remaining

participants) and a lower group (the remaining two thirds) were selected. No selection criterion was acknowledged. The “executives” received two thirds of the collected monies, the middle group one third, and the lower group nothing. Executives could communicate with any other group, middle group members could communicate at will with lower group members, but either lower group had to ask permission to communicate with the group(s) above and permission could be refused. The executive committee was permitted to make rules. With a basic contract of maximizing group learning, away we went.

In the simulation in which I took part, the “executive committee” split on whether to be very authoritarian (to maximize learning), or very participative, on principle. A “swing” faction argued that, either way, speedy action was necessary. The swing faction lost, and lengthy discussion ensued. The issues were those we love to discuss: as teachers, weren't we *obliged* to act according to our principles? But wouldn't learning be maximized by highlighting distinctions in power? And so on, and on, into the afternoon. It was a good discussion. Twenty minutes after the executives began their deliberations, a plan action was at last hammered out. Or, rather, two plans – half the group was to be handled one way, half another. High-minded intentions for scientific

investigation (including this executive's own) were the order of the day.

But time, tide, and group dynamics wait for no one. When at last the executives decided to proceed, the person who went out to check on how things were going in other groups was greeted with mistrust and suspicion, as a spy. There was some talk of preventing his return to the executive group (hostage!). While the executives deliberated, the lower groups experienced the frustrations of not knowing what decisions were being made about them by others, with whom they could not even communicate. (A bid for communication from the middle group was actually refused.)

In the vacuum of executive silence, the lower groups interpreted, drew conclusions, and acted. Leaders emerged, and ideas. The bottom group “unionized,” with threats of utter non-cooperation. Several people elected to simply sit out and watch the proceedings. The lower group approached the middle group with an invitation to collude against the still-silent executives. The non-executives ultimately combined. Obviously, a great deal of organizing had taken place without the “executives”!

The climax of our power game was uproar and confusion, as two executive groups attempted to communicate with the now-organized and highly skeptical combined lower groups. The attempt to split the lower groups failed, as the combination stood solid. In an effort to carry out its plan, the “authoritarian” faction attempted to snatch the lower groups' money (unsuccessfully), further heightened the mistrust. By this time, “members” were thoroughly resistant to both authoritarian and participative approaches, and expected the worst of the executives. Despite all this, however, some executives did successfully exert power. The members were moved back into the main exercise room, and some order was restored. After resisting the forcible attempts of one group of executives, the middle group money-holder simply *gave* the money to the president when she asked for it.

Events included loud and fervent argument, insistence, and the high-minded attempt to take

lower participants' money (for the best of reasons, of course). Authority was resisted and also complied with. Frustration and anger and mistrust grew despite good intentions and a high order of knowledge in the group as a whole about group dynamics. Clearly, people were thoroughly involved and invested in a simulation involving \$2 each and about 40 minutes' time. People didn't want to quit – Lee and Terry had to insist, even though they had established their right to terminate the exercise at the outset. People were far more interested in continuing the confrontations and conflicts than in coming back to the “real world” of a discussion.

When Lee and Terry finally succeeded in calling us all back to debrief and process what had occurred, many highly illuminating insights were shared. The bite and impact of the exercise were impressive. For instance, the covert selection criterion for admission to the “executive committee” in this case was school status. On some level, even though that was never specifically announced, that triggered social responses – feelings of power, control, responsibility and righteousness among the executives, and (particularly in fight of the executives' long silence) hostility on the part of others. Money, even the miniscule amount of \$2 per person, served as a highly salient indicator of power. So, too, the rules constraining communication: higher groups refused communication requests from lower groups, even among OB professors. Many other responses underlined the real, gut-level effectiveness of the simulation: people were *involved*.

I suspect (as Terry and Lee report) it's dynamite with the students. The remainder of this month's *Exchanging Research* will consist of a list of essential materials on power for the OB teacher by Lee and Terry.

Mariann Jelinck  
Research Editor  
The Amos Tuck School  
Dartmouth College

# RESOURCES FOR TEACHING ABOUT POWER IN ORGANIZATIONS

*Lee Bolman and Terrence E. Deal*  
*Harvard Graduate School of Education*

## Introduction

Despite an emphasis in the field of OB on collaboration, rational action, and organizational design, the topic of power continues to crop up across organizational settings and events and to seep into classroom discussions about organization

How do I use it? How do I avoid it? How do I give it away?

Although many of these questions seem simplistic or naive on first inspection, one quickly encounters dilemmas, conceptual confusion, ambivalences, and ambiguities in trying to provide satisfactory answers. Because the concept of power is so complex and elusive, yet so essential in understanding – or managing – organizations, we spend considerable time and effort trying to help students understand, experience, and develop strategies for dealing with power.

The purpose of this short article is to share some resources that we have found useful in thinking and teaching about power in our introductory OB course. We make no claim that our list is either comprehensive or sufficient. Our course is offered in a graduate school of education, is intellectually pluralistic – intentionally designed to present several theoretical perspectives, and is heavily experiential (Bolman and Deal, 1979). These factors, among others (including our own intellectual biases and preferences), have contributed to our choices of which resources and materials around the issue of power we consider most important. The following list of resources is offered as food for thought to stimulate an exchange rather than as recommendations for action among our colleagues.

## Thinking about Power: Some Resources

Our course emphasizes four perspectives – or frames – for viewing organizations: (1) human resource, (2) structural, (3) political and, (4) symbolic. Where possible, we try to examine various topics and issues from these four perspectives. Power is no exception and we try to look at power in a variety of ways. Under each perspective, we have listed the readings that we (and students) find most useful in thinking about power:

theory and behavior. Students in our introductory OB class, for example, consistently raise difficult questions about the issue of power: What is power? How do I get it? How do I know when I have it? Should I want it?

### 1. Human Resource Perspective

- French, John R. P., Jr., and Bertram H. Raven, “The Bases of Social Power,” in *Studies of Social Power*, D. Cartwright (ed.), Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1959, pp. 150-167. Proposes five bases of social power: reward power, coercive power, expert power, reference power, and legitimate power.
- McClelland, D., *Power: The Inner Experience*, Chapters 1, 2, 7. New York: Irvington, 1975. Discusses individual power motives, power orientations, and their complications. A very useful discussion of the “two faces” of power, and the duality of human responses to power.
- Oshry, Barry, *Power and Position*, Boston: Power and Systems Training, 1977. Oshry provides a thoughtful discussion of sources of power and powerlessness in different organizational positions.
- Tannenbaum, A. S., *Hierarchy in Organizations*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974. Tannenbaum focuses particularly on the relationship between power and hierarchical position.

### 2. Structural Perspective

- Kantor, Rosabeth, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books, 1977. Analyzes the structural bases of power in organizations. Discussions of empowerment, powerlessness, and power differences among sexes are particularly good.

- Dornbusch, Sanford M., and W. Richard Scott, *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977. A thorough discussion of the power literature – especially in the field of sociology. Dornbusch and Scott delineate the concepts of power and authority and examine mainly how legitimate power is exercised through the formal evaluation system.
- Spady, William G., and Douglas E. Mitchell. Three unpublished manuscripts. “Authority, Power and Expectation as Determinants of Action and Tension in School Organization” (1977), “The Uses of Authority and Power in the Organization and Control of School Task Performance” (1977). “Authority and the Functional Structuring of Social Action in Schools” (1977). (Summarized in Spady, William G., and Douglas E. Mitchell, “Authority in the Management of Classroom Activity.” In Duke, Daniel L., editor, *Classroom Management*, the 1978 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979. Unpublished manuscripts may be obtained by contacting William Spady at the American Association of School Administrators in Washington, D.C. or Douglas Mitchell at the University of California at Riverside.) A thorough discussion of the sociological literature on power and authority. Of particular interest is their attempt to link phenomenology with sociology and the various problems that can arise when super-ordinates and subordinates operate from different power perspectives.

### 3. Political Perspective

- Baldrige, J. Victor, *Power and Conflict in the University*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971. Presents a case study of power issues that arose around attempts to change a large university. In Chapter 5, Baldrige

outlines a political model which is parsimonious and quite helpful.

- Gamson, William, *Power and Discontent*, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968. Distinguishes between inducement and constraint power, and chronicles the fascinating relationship between “partisans” and “authorities”.

### 4. Symbolic Perspective

- Cohen, Michael D., and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974. In Chapter 9, particularly, Cohen and March treat power as more ambiguous, elusive and tautological than do other writers. Although they focus on the college presidency, their ideas are applicable to other roles and settings.
- Edelman, Murray, *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1977. While Edelman does not treat power directly, his framework can be used to interpret the exercise of power in organizations.

### Teaching about Power: Some Resources

For the past year, we have used a Power simulation in our introductory class. The simulation gives students the opportunity to feel power and powerlessness. There are two resources that provide the basis for understanding, conducting, and debriefing this simulation.

1. Oshry, Barry, “Power and the Power Lab” in W. R. Nord (ed.), *Concepts and Controversy in Organizational Behavior*, Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing, 1976.
2. Brown, L. David, “Toward a Theory of Power and Inter-group Relations” in Cary L. Cooper and Clayton Alderfer (eds.), *Advances in Experiential Social Processes*, Volume 1, New York John Wiley & Sons, 1978.