

A Brief Study on Remembering, Social Power, Bases

Dr. Pramod Pandey

Associate Professor, Masters In Business Administration (General Management), Presidency University,
Bangalore, India

Email Id-pramodkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The capacity of people or organisations to influence others and affect desired results is referred to as having social power. An overview of the origins or foundations from which people get their power the basis of social power is given in this abstract. In order to analyse and explain social dynamics, leadership, and interpersonal interactions, it is essential to understand the foundations of social power. The abstract looks at the several types of social power that social psychologists have discovered, such as legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, referent power, and informational power. Each source of authority is described in terms of its traits and the ways in which it affects other people. The abstract also covers how various sources of power interact with one another and how they might work in harmony. The use of social power bases is pervasive, including everything from interpersonal interactions and social movements to organisational leadership and management. A person may create methods for successful leadership, negotiation, and influence by understanding the foundations of social power. Additionally, understanding and examining the sources of power in various situations may throw light on the dynamics of social interactions and assist spot any possible power imbalances or abuses. The grounds of social power are thoroughly discussed in this abstract, which also emphasises their significance for comprehending social dynamics and interpersonal interaction.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Expert power, Influence, Social, Source.

I. INTRODUCTION

Social power has a big impact on how people interact with one another, how they behave, and how things turn out in different social circumstances. It speaks to a person's or group's capacity to exert influence and control over others. The sources or foundations from which people acquire their authority are known as the basis of social power. Understanding these foundations is essential for understanding interpersonal dynamics, leadership, and society dynamics. Social psychologists have identified a number of fundamental sources of social power, each of which is distinguished by certain traits and influencing methods. These bases include authority, incentive, coercion, knowledge, referential, expert, and informational power. The official positions or responsibilities that people occupy within a social system, such as that of manager, educator, or political leader, are the source of their legitimate authority. It is based on the power conferred on people by the social system and is often connected to the capacity to impose laws or make choices[1], [2].

The capacity to provide people prizes or incentives, such as recognition, promotions, or pay raises, is what gives someone reward power. This authority is founded on the conviction that good results will result if the prominent person's intentions are followed. On the other side, coercive power entails using punishment, threats, or unfavourable outcomes to persuade others. In order to motivate compliance, it depends on the threat of penalties or possible injury. An individual's knowledge, abilities, or ability in a certain field provide them expert power. It is predicated on the idea that the individual has superior knowledge or competence, prompting others to seek their counsel or do as they say. The respect, admiration, or identification that others feel for a particular person gives them referent power. This

power, which is often attributed to charismatic leaders or powerful role models, is based on the desire to be liked or accepted by the prominent person[3], [4].

Access to important or uncommon knowledge that others want is the foundation of informational power. It is predicated on the idea that the individual has pertinent information or insights that may be useful to others. The sources of social power are not mutually exclusive, thus people may use a variety of sources to influence others. Depending on the situation and the relationships at play, various bases may be combined and interacted with differently. In many fields, it is crucial to comprehend the sources of social power. Recognising and using these pillars may improve teamwork, employee engagement, and leadership effectiveness in organisational contexts. Understanding the sources of power in interpersonal interactions may help people negotiate social dynamics and create wholesome relationships based on mutual respect and influence. Understanding how people exercise influence and control over others in social circumstances may be framed by considering the grounds of social power. Each foundation has unique traits and influence processes, and they may cooperate and reinforce one another. Understanding the foundations of social power aids people in negotiating social dynamics, developing their leadership potential, and creating fruitful connections. Individuals may participate in moral and persuasive behaviour, contributing to beneficial social interactions and results, by grasping the underlying principles of social power[5], [6].

Along with the previously mentioned bases of social power, it's critical to understand how complicated and variable power dynamics are in social interactions across situations and cultures. Cultural norms, institutional institutions, and personal beliefs may all have an impact on how power is seen and how effective certain sources of power are. For instance, coercive power and legitimate authority may be more important in certain cultures than referent power and expert power. Furthermore, traits like credibility, trust, and the capacity for good communication are necessary for the successful use of social power. People may more successfully construct their bases of power and strengthen their influence over others by developing trust and credibility. The influence of social power may be increased by effective communication, which includes active listening, empathy, and persuasive abilities. The ethical implications of social power and its appropriate application must also be taken into account. The many bases of power may be utilised to inspire and motivate people and for other good things, but they can also be exploited or misused. Fairness must be upheld, others' autonomy and dignity must be respected, and authority must be used to further the interests of both people and society as a whole[7], [8].

Furthermore, social power is dynamic and subject to alter throughout time. Power may be gained or lost by people depending on their deeds, successes, or modifications to their social environment. Understanding how social interactions occur on a more subtle level and the ability for people to change their power dynamics are made possible by the fluidity of social power. The foundations of social power provide a framework for comprehending the origins of people's influence over others. These bases, which include informational power, legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, and referent power, are crucial in determining social dynamics and interpersonal interactions. However, elements like trust, trustworthiness, good communication, and ethical concerns are necessary for the efficient use of social power. Understanding the complexity of social power improves our comprehension of interpersonal relationships and empowers people to deal with power dynamics in a more responsible and efficient manner[9], [10].

II. DISCUSSION

Any management theory that tries to explain the dynamics of behaviour in organisations must include power. The idea that power and leadership are closely linked is one that is universally accepted. Power is indeed used in leadership, and power is the "reason" why subordinates follow their manager's instructions. Therefore, it is crucial for managers to comprehend the possible bases of power and how to obtain and apply them successfully. John French and Bertam Raven created and published the most well-known theory on the sources of social power in 1959. The five pillars of power were characterised as referent, expert, legitimate, reward, and coercive. This article describes the model's foundations,

defines the sources of social power, and examines how theory and research have changed over the last 50 years.

Fundamentals

Power has played a crucial, significant, and pervasive role in the study of social phenomena, we must first acknowledge. It is evident that some individuals in organisations have more power than others, and it is also obvious that power may be used in a variety of ways, both good and bad. People respond to the term "power" in vastly diverse ways. For other people, having authority brings up bad leaders like Adolf Hitler or Muammar Gaddafi, as well as a boss who has treated them poorly. Others recall inspiring figures like John F. Kennedy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., or a boss they truly looked up to. This variety of responses illustrates the fact that power is neither good nor harmful in and of itself. Power is simply the ability one person has to influence another person, group, or organisational entity, regardless of how it is employed.

It is also possible for someone to utilise their influence to amplify the strength and influence of others. Surprisingly, rather than power itself, a lack of authority or a sense of helplessness may be more detrimental to organisational productivity, employee morale, and management efficiency. Since understanding how to acquire and utilise power is essential for managers who want to be successful, the subject of power is addressed in every management textbook. It's also critical to comprehend how individuals respond when others abuse their authority against them. When managers use their authority, for instance, the reaction from others may range from obedience to a calculating response (what can one gain by following the manager?), or it can be a positive, emotional response that results in high levels of devotion to the work. It goes without saying that managers need to learn how to leverage their position of authority to get the results they want from their subordinates, colleagues, and even their own bosses. According to Jeffery Pfeffer's 1992 book *Managing With Power*, managers require the ability to execute tasks as well as the capacity to identify what has to be done, and bases of power are crucial abilities for completing tasks. Simply defined, leadership is the practise of influencing others' behaviour, usually towards a certain goal. the accomplishment of organisational objectives. A person must be able to influence others for influence efforts to be effective. persuade campaigns will fall flat if there is no compelling reason for people to listen to the person trying to persuade them. The resource that the leader is using to try to influence others is power. People are powerless without it to lead. The framework of bases of social power created by French and Raven in 1959 is still the most frequently acknowledged among the several frameworks of power presented by different researchers. They described social power as the potential influence one person may have to modify the behaviours or beliefs of another person in their theory, which is included in the majority of management textbooks. The ability one person may draw on to influence another person is defined by the social power bases they conceptualised.

Five fundamentally distinct bases of social power that are socially reliant on ongoing contact between two persons were put out by French and Raven in their original work. They identified two types of power that are produced by an individual (referent and expert) and three that are based on a position that is provided by an organisation (legitimate, rewarding, and coercive). The third element that French and Raven used to separate the power bases was whether or not monitoring the influencee was crucial for the power base to have an effect. According to them, monitoring was crucial for the coercive and rewarding aspects of power but unnecessary for the legitimate, competent, and referential ones. In other words, these power bases enable effective influence even when the influencer is not actively monitoring the influencee. Let's describe the five pillars of social power immediately.

A person's ability to influence others comes from their admiration, respect, and identification with them. This is known as referent power. A person may become known for their moral character, possess physical allure, or display charisma to compel people to follow them freely. For instance, subordinates are attracted to and seek to follow supervisors who have referent authority. A person must act honourably at work and show respect for others if they want to gain referent power. For instance,

President John F. Kennedy was more beloved and respected than his successor, Lyndon B. Johnson, despite not having presided over the enactment of nearly as much legislation. He possessed that "something" that made other people want to be around him more than his technical skill on the job. He emanated a huge level of confidence, which many people respected and looked up to, and this referent power gave him considerable sway over both his cabinet and the general populace.

Another kind of personal power that results from a person's aptitudes, talents, and skills is expert power. People acquire expert power, for instance, by education, training, and excelling in crucial facets of their work. Perhaps someone has a unique aptitude for maths and analysis. This individual may influence others in areas of maths when others learn about this fact. Expert power often only applies to certain job-related fields, while referent power has a far broader range. For instance, a master programmer may have significant professional influence over the creation of new software, and others may take their suggestions into consideration. However, this individual will have less expert authority to draw on if the topic shifts to a focus on the marketing of new software. A person often has to demonstrate higher skill than others over time in order for expert power to emerge.

It is crucial to remember that a person gains both referent and expert power via direct or indirect experience with others. Through connection, people come to respect and adore one another. Through encounters involving a person's knowledge in a specific field of work, they also learn to recognise a person's expert power. The key idea here is that "personal power" is really something that other people provide to you over time. Consequently, it is conceivable for individuals to lose this kind of influence. For instance, a manager's referent authority may be harmed if they act unethically, and if they provide bad advice and it turns out to be true, they may lose part or all of their expert power. Positional power, as opposed to personal power, is given to a person by virtue of their hierarchical position within an organisation. It is predicated on the idea that a person's position within an organisation gives them the right to legitimately affect the behaviour of others. Therefore, the purest form of position power is lawful power. For instance, it is generally accepted that an Army drill sergeant has the "right" to instruct a trainee and that the learner has a duty to comply. Since legitimate authority is rooted in organisational structure, it will increase as a person rises through the ranks. In the Army, a captain has greater lawful authority than a sergeant. Additionally, a person's lawful authority will decline if they are demoted in an organisation. Legitimate authority also has a zone of influence attached to it. People's lawful authority doesn't change as long as they stay in that zone, but if they leave, it could be reduced. For instance, a manager could legitimately be able to order extra labour from staff members but not necessarily mandate that they utilise the company's goods. For instance, several Ford and Honda employees both drive Fords.

Another kind of positional power is the capacity to reward people for desirable behaviours. This power is known as reward power. For instance, if a manager is given authority over how others are paid and evaluated for their performance, employees will be more likely to follow their boss's instructions in order to benefit from these benefits. A calculative or "contractual" connection exists in this case. The management may compensate the subordinate if they do specific tasks that are wanted by the manager. To be effective in modifying the behaviour of the subordinate, the incentive must be appreciated by the subordinate. Additionally, the manager loses part of the organization-granted reward authority if the firm experiences a time in which the targeted incentives are not accessible. In these situations, it is still conceivable for a manager to replace praise for excellent performance for monetary compensation. Another position-related kind of power that is basically the reverse of reward power is coercive power. It is based on a person's capacity to punish others for failing to perform what that person wants done. For instance, if a manager has the authority to refuse giving out organisational resources (such money, promotions, discretionary time off, and the like), their subordinates will be more likely to refrain from acting in a way that may lead to the management employing this coercive power. It is crucial to remember that using coercive authority might have unintended repercussions, such as resentment, and is often most effective in preventing undesirable behaviour.

Additionally, it could be important to employ incentive power to encourage desired behaviours once the undesirable behaviour has been discontinued. Strangely enough, there are situations when the

punishment serves as a reward. For instance, let's say a manager corrects a worker's conduct, and the worker feels relieved because "at least I got some attention from my manager." The undesirable behaviour can continue as a consequence. Coercive force must thus be utilised sparingly and with care to prevent it from losing its effectiveness.

The idea of a sixth basis of power, first discussed by French and Raven, has sometimes appeared in works on social power. Information power differs conceptually from the other five in that it is "socially independent," or might persist even in the absence of ongoing contact. Some have paired it with professional strength. Information power comes from the ability to persuade people to alter their behaviour via compelling information. This kind of power, which is simply persuasion, is transient, meaning that it may pass from one person to another and inspire the other to change. For instance, according to the literature on empowerment, one of the things a manager can do to empower others to act in a more independent manner and use their knowledge, experience, and motivation to take charge of problem-solving and making decisions is to provide them with information. Employee suggestions that might increase income or cut expenses, for instance, may be more probable if they are aware of the company's financial difficulties. Information power differs from other power bases in that it can and often does flow from one person to another.

Importance

Prior to the middle of the 1980s, there had been only little attempts to evaluate the French and Raven taxonomy's usefulness. The many methodological issues in published research make it challenging to understand the results. A review of numerous field research using the framework by Philip M. Podsakoff and C. A. Schreishem was published in Psychological Bulletin in 1985. They made a number of recommendations for enhancing next model research. A measurement of the power bases was devised in 1989 by Timothy Hinkin and Schreishem. The Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI) was another tool that Raven, Joseph Schwarzwald, and Meni Koslowsky published in the Journal of Applied Social Psychology in 1998. The IPI analyses 11 bases of power, including the original five, information power, and updated versions of the legitimate, coercive, and reward bases. Their analysis revealed that these 11 sources of power were grouped into seven components and further complicated the instrument. Both of these interventions have not found support in the literature. The French and Raven taxonomy still has to be measured more accurately, according to scholars, including Raven himself in 2008.

However, the ongoing fascination with power, particularly as it relates to modern leadership paradigms, leads scholars to look into the theoretical foundations of the original French and Raven taxonomy. In addition to increasing inquiries across cultures and tying power to crucial leadership challenges, continual attempts are being made to build more reliable tools. For instance, a research from 2005 by Mainuddin Afza reveals identical results in India to studies from the United States in that application.

of power bases is connected to worker commitment, happiness, departure intention, and compliance. In 2008, Li-Fen Liao conducted another research in R&D departments and discovered a connection between the utilisation of power bases and knowledge sharing. In 2011, W. Alan Randolph and Edward Kemery conducted multi-organizational research in which they discovered that the connection between manager empowerment practises and employee perceptions of psychological empowerment was totally mediated by managerial usage of power bases (as viewed by workers).

The French and Raven taxonomy of social sources of power continues to be of great interest. Even while they strive to create a measure that will have a chance of being widely accepted in the literature, researchers continue to learn new things. The model is still popular in management courses because it gives managers useful advice on how to increase the efficacy of their influence. Managers must build and use their bases of social power in order to have influence. The organisation clearly has legal ability to reward and coerce. Managers must thus strive to hold positions that provide various sources of influence. On the other hand, managers may cultivate referent and expert authority on their own. The foundations of social power may be utilised to exert influence once they are attained. If the goal is to elicit a favourable emotional reaction from one's followers, managerial practise shows that it may be desirable to lean more heavily on one's own sources of power (referent and expert) than on position

sources (legitimate, reward, and coercive). Let's not lose sight of the fact that influence may work both ways. People at lower levels of an organisation have the ability to acquire and make use of bases of power, particularly those that are personal.

III. CONCLUSION

Grasp how people exercise influence and control over others in social circumstances requires a grasp of the fundamentals of social power. People have access to a variety of sources from which they obtain their influence thanks to the numerous bases, which include legal power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, referent power, and informational power. Social dynamics, leadership, and interpersonal interactions are shaped by the interplay of the social power bases. Depending on the circumstance and their individual capabilities, people may access many sources of power. People may manage social interactions more skillfully in organisational contexts, personal relationships, or larger social movements by recognising and comprehending the foundations of social power. However, it's critical to recognise the ethical implications of social power and to use it ethically. Utilising power for the common good, respecting others' autonomy and dignity, and guaranteeing justice in the use of power are all ethical issues. Power may be abused or exploited, which can have bad effects and damage both relationships and people.

Furthermore, cultures and situations may influence how well-regarded and effective certain sources of power are. How people perceive power and react to various sources of power is influenced by cultural norms and social systems. Understanding social dynamics and efficiently using power require taking these cultural and contextual considerations into account. Overall, having a thorough awareness of the sources of social power enables people to successfully navigate social situations, hone their leadership abilities, and create loving and respectful relationships. People may use their power responsibly and contribute to constructive social change and results by understanding the sources of influence and the ethical components of power.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Carrillo, A. Gonzalez-Sparks, and N. U. Salcedo, "Social power of preadolescent children on influence in their mothers' purchasing behavior: Initial study in Peruvian toy stores," *J. Econ. Financ. Adm. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JEFAS-01-2018-0018.
- [2] M. Schaerer, C. du Plessis, A. J. Yap, and S. Thau, "Low power individuals in social power research: A quantitative review, theoretical framework, and empirical test," *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.08.004.
- [3] M. Ye, J. Liu, B. D. O. Anderson, C. Yu, and T. Başar, "Evolution of Social Power in Social Networks with Dynamic Topology," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, 2018, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2018.2805261.
- [4] A. Scholl, K. Sassenberg, N. Ellemers, D. Scheepers, and F. de Wit, "Highly identified power-holders feel responsible: The interplay between social identification and social power within groups," *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/bjso.12225.
- [5] A. K. Kupfer, N. P. Vor Der Holte, R. V. Kübler, and T. Hennig-Thurau, "The role of the partner brand's social media power in brand alliances," *J. Mark.*, 2018, doi: 10.1509/jm.15.0536.
- [6] H. Knegtman, W. W. Van Dijk, M. Mooijman, N. Van Lier, S. Rintjema, and A. Wassink, "The impact of social power on the evaluation of offensive jokes," *Humor*, 2018, doi: 10.1515/humor-2017-0106.
- [7] M. R. Brear, P. N. Shabangu, K. Hammarberg, J. Fisher, and H. Keleher, "Community-based care of children affected by AIDS in Swaziland: A gender-aware analysis," *Prim. Heal. Care Res. Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1017/S1463423618000774.
- [8] M. Hashemian, P. A. Santos, R. Prada, and S. Mascarenhas, "Enhancing Social Believability of

Virtual Agents using Social Power Dynamics,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents, IVA 2018*, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3267851.3267902.

- [9] S. Hareli, M. Halhal, and U. Hess, “Dyadic dynamics: The impact of emotional responses to facial expressions on the perception of power,” *Front. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01993.
- [10] M. Schaerer, M. Schweinsberg, and R. I. Swaab, “Imaginary alternatives: The effects of mental simulation on powerless negotiators,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1037/pspi0000129.