

# Perception of Organizational Power in Textile Industry

Mehmet Kiziloglu<sup>1</sup>

(Department of Management and Organization, Pamukkale University, Turkey )<sup>1</sup>

---

**ABSTRACT:** Power is the ability to influence others. One of the most influential theories of power comes from the work of French and Raven, who attempted to determine the sources of power leaders use to influence others. French and Raven identified five sources of power that can be grouped into two categories: organizational power (legitimate, reward, coercive) and personal power (expert, referent and information). Organizations require a control system and use power to reach their goals. In the organizations, relationships between administrators and employees are so critical aspect. Employees' perception of organizational power play a crucial role to reach organizational goals. There are studies on organizational power although the number of the studies is low. The aim of this research is to evaluate the perception of organizational power of the textile employees. Data were gathered from 171 employees who are working at textile companies in Denizli. SPSS was used for the data analysis.

**Keywords:** Organizational Power, Textile Industry

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Power has been a central topic in classical organization theory (1) (2) (3). Power is a natural process in the fabric of organizational life (4) (5). Getting things done requires power (6). Every day, managers in public and private organizations acquire and use power to accomplish organizational goals. This paper addresses the nature of power. The standard theory is that power is the capacity for influence and that influence is based on the control of resources valued or desired by others. Power in organizational life is a critical aspect of relationships between administrators and their followers (7). In order to achieve organizational aims, administrators need to know how employees perceive organizational power and what they. There are studies on organizational power (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13) although the number of the studies is low.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Power

Power is the ability to guide others to the needed behaviors (14) (15) (16). Power is a capacity or potential. Power might exist but the owner may not use it (Robbins, 1994). Power can be defined as an individual's 'capacity to modify others' states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishment" (17). Yet, power is the source of manipulation process and the need for power is one of human basic instincts. There are various bases of power, including differences in roles, expertise, and connections to powerful others (18) (19). A person may experience power in one particular relationship, group, or situation (20) (21) (22).

### 2.2. Organizational Power

The nature and quality of a formal organization requires a control system. In this framework, it is necessary for such an organization to make use of power. Leaders resort to certain sources of power for leading and coordinating behaviors of his organization's members, where the type of power used is important. Power source classifications in the literature are generally similar. One of the leading studies is French and Raven's research (19). French and Raven grouped power sources under five dimensions: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power and referent (charisma) power. Many researchers have studied these five sources of power and searched for others (23) (24) (25). For the most part, French and Raven's power sources remain intact. In the present study, this classification was used. These are (26);

- Legitimate power is a person's ability to influence others' behavior because of the position that person holds within the organization. Legitimate or position power, as it is sometimes called, is derived from a position of authority inside the organization, often referred to as 'formal authority'.
- Reward power is a person's ability to influence others' behavior by providing them with things they want to receive. These rewards can be either financial, such as pay raises or bonuses or nonfinancial, including promotions, favorable work assignments, more responsibility, new equipment, praise, and recognition.
- Coercive power is a person's ability to influence others' behavior by punishing them or by creating a perceived threat to do so. For example, employees may comply with a manager's directive because of fear or threat of punishment.

- Expert power is a person’s ability to influence others’ behavior because of recognized knowledge, skills, or abilities.
- Referent power is a person’s ability to influence others’ behavior because they like, admire, and respect the individual.

**III. METHOD**

The instrument used in this study is the organizational power questionnaire comprised five factors with 30 questions. Raven, vd. (27) designed this questionnaire, with the reliability of 0.84, the results were satisfactory. The factors of this questionnaire include reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, expert power, referent power and informational power.

The sample group in the present research is employees of a textile companies in Denizli, which in this research, among them 171 individuals were selected based on simple random sampling as statistical sample members. Finally, 171 questionnaires were distributed and then analyzed in SPSS.

**IV. FINDINGS AND RESULTS**

The aim of this study to determine the views of the textile employees about perception of organizational power, sharing the resulting data on perception of organizational power and the creation of awareness of organizational power in the textile companies.

The participants of the survey were employees who work in textile sector. The total number of the participants was 171. The sample consisted of 59 men with 34.5% and 112 women with 65.5%. Considering participants education level; 24% have primary school, 34% have high school, 38% have bachelor degree and 4% have master degree degree. The rate of the participants who have bachelor is the highest level. In addition to these, the positions of the participants, 67.8% are employees, 17% low level manager, 14,6% are middle level manager, 0,6% are top level manager. Many of participants to our study is employees. According to the results of participants’ job experience, 28.7% are 1-5 years, 30.4% are 6-10 years, 35.7% are 11-20 years and 5.3% are 21 and up years.

The reliability analysis of the 30 items questionnaire was 0.84 and then t test and anova was conducted to see the difference between the demographic datas and organizational power dimensions.

**Table 1.** Comparison the employees according to their age level

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Reward Power	21-30	62	4,12	,686	2,861	0,003
	41 and up	33	3,46	,874		

As shown in Table 1, result of the t test analysis revealed that a significant difference between 20-30 years old and employees who were over the age of 41 who are employees participated in the survey. Employees consider different about the perception of reward power in the scale of organizational power. While the arithmetic mean of the reward power participants between 20-30 years old is ( $\bar{x}$ =4,12), participants over the age of 41 and up is ( $\bar{x}$ = 3,46). Reward power has more impact on employees between 20-30 years old than over the age of 41 and up.

**Table 2.** Comparison the employees according to their levels of education

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Coercive Power	Primary School	41	4,46	,798	1,675	0,036
	High School	58	3,94	,743		
	University	72	3,14	,489		

Table 2 showed that anova test analysis revealed a significant difference between the employee’s education level of primary school, high school and university. Employees consider different about the perception of coercive power in the scale of organizational power. Arithmetic mean of the coercive power participants from primary school is ( $\bar{x}$ =4,46), participants from high school is ( $\bar{x}$ =3,94) and participants from university is ( $\bar{x}$ =3,14). As we see from the result, perception of coercive power for the participants from primary school is the highest.

**Table 3.** Comparison the employee according to their job experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Expert Power	1-5 years	49	4,24	,434	0,347	0,026
	11 and up	70	3,21	,729		

As shown in Table 3, result of the t test analysis revealed that a significant difference between the employees who have job experience of 1-5 years and 11 and up years. Employees consider different about the

perception of expert power in the scale of organizational power. While the arithmetic mean of the expert power for the participants' job experience 1-5 years is ( $\bar{x}=4,24$ ), 11 and up years job experience is ( $\bar{x}=3,21$ ).

**Table 4.** Comparison the employee according to their positions

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Legitimative Power	Employees	116	4,43	,816	1,357	0,018
	Middle and Top Level Managers	55	2,95	,782		

Table 4 showed that the t test analysis revealed a significant difference between employees who are employees and managers. Employees consider different about the perception of the legitimative power in the scale of organizational power. Arithmetic mean of the legitimative power participants who are employees is ( $\bar{x}=4,43$ ), participant who are managers is ( $\bar{x}=2,95$ ). As we see on the result, legitimative power have more impact on employees than middle and top level managers.

**Table 5.** Correlation of Organizational Learning Capacity and Its Dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Reward Power	$\alpha=,75$					
2.Coercive Power	,595**	$\alpha=,74$				
3.Expert Power	,420**	,662**	$\alpha=,80$			
4.Legitimative Power	,339**	,600**	,515**	$\alpha=,70$		
5. Referent Power	,326**	,582**	,486**	,472**	$\alpha=,73$	
6.Organizational Power	,769**	,881**	,802**	,748**	,721**	$\alpha=,87$

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level,       $\alpha$ = Significant Level

Correlation analysis has been conducted to test organizational power and its dimensions. As shown in Table 5, the result of correlation analysis revealed that the direction and degree of the relationship between organizational power and its dimensions. When we examine the Table 5, we see that there is a high and positive relationship between organizational power and its dimensions.

## V. CONCLUSION

The main aim of the research was to determine perception of organizational power of employees in textile companies. Organizational power is an important phenomenon for the companies but how to use it more importantly. Our study tried to evaluate perception of organizational power through the eyes of employees. When the results are evaluated, it is seen that reward power has more impact on employees between 20-30 years old than over the age of 41 and up. So, young employees are more motivated with reward and reward power have a significant impact on young employees. According to our observation and results, perception of coercive power for the participants from primary school is the highest due to their education level and they trust themselves less than university level.

Perception of expert power for the participants with job experience 1-5 years is more remarkable than participants with 11 and up years job experience. New employees need more experience about their profession from their experienced manager. So, expert power always affect new employees. Employees with 11 and up years job experience are more experienced than new employees and expert power has less affect. Another result is legitimative power have more impact on employees than middle and top level managers. Employees have no legitimative position and also power. But middle and top level managers have legitimative position and also power. Because of this reason legitimative power has more impact on employees than middle and top level managers.

As a result, this study was conducted to determine perception of organizational power in textile companies, shed light on other research and reveals more effective results in different regions with different participants.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Crozier, M. (1964). The bureaucratic phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [2]. Etzioni, A. (1961). A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates. New York: Free Press.
- [3]. Pondy, L. R. (1966). A systems theory of organizational conflict. Academy of Management Journal, 9: 246–256.
- [4]. Haugaard, M. and Clegg, S. (2012). Power and organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [5]. McClelland, D. C., and Burnham, D. H. (2003). Power is the great motivator. Harvard Business Review, 81(1), 117-129.
- [6]. Pfeffer, J. (2003). Introduction to the classic edition. In J. Pfeffer & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective: xi–xxix. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [7]. Ward, E. W. (1998). Managerial power bases and subordinates manifest needs as influences on psychological climate. Journal of Business and Psychology, 12 (3), 361-378.

- [8]. Altınkurt, Y. and Yılmaz, K. (2011). Relationship between the school administrators' power sources and teachers' organizational trust levels in Turkey. *Journal of Management Development*, 31 (1), 58-70.
- [9]. Aydoğan, İ. (2008). Okul yöneticilerinin öğretmenleri etkileme becerileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 33-51.
- [10]. Can, N. and Celikten, M. (2000). Alt düzey personelin güç kaynakları: Erciyes Üniversitesi Örneği. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yonetimi*, 22 (2), 269-290.
- [11]. Deniz, M. and Çolak, M. (2008). Örgütlerde çatışmanın yönetiminde gücün kullanımı ve bir araştırma. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7 (23), 304-332.
- [12]. Özaslan, G. and Gürsel, M. (2008). Eğitim yöneticilerinin güç tipi tercihlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25, 351-370.
- [13]. Yucel, C. (1999). Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia, USA.
- [14]. Greenberg, J. and Baron, R. A. (1993). *Behavior in organizations: understanding and managing the human side of work*. Boston : Allyn & Bacon.
- [15]. Özkalp, E. and Kirel, C. (2003). *Örgütsel davranış*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- [16]. Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- [17]. Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H. and Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110: 265-284.
- [18]. Brass, D. J. 1984. Being in the right place: A structural analysis of individual influence in an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 518-539.
- [19]. French, J., and Raven, B. H. (Eds.). (1959). *The bases of social power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- [20]. Anderson, C., and Berdahl, J. L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83: 1362-1377.
- [21]. Emerson, R. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27: 31-41.
- [22]. Thibaut, J. W., and Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- [23]. Carson, P. P., Carson, K. D., and Roe, C. W. (1993). Social power bases: A meta- analytic examination of interrelationships and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(14), 1150-1169.
- [24]. Finkelstein, S. (1992). Power in top management teams: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 505-538.
- [25]. Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 387-413.
- [26]. Lunenberg, F. C. (2012). Power and Leadership: An Influence Process. *International Journal of Management, Business and Administration*, 15 (1), 1-9.
- [27]. Raven, B.H., Schwarzwald, J. and Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualising and Measuring a Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 28 (4), 307-332.