

THE EFFECTS OF ATTRIBUTION AND SOCIAL CONTEXT ON SUPERIORS' INFLUENCE AND INTERACTION WITH LOW PERFORMING SUBORDINATES

DEAN TJOSVOLD
Faculty of Business Administration
Simon Fraser University

Organizations need to create the conditions in which superiors use their power effectively and appropriately, perhaps especially when subordinates are performing inadequately. Ninety undergraduates became managers who interacted with a low performing worker who demonstrated either insufficient ability or motivation. The managers also believed that their goals were cooperatively, individualistically, or competitively linked to the subordinate. Results identify situational variables that moderate superiors' influence. Generally, the social context affected the orientation to the subordinate in that cooperative compared to competitive superiors expected mutual assistance, communicated supportively, and gave assistance. Attribution affected the choice of influence methods and the attitudes of superiors. Superiors used threats and came to dislike the low effort subordinate, but wanted to work again with the low ability subordinate. Cooperation fostered attraction even when the other performed ineffectively, provided the reason was inadequate ability and not inadequate motivation. Evidence also suggests that competition creates a rigid response to the low performing subordinate whereas cooperative supervisors flexibly respond to the specific shortcoming of subordinates.

Managers and supervisors inevitably encounter subordinates whose performance is inadequate. Their capacity to cope with this problem can both improve subordinate performance and contribute to the success of the organization. Much of the research relevant to this issue has focused on documenting the consequences of influence attempts to identify methods supervisors may use to influence subordinates effectively (e.g., Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980; Curtis, Smith, & Smoll, 1979). Considerable work has also tried to identify the dynamics by which individuals and groups come to have power in an organization (e.g., Hinings, Hickson, Pennings, & Schneck, 1974; Pfeffer, 1981). Recently, researchers have tried to understand the antecedents of the

use of power and influence to clarify when superiors decide to influence and their choice of influence method (e.g., Mowday, 1979). The influence method affects the productivity and satisfaction of subordinates, and the self-concept and attitudes of the powerholder (Kipnis, 1976). Powerful supervisors have been found to use power coercively and, as a result, to devalue subordinates and seek social distance from them (Kipnis, 1972). Individual differences such as self-confidence have been found to moderate the choice of coercive or persuasive influence (Ayers-Nachamkin, Cann, Reed, & Hovne, 1982; Falbo, 1977; Instone, Major, & Burkner, 1983; Mowday, 1979). However, situational conditions that mediate supervisors' influence and interaction with subordinates have been relatively neglected. This study investigates the role of superiors' attribution of the causes of subordinate's low performance and their social context with the subordinate. In particular, this study examines the effects of superiors' attribution of a subordinate's low performance to insufficient ability or insufficient motivation and their cooperative, competitive, or individualistic interdependence on the superiors' expectations, communication, influence, and relationship.

Sex, achievement needs, self-esteem, and other individual difference variables have been related to the choice of influence attempts. Mowday (1979) proposed that these diverse findings could be integrated with the hypothesis that a lack of self-confidence underlies the use of coercion whereas self-confident persons rely on persuasion. His results suggest a role for self-confidence, but they do not indicate that self-concept is a strong determinant of the choice of influence method (Mowday, 1979).

The subordinate's own performance is a situational variable that appears to substantially affect influence method. Sims (1980) concluded that field and experimental studies support the common expectation that superiors are punitive toward low performing subordinates. Indeed, the results were so consistent that Sims argued that low performance causes superiors to use punishment.

Yet the relationship between superiors' influence and subordinate's inadequate performance is likely to be more complex than Sim's conclusion suggests. Superiors who attribute the low performance to a lack of effort are apt to respond much differently than those who attribute the inadequate performance to a lack of ability (Mitchell, Green, & Wood, 1981). Attribution research indicates that insufficient motivation is considered subject to self-control and modification; unmotivated persons are thought to be able to work if they decide to do so (Tedeschi, 1974; Weiner, 1974). This reasoning suggests that

threats and other strong influence attempts may be effective and appropriate with a low effort subordinate. Low ability subordinates, on the other hand, may elicit quite different reactions. Inability is considered to be outside of self-control; punishment and coercive influence are seen as ineffective, whereas assistance and encouragement are appropriate.

The above reasoning implicitly assumes that superiors are positively oriented to subordinates and believe that an effective performance by the subordinate will help them achieve their own goals. Organizations formally structure superiors' and subordinates' goals to be cooperatively related, but there is a debate about the extent organizational reality matches this ideal. Kanter's (1977, 1979) analysis of organizational power assumes superiors and subordinates are cooperatively related and that powerful superiors use their power to aid subordinates. Commentators on organizational politics argue that in reality superiors and subordinates are often in competition (e.g., Pfeffer, 1981). Imprecise definitions have impeded clarification of these issues. Deutsch's (1949, 1973, 1980) definitions of cooperation and competition have proved useful. In cooperation, persons perceive that their goals are positively related: one's goal attainment helps others reach their goals. Persons in competition perceive their goals to be negatively linked: one's goal attainment makes it less likely that others will reach their goals. A third situation is individualistic in that goals are thought to be independent: one's goal attainment neither facilitates nor frustrates others' goals.

Considerable research supports Deutsch's theory that these goal interdependencies affect the dynamics and outcomes of social interaction (Deutsch, 1973, 1981; Johnson, Johnson, & Maruyama, 1983; Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981). According to Deutsch, persons in cooperation want each other to perform effectively and reach their goals because that helps everyone be successful. As a consequence, they have positive expectations and trust, share their resources, influence each other, and develop attraction. In contrast, persons in competition avoid assistance and may even interfere because others' effectiveness in reaching their goals makes their own success less likely. Deutsch's theory has been empirically developed but not sufficiently integrated into the study of organizations. Cooperation research suggests that superiors who understand that their goals are cooperatively linked with the low performing subordinate would give assistance and encouragement; the competitively related superiors would be more punitive and unsupportive.

Attributions of the inadequate performance and social context are

hypothesized to affect expectations, communication, influence, and relationship. Specifically, supervisors are expected to be more supportive, give more assistance, and be less punitive when they understand that the subordinate lacks ability rather than motivation. This stance of encouragement for low ability subordinates is expected to be stronger within the cooperative social context. Superiors in competition are expected to be punitive and less generous than those in cooperation. There is much less evidence to base hypotheses on the individualistic context. It seems reasonable to conclude that individualistic context superiors would be more open and helpful than competitive ones but less helpful than cooperative superiors.

Method

Subjects

Ninety undergraduates, recruited from business administration courses at Simon Fraser University, volunteered to participate in this study and were randomly assigned to one of six conditions, 15 in each condition. They received course credit and one chance in a \$25 lottery for their participation in the study.

Variables

The two independent variables of performance attribution (low effort vs. low ability) and social context (cooperative, competitive, or individualistic) were orthogonally crossed to form six treatment conditions. All subjects were told that they were to take the role of the manager in a problem-solving department of a company that specializes in solving problems of other organizations. Their department would soon be given problems and they would supervise the person who would work on them. As supervisors usually have control over subordinates' rewards, they were told that they would be able, in addition to communicating with the subordinate, to add up to six quarters or take away six quarters that the subordinate already had.

Subjects in the *low effort* condition encountered a subordinate who looked briefly at the problems and indicated in written comments that the problems were simple and boring and that she or he did not want to work on them. Subjects in the *low ability* condition encountered a subordinate who thought the problems were too challenging and difficult and concluded that she or he did not have the ability to complete them.

The social context was operationalized by informing the subjects about the situation and telling them how their chances in a lottery

were related to the workers' chances. In the *cooperative condition*, subjects read that their company had a history in which supervisors and workers tried to work together and avoid trying to outdo each other. They received rewards, recognition, and opportunities for promotion by working with each other. They were also told that the number of chances they would receive in a \$25 lottery depended on how well they worked on their own task and how well the worker completed his or her problems. Both would receive the same number of chances based on their combined work. In the *competitive condition*, subjects read that their company had a history in which managers and workers tried to outdo each other and organizational rewards were contingent upon doing better than others. They would receive more chances in the lottery if they did their own task more successfully than the worker. In the *individualistic condition*, subjects were told that their company had a history of each member working for his or her own individual benefit and that they could obtain organizational rewards by working well on their own tasks. The number of chances they would receive depended on how well they worked on their own task and not at all on how well the worker did.

Dependent Measures

There are four sets of dependent measures in this study. The first set included the expectations the subjects had of their interaction with the workers. In a questionnaire administered before they supervised the worker, they indicated on 7-point scales the extent they expected to help the other and the extent they expected the other to help them in the up-coming interaction. They rated on 7-point Likert type scales with 1 labeled as "A very little" and 7 as "A great deal" for these and other ratings.

The second set of dependent measures involved the communication subjects had with the worker. Communication was restricted to written comments. Communication messages were categorized twice. Two trained undergraduates who did not know the hypotheses or the conditions of the subjects first coded the comments as supportive, unsupportive, or neutral. Supportive comments were those judged to encourage, give confidence to, or actually help the worker. Nonsupportive comments discouraged, undermined, or interfered with worker performance. Neutral comments were those thought not to have any appreciable positive or negative impact on the worker's confidence, motivation, or performance. Then the comments were coded into more specific categories. All subjects were explicitly asked by the worker to provide assistance. Subjects who responded positively with encouragement or

actual aid were counted as responsive. All specific offers to help that the subjects made to the worker were counted. Subjects were also scored as to whether they asserted to the worker that they had power over him or her and as to whether they threatened to punish the worker. Overall, the coders agreed 93% of the time. They were able to resolve any disagreements, and these resolved ratings were used in the analysis.

The third set of dependent measures involved incentives for the worker. The number of quarters the subjects gave or took away from the worker were counted. In addition, subjects indicated on 7-point scales the extent to which the worker should be rewarded and punished.

The fourth set of dependent measures included the subjects' perceptions of their relationship with the worker. They indicated on 7-point scales the extent the worker helped them and the extent they were open to the worker and the worker open to them. Similarly, they responded on 7-point scales to the questions: "How much do you like the worker?" "To what extent do you want to work again with the worker?" "How much does the worker want to work with you again?" And, "To what extent are you satisfied with your relationship with the worker?"

Procedure

Subjects were informed that the experiment investigates how managers and workers interact to complete the problems. The experiment was conducted in three phases. Subjects prepared for the interaction by learning of the setting and their experimental condition; they supervised the worker in phase 2; and they were then debriefed.

Two subjects were scheduled with two confederates (posing as subjects) at each session. Two groups with one subject and one confederate were formed, and each group was led into a separate room, read the instructions, and told that they would be the managers and the other group the workers. The instructions also indicated the social context induction.

After the subjects understood the instructions and their conditions, they completed a short questionnaire on their expectations about the up-coming interaction. The confederate was then escorted out of the room and a second confederate then entered the room and took the role of the worker. The experimenter then handed the worker's problem to both the worker and the subject and gave the subject his or her own task. The experimenter also reminded them that they could communicate what they wished but that it had to be by written messages

and that they had fifteen minutes to work on the task.

The worker task was a set of four problems that required considerable thought and effort in order to solve. The problems were difficult enough so that subjects would believe workers might or might not have the ability to complete them. For example, they were to solve the horse trading problem (Maier, 1970). The subject's task was 25 straight forward business mathematics questions taken from college texts.

After fifteen minutes the experimenter returned and ended phase 2, separated the subject and confederate, and had the subjects complete the post-experimental questionnaire. Subjects were then probed for suspicion, debriefed, thanked, given credit in a course, and one chance in a \$25 lottery.

Confederates

Three female and three male undergraduates were given 12 hours of training and participated in an extensive pilot study to help subjects learn about the situation and to understand and experience the social context and attribution inductions. In phase 2, they took the role of the worker. During the interaction they made standard written comments at five set times, restating the social context three times and the attribution condition two times. After 12 minutes, they indicated that they could not complete the problems and asked for help from the subject.

Results

Subjects were placed in a cooperative, competitive, or individualistic context and interacted with low-performing subordinates who either lacked ability or motivation. Subjects in the cooperative context indicated on a 7-point scale that they ($M = 5.92$) had a more cooperative relationship than those ($M = 4.75$) in the individualistic condition and those ($M = 3.33$) in the competitive condition, $F(2, 84) = 21.78, p < .01$. Subjects ($M = 2.90$) in the low effort subordinate condition indicated on a 7-point scale that the other had less motivation than did subjects ($M = 4.54$) in the low ability condition, $F(2, 84) = 21.18, p < .01$. Similarly, subjects ($M = 3.45$) in the low ability subordinate condition reported on a 7-point scale that the other lacked ability compared to subjects ($M = 4.98$) in the low effort condition, $F(2, 84) = 21.43, p < .01$. On the basis of these results, it can be concluded that the experimental inductions were successful.

TABLE 1
Comparisons of Means on Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Cooperation		Competition		Individualistic		Significant Comparisons
	Low Effort (1)	Low Ability (2)	Low Effort (3)	Low Ability (4)	Low Effort (5)	Low Ability (6)	
Expectations Self to Help Other Other to Help	5.88 5.25	5.94 5.24	3.67 3.87	3.00 4.50	4.29 3.93	5.21 4.07	Context, 3.10** Context, 5.47*** 1 & 2 vs. 3, 5 & 6
Communication Supportive	2.25	2.12	1.00	1.21	1.71	2.21	Context, 4.66*** 1, 2 & 6 vs. 3
Unsupportive	.12	.05	.80	.71	.50	.50	Context, 9.89*** 1 & 2 vs. 3, 2 vs. 4
Offers of Assistance	2.31	3.06	1.80	2.07	1.71	2.42	Attribution, 3.07* 2 vs. 3 & 5
Responsive	75%	76%	6%	42%	29%	29%	Context, 3.22** 1 & 2 vs. 3
Assert Power	56%	5%	73%	21%	35%	14%	Attribution, 7.67*** 2 vs. 1, 2 & 6 vs. 3
Threaten	18%	0%	33%	7%	35%	0%	Attribution, 9.48*** 2 & 6 vs. 3 & 5

Notes: Significant comparisons are the analysis of variance effects and their level of significance and the follow-up *t* tests comparing the conditions that were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$

TABLE 1 (continued)

Dependent Variable	Cooperation		Competition		Individualistic		Significant Comparisons
	Low Effort (1)	Low Ability (2)	Low Effort (3)	Low Ability (4)	Low Effort (5)	Low Ability (6)	
Incentives for Other Quarters Given	.31	.35	.67	.64	.50	.92	Attribution, 3.89** Attribution, 7.32*** Context, 3.46** Attribution, 9.99*** 2 vs. 3, 6 vs. 1, 3 & 5
Quarters Taken	.50	.11	.60	.21	.57	.14	
Other Should be Rewarded	3.81	5.29	3.67	4.00	4.14	4.86	
Other Should be Punished	3.13	2.35	4.13	2.93	3.07	1.71	
Positive Relationship							
Other Helped Self	3.44	4.82	3.33	3.00	3.21	3.50	Context, 3.07** 2 vs. 1, 3, 4, 5 & 6
Other's Openness	4.19	5.48	3.55	3.57	3.79	4.43	Context, 4.21**
Own Openness	5.25	6.06	4.47	4.07	4.50	4.93	Context, 7.48*** 1 & 2 vs. 4 2 vs. 3, 5 & 6
Liking	4.50	5.42	4.13	4.71	4.15	4.43	Attribution, 5.03** 2 vs. 1, 3, 5 & 6
Work With Other in Future	4.82	5.24	4.14	4.72	3.86	5.07	Attribution, 5.30** 2 vs. 3 & 5, 6 vs. 5
Other Work With Self in Future	4.19	4.71	3.47	4.36	3.86	4.29	Attribution, 3.92** 2 vs. 3
Satisfaction With Relationship	3.81	5.29	3.67	4.00	4.14	4.86	Attribution, 7.31*** 2 vs. 1, 3, 4 & 5 6 vs. 3

The supervisors' use of power and interaction with the subordinate were expected to depend on the social context of their relationship and the attribution of the cause of the low performance. Results strongly support the hypotheses. Two by three analyses of variance were conducted on the dependent measures and follow-up *t*-tests were used to compare the six conditions when the analysis yielded a significant effect. Means, *F* results, and all comparisons among the experimental conditions are given in Table 1.

Expectations

Consistent with the hypothesis, the analysis yielded a main effect for social context on expectations. Subjects in cooperation expected to help the other more than did those in the individualistic context who, in turn, thought they would be more helpful than those in competition. Similarly, subjects in the cooperative conditions expected the worker to help them more, compared to the individualistic subjects and the competitive-low effort subjects.

Communication and Assistance

Attribution and context did affect communication and assistance largely in accord with the hypotheses. Subjects in both cooperative conditions and those in the individualistic one with the low ability subordinate were more supportive in their communication than those in the competitive-low effort condition. Similarly, cooperative context subjects were less unsupportive than the competitive-low effort; the cooperative-low ability subjects were less unsupportive than were the competitive-low effort subjects. The cooperative-low ability condition subjects offered to give assistance to the subordinate more than did competitive-low effort and individualistic-low effort subjects. The analysis on actual assistance yielded a main effect for context. Follow-up tests indicated that subjects in both cooperative conditions gave more aid than did competitive-low effort subjects.

Communication messages could also be analyzed for assertions of power and threats. More competitive-low effort subjects reminded the subordinate that they had power over them than did cooperative and individualistic-low ability subjects; more cooperative-low effort subjects asserted their superior power than did cooperative-low ability subjects. The analysis on threats also yielded a significant effect for attribution. More competitive and individualistic subjects threatened the low effort subordinate than did cooperative and individualistic subjects with the low ability subordinates.

Incentives

Overall, subjects appeared reluctant to either give or withdraw quarters from the subordinate. No significant differences were observed for quarters given. For the quarters-taken measure, the significant finding due to attribution suggests that subjects were more likely to take away quarters from the low effort subordinate rather than from the low ability one. Context and attribution did affect subjects' ratings of the extent the subordinate should be punished. Cooperative-low ability subjects thought the subordinate should be punished less than did the competitive-low effort subjects. The cooperative, competitive, and individualistic subjects thought the low effort subordinate should be punished more than did the individualistic subjects with the low ability subordinate.

Positive Relationship

Context was found to affect interaction largely as expected. Cooperative subjects felt more helped by the low ability subordinates than subjects in any other group. Analyses suggest that cooperative subjects thought the subordinate was more open than competitive ones. Cooperative subjects indicated that they themselves were more open during the interaction than did competitive-low ability subjects. Cooperative-low effort subjects rated themselves as more open than did competitive-low effort and individualistic subjects.

Attributing the subordinate's low performance to a lack of ability or effort significantly affected the subject-subordinate relationship: specifically, cooperative-low ability subjects liked the subordinate more than did cooperative-low effort, competitive-low effort, and individualistic subjects. Cooperative-low ability subjects wanted to work with the other in the future more than did competitive and individualistic-low effort subjects. Individualistic-low ability subjects wanted more to work with the other than did individualistic-low effort subjects. The cooperative-low ability subjects thought the subordinate wanted to work more with them than did competitive-low effort subjects. Finally, cooperative-low ability subjects were more satisfied with their relationship than were cooperative, competitive, and individualistic subjects with the low effort subordinate. Individualistic-low effort subjects were also more satisfied than were competitive-low effort subjects.

Discussion

Results identify situational variables that moderate a superior's communication and choice of influence methods with low performing subordinates. Both attribution of the cause of the low performance and the social context between the superior and subordinate affected the superior's assistance, communication, influence, and resulting attitudes. Generally, social context was found to create the expectation and orientation toward the subordinate. Cooperative superiors expected mutual assistance, communicated supportively, gave assistance, and felt open to the subordinate. Attribution of the low performance as due to insufficient ability or motivation was found to have its major impact on influence methods and attitudes toward the subordinate. Superiors threatened, asserted their power, disliked, sought social distance from, and felt dissatisfied with the low effort subordinate. The low ability subordinate elicited more encouragement and favorable conclusions. Therefore, low performance did not inevitably induce superiors to be punitive; the superiors' understanding of the reason underlying the low performance and their goal interdependence can substantially alter their interaction.

The competitive superiors were unsupportive, and their negative focus seemed generally less affected by their attribution of the subordinate's performance compared to the cooperative and individualistic superiors. Attributing low performance to a lack of effort did intensify the competitive superiors use of threats, assertion of power, and refusal to give assistance. However, competitive superiors communicated unsupportively, were closed, and felt dissatisfied with their relationship whether they attributed low performance to insufficient effort or ability. Generally, it was the cooperative and individualistic superiors, not the competitive superiors, who communicated supportively, wanted to work with the subordinate, avoided threats, and were satisfied with the low ability subordinates. Although supportive of the low ability subordinate, cooperative superiors asserted their power, used threats, and disliked the low effort subordinate.

These results are consistent with previous studies suggesting the rigidity of competition. Persons disposed to compete were found to do so regardless of the other's disposition. On the other hand, persons who were oriented to cooperate were flexible in that they cooperated with cooperators, but competed with those disposed to compete (Kelly & Stahelski, 1970). Competitively compared to cooperatively oriented discussants were found to be uninterested in hearing opposing arguments, to feel closed to opposing views, and to reject other's information and ideas in making decisions (Tjosvold, 1982; Tjosvold &

Deemer, 1980). Cooperation not only appears to create more positive expectations and interaction, but it also creates more openness and flexibility in responding to others.

This study's findings are consistent with considerable research distinguishing between the dynamics and outcomes of social interaction in cooperation and competition. But they also suggest a modification of Deutsch's position. Deutsch (1949, 1973, 1980) argued that cooperation results in interpersonal attraction because of actual mutual goal facilitation. Cooperators assist each other and develop positive feelings and attitudes because they help each other reach their goals. But in this study, the subordinate performed ineffectively and did not help the superior gain tangible rewards. However, the cooperative superiors were attracted to the subordinate who lacked ability, but not to the subordinate who lacked effort. Additional data shed light on this issue. Despite the absence of goal facilitation, cooperative superiors indicated they felt helped by the low ability subordinate. Perhaps then persons in cooperation want to give assistance and feel rewarded when they do, although it may not result in the immediate facilitation of the other's or their goals. If the subordinate rejects the aid by demonstrating a lack of effort, then the cooperative persons may feel unappreciated and unrewarded. An alternative explanation is suggested by Johnson and Johnson (1972). They found that the expectation of goal facilitation, not actual facilitation, induced attraction in cooperation. The cooperative superiors of this study did indicate they wanted to work with the low ability subordinate in the future, perhaps because they felt the subordinate could be helpful. However, the low effort subordinates not only failed to help them in the present but demonstrated they could not be relied upon in the future. It may be tentatively concluded that attraction in cooperation may result from goal facilitation, expected future facilitation, or the opportunity to assist a receptive other.

Results of this study highlight the fact that superiors are not inevitably supportive and helpful toward subordinates (Pfeffer, 1981). It is not sufficient to develop knowledge about effective ways to influence and assist subordinates. Research on the conditions obtaining when superiors want to aid subordinates and the application of that knowledge to create these conditions in organizations are needed. Results suggest that superiors, when they believe their goals are negatively related to subordinates, do not try to aid subordinates and influence them to improve. Neither are they likely to be open and responsive to the individual difficulties and shortcomings of subordinates. Removal of the competitive elements to develop an individualistic context, re-

sults suggest, can improve interaction, but the development of strongly cooperative context would appear to strengthen supervision and openness to low performing subordinates.

The sample and operations of this study, of course, limit its conclusions. After the induction of the social context operation, subjects were asked to rate their expectations for the upcoming interaction. This rating may have appreciably strengthened the expectations and subsequent effects of the social context, and future studies could investigate whether social context has similar effects without explicit indication of expectations. More generally, future studies, especially field studies conducted in ongoing organizations, are needed to test the generalizability of the findings. However, this study does provide experimental findings with high internal validity. In addition, previous studies on superiors' responses to subordinates have relied on summaries of perceptions, but this study measured actual behavior (Sims, 1979; 1980). Findings are also consistent with considerable social psychological research conducted with a variety of operations and samples of the effects of attribution and social context.

In summary, the superiors' goal interdependence with the subordinate and their attribution of the underlying reason for the subordinate behavior affected their expectations, communication, influence, and supervision. Cooperative superiors had positive expectations, were generous with assistance, and were openminded toward the subordinate. Attribution of the cause of the low performance seemed to affect how superiors influenced and felt about the subordinate. Low effort subordinates elicited punitive, strong influence, and the low ability subordinate generated attraction and a desire to work again in the future. Competitive superiors maintained a largely negative stance and were less responsive to the particular shortcoming of the subordinate. Cooperative superiors supported and were attracted to the low ability subordinate, but they could be assertive with low effort subordinates. Results indicate that superiors cannot be expected to always be motivated to influence subordinates effectively and improve their performance. Research is needed to identify and create the conditions in which superiors chose to threaten, assert, punish, offer assistance, support, or encourage in order to help subordinates perform successfully.

REFERENCES

- Avery RD, Ivancevich JM. (1980). Punishment in organizations: A review, propositions, and research suggestions. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 123-132.
- Ayers-Nachamkin B, Cann CH, Reed R, Horne A. (1982). Sex and ethnic difference in the use of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 464-471.

- Curtis B, Smith RE, Smoll FL. (1979). Scrutinizing the skipper: A study of leadership behaviors in the dugout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 391-400.
- Deutsch M. (1949). An experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. *Human Relations*, 2, 199-231.
- Deutsch M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch M. (1980). Over fifty years of conflict research. In Festerginer L (Ed.). *Four decades of social psychology* (pp. 46-77). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hinings CR, Hickson DJ, Pennings JM, Schneck RE. (1974). Structural conditions of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 22-44.
- Instone D, Major B, Bunber BB. (1983). Tender, self-confidence, and social influence strategies: An organizational simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 322-333.
- Johnson DW, Johnson RT, Maruyama G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 5-54.
- Johnson DW, Maruyama G, Johnson RT, Nelson D, Skon L. (1981). The effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 47-62.
- Johnson DW, Johnson S. (1972). The effects of attitude similarity, expectation of goal facilitation, and actual goal facilitation on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 8, 197-206.
- Kanter RM. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter RM. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(4) pp. 65-75.
- Kelly HH, Stahelski AJ. (1970). Social interaction basis of cooperators' and competitors' beliefs about others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 66-91.
- Kipnis D. (1972). Does power corrupt? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 33-41.
- Kipnis D. (1976). *The powerholders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maier NRF. (1970). *Problem solving and creativity*. San Francisco: Brooks-Cole.
- Mitchell TR, Green SG, Wood R. (1981). An attributional model of leadership and the poor performing subordinate. In Staw B, Cummings LL (Eds.). *Research in organizational behavior, IV* (pp. 197-234). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.
- Mowday RT. (1979). Leader characteristics, self-confidence, and methods of upward influence in organizational decision situations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 709-725.
- Pfeffer J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Boston: Pittman.
- Sauders CS, Scamell R. (1982). Intraorganizational distribution of power: Replication research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 192-200.
- Sims HP Jr. (1979). Limitations and extensions to questionnaires in leadership research. In Hunt JG, Larson LL (Eds.). *Crosscurrents in leadership* (pp. 209-221). Carbondale: University of Southern Illinois Press.
- Sims HP, Jr. (1980). Further thoughts on punishment in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 133-138.
- Tedeschi JT. (1974). Attributions, liking, and power. In Huston TL (Ed.). *Foundations of interpersonal attraction* (pp. 189-193). New York: Academic Press.
- Tjosvold D. (1982). Effects of the approach to controversy on superiors' incorporation of subordinates' information in decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 189-193.

- Tjosvold D, Deemer DK. (1980). Effects of controversy within a cooperative or competitive context on organizational decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 590-595.
- Weiner B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Copyright of Personnel Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.