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Power is, perhaps, the ultimate Rorschach test—how one uses it often reflects one’s personal values and beliefs. Thus, at one extreme might be individuals who view power as an opportunity to better the lives of others and improve society. And, at the other extreme might be individuals who view it as a license to pursue selfish goals. We need only look at leaders throughout history to see the diversity with which power has been used. For example, while Moses used his power to lead the Hebrews from Egyptian slavery, Ferdinand Marcos used his power in the Philippines to impose martial law and create a government filled with corruption. While Abraham Lincoln labored to unite a country torn by war and emancipate Blacks from slavery, Adolph Hitler commanded the invasion of countries and death to millions of gypsies and Jews. And, while Nelson Mandela brought an end to Apartheid and is currently raising the living standards of Blacks in South Africa, Josef Mengele used his ranking to conduct unthinkable medical experiments on concentration camp inmates at Auschwitz.

It is evident, therefore, that power affects individuals in a variety of ways. Contrary to the popular notion that power acts as a corrupting influence, for some it is a cue for heightened social responsibility. But what are the factors that are associated with socially benevolent, as opposed to self-serving, tendencies among individuals with power? Are certain individuals more prone to behave one way rather than the other? And is it possible to predict how an indi-
POWER: A DANCE WITH THE DEVIL?

For centuries, philosophers, scientists, and laypersons alike have speculated about the corrupting influence of power. People in high places, they surmised, could not and should not be trusted. In 1887, Lord Acton declared his belief that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." And today, surrounded by seemingly rampant reports of crooked government leaders, police brutality, and child abuse, people are quick to attribute destructive or selfish behavior by elite members of society to their powerful status.

It is this sentiment that echoed through early psychological research on social power and which epitomized by Kipnis’s (1976) work on the Meta-morphic Effect. This effect refers to what he initially argued was the general, pervasive way that power changes people, inducing them to pursue selfish ends (see also Kipnis, 1972; Kipnis et al., 1976; Kipnis et al., 1981). Kipnis and colleagues theorized that because power holders are typically in control of desired resources, they are likely to find their ideas and views readily agreed with by subordinates. Because of actor-observer differences in person perception (Jones & Nisbett, 1972), power holders may be insensitive to the role that their power plays in producing such ye-saying, and may instead attribute it to the quality and value of their input. Consequently, they come to believe that their ideas and views are superior, implying that they are somehow special as compared to their subordinates, and thus perhaps deserving of the resources, privileges, and so forth that typically come with power. In this way, Kipnis and colleagues argued, power holders may come to devalue the worth of their subordinates and perceive them as mere objects for manipulation in the service of the power holders’ own (more important) goals. Moreover, they may adjust their code of ethical behavior in order to rationalize such manipulation. Thus, over time, even the most well-intentioned individual has the potential to be corrupted by power.

Kipnis was not alone in his early view of power. Whether in the form of a personality variable (e.g., McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973) or a situational variable, power has been linked to such vices as stereotyping (Fiske, 1993), sexual harassment (Brewer, 1982; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1983), sexual aggression (Groeb, 1979), child abuse (Bugental et al., 1967), and self-destructive behavior (McClelland, 1987).

Contrary to its reputation, however, power is not a universally corruptive force, and to gain a position of power is not an automatic engagement to dance with the devil. After all, we often aspire to rise in the ranks, and when colleagues or friends are tapped for more powerful positions, they are often congratulated, not shunned. Therefore, at some level, though wary of the metamorphosis some individuals seem to undergo, we must recognize that power has the potential to lead to positive, even socially beneficial, consequences. So, while power may lead to selfishness and moral deterioration in some, it may also lead to benevolence and moral fortification in others. The range of effects that power may have is wide, and scientific appreciation and interest in such individual differences are only recently emerging.

THE TRUTH ABOUT POWER REVEALED

The idea that individual differences might exist in the effects of power emerged early on in research on leadership behavior. In an effort to identify the behaviors that constitute effective leadership, Shartle (1961; see also Boles & Strohbeek, 1951; Cattell, 1951; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Liukert, 1961) uncovered two basic types of leadership behavior. One behavior cluster, labeled "considerate behavior," included attending to the opinions of other group members and showing concern for the welfare of others. The second behavior cluster, labeled "initiation of structure in interaction," included assigning tasks and requiring that certain task standards be met. These two behavior sets, or interaction styles, were later related to certain personality types. Specifically, through the development of the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale, Fiedler and his colleagues (e.g., Fiedler & Chemers, 1984; Fielder & Garcia, 1987) were able to identify and differentiate between leaders scoring high in LPC and those scoring low on the scale. Whereas individuals with low LPC scores are said to be focused on finishing a given task (high-task motivation), those with high LPC scores are described as more concerned with relating to other group members (high relationship motivation).

In recent years, further empirical evidence regarding individual differences has accrued in various power-related domains. One such area is that of stereotyping, which Fiske and her colleagues (Fiske, 1993; Fiske & Deput, 1996; Fiske & Morling, 1998; Goodwin et al., 2000; Goodwin, Operario, & Fiske, 1998) have conceptualized as one possible manifestation of power. According to their model, power holders stereotype at times by default or passive means. That is, because power holders’ outcomes do not depend so much on the actions of subordinates (while the outcomes of subordinates depend heavily on the decisions of power holders), power holders are not likely motivated to devote much attention or effort to processing individualizing information about their subordinates. Power holders may simply be unable to carefully attend to individualizing information about individual subordinates because of the sheer number of subordinates they must supervise. The model argues as well that power holders may at times stereotype by design (Fiske & Deput, 1996; Goodwin et al., in press; Goodwin et al., 1998). That is, they may use effortful and intentional strategies to perceive and interpret subordinates in stereotype-consistent ways. By doing so, they reinforce the behavior of subordinates in ways that confirm and maintain their preconceived perceptions of others. Stereotyping, by design essentially reflects the power holder’s motivation to confirm expectations and justify the use of power.
Research conducted in support of the model suggests that being other-oriented may play a role in individual differences in the effects of power. In particular, Goodwin, Guibin, et al. (2000) suggest that one's own sense of responsibility toward others may be a factor that moderates the power-stereotyping effect. Under the pretense that they were to review job applications, participants were placed either in a relatively powerful position (i.e., their inputs counted toward 30% of the final decision) or a powerless position (i.e., their inputs did not affect the final decision). Some participants also had their concept of responsibility preactivated or primed through completing the Humanitarian-Egalitarian Values Scale (Katz & Hass, 1988) prior to the application review task. As predicted, participants who were primed with responsibility related items, compared to those who were not, subsequently paid more attention to individual applicant information, reflecting a decrease in their tendency to stereotype. Furthermore, trends in the data suggested that of the participants primed with responsibility, the majority of who increased their attention to individualizing information were in the high power condition. Thus, stereotyping need not be an inevitable result of power. Individuals who have developed feelings of responsibility towards others may possess a natural immunity to this aspect, at least, of power's effects.

More blatant forms of domination and power abuse are sexual aggression and sexual harassment, and research suggests that power and sex are indeed related (Bargh et al., 1986; Pryor & Stoller, 1994). Dominance motives, for instance, are present in men who are likely to sexually aggress. In both an incarcerated population of convicted rapists (Groth, 1979) and a nonincarcerated population (Liska & Roth, 1988; Malamuth, 1986), tendencies toward sexual aggression have been found to be associated with power motives. Similarly, Pryor and his colleagues (Pryor, 1987; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1983; Pryor & Stoller, 1994) have demonstrated a cognitive association between the concepts of power and sex but, notably, only for individuals who are likely to sexually harass. More specifically, using a paired-associate memory task, Pryor and Stoller (1994) found that men with sexual harassment tendencies perceived an illusory correlation between power-related and sex-related words, yet this correlation was not exhibited by men without such tendencies. Other studies have demonstrated individual differences in behavior as well. For instance, when placed in situations in which they held power over a female subordinate (a confederate) by virtue of their role (e.g., golf instructor), men with sexual harassment tendencies touched the subordinate more often and expressed more sexualized comments than men without such tendencies (Pryor, 1987; Pryor et al., 1993).

Individual differences in the power-sex association are also apparent at the nonconscious level (see Bargh & Alvarez, this volume). Bargh et al. (1995) subliminally primed participants, who were first pretested on their tendencies to sexually harass and sexually aggress, with power-related words in a pronunciation task. They found that participants who were likely to sexually harass or sexually aggress were faster than participants without such tendencies to pronounce sex-related words immediately after being primed with power-related words. In other words, for these participants, activation of the power concept led to the automatic activation of the sex concept, enabling them to pronounce the sex-related words more quickly. A second study demonstrated that participants with tendencies toward sexual aggression were more likely to rate a female confederate as attractive after being primed with power-related words than with neutral words. There was no such effect on perception, however, for participants without sexual aggression tendencies. The concepts of power and sex were thus shown to be automatically associated, and therefore vulnerable to unconscious activation, but only for individuals possessing sexual harassment or sexual aggression tendencies. Together with the findings of Pryor and his colleagues, these studies reveal one mechanism by which power can lead individuals to exhibit behaviors that are in line with sexual harassment and sexual aggression. They also reveal individual differences in power's effects on cognition, perception, and behavior.

Dean and Malamuth (1997) propose that individual differences in the proclivity to sexually aggress may be moderated by factors related to being other-oriented. Specifically, they argue that among males who are at a high risk of sexually aggressing, those who can be categorized as nurturant are less likely to actually sexually aggress, whereas those who are more self-centered are more likely to sexually aggress. Additionally, when their levels of empathy are low, men who tend to become aroused by witnessing sexual aggression are more likely to sexually aggress themselves. In contrast, when their levels of empathy are high, the link between arousal from witnessing sexual aggression and sexually aggressive behavior is diminished (Malamuth, Henrey, & Linz, 1983).

Together, these pieces of evidence from independent and diverse topics of study hint at the same conclusion: whereas some individuals in power may behave rather unscrupulously, without regard to the needs and feelings of those beneath them, others appear to behave in the opposite manner, with greater felt responsibility and consideration for their subordinates. Thus, some powerholders can end up stereotyping underlings—a selfish act, since it saves the powerholder the time and energy of processing another person's individualizing information, while at the same time bolstering their own preconceived notions about the other. Powerholders with heightened feelings of responsibility, however, may take the necessary time to form individual, more accurate impressions. Similarly, some powerholders may sexually harass or coerce their underlings, reflecting the selfish pursuit of needs and desires without consideration of the impact such behavior will have on the victims. Yet those who possess feelings of nurturance and empathy may be less likely to take advantage of their elevated position to satisfy sexual goals. In summary, power seemingly promotes self-serving behavior for some and other-oriented behavior in others, and it is this difference that may eventually lead to the abuse or responsible use of power, respectively.
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN RELATIONSHIP ORIENTATION AS A MODERATOR OF THE USE OF POWER

Although there is a relative wealth of research on the negative effects of power, studies that focus directly on positive effects are few, and only recently have efforts been made to study individual differences in power's use and abuse (see Dépret & Fiske, 1993, for a review). In their search for moderators, Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh (in press) investigated the role of individual differences in relationship orientation in understanding the effects of power. They reasoned that powerholders' behavior toward subordinates may extend logically from the ways they tend to relate to others in general. Chen and her colleagues chose to examine communal and exchange relationship orientations, first proposed by Clark and Mills (1979).

According to Clark and her colleagues (Clark & Mills, 1979; Clark, Mills, & Powell, 1985; Clark et al., 1987; Mills & Clark, 1982), individuals differ in their communal and exchange orientations to varying degrees. Individuals with a strong communal orientation are generally concerned with other people's welfare; benefits are given in response to others' needs without any specific expectation of benefits in return. Individuals with a strong exchange orientation, on the other hand, are typically concerned with others' welfare per se; rather, the focus is on the fair exchange of benefits, which are given with the specific expectation of receiving something comparable in return or as payment for a benefit previously received.

Considerable research supports the distinction between communal and exchange orientations. Individuals with communal orientations, for example, have been shown to lend help to others more than individuals with exchange orientations (Clark, Ouellette, et al., 1987). Even when actual helping is not possible, communal individuals keep track of the needs of the other more often than exchange individuals (Clark, Mills, et al., 1986). Moreover, communal individuals report feeling better if they have helped another than if they had not (Williamson & Clark, 1989, 1992). Communal individuals, therefore, appear to have a chronic goal to respond to others' needs or to be socially responsible. Accordingly, their personal goals and interests may often be in accord with the goals and interests of others (see also Triandis, 1965).

Individuals with exchange orientations, on the other hand, display a more favorable reaction than communal individuals to being given immediate compensation for a benefit given (Clark & Mills, 1979). And if not repaid, these individuals tend to feel that they have been exploited (Clark & Waddell, 1985). Additionally, when working on a joint task that will lead to a reward, exchange individuals are more likely to keep track of each person's input (Clark, 1984). Together, these studies show that exchange individuals tend to be more focused on making sure they are being treated fairly than on helping others and responding to their needs. They wish neither to be owed a personal favor, nor to owe a favor to another individual. Exchangers, therefore, appear to have a chronic goal to pursue more self-oriented goals, and this focus on the self may not, at times, coincide with the interests of others.

Regardless of their different relational pursuits, power may serve to heighten the goals and interests of communalists and exchangers by making the resources necessary to attain one's goals more readily available. Furthermore, for communalists, being in a position of power may imply that those without power have a greater need for benefits than the self. As a result, communal powerholders may feel a desire to respond to the needs of those who are dependent on them (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963). In contrast, for exchangers, being in a position of power may imply that they have more to offer, and thus more deserving of benefits, in relationship exchanges. They may therefore perceive it as unfair and inappropriate to focus primarily on benefits for the self.

TESTING THE RELATIONSHIP ORIENTATION—POWER INTERACTION

Chen and her colleagues (in press) theorized that individuals who are primarily communal tend to be more socially responsible than individuals who are primarily exchange oriented, and that this difference would be amplified when these individuals are placed in a position of power. In their depiction of the socially responsible personality, Berkowitz and Luttermann (1968) argued that socially responsible people are highly involved in their society and adhere to cultural norms. In one study, therefore, Chen and her colleagues reasoned that communalists, compared to exchangers, would be more likely to present themselves as followers of social norms, particularly when in power (Chen et al., in press, Study 2). They may desire to be as, it were, ideal citizens or role models for others. In the study, pairs of participants who were primarily communal or exchange were brought to a professor's office. One participant in each pair was casually guided to sit behind the professor's desk while the other was guided to sit in the guest chair directly across from the desk. With this seating arrangement, participants were contextually primed with either power (professor's desk) or powerlessness (guest chair) (see Bargh, 1989, 1992, 1994). Participants completed two scales that either directly or indirectly measured social responsibility. One scale was the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), and the other was the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986). The first scale measures respondents' concerns with social approval and acceptance directly, whereas the latter does so indirectly (endorsement racist beliefs on the Modern Racism Scale is likely to be perceived as inverting social disapproval). As predicted, communally oriented individuals exhibited a greater concern with social responsibility when primed with power than with a relative lack of power. That is, they had higher Social Desirability scale scores and expressed less racist (i.e., more socially acceptable) opinions on the Modern Racism Scale when sitting in the power chair. Exchange oriented individuals, meanwhile, had a tendency to exhibit less concern with social responsibility when
primed with power than with powerlessness. They tended to exhibit less direct concern with social desirability and to express more racist attitudes.

In subsequent study, Chen and her colleagues examined the effect of power on the behavior of communally versus exchange oriented individuals (Chen et al., in press, Study 3). Once again, communal and exchange participants were primed with the concepts of power and powerlessness via their seating arrangement in a professor's office. This time, only one participant was brought to the office at a time. However, each participant was led to believe that a second participant was also scheduled for the session but was running late. While waiting, the experimenter explained that ten exercises from a list would be divided between the two participants for each to complete. Then, after waiting several minutes for the fictitious other participant to arrive, the experimenter asked the participant to peruse the list of exercises and select five, adding that whichever one he or she did not choose would be left for the other participant to complete. The list of exercises, which was made to appear as if it were originally intended for only the experimenter’s reference, contained information about each exercise, including the length of time required to complete it. Participants were told that they were free to leave once they completed the five exercises they chose for themselves. The amount of time participants committed to via their five exercise choices was taken as a measure of socially responsible versus self-serving behavior. That is, opting to complete the longer exercises meant sacrificing one’s own time and benefiting the other participant, whereas choosing the shorter exercises meant being able to leave the experiment earlier, but at the other participant’s expense. As predicted, communal and exchange participants were influenced by the power cues to make their choices in opposing ways. While communal participants chose more of the longer exercises for themselves when primed with the concept of power versus powerlessness, exchange participants chose more of the shorter exercises when primed with the concept of power versus powerlessness.

Lee-Chai and Bargh (2000) demonstrated that these findings are not merely brief, initial effects but differences that persist over time. Additionally, whereas the Chen et al. (in press) studies used subtle contextual cues to nonconsciously prime power and powerlessness, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2000) showed that these effects hold even when participants are fully aware of their power over others. For their study, communal and exchange participants were recruited through job advertisements in the university paper. They were hired to serve as supervisors in a data collection project that spanned ten weeks. Each participant supervised the work of two subordinates, who in actuality were fictitious, and communicated with them through electronic messages. While one subordinate was cheerful, thorough, and prompt, the other tended to be curt, sloppy, and tardy. Periodically throughout the 10 weeks, participants agreed to complete various scales to help the principal investigator with a purported ancillary project. These scales included several power-related measures: the Social Domains Orientation scale (Pratto et al., 1994), Machiavellianism IV scale (Christie & Geis, 1970), and Misuse of Power scale (see below for a more full description). Participations also completed biweekly evaluations of their subordinates, monitored the work of their subordinates, and made decisions regarding payment to subordinates.

Consistently throughout the 10-week period, communal supervisors were less likely than exchange supervisors to view power as an opportunity to dominate and pursue self-serving goals, as evidenced by lower scores on the Social Domains Orientation, Machiavellianism IV, and Misuse of Power scales. Moreover, trends in the data suggested that these differences between communal and exchange supervisors became more pronounced over time, rather than dwindling as some may have speculated. In terms of supervisory behaviors and judgments, communal supervisors monitored their subordinates more thoroughly than exchange supervisors, checking their work more often for errors and logging onto their e-mail accounts more frequently to check for correspondence from them. Such greater attention to subordinates by communal supervisors was also reflected by their evaluations of them. Communal supervisors differentiated their two subordinates to a greater degree than exchange supervisors. Thus, the good subordinate received a much more positive evaluation than the poor subordinate. Finally, when asked to divide bonus money among group members, communal supervisors tended to keep less of the cash award for themselves than did exchange supervisors. In general, communal supervisors were more responsible in their rule than exchange supervisors.

These studies show that whether individuals use their power for social good or selfish gain may depend, in part, on their chronic relationship orientations. Individuals who are primarily communal are chronically motivated to respond to the needs of others. Power may simply better enable them to fulfill this need. Individuals who are primarily exchange, meanwhile, are chronically motivated to protect their own interests. They may view power as an opportunity to pursue self-interests more fully when resources are more available.

Though recent studies suggest that relationship orientation may be one way to predict the nature of power’s effects over a particular individual, there may be more direct methods of assessment. Relationship orientation, after all, is concerned with rules of interaction more generally and does not specifically speak to power dynamics. Moreover, although adherence to exchange rules might make one more inclined to pursue self-oriented goals when in power, it is not intended to be synonymous with exploitation and corruption. To be sure, self-oriented goals are not the only goals pursued by exchange, and not all self-oriented goals conflict with the goals of others. Additionally, when power differences are minimal in an interpersonal relationship, exchange oriented individuals tend to be primarily concerned with equity and fairness. Thus, we created a new measure in an effort to better predict individual differences in the likelihood to misuse power. Moreover, because fewer measures of power exploitation exist than measures of social responsibility, and because of the greater urgency revolving around the detection of potential abusers, this measure focuses on the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that we believe abusive powerholders are likely to hold.
THE MISUSE OF POWER SCALE

Tendencies to misuse power, by definition, are behaviors that emerge only under circumstances in which the individual holds power, whether it be in the form of behavioral control or fate control (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), or based on factors such as expertise, reward capability, coercion, legitimacy, or reference (French & Raven, 1959). The misuse of power also requires that the individual hold certain beliefs about entitlement and dominance and have somewhat cavalier attitudes toward propriety. Thus, it is distinct from conceptually similar variables, such as Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970), which addresses one’s beliefs that others may be manipulated for self-gain and which may manifest itself regardless of the individual’s power status. The misuse of power is also distinct from Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994), which focuses on beliefs in the inequality of social groups, and that one’s own group is superior to outgroups. It is, more or less, a hybrid of these variables within a power context, and one that speaks directly to interpersonal situations in which one individual has the ability to influence the behavior or control the outcomes of the other. It is this essence that Lee-Chai and Chartrand (2000) attempted to capture with the Misuse of Power scale.

Construction of the Misuse of Power Scale

Many of the items on the Misuse of Power scale (MOP) were intended to measure general attitudes toward the misuse of power (e.g., Darwin’s “survival of the fittest” not only applies to biological evolution, but also to society, if people did not break the rules every now and then, society would remain stagnant). Some items, however, addressed a variety of specific goals that may be associated with power. For instance, an individual may misuse power in order to gain monetary or material gains (e.g., It is acceptable for people in high positions to take liberties with their company’s fringe benefits as a form of extra compensation), to gain status or prestige (e.g., Sometimes it is better to hire a less qualified applicant to protect one’s level of superiority), to exact revenge or alleviating personal distress (e.g., Under the constant pressures of a high-powered job, it is understandable if one occasionally takes out a bad mood on one’s employees), or to influence another’s attitudes or behavior (e.g., It’s good to have at least one friend who can be easily manipulated and coaxed into doing just about anything). Many of the items reflected a blatant disregard for ethical rules of conduct and the consequences of one’s behavior on others. Items for the initial version of the MOP were generated independently by three researchers and were based in part on words associated with power that were solicited from undergraduates in a pretest. The initial version of the MOP consisted of 49 critical Likert items and 11 fillers. Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 9 (agree strongly).

Once all potential items had been amassed, they were administered to 133 undergraduates (46 males, 84 females) at New York University who were enrolled in an introductory psychology course and who received credit toward a course requirement. Participants were told that the purpose of the study was to protest various measures for several different researchers in the psychology department. One of these measures was the MOP.

As previously noted, the misuse of power is likely to be related to beliefs in the social dominance of certain groups over others, the inherent goodness or evil in human nature, and the morality of manipulating others for personal benefit. In addition, one’s general likelihood to misuse power should be reflected in one’s tendencies to misuse power in specific situations, such as in cases of sexual harassment or sexual aggression. Several scales, therefore, were administered with the MOP in order to assess convergent validity: Social Dominance Orientation scale (SDO), Philosophies of Human Nature scale (PHN, Wrightsman, 1984), which includes the subscales of cynicism and trust; Machiavellianism IV scale (Mach), and Right Wing Authoritarianism scale (RWA, Altemeyer, 1981), which measures one’s attitudes toward authority and obedience. In addition, measures involving specific situations of the misuse of power were included: Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH, Pryor, 1987), which includes items assessing the likelihood that respondents would engage in blatant, subtle, or indirect sexual harassment, as well as more subtle forms of sexual harassment such as using one’s power to secure a date with another individual and Attractiveness of Sexual Aggression scale (ASA, Malamuth, 1985a, 1985b) scale, which measures one’s likelihood to rape or sexually force another individual.

The researchers also measured the likelihood that participants would commit exploitative or self-serving behaviors by administering a measure containing 16 scenarios. These scenarios were used to assess predictive validity for the MOP scale. Each scenario asked participants to imagine themselves in a position in which they held power. The form of power varied from reward power to coercive power to legitimate power (see French & Raven, 1959). In each situation, participants could use their power to attain selfish gains or take certain liberties. Participants were asked to assume that no matter what the behavior, nothing bad would be likely to happen as a result of their action. A sample scenario reads as follows:

Imagine you have been elected as student body president. As president, it is up to you to decide which campus organizations get to hold certain activities. One day, a fraternity asks for your authorization to hold a social activity. However, their agenda goes against a few school policies, and you tell them your concerns. In response, the fraternity offers you $500 to overlook the policy infraction and authorize their application. How likely are you to do the following: a) accept their offer and authorize their activity; b) ignore their offer and reject their application for the activity; c) report the proposed bribe to the University Judiciary Board?
Participants rated the likelihood of each behavior on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all likely, 5 = very likely).

Participants completed the MOP and other power-related scales over two sessions. In the first session, participants were given the SDO, PHN, Mach, and RWA scales, interspersed with three filler scales unrelated to power. Half of all participants received the measures in the above order, while the other half received them in reverse order. One week later, participants returned for the second session, during which they completed the MOP, scenarios, LSH, and ASA scales. The items on the MOP were administered both in a forward and reverse order. Whereas the MOP and the scenarios alternated for which was presented first, the LSH and ASA scales were always administered last due to their graphic nature.

After adjusting for reversed items, responses were averaged across the 49 critical items on the MOP. The mean score was 2.92, with a standard deviation of .85. The MOP was first subjected to an analysis of variance to test for the effects of sex and order. Because gender effects are generally found on other power-related scales such as the SDO, RWA, LSH, and ASA, we expected to find a gender effect on the MOP as well. As predicted, the analysis of variance revealed a significant main effect of sex, F(1, 125) = 19.81, p < .001, with males (M = 3.18) exhibiting higher scores than females (M = 2.76). The order of items was not significant, nor was there an interaction between sex and order.

For all 49 items, the reliability coefficient reached .89. In order to create a shortened, more manageable version of the scale, items that had item total correlations of at least .40 were culled. These 18 items, which are listed in Table 4.1, have a coefficient alpha of .87. The mean score on the 18-item version was 2.76, with a standard deviation of .44.

A factor analysis was then conducted on the 18 items of the shortened MOP. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation satisfactorily yielded one main factor that accounted for 32.4% of the variance. The eigenvalue for this factor was 5.54 with the next largest factor carrying an eigenvalue of 1.58 and only 8.5% of the variance. Item loadings on the main factor ranged from .25-.66. These results confirm that the 18 items of the shortened MOP measure a single variable with adequate reliability.

**Convergent and Predictive Validity**

Participants' responses on the SDO, PHN, Mach, RWA, LSH, and ASA scales were used to assess convergent validity for the MOP scale. The 18-item version was used for all analyses. Furthermore, the PHN was broken down into its Cynicism and Trust subscales, since past research has revealed only a moderately negative correlation between these two subscales (Wrightsohn, 1964). Additionally, the items on the Trust subscale were reversed and will hereafter be referred to as the Distrust scale.

A correlation matrix was generated for all power-related measures (see Table 4.2). The MOP correlated positively with all other power-related scales at a significant level (ps < .001), except for Distrust (r = −.11, ns). Correlation coefficients ranged from .30 with RWA to +.63 with SDO. The MOP, therefore, conceptually resembles other measures related to power without being completely redundant. Surprisingly, Distrust correlated only slightly or not at all with the other power-related measures, suggesting that dominating or taking

---

**Table 4.1. Items on the Misuse of Power Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People who have spent their lives working their way up the corporate ladder have earned the right to bend the rules here and there once they finally get to the top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is nothing wrong with occasionally taking credit for one of your subordinate's ideas, since they will be doing the same to their subordinates in due time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is not acceptable for people in high positions to take liberties with their company's fringe benefits in the form of extra compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. One should always take advantage of any opportunity that comes one's way, regardless of the consequences for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is unacceptable to shift the blame for a bad idea onto a subordinate, even though his or her career would not be jeopardized by the mistake like yours would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Greed is beneficial, since it helps to increase one's productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Given enough opportunities, everyone can be corrupted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is wrong for people to try to take advantage of each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I had the opportunity to sue another individual, I would sue for all the money he or she was worth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is not right for physically stronger people to try to intimidate weaker people for personal gains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rules are not meant to be broken, even if no one finds out, and no one is directly hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is never acceptable to deceive one's subordinates, even when the truth will tarnish one's reputation as a leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Those who allow others to walk all over them deserve what they get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is unacceptable to push your opinions on others, even if those people never seem to form coherent opinions of their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The best method of getting your way with someone is to make him or her feel guilty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. People in high positions have not earned the right to receive special treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. One should take care not to step on people on the way to the top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It's good to have at least one friend who can be easily manipulated and coaxed into doing just about anything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 4.2. Correlations Coefficients for the MOP and Power-Related Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOP</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Cynicism</th>
<th>Mach</th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>LSH</th>
<th>ASA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mach</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSH</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01
advantage of less powerful others requires an element of trust, perhaps that the other will not rebel or betray their subordinate position. At the same time, however, cynicism does positively correlate with other power-related measures. Thus, while not wholly distrustful of others, individuals who are likely to misuse power tend to be cynical about human nature.

In a second analysis, the researchers correlated the MOP with an indirect measure of the use of power, the Communal and Exchange Orientation scales. Communal and exchange scores were obtained for 113 of the participants. At the beginning of the semester, students in the introductory psychology course had completed a battery of scales, including the Communal and Exchange Orientation scales, for preselection purposes. The MOP correlated negatively with the Communal Orientation scale, $r = -.40, p < .001$, and positively with the Exchange Orientation scale, $r = +.23, p = .015$. Furthermore, an analysis of variance comparing participants who were primarily communal to those who were primarily exchange confirmed that communal participants had significantly lower MOP scores ($M = 2.21$) than exchange participants ($M = 3.09$), $F(1, 66) = 24.85, p < .001$. Thus, mirroring the results of Chen and her colleagues (in press) and Lee-Chai and Bargh (2000), communal individuals had a lower likelihood of misusing power than exchange individuals.

Scores on the scenarios were next summed to assess predictive validity for the MOP. For each scenario, only the behavior that reflected a misuse of power was included in the calculations. Scores for the scenarios correlated strongly with scores on the MOP, $r = -.53, p < .001$. However, compared to the MOP, the scenarios had a weaker negative correlation with communal scores ($r = -.20, p = .04$) and did not correlate with exchange scores ($r = .09, n.s.$), suggesting that communal and exchange orientations may not predict scores on the power-related scenarios as well as scores on the MOP. Because correlations between the MOP and RWA, SDQ, Mach and Mach were strong, we conducted an analysis to confirm that the MOP holds predictive value above and beyond these other power-related measures. Scores on the MOP were regressed onto scores from the scenarios after first entering scores on the RWA, SDQ, Mach and Mach in the analyses.

The three power-related measures, combined, accounted for 31.25% of the variance, with the MOP accounting for an additional 4.51% of the variance, $b = .03, F(113) = 2.52, p < .05$. Thus, it appears that the MOP provides a contribution to the prediction of power abuse tendencies separate from the RWA, SDQ, Mach scales.

Together, these analyses demonstrate preliminary evidence for the usefulness of the Misuse of Power scale in predicting selfish, inappropriate behavior by powerful individuals. This evidence is bolstered even more by the effectiveness of the MOP in reflecting differences between communal and exchange powerholders in the longitudinal study of power, described earlier (Lee-Chai & Bargh, 2000). Further testing of the Misuse of Power scale, however, is needed in both laboratory and field settings to better evaluate the predictive value of the new measure. In these early studies, administration of the MOP and scenarios in close succession may have led participants to be concerned with consistency in their responses, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the MOP to predict abusive tendencies in the scenarios. Additionally, though the scenarios were of common, plausible situations to which undergraduates could easily relate, responses may not have fully reflected actual behavior. Future testing of the MOP begs for a study in which participants actually have the opportunity to misuse their powerful status for selfish gain.

**Conclusion**

Just as there is more than one way to skin a cat, there is more than one way to detect individual differences in the use and misuse of power. Goodwin et al. (2000) found that feelings of responsibility moderated the power-related behavior of stereotyping. Dean and Malamuth (1997) argue that individuals with more self-centered personalities are more likely to sexually aggress, whereas those who are more nurturant are less likely to sexually aggress. The Chen et al. (in press) and Lee-Chai and Bargh (2000) studies suggest that communal and exchange orientations may moderate the effects of power, leading to either prosocial, responsible gestures or more self-oriented aims. And the creation of the Misuse of Power scale, which reflects the pursuit of selfish goals and disregard for the welfare of others, potentially provides a more direct method of detecting individual differences in the use of power.

Despite their diversity, these varying methods of detection share two common factors. First, it should be noted that much of the research reviewed in this chapter has approached the question of power from a Person × Situation angle. In other words, the researchers have proposed that the effect of the situation is likely to differ depending on various individual differences. The presence of power cues in the environment interacts with personality variables, such as nurturance or relationship orientation, to produce effects, whether they be positive or negative.

Second, each research points to the direction of one's primary focus, whether it be toward selfish interests or the interests of others, as a moderator for power's effects. When an individual's own needs and interests receive primary attention, chances increase that the needs and interests of others, both physical and emotional, become overlooked or blatantly disregarded. On the other hand, when the needs and interests of others receive primary attention, it becomes less likely that others will suffer negative consequences as a result of an individual's actions. It does not necessarily follow, however, that if the needs and interests of others receive primary attention, one's own needs and interests become neglected. Just as Clark and Mills (1993) argued in their depiction of the communal orientation, meeting the needs of others may simultaneously meet one's own needs as well as the needs of others. In other words, since the goal to benefit others is also a personal goal, meeting one automatically meets the other.

Of course, investigating self-focus versus other-focus may not be the only
route to predicting the use or misuse of power. Other possibilities include perceptions of ingroup versus outgroup, perceptions of the self as distinctive versus nondistinctive, or collective versus individualistic tendencies (see also Gardner & Seeley, this volume). Further research is needed to broaden our understanding of factors that promote and prevent the misuse of power.

Possession of such knowledge may prove useful in the fight against corruption, with applications possible in virtually any realm involving hierarchical structures. Political offices, government employees, militaries, police academies, and businesses are only a few areas that might benefit from the information. Care must be taken, however, to ensure that knowledge of an individual's proclivities in situations of power is not itself misused. After all, predictive measures are never entirely accurate, and tendencies toward the abuse of power do not guarantee eventual behavior. Rather than adopting an attitude of prevention, it may be wiser to adopt an attitude of promotion. That is, rather than testing individuals and convicting them before any crime is committed, it would be more ethical and prudent to establish programs that train individuals in becoming more other-focused. Such programs are already underway in the form of sensitivity training in major corporations for individuals who exhibit abusive behavior toward others. Regardless of the form of training, there is no doubt that efforts to curb the misuse of power must be made worldwide.
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Power Motivation and Motivation to Help Others

IRENE H. FRIEZE
BONKA S. BONEVA

As we examine expressions of power, it is important to consider what role personality factors play in why people might or might not be interested in having power over others. A large body of research has suggested that people have relatively stable patterns of underlying unconscious motives. Such motives are among the factors that determine how people make choices and what goals they seek. Motives are believed to develop in childhood and are an aspect of one's personality throughout one's life.

One of these motives is power motivation. This chapter examines some of the research and theory related to the expression of power motivation. As will be discussed, power motivation is related to a number of diverse behaviors, including overt aggressiveness as well as desires to help others. First, the approach of motivation theory is briefly outlined and then research specifically on power motivation and its correlates is reviewed. The chapter then illustrates how helping behavior may be motivated by power motivation. Finally, we turn to a discussion of how to measure power motivation generally, and helping power motivation in particular is presented.

SOCIAL MOTIVES

One of the major theorists examining human social motives is David McClelland (e.g., McClelland, 1987). McClelland (1987) argues that most social behavior can be understood in terms of an interaction between underlying motives and features of the environment. He suggests that there are three basic motives: