

exercise of social power, some share in the vital activities of the organizations, quite apart from just doing one's assigned task. Arising out of this idea, we have in progress not just a small change in the technology of management but a very fundamental change in our view of the nature of social power and our view of how things should be.

There are two major misconceptions about power, control, and influence in organizations which I would like you to get clear in your minds. These misconceptions have led all of us, including managers of organizations, to some errors in judgment and practice.

One misconception has to do with the idea that social influence or control is an all-or-none thing. This is the assumption that, if I have power over you, then you do not have power over me, or vice versa. It is the notion that between two organizations one is likely to dominate and control the other.

This assumption gets expressed in managerial behavior, through a feeling on the manager's part that he cannot let anyone else have much control in the organization, because someone else might then get a little more than he, the manager, has, and when that happens instantly he loses all control. Is that not a familiar notion to you? You have heard managers say in effect, "I must keep control, because, if I don't have it then somebody else has it." This is a most unrealistic view. It is clear from our studies of all kinds of organizations that the possession of influence and control in organizations is dispersed; no one has all of it, and no has none. Consider the last time you had dealings with the least member of your own organization, and call to mind the way you calculated the possibilities this person had of countering your efforts at control. He can quit, he can go on strike, he can commit errors, he can restrict his performance, he can withhold information. He not only can do these things, if pressed, he will. You recognize his power, limited though it is, and take it into account in your calculations. We have to think of control, then, not in terms of having or not having, but in terms of some balance, some distribution of it, particularly across the hierarchical levels.

The other misconception I want to emphasize has to do with the notion of there being a fixed quantity of control in an organization, such that delegation to a subordinate diminishes the manager's own control. Managers often base their policies on this assumption, that there is only so much control, and if one party has less somebody else