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CHAPTER -1-

INTRODUCTION

DEFINITION

The word ‘Power’ is a commonly used term in our everyday life. It has been utilized in array of senses and defined in various concepts. "We are sure that we meant something by the word, and have a vague idea what it is" Dahl (1957). One who understands the intricacies involved in the definition of the word and master the skill of its implementation could make good use of it and reap in abundance. The concept of power has been so defined and used in varying perspectives that, sometimes seems to have nothing to do with the etymological meaning. No matter on what concepts the term is being used, we shall see the meaning of power in its originality. The word ‘power’ is derived from the Latin word “potere” which meant, “to be able.” According to this translation power is the ability to do, to cause effect, or simply the ability of an entity or group of entity etc. Therefore, this ability can be attributed to anything that has ability, including men. This study will deal with the ability of a person or a group of persons and nothing more. A simple definition of such power is the ability to do or act physically, mentally, legally, politically, and spiritually.

In the entire lexicon of sociological concepts none is more troublesome than the concepts of power. We all know perfectly well what it is until someone asks us,” (Bierstedt, 1950). Social Power can also be applied to work. It is the ability to do something pleasant or unpleasant for others so that he willingly or unwillingly complies. The person complying with power is dependant on the more powerful person for a desirable outcome that cannot be achieved by other means (Emerson, 1964). It is the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action (Weber, 1978). In this sense power is viewed as an instrument to dominate over the other. The impacts of power are experienced at all types of social organizations.
Power was of concern to chiefs, priests and kings. And today it is not only those at the helm of state governance who are involved with power. People from all walks of life working in different shades of organizations are also very much attached with power and librarians are no exception. The studies of power gain more momentum in the field of politics and the business organizations. The relevance of its use in a library environment is yet to be fully realized. Sceptics fail to conceive library as an organization wherein human interaction and communication contribute to the proper orientation of the library towards its goal. In India proper channeling of power in inter-personnel relations suffers a set back. Meaningful studies of power in the Indian library environment are yet to be initiated and owing to the same literature are unavailable. As it is understood, power is somehow implemented everyday in libraries all over India among the professionals and staff. If ask about power exercise, library professionals may whine about their lack of power. This is true to some extend and it is also true that librarians are not authorized to hire and fire at will which sometimes pave the way for subordinates non cooperation. Power does not confines to positional and legitimate influence and there are various way superiors and subordinates uses power even when their position are conceived to be powerless. Had power been depending solely on position subordinates will not be able to influence their super-ordinates. Despite of claims that library professionals held less power they still use power to influence others in order to get things done or to achieve the library goals. Scepticism about library professionals’ use of power may be due to the fact that their conception of power and leadership are not clear. These very facts aggravate the personal relation among library professionals and heighten the need to conduct the study in the library environment. In an organizational set up like libraries where effective management of personnel are crucial to achieve the goals being set forth, the use of power would surely improve the way the library is being managed.

Power in this study will be further limited to the power of leaders, which is used to influence others in an organizational environment. In the organizational perspective the wider
concept of power is to achieve goals at the same time, leaders who get things done achieve such goals by consciously or unconsciously using power. Taking into consideration the organizational aspect of power Parson (1967) opines that power is “the ability to achieve goals and get things done”. Besides behaviours and traits, a leader is expected to exercise a fair share of power and it is interesting that some leaders possess a flair for the implementation of certain power though sometimes unknowingly.

**POWER AND INFLUENCE**

Power is used synonymously with influence due to its proximity in concepts and common usage. Morriss (1987) argued, “If power and influence are synonymous then the phrases ‘power to influence’ becomes nonsense”. While conducting a study on power it is equally important to properly distinguish the concept of influence. Confusion between the two can be a harmful omission and a chaotic approach. It will also be sheer callousness on my part not to draw a clear distinction between the terms.

Katz and Kahn (1966) defined influence as a transaction between two person where A change B’s behaviour to cause an intended effect whereas, power is the capacity to exercise such influence. Lipitt et al (1952) perceived it as an attribution and found that subjects attributed with power tend to influence others more than those with less power attribution. While establishing that power is not synonymous with influence Bass (1990) suggest, “Power is the potential to influence”. Power may or may not be an attribution yet it is clear that influence is the practical implementation of power to produce behavioural or psychological effects in a person or group of persons. Power is the ability and influence is the course of interpersonal relation where people, group of person or organization use power to convince another person, group of person or organization to produce the intended behaviours. Power in this study will be perceived as the ability to wield influence over others.
THE BASES OF POWER

To bring about a proper analysis of the use of power by managers or for that matter librarians as managers there is a need to identify the sources of power that forms the integral portion of the study. It is true that overlapping is unavoidable in examining the sources of power. This is due to the fact that one form of power may substantially generate another form of power. Even after conceptualizing the different bases of power, it is also inevitable that they are probably intertwined.

The most accepted and discussed identification of power can be traced to that of French and Raven (1959). They identified five kinds of power bases, which gain importance and popularity among researchers. Their five bases of power were expert power, referent power, reward power, coercive power and legitimate power. Etzioni (1961) conceived three broad forms of power giving the bases of each:

- **Coercive power** is rested on threat of physical sanctions, generation of frustration or controlling through force the satisfactions of needs.
- **Remunerative power** is based on control over material resources and rewards.
- **Normative power** is based on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations.

Another three sources of power identified by Peabody (1962) are, position power, competence power and personal power. The French and Raven model as noted by Patchen (1974) was inadequate because the various bases of power were not defined in a conceptually parallel way. The models, which constitute five bases of power, were later added with two more bases—information and connection (Hersey, Blanchard and Natemeyer, 1979, Raven, 1965). Thus, the French and Raven model were stretched to seven bases. Hinken and Schriesheim (1989) in sharpening the distinctions among the previous five bases define as follows -

1. **Expert power**: is the ability to administer to another person information, knowledge, or expertise.
2. **Referent power**: is the ability to administer to other person feelings of personal acceptance or approval.

3. **Reward power**: is the ability to administer to other person things he/she desires or to remove or decrease things he/she does not desire.

4. **Coercive power**: is the ability to administer to other person things he/she does not desire or to remove or decrease things he/she does desire.

5. **Legitimate power**: is the ability to administer to another person feeling of obligation or responsibility.

The two bases that come as later additions may be defined as follows:

1. **Information power**: is the ability to administer or withheld information valuable to another person.

2. **Connection power**: is the perception of having connections with influential or important persons.

As mentioned earlier certain base of power may have some effect on the other. Library professionals in the superior position of the organizational hierarchy may tend to have used more coercive and legitimate power that affects the subordinates' feelings negatively that the superior may not be in a position to use referent power. In contrast, one with expert power may be looked up so much that he/she has more referent, legitimate, or even reward power. Obviously, certain powers are correlated and lodged in the same person whereas, others consequently negates to the extreme being less powerful.

Patchen (1974) suggest certain conceptual difficulties in the French and Raven model. Reward and coercive were defined in terms of the influencer’s resources. Referent and legitimate were defined in terms of the influencee’s characteristics and motives. Expert power depends on the influencer and the knowledge he/she possessed. Empirically correlations were found with the model. In a national random sample of executives Rahim (1986) obtain a correlation of 58 between the expert and referent power the subjects attributed to their
superiors. The control of reward and coercive power possessed by the superior correlate similarly with their legitimate power as conceived by the subordinates.

Though various problems seems to cloud the model of French and Raven it is found to be used in may experimentations and field research. For the purpose of the present study the bases of power is conceived as sources of power that make one influential and this sources of power has seven dimensions viz., expert, referent, reward, coercive, legitimate, information and connection. These bases of power will be investigated in two ways: one is which dimensions make themselves influential and the other is which dimensions make their superior influential.

INFLUENCE STRATEGIES

Although the boundary between power and influence is thin it is clear form various observation that power is oriented through certain behavioural strategies. These very behavioural strategies are termed as influence strategy. Upward and downward orientation of influence strategies in order to exercise power is found to be relevant in any human relations in organizations including libraries. Managers' use of influence strategy differs in method, situation and intention.

The skilful use of power or influence strategy can be traced as early as the studies of Nicolo Machiavelli to Lasswell (1948) and Lane (1961). Though these studies are interpersonal in approach it is based on the philosophy of inherent goodness and perfectibility of humankind. Goodchilds, Quadrado and Raven (1975) initiate the identification of influence strategies by asking subject of what strategies they use to influence others. Falbo (1977) generated a list of power strategies by asking the subjects to write an essay on 'How I get my way'. Based on this study Falbo and Peplau (1980) categorized various strategies that were used to conceptualize the Multidimensional Scaling System of power strategies. The Multi
dimensional Scaling System was later modified by Sagrestano (1992) and the modified version includes the following strategies: bargaining, discussing, persistence, persuasion, reasoning, asking, stating importance, telling positive effect, suggesting, laissez-faire, negative affect and withdrawal. Similarly, Dunn and Cowan (1993) define and categorize the various influence strategies as, strong, weak and neutral as follows:

Under the strong category the strategies are:

1. **Autocracy**: insisting, claiming greater knowledge, using authority, or telling.

2. **Bullying**: Making threats or insults, becoming violent, or ridiculing.

3. **Laissez-faire**: Taking independent action.

The weak category of influence strategies includes:

1. **Persistence**: Continue asking, nagging, or trying to get way; prolonging request.

2. **Manipulation**: Implying deceit; dropping hints, acting ill or incompetent, flattering; attempting to induce use of sex.

3. **Sexual Manipulation**: Behaving seductively or flirting, acting feminine or implying use of sex.

4. **Controlled Emotion**: Maintaining composure, speaking calmly; controlling feelings.

5. **Expressed Emotion**: Displaying emotions, crying; expressing feelings.

6. **Positive Behaviour**: Being nice or sweet, making jokes or avoiding abrasive behaviour.

7. **Supplication**: Pleading or begging.

8. **Avoidance**: avoiding target; influencing someone else instead.

9. **Advocate**: Employing someone else's help in influencing target.

10. **Disengagement**: withdrawal of affection, becoming silent, cold, or distant.

The Neutral Influence Strategies are:

1. **Asking**: Making a simple request

2. **Bargaining**: Negotiating reciprocation
3. **Reasoning:** Presenting reasons or logical arguments, persuading.

In a study to understand the "power tactics" people use in different situations in an organization Fairholm (1985) identifies the following tactics viz., controlling the agenda, using ambiguity, practicing brinkmanship, displaying charisma, forming coalitions, co-opting opposition members, controlling decision criteria, developing others, using outside experts, building favourable image, legitimizing control, incurring obligation, controlling organizational placements, using a proactive strategy, using "quid pro quo", rationalizing, selecting allocating resources, selective dispensing rewards, and punishment, using rituals, using a surrogate, using symbols and training and orienting others. In a study conducted on the use of influence strategies Savard and Rogers (1992) identifies reason, request, making one feel good, chain of command with superior and peers as important tactics, Yeh (1995) on investigating the downward influence style in cultural diversity found the use of assertiveness, exchanges and higher authorities as bearing significant difference. Bjorkman (1998) conceptualize influence into personal and positional. There is no distinct demarcation on the concept of various influence strategies as revealed in empirical and theoretical analysis.


1. **Assertiveness:** - insisting, vindicating, verbal anger, telling the rights and rules or thrusting on to make a person complies. It is found that the strategy utilized in all levels.
2 **Coalition/Forming alliance** - In this strategy lateral and subordinate supports are established to influence the subject. Used more on upward influence.

3 **Exchange of benefits.** - Promising something in return for the work done. The strategy is used in upward, downward and lateral influence.

4 **Ingratiation:** - Persuasively commending about the person from whom the favour is wanted. Sometimes by making the person feel important or by asking politely. Superior subordinate and peers used this style.

5 **Manipulation:** - Giving an apparent or argument to change the mind of a person who is not aware that he/she is being manipulated. It can be utilized to influence, co-workers, subordinates and super-ordinates.

6 **Reasoning/Rationality.** - Request made with logical or judicious explanation to make a person comply. It is found to be more affective with upward influence.

7 **Threats/Defiance** - Indication of an intention to inflict, punish or hurt if the person fails to comply. The person is made to do the job willy-nilly. The one who uses this strategy should be in a position to do the harm.

8 **Upward appeal:** - In this strategy the support of somebody in the higher rank (e.g., the subject's boss) is acquired to put pressure on the target. Making a formal appeal to the higher ups or obtaining their support is included in this strategy.

9 **Used of Sanction** - The strategy involves both rewarding and denying something to the target. Rewarding for being cooperative or denying a promotion for being not cooperative are included in this strategy.

Various studies have suggested identification of influence strategies adopted by managers. Each investigator seems to have different way of distinguishing and defining the strategies. To investigate the influence strategies of Indian library professionals, these influence strategies, proven to have relevance in the Indian organizational environment, are
implemented. In this study, influence strategies are conceived in two ways: upward influence strategies and downward influence strategies.

LEADERSHIP

Leaders as prophets, priests, chiefs, and kings serve as symbols and representatives are models for their people in the Old and New Testaments, in the Upanishads, in the Greek and Latin classics, and in the Icelandic regions (Bass, 1990). Leadership is one of the oldest study written in the Egyptians hierographics more than 5000 years ago, countless volumes of books; articles and journals has been written on the subject whereas no clear and universally acceptable understanding is established. Leadership remains "one of the most observed and least understood phenomenon" (Burns, 1978). Decades of academic analysis has given in more than 350 definitions of leadership, thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted in the last 75 years alone, but no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from non leaders and perhaps more important what distinguishes effective leaders, from ineffective leaders and effective organizations from ineffective organizations "(Bernis and Namus, 1985). According to Katz and Kahn (1978) Hersey and Blanchand (1977) and Schultz (1982) leadership plays a pivotal role in the organization to achieve goals and successes. In other words the success and failure of the organization depends on its leaders.

The description and meaning of leadership will differ in context and purpose for which it is being conceived. Different people conceived the purposes of the studies; researchers have defined differently in their own perspective. Leadership is defined by Hempill (1949) as behaviour involved in directing group activity, as process of influencing the activities of an organized group (Stodgill, 1950), and as an attempt to change behaviour (Bass, 1960); as the course of directing and in ordination the work of group members which involves work relations, praising or criticizing and showing conduction (Fiedler, 1967) as leaders existing
influence; at the margin to compensate what was missing in the specified process and structure (Miller, 1973); as the process of influence between leader and follower (Hollander, 1978); as followers perception of the leaders abilities (Kouzes and Posner, 1990). To sum up, "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as these are persons who have attempted to define the concept (Stogdill, 1979). The search for the one and only one proper and true definition of leadership seems to be fruitless, since the appropriate choice of definition should depend upon the methodological and substantive aspects of leadership in which one is interested (Bass, 1990). However, for the present purpose leadership will be perceived as the process in which leaders influence others in an effort to attain organization goals and objectives. In this study leadership will be viewed in two perspectives: leaders own perception and subordinates perception.

LEADERSHIP STYLE

With the onset of human relation theory in the study of leadership after World War II, the focuses on the behavioural differences among managers gain momentum. The distinction of an individual as a successful leader was found more on the behavioural approaches. Bole (1963) found that, "as the task leader continued to force people to focus on their jobs, certain of their needs were frustrated. What emerged was a social leader, one whose role was to reduce tensions and make the job more pleasant. The behaviour of this leader helped to boost morale and crystallize and defend the values, attitudes and beliefs of the group". The approach draws the attention of many researchers in the behavioural sciences and a number of models and styles have emerged. In general, all studies on the model or styles of leader are based on the accomplishment of Task and people oriented leadership styles.

Halpin and Niener (1957) after modification of the nine dimension suggested by Ohio State University identified consideration, initiating structure, Production emphasis and
sensitivity or social Awareness as the ideal leadership styles without much overlaps. A research similar to the Ohio State University was conducted at the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Centre. In 1950 the Michigan Survey identified two leadership styles—Production (job) orientation and People (supportive) orientation. Various studies have taken place and enormous amount of literatures attempting to identify the dimension of leadership styles have been produced. As it is always true with the study of leadership, there are overlapping and repetitions in this process of identifying the styles leaders use to achieve the goal or make people do the job.

Saraf (1995) after an extensive search of literature identified 5 (five) dimensions of leadership styles. These styles were tested in Indian Library Environmental and were found relevant. For the purpose of this study these five leadership styles will be adopted. The styles as described by various authors (see, Blan and Scott, 1962; Weber, 1947; Bensman and Rosenberge, 1960; Bales, 1958; Linkert, 1961; Bars, 1990; Kalar, 1971; Sinha, 1980 and Saraf 1995) are as follows:

1. **Authoritarian Style** The authoritarian leader is strict, supervise closely, and adhere to procedure. The personalities of the authoritarian are rigidity, self-centeredness, suspicious, insecure and anxiety. They can accomplish the job but subordinates remain unsatisfied.

2. **Bureaucratic style** The bureaucratic leaders work with appointed officials. Legal authority based on rational ground supports the positions of these leaders. Their authority rests on belief in the legality of normative rules and those elevated to authority under such rules are to issue command. The styles makes people cautious conservative, unwilling to risks, impersonal in thought and breeds arrogance.

3. **Task oriented style** Leaders with a strong sense of achieving/fulfilling goals are known to be task oriented or performance oriented. Thus, the leadership adopted by such leaders is termed task-oriented style. Such leaders contributed to the group’s effectiveness by setting
goals, allocating labour and sometimes enforcing sanctions. They are moderates, neither too sensitive nor too aggressive.

4. **Participative style**: The participative style is synonymous with democratic, considerate, permissive and non-directives styles. Leaders share decision-making policy with subordinates and this in turn highly motivate the subordinates and makes them take more responsibilities. The participative leadership allows each member of the group to gain recognition and a strong sense of self-worthiness.

5. **Nurturant Style**: The Nurturant style is said to be the preferred style in India (Sinha, 1980). A nurturant leader cares for his subordinate shows affection, takes personal interest in their well beings, this personal warmth helps create a climate of trust and understanding where subordinates grow up and acquire maturity.

**MEASURING LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS**

Measuring leaders’ effectiveness had been done through many ways depending upon the model of leadership being investigated. Some of the most widely used checklist for measuring leaders effectiveness is the set of behavioural categories developed by Bals (1950) Carter, et al (1951) Mann (1961) Bales et al (1979) Bals and Cohin (1980) and Komaki et al (1986). Bars (1960) suggested that leaders’ effectiveness can be measured through group effectiveness and proposed that this group effectiveness can be defined as (1) The group’s output, (2) its morale and (3) members satisfaction. Likert (1958) proposed 12 indicators of leaders’ effectiveness and refined by Mentzberg (1973) into nine lists of indicators, which was defined by Wagner (1978) through factor analysis and reduced into six activities. As far as librarians are concerned Bechlel (1993) suggested that excellent leadership, however, begins with the notion that enabling everyone who works in the library to grow in knowledge ability and commitment to library service is the primary task. Since the inclusion of all possible variables for determining librarians leadership effectiveness is beyond the purview of
this study, librarians' leadership effectiveness will be measured in relation with subordinates, super-ordinates, organizational climate and background variables

**THE RELATIONSHIP OF POWER AND LEADERSHIP**

Conceptual frameworks relating to the relationship between power and leadership remains subtle and sparse. However, in the processes of defining power, leadership seems to significantly matter. We have, in our previous discussion, conceptualized power as the potential and influence as the process. Yet the relationship between power, influence and leadership remains unidentified.

A remarkable view by Tannenbaum, and company (1961), in this regard was formulated and according to them leadership 'is interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation and directed through the communication process towards the attainment of a specific goal or goals.' Power according to them is ability or potential for influence and leadership is the ability or potential for influence and leadership is the actual use of power by the leader to get compliance in achieving the goal. In the words of Gibbs (1969) 'leadership is but one facet through perhaps the most readily visible fact of the larger process of role differentiation. Leadership is simply this concept applied to the situation obtaining in a group when the differentiation of roles results in one or some of the parties to the interaction influencing the actions of the others in a hared approach to common or compatible goals.' The concepts of leadership and influence attempts are hard to distinguish. Korman (1971) aptly put that 'the statement, "a leader tries to influence other people in a given direction" is relatively simple but it seems to capture the essence of what we mean by leadership.' Similarly, Filley and House (1969) defined leadership as 'a process whereby one person exerts social influence over the members of the group. A leader, then, is a person with power over others who exercise this process for the purpose of influencing their behaviour.'
From the above discussions it is clear that leadership and power are influence processes and 'the connecting link between leadership and power is influence' (Ansari, 1990). For the purpose of this study, power is the potential to influence and leadership is the actual exercise of power.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

Organizational climate is a man made system with the objective of achieving goals that the organization set forth. Some organizational climate are said to have boost the overall productivity of the organization and motivates its personnel while other with a set of attractive rules and regulation fails to achieve. Starting with a contrived system the organizational climate creates a distinct personality of the organization that may or may not be conducive to the objectives of the organization. Therefore, two different organizations will have two different personality or organizational climate of their own. The type of organizational climate, friendly or hostile, conducive or inconvenient is based purely on the perception of the people working in it.

The study of such psychological climate is said to be initiated by Lewin (1936) in his famous equation, \[ B = f(P, E) \] where behaviour 'B' is a function of both personality 'P' and the forces of environment 'E'. This discovery of organization as an important factor that shapes the personals working in it led to the study of organizational climate. However, the study gains momentum only in the late 60s. Linkert (1961) suggested that each different system would create a different climate. This was later reinforced by Litwin and Stinger's (1968) finding of a study of organizational climate in three simulated firms. The organizational climate study of Litwin and Stinger (1968) suggested that the climate perceived are, structured, punitive, non-supportive, less chance for responsibility, participative, encouraging operation, strong norms of responsibility, personal initiative and risk taking. Similar studies of
organizational climate indicate the organizational climate can enhance motivation, productivity, and job satisfaction.

In a study conducted on organizational climate Upadhyay (1983) is of the view that there are two factors, external and internal which influence the organization. Again the organization, in the process of interaction, influences the environmental factors. In an earlier study, forehand (1968) had suggested environmental variables are external to the individual but internal to the organization. Upadhyay's (1983) argument is based on external factors like cultural/social systems that are not within the framework of the organization. Dastmatchian (1986) finds that vulnerability of the organization to threats imposed by the labour market has significant effects on the attitudes of the organizational decision makers in creating favourable organizational climate. The variables used to scale the organizational climate are as follows: -

1. Creativity and readiness to innovate,
2. Leaders psychological distance,
3. Management concern for employee involvement,
4. Orientation to wider community, and
5. Questioning authority,
6. Reward orientation,
7. Rules orientation,
8. Sociability.

On the basis of earlier literature Akhilesh and Pandey (1986) conclude that “the difference in organizational climate score between two organizations may be an indicator of relative performance and satisfaction of its employees” and the perception of organizational climate vary according to the individuals hierarchical position. In Srinath's (1990) views, “the dynamics operating in and around the organization” is what leads to the organizational climate.
Organizational climate has been investigated in various types of organization resulting in various sets of indicators. These findings only support the definition that every organization has a personality or climate of its own. It is the direct or indirect perception of the individuals within it that have created the image of the climate. Therefore, organizational climate can be defined as a molar concept that reflects the general atmosphere of a work place, and is assumed to influence the motivation, satisfaction and behaviour of the individuals in the organization (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Payne, 1971).

Based on various definitions and findings organizational climate in this study is conceptualized as the attributes of the organization as perceived by the individuals within the organization.

CONCLUSION

It is imperative to note that power strategies are made up of factors like the bases of power, influence strategies, leadership styles and organizational climate. Bases of power are the sources that make the subjects' change the mind of the target. Having one or more power bases subjects may use various strategies to influence the target. However, chances are that a person may not particularly base his/her power on any given base but he/she may still attempt to influence. Different people have different leadership styles and the influence processes adopted by different leaders are likely to differ accordingly. Organizational climate is also one important factor that shapes the power strategies and the strategies differ from climate to climate. Therefore, it is necessary to take the whole scenario into consideration in order to understand the power strategies better.

The process of power strategy involves more than one person. It is indeed a study of the relationship between two or more people. Organizations have three different types of relationship namely, upward, downward and lateral. These relationships are called interpersonal relationship. The upward relation is the power strategies toward the superior and
downward relation is conceived as the strategies towards the subordinates. Similarly, lateral relationship is the strategies towards peers. This study is limited to upward and downward relationship.