

# The Hierarchy of Social Power

Emily Edwards, Indiana University – Purdue University Columbus Cheryl Warner, Ph.D., Aide and Health Staffing Solutions



Survey Items	Average Mean Differences	Standard Deviations	t Scores*
Kn	owledge		
Social power is defined by money or wealth	0.41719	1.159	11.119
2. All residents of the United States are treated equally	-0.12788	1.040	-3.799
There is evidence of oppressive practices in today's society	0.30915	1.047	9.107
Some cultural groups have more privilege and social power than other groups	0.40461	0.932	13.409
<ol><li>There is evidence of discriminatory practices in today's society.</li></ol>	0.25000	1.027	7.513
<ol><li>Anyone can achieve success, regardless of his or her cultural group, if he or she has ambitions and willing to work hard.</li></ol>	-0.36925	0.990	-11.528
Av	vareness		
6. Understanding privilege and social power will help me be a better citizen.	0.23214	1.069	6.697
I am aware of my many social identities	0.35616	0.977	11.226
10. I can explain how my social identities have power and privilege.	0.75815	1.086	21.529
Profession	ıal Development		
7. Understanding privilege and social power will help me be a better educator (professional).	0.27406	0.914	9.269

#### Conclusions

- Students' responses on the survey *supports the research* hypotheses that HoSP is an effective learning activity. Our results confirm facilitators' and instructors' observations that the activity fosters learning.
- One limitation of this study is its homogenous sample. Results may differ based on a more culturally and demographically diverse sample.
- The study's results support the use of HoSP as a learning activity to engage discussion and self- and other-awareness of **social power and privilege.** Although this study focuses on college students, HoSP may have utility with other populations, such as high school students, graduate students, and professionals, with appropriate modifications.

#### References

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. The Counseling Psychologist, 31(3), 253-272. doi: 10.1177/0011000002250634 Warner, C. B. (2011). Hierarchy of social power. In A. D. Coker, J. S. Pangelinan, & M. Pope (eds.), Experiential Activities for Teaching Multicultural Counseling Classes and Infusing Cultural Diversity into Core Classes(pp. 192-194). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

## Introduction

- The helping profession literature defines cultural competence as multidimensional and a developmental process of learning. One aspect of cultural competence requires an understanding of **Procedures.** A brief survey (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .71$ ) and postthe macro-level dynamics, such as institutionalization, social power, and privilege (Vera & Speight, 2003).
- Teaching on privilege and social power in multicultural counseling courses illuminated a need to construct a social power awareness learning experience.
- The Hierarchy of Social Power (HoSP, Warner, 2011), was developed to facilitate small group discussions on social power and increase awareness of the relevancy of multiculturalism to students' professional development.

## Research Questions:

- 1. Will HoSP increase students' knowledge about social power?
- 2. Will HoSP increase students' personal awareness about their (M = 3.697, SD = .428) and post-survey (M = 3.952, SD = .428)social identities and social power?
- 3. Will HoSP help students understand the relevancy of social power to their professional development?
- 4. Will students report positive or favorable experiences with HoSP?

### Methods

public institutions (52% from Institution A and 48% from Institution B) participated in the *HoSP* as a class activity during the academic years of 2010-2012 (Phase 1) and 2015-2017 (Phase 2).

The sample was predominantly female (69%), Caucasian (88%), and freshman (68%). Refer to handout for Graph 1.

survey process questions measuring students' feedback were developed for the study. Based on the feedback and data analyses from Phase 1, post-survey items and the Likert scale were modified for Phase 2. The surveys were converted from paper to online during Phase 2.

**Data Analyses.** Sample t-tests compared the differences between the pre- and post-survey responses test the hypotheses. Descriptive statistics were reported for the third research question.

## Results

Research Questions 1, 2, and 3. An analysis of the differences between the mean scores for the pre-survey .428) was significantly different (t = 25.817, p < .000). A paired sample t-test revealed statistically significant differences for each question item (see Table 1). Thus, our results supported the hypotheses for research questions 1, 2, and 3.

**Research Question 4**. Students endorsed positive scores **Participants.** Students (n = 986) from two predominantly white (e.g., scores 4 or 5 on the 5-point Likert scale) on additional post-survey process items. The frequencies ranged from 62% to 87% and the averages of these items ranged from 3.67 to 4.37 (refer to Table 2 in handout).