



Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

Reil Angelo C. Valdueza¹, Jornie Lumintao²

¹BA Political Science - Central Mindanao University, Bukidnon, Philippines

²BA Political Science Faculty – Central Mindanao University, Bukidnon, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Published Online: December 20, 2024

Organizational practice is ubiquitous in the daily workings of social life. Organizations has been an integral part of political life, especially as an aspect where expressions of power and interests reside. In these discussions, a review is warranted in order to map out the existing approaches and theories implored in understanding the topic. This review examines literature in the field of organizational studies, particularly in power dynamics and relations Using the 74-year time gap as time-frame. This review takes on the examination of different theoretical approaches and frameworks in the studies considered, as well as the variables that those studies take basis in their analysis. Through these inquiries, power dynamics in organizations are found to encompass various approaches situated in the social science. Additionally, power discussions in organizations and its mechanisms is not to be divorced with institutional dynamics, due to the ubiquity of institutional discussions as units of analysis. In this regard, this paper places itself in the realm of institutional regulation and member compliance as an effective contribution to the existing literature. The compliance dynamic of rules formulated by the authority and their utility in governance are useful perspectives attributed by this review to be informed outlooks for future research endeavors, utilizing in particular, political science perspectives.

KEYWORDS:

Organizations, Power Dynamics, Institutional Regulation and Member Compliance

INTRODUCTION

The existence of organizations in recent history is regarded to be an embedded part of political life. Especially in a democratic environment where rights to assemble (Article III, 1987 Philippine Constitution) and to build formal and informal connections are protected, with this organizations are cemented in the outpost and workings of everyday political instances. Academically, the past half-century has seen the study of organizations as an active area within sociology (Scott, 2004). Most human activities take place in social structures other than markets (Simon, 1991), this means that society as a community of heterogeneous individuals is the framework by which human tendency exist. As an aspect that affects both the grassroots of society

Corresponding Author: Reil Angelo C. Valdueza

**Cite this Article: Reil Angelo C. Valdueza, Jornie Lumintao (2024). Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective. International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies, 4(12), 1340-1359*

through its members and elites in its legitimized leadership positions, the power exchanges and dynamics that exist within the body deserve surmount attention from scholars and the academic community alike. As what is going on inside, outside and between organizations is central in all analysis of society (Goran, 1994).

On conventional understanding, power in organizational contexts is simply displayed expressively and covertly in a linear fashion, where institutional frameworks are understood to be the outcome of the power dynamics made to be a product of overtly laid out positional advantages (University of Waikito, n.d.). In other words, due to the legitimized organizational structure, power is in the hands of the individual agency and its cooperation in the power dynamics.

This review initially proposes that power in political organizations is also manifested in the rule-making prowess of the authority. Rule formulation, formalization, and acceptance are also effective arenas in which power is clearly defined. Rule making is a form of both policy making and organizational or bureaucratic decision making is suggested.

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

The nature of rules should also be seen as an important aspect of decision making, differentiating it both from generalized policy making and from individualized discretionary decision making (Black, 1997). In light of this line of argument, rule obedience as a factor that challenges the authority of the organization is also a form of arena where power is clearly exercised. This review seeks to unravel the notions of rules and law-making on the part of the authority and the member's willingness/rejection to acknowledge the same, considering the institutional truths that fall within. Where rules and procedures often define the institutional backdrop of organizations, this makes it incidental to studies of institutional change in organizations. Institutional studies on the subject in this proposed approach matter, however, a more definite thought would be attributed to the power dynamics of rule compliance and formulation.

It is paramount to understand the power dynamics behind rule-making and/or policy-making processes of organizations relative to their members because it is the primary tool in trying to make sense of the common dilemma that organizations face. The problem arises when the members of the organization themselves challenge and question the spirit of the rules made by the central authority. This causes the legitimacy of such institutions to degrade and may eventually lead to instances of institutional change, in the extreme case cause its eventual dissolution. Examples of this include the P9.9 million collected from violators of the Land Transportation and Traffic Code (RA 4136) in Davao City (GMA Regional, 2024). In the domestic level, the Philippine Government under the direction of President Marcos Jr. recently confiscated P10.41 B worth of illegal drugs in more than 27,000 barangays during his drug campaign (PCO, 2024). As shown at the national level, the drug problem is still apparent despite the clear prohibition of its spread and utility by the R.A. 9165 or otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002. From a broader perspective, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change established a framework (Kyoto Protocol) that would limit the emission of greenhouse gases in the countries. The US among others, although a signatory to said convention did not ratify the said protocol, in fact, it was put into effect without the cooperation of the USA (Stiles, 2013). Historical narratives that put the organization to the extreme case may be attributed to the American Civil War, where citizens were starting to challenge the long-established notion of slavery among blacks in the country (Gudmestad, 2023). Express constructions of the regulator as an ally, threat, and obstacle that vary with organizational expertise, authority, and continuity of relationship between the organizational member and the regulator (Gray et. al., 2014). The relationship between the members of the organization and the standing authority can fluctuate due to the course of policies that such

an organization establishes. Thus, the regulatory dilemma threatens the harmony of the organizational society.

In order to advance an understanding of the dilemma, it is crucial to first take into account the existing literature in order to fully map out the knowledge attributed to the subject, as well as to academically confirm the proposed angle on the subject. So, while power is described as an integral part of organizations, it is also stressed that power dynamics are under-theorized (Blackler, 2011; Contu and Willmott, 2003; Jasperson et al., 2002; Marabelli and Galliers, 2017). There exists a dearth of theoretical attention in terms of studying the power dynamics that precede the everyday dealings of organizational life. In light of the relatively little attention that organizations enjoy in scholarly work, particularly in theory, the purpose of this review is to expose the existing literature and approaches that this general issue is applied with. Particularly, in arguing using a political science approach (centered on power). This article deals with the general objective in the form of an inquiry which is: *what exists in the literature about the power dynamics that reside within formal organizations and how does this contribute to the political discourse?*

In order to fully strike the given objective, utilizing the scoping review as the methodology of knowledge synthesis will give the position the most justice. Scoping reviews generally aim to map rapidly the key concepts underpinning a research area and the main sources and types of evidence available (Arksey and O'Malley, 2005). Foremost is our aim which is to map out the current data on the subject, the identification of certain characteristics/concepts in papers or studies, and the mapping, report, or discussion of these characteristics/concepts, these regards are central to the scoping review method of data synthesis (Munn et.al., 2018). Furthermore, scoping reviews are an ideal tool to determine the scope or coverage of a body of literature on a given topic and give a clear indication of the volume of literature and studies available as well as an overview (broad or detailed) of its focus (Armstrong et. al., 2011). The methodologies and theoretical frameworks utilized in understanding organizational politics are also another line of inquiry that this review is anchored to chart. For this objective, scoping reviews can be useful tools to investigate the design and conduct of research on a particular topic (Callary, et. al., 2015). Since the aim of the article is to provide a general overview of the subject, the utilization of the scoping review becomes imperative. This review takes the utility of scoping reviews in answering the proposed sub-inquiries for a structured approach to the main research question.

1.) *What forms of theoretical approaches and designs does the existing literature on power dynamics in organizations contain?*

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

2.) *What are the variables that indicate the power relations determined in the studies compiled?*

3.) *How does these inform our understanding of organizational politics with regard to its exercise of power within?*

Charting the conceptual evolutions and theoretical approaches through a scoping review of the general issue of power dynamics in organizations effectively creates the basis by which the problem can be situated.

Political Science as the lens of analysis

Organization is formed from the word “organize”. The word organize, itself, means to put in working order; to arrange in a system. This means to organize involves two things: humans and materials. Because of this writers reasonably maintain that organizations are political systems (Cyert and March, 1963; Crazier, 1964; Thompson, 1967; Karpik, 1972). In the context of organizations, the concept of power must be invariably discussed since it deals mainly with asserting the general interest over subserving wills inherent in the agency. In discussing the concept of power, it is the capacity of an individual or group of individuals to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner in which he desires and to prevent his own conduct from being modified in a way which he does not (Schein, 1977). It is the outside capacity of an agency to affect others through its actions and perceived resources. On another, power is illustrated as A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do (Dahl, 2006). Simply put, it is the ability to affect others counter to what they desire.

Scholars who argue for a power-based political delineation are very evident in the scholarly community as a result of the ever-deepening of political discourse. While it is undeniable that this seminal issue is under the general umbrella of social sciences, as it deals directly with the behavior of people in the society, political science as a major academic approach goes directly supplementary in describing the dimensions of organizational work, as in the primary, power dynamics is what backdrops the activity in its essence. Partridge (1963) admits that political activity itself is connected very intimately with power, it may have been quite properly defined as simply the struggle for power. In organizational frameworks and systems, power is what centers everything and it is a primary priority for a proper approach in order to understand its nature appropriately. According to Easton (1953), politics is mainly concerned with the generation of authoritative decisions binding for the entire society. Assailing this definition, authoritative decisions are anchored on the assumption that in society conflicts of interest will arise which necessitates the need for the sovereign intervention of a political system that will generate the highest decision for all. In this respect, power

and its expression through the authority of the political system is understood, power is also observed in the clash of opinions and interests, and power is absolutely manifested in the perceived reality to accept the generated outcome of the system and thus the organization at large.

In order to clarify some terminologies, the core idea behind the word ‘organization’ and why it's important to distinguish it from the word ‘institution’. Scholarly discourses as differentiated from everyday conversations, view a different meaning of institutions. At best, institutions according to conventional understanding are physical and tangible bodies that attain a specific goal while containing systems of bureaucracies within. In contrast, Hall (1986) defines institutions as ‘the formal rules, compliance procedures, and standard operating practices that structure the relationship between individuals in various units in the polity and economy’. They are existing rules in society that both enable and constrain individuals. Organizations on the other hand, are stable associations of persons engaged in concerted activities directed to the attainment of specific objectives (Bittner, 1965). In a deeper analysis of their differences, North (1990) argues that organizations are a response to the institutional structure of societies and that the actions of organizations are a major cause of the alteration of the wider institutional structure. Here organizations are considered as an entity in the greater institutional framework that it exists upon. For the direction of this review, the term organization will be used as the core purpose of this work is to study the ways in which power is manifested and displayed within the organization as a formal entity.

METHODS

This review article will utilize the scoping review method of data synthesis as proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (2005), including the 5 stages of development in completing the review. Which includes in particular, (1) identifying the research question, (2) identifying relevant studies, (3) study selection, (4) charting the data, (5) collating, summarizing, and reporting the results. Wherefore, step 1 is completed in the introduction and with steps 2,3, and 4 in the preceding sections and, 5 will be accomplished with the Findings section.

SEARCH STRATEGY

As an initial step, the search for studies was first instituted to find relevant article reviews that fall within the general outline of power dynamics in organizational politics in the social literature. Article reviews were found regarding the subject which contributed meaningfully to the knowledge this review sought, however, there were no reviews that opted to utilize the scoping review as a method of knowledge synthesis.

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

After this, the search began answering the research question indicated in the introduction, using a 74-year gap timeframe (1950-2023). It included relevant articles, journals, books, and even dissertation studies that strike the similar subject of power in organizational politics. The search was mostly anchored on research that is provided under familiar databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Philippine E-Journals. Keywords were implored in order to propose relevancy for the general topic and to further screen the articles found in step 2 of relevant studies. “Organizational politics”, “Power dynamics”, and “Organizations”; with abstracts that contain the terms “power”, “organizations” and “power relations” were utilized as key terms.

IDENTIFYING RELEVANT STUDIES

Initially, (1) a total of 5,140,000 research articles are found. Using the indicated databases in the preceding section. It found chapters of books, journals, research dissertations, research articles, and even textbooks as materials for the concept. (2) Using the same research databases, the time gap of the last 74 years of research was proposed as a filter in the data which left 17,800 articles. (3) A search for key terms such as “Power”, “Organizations”, and “Power dynamics/relations” (as indicated in the previous section), were searched in these articles to confirm the centrality of power in these organizational studies. (4) To fully warrant the relevancy of the needed articles for this review, an expeditious abstract and introduction reading was done in order to check the content of the articles, where further exclusionary factors delineated in the next section are followed. (5) After a final reading of these articles, a total of 52 articles were chosen to be subjects for full-text reading and analysis. A comprehensive step for clarity is listed below:

- Initial search in databases using the research question
- 74 - year timeframe filter
- Search for key terms
- Expeditious reading of abstracts and introductions using additional exclusionary points
- Final listing

Study of Selection and Delimitation

Looking at the initial yield of searches, journals, and books were undoubtedly gathered as part of the knowledge building that this article demands. To this end an exclusion-inclusion criteria was established in order to screen effectively the articles that were compiled. Firstly, articles, journals, and research materials under the time 1950-2024 were established as a filter. Second, exclusionary factors include the absence of power as a seminal aspect in the organizational study, economically and psychologically centered studies, and variations of studies under office administration and microeconomics. Furthermore, the

absence of power-centered theoretical frameworks and inter-organization focuses were added as exclusionary factors that screen the articles compiled.

As exemplified in the introduction, a clarification of the terms ‘institution’ and ‘organization’ had to be done in order to avoid institutional studies that focus on inherent rules and constraints that the individual agency is affected by. A boundary must be clearly set because political institutions approached in a colloquial manner reflect a definition similar to that of organizations, which is essentially different from what the scholarly work offers. This may be largely due to the rise of new institutional approaches in political analysis that take the locus on rules and informal settlements of understandings and cultures in their relationship with the liberty possessed by individuals. In this matter, institutional studies that are found to be under the general umbrella of new institutionalism are excluded from the knowledge synthesis. This applies if the general object of the study is not organizations as an entity but rather institutions as a concept of inherent restraint to the agency.

Lastly, organizational cultures and forms of managerial accounts are seldom found using the key terms listed above. Thus, a short reading of its abstract and conclusions is to be done in order to ensure that the article contains the ‘political’ content that this article aims to synthesize.

Time and Feasibility

Articles that were generally within a 74-year gap from the current time were chosen to be included in the review. This is done considering the dearth of literature that the topic suffers and the outlook of providing an overview of how the understanding of the topic has evolved over time. Furthermore, the 1950s time can be considered as a peak time for organizational politics. This is largely due to the influx of international organizations being established during this time, leading the due course of organizational contexts in a democratic framework spread across nation-states. The International Monetary Fund is established in 1944, as a response to a world-wide economic depression (IMF, 2022). The United Nations officially began, on 24 October 1945, when it came into existence after its Charter had been ratified by China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, and by a majority of other signatories (UN, n.d.). In addition to these, the World Health Organization’s constitution was put into force in 1948, after a lag of 2 years for its official ratification (WHO, n.d.). Samuel Huntington (1990) described the mid-20th century as the second democratic wave due to an evident democratization of countries spanning from Latin America to South East Asia. Where independence and an overall submission to the democratic framework the US as a hegemon had established. This includes the Philippines as a Republic among others,

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

which adopted a constitution closely patterned from that of a liberal democracy as the USA. This shows that the atmosphere of both nation-states and international scopes paved the way for a time when organizational life flourished and the formalist cooperationist lifestyle was encouraged.

This exemplifies the heavy reason for the inclusion of a lofty 74 years of research, in order to fully map out the concepts that are associated with organizational politics, taking due consideration to the time of its flourishing.

CHARTING OF DATA

Percusory categories such as the type of research article, dates of publication, place of publication, and main theme will be employed in order to fully map out the literature on power dynamics in organizational politics. In answering the sub-objectives, categories such as results and data, theoretical approaches, population, social context, and key variables will be added. A specific version of knowledge synthesis for the sub-objectives is further indicated below.

Utilizing the research instrument/aid Zotero, the listed literature will be organized firstly according to the commonality of their theoretical frameworks of analysis. Second, with relevance to the full-text reading and analysis, the variables indicated as factors causing the genesis of power dynamics in organizations. Listing according to the articles, the actors involved and the bases which affect the exercise of power. Lastly, is to compare them comprehensively and argue for the literature gap seen in the Findings Section. All of these indicated steps will effectively answer the specified sub-objectives of this scoping review.

FINDINGS: WHAT EXISTS IN THE LITERATURE ABOUT THE POWER DYNAMICS THAT RESIDE WITHIN FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS AND HOW DOES THIS CONTRIBUTE TO THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE?

The following is a structured approach through the organized sub-inquiries in an attempt to answer the general research question. Which includes the research design and theoretical frameworks mapped out for power studies within organizations and the pertinent variables that indicate relations of power dynamics within them.

Sub-question 1: What forms of theoretical approaches and designs does the existing literature on power dynamics in organizations contain?

It must be noted that almost all of the studies compiled utilize a qualitative approach, there are some that use a mathematical approach in attempting to measure power relations, but as a general overview, these studies fall under the inquiry of quality data rather than quantifiable elements. And most of them are anchored in the study of the structural aspect rather than the individual agency as key factors in

determining the existent power dynamics within the organization, deepening the institution's importance in answering these areas of inquiries. These are chapters of scholarly books, case studies, journals, review articles, and some research items that fall under the description of supporting data to further the knowledge of the study it is anchored upon.

In terms of discipline, most of the studies involve interdisciplinary theories and general ideologies, however, keen attention is pondered upon power dynamics which as explicated in the introduction, is what carries the political in this review. Economics and microeconomics, as well as psychology and managerial studies, are incorporated in some articles, provided that those are not the focus of the article as established in the exclusionary factors listed in the delimitation section.

Agency Centered Approaches:

Cooperationist; Rational Choice; Political Capitalist Theories

Moe (2005) in his study 'Political Institutions: Perspectives on Politics', utilized initially a rational choice theory approach, but later on argued that Cooperationist theories are more supplemental in trying to grasp political institutions as sources of power. The assumption was that in a body where work is to be done by individuals residing under a specific system of arrangements, individual rationality is what drives the power dynamics within. However, in looking at the nature of political institutions and the constant exchanges that happen within, ideas of cooperation with the addition of power is what is more accurately displayed in these institutions. From a functionalist perspective, Bradshaw and Murray (1991) differentiate between the pluralist view, which "focuses on overt stakeholder behaviours such as coalition formation and bargaining" and the rationalist view, which "focuses on the legitimate authority of top management and the intended rationality of its decision making activities". Regulator perspectives in organizational governing are attributed in an analysis through a rational choice approach, particularly in evaluating the typology of determination in perceptions from the members (Gray and Silbey, 2014).

Further proponents of a cooperationist approach are listed, especially in understanding that power in organizations is inherently relational, in the sense that it exists and is displayed primarily in relation to others (Emerson, 1962; Thibaut et. al., 1959). In another dimension of cooperationist theories, Bacharach (1980), in his study, 'The Social Psychology of Conflict, coalitions, and bargaining', he offered a concept of equilibrium, particularly in the authority and survival of the organization. He established that political interactions continue to persist in organizational life and that through this the balance of authority is continually challenged. Organizational coordination as a line of inquiry

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

was utilized with institutional approaches and the quantitative simulation model from heterogenous agents (Dosi and Marengo, 2014).

In a more psychological approach, Jost and Banaji (1994) argued for the Systems Justification theory, which is anchored on the idea that the basic psychological motive behind individuals in power is to defend, legitimate, and bolster social systems manifests itself in the desire to see hierarchies as legitimate. In this theory system maintenance and institutional conservatism are the main proponents that exert the precursory efforts of power in organizations. The psychological consequences of being powerful often enable power holders to reinforce and maintain their advantageous positions (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962). Power is to be viewed in these approach as a tool that is being used by legitimate power holders (elites) in order to exercise an authority that maintains and reestablishes present norms and systems. From an episodic/‘power over’ perspective, power is seen as a restraining force and is linked, for example, to control, coercion, influencing others and authority (Clegg et al., 2006; Kärreman, 2010; Lawrence et al., 2012).

Contrary to this approach, is when power holders in the organization behave in a contrasting manner against the existing systems and norms. They shape the changes inside institutional frameworks which the organization exists upon (North, 1990). Keltner et al.’s (2003) power-approach theory posits that powerful individuals behave in disinhibited ways away from institutional constraints inherent in the existing organization. Power holders also demonstrate an approach orientation by engaging in less conformity and more frequently violating norms (Galinsky et al. 2008). These are approaches centered on the psychology of an individual to go against the status quo as an expression of power and its dynamic within organizations.

Arenas of institutional change is also a prominent ideal in the general idea of power dynamics in organizational politics. Anchored on an individualist stance, Pfeffer (1992), referred to change as an inevitable fact of institutions in organizations, they are part of the volatile nature of society which displays itself rather more clearly in organizations and political institutions. Homogeneity as an ideal sets itself more clearly in organizational recruitment. Wilson (1995), establishes how inducements or rewards are made to be the determining factor of the heterogenous nature of the population that the organization has authority over.

Coming from a rational choice strand, Schein (1997) in his ‘Individual Power and Political Behaviors in Organizations: An Inadequately Explored Reality’, viewed the intent of the power holder to be the central factor in determining the course of action of the means he chooses to exercise his power. Behind the resources that he viewed as an inherent asset in organizational life, the intent of the

individual goes beyond the outcome and is the soul beneath the power dynamics constantly exerted. French and Raven (1959) added the 5 bases of power that may be used in expressing power in organizations. These include reward, coercive, referent, legitimate, expert, and informational. These are regarded as important concepts in the power dynamics of organizational politics that are due to a rational choice theory paradigm. In line with this work, an addition of a capital framework is employed, to further the bases of power introduced by French and Raven. In this regard, the political capital is seen as a reverbating acquisition and deployment of power similar to how economic capital is used to generate revenue (Ocasio et.al, 2019).

Political capital according to the capital framework consists of parts that is coherently existent and relationally consistent with the idea of power bases initially established. First is economic capital, defined by Bourdieu (1985) as the individual’s ownership of financial resources or other valued resources that can readily be converted into money and is directly applicable to organizational contexts. The relationship of economic capital to power follows directly from the resource-dependence perspective (Emerson, 1962; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). The assumption is that individuals depend on resources to gather a sufficiency of power, which is anchored on its scarcity.

Another is, cultural capital, Lamont and Lareau (1988) define cultural capital as those forms of cultural knowledge of the dominant social classes that result in social and cultural exclusion. It is a part of an institutional hold that exists below the context of organizations. Collins’s (1981) notion of cultural resources: cultural capital is a resource that entails command over the language, cognition, values, and outward indicators of the dominant styles of communication and interaction, both verbal and non-verbal, among organization members. (Rivera, 2016). Thus, cultural capital allows organizational actors to influence others in the absence of formal authority. Allowing it to be the driving base of power in an individual’s prerogative which inevitably furthers the power dynamics in an organizational context.

One’s ability to access data and mobilize information is consequential to one’s ability to exercise power. Thus, knowledge capital is essential as a power source also (Bourdieu, 1985). Social capital entails the networks of connection that may lie under the arsenal of an individual agency, as a wielder of power in organizations. Lin’s (1999), conceptualization of social capital as the source of information, instrumental and affective commitments available through social networks that enhance the focal actor’s position.

Symbolic capital is based on the resources that accrue through one’s titles, credentials, ethnic background, age, or any other form of category membership. In particular,

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

symbolic capital is best understood as membership in a labeled category, such as those derived from name, rank, degree, or organizational position (Bourdieu 1985; 1989). Connecting this form of capital is reputational capital, which accrues for the good social position that an individual acquires which may arise from symbolic credentials. Kilduff and Krackhardt's (1994) finding that being perceived as having a prominent friend in an organization increased perceptions of one's performance demonstrates the link between social and reputational capital. It can also augment power based on dependence, according to Willer et. al., (2012), using power for personal gain can lead to perceptions both of competence, i.e., high status, and selfishness, i.e., low status, enabling the powerful who avoid perceptions of selfishness to leverage their power to gain status. Organizational capital encompasses the concept of administrative capital and bureaucratic capital, but on actual authority, both directly and indirectly, over decision-making and agenda setting (Lukes, 1974). This is the managerial aspect of the power base, which protrudes the sufficiency of exercising order-based rationality in the power holders of the organization.

Institutional capital is another that is listed, it encompasses the ability of organizational leaders to define the rules of the game, e.g., to establish the value of different forms of capital and to create symbolic systems of classification (Ocasio et. al., 2019). Expert power that is based on a participatory source is also utilized in order to examine the power relations in organizations (French and Raven, 1959).

Structurally Centered Approaches:

Institutionalism; Systemic-organizational centered approaches; Positional Power

Discussions on Organizational Change and Power dynamics also warrant an excerpt of attention in understanding the power dynamics in organizations. Power model of change is centered on the authority of the leader as a figure that imposes and commands the drive of the organization (Bouwen, 1995). Taking Bouwen's discussion on organizational positions as a source of power, positional legitimacy focuses on the person's formal position as the legitimacy to incur negative and positive coercive measures in organizational change (Bass, 1960). It caters the existing organizational hierarchy as a direct, observable, and direct expression of power. As an extension to these lines, French and Raven (1959) also forwarded Expert power as a crucial factor in organizations. Accordingly, change and continuity in organizations are often made possible by the control of top management bureaucrats. Law creation and regulation are inquisitive outlooks in the literature which is used by Edelman (1992) through structural contexts and elaborations.

However, criticism is provided by Boonstra et. al. (2010) together with some pluralist perspectives on the power model of change. These problems partly arise because the power model allows little participation of members of the organization and disregards learning possibilities (Boonstra, et. al., 2010). The pluralist view, in contrast to the earlier power model of change, establishes that cooperation and agreement is necessary for the function of the organization. Which is surrounded by negotiations and exchanges of resources. Pettigrew in 1997, advocated for the management of meaning better known as the sales model, which refers to a process of symbol construction and value use designed both to create legitimacy for one's own demands and to de-legitimize the demands of others. Management of meaning involves the ability to define the reality of others (Pettigrew, 1997). Model of organizational learning with a strong emphasis on participative design and development (Boonstra, 1997; Emery, 1993) is another that focuses on the communicative efforts inside the organizations and democratic dialogue (Bouwen, 1995; Gustavsen, 1992).

The 4I framework developed by Crossan et. al., (1999), illustrates organizational learning as an intuitive process of developing institutional frameworks that exists beneath organizations. Organizational learning is seen as a simultaneous and dynamic process— at the same time that people assimilate new ideas and actions, and transmit them to groups and to the organization, what has already been learned by the organization (institutionalized) flows toward the groups and individuals, thereby influencing their learning process. The Intuiting process occurs at the individual level in a stage called “pre-cognition”, which occurs prior to the generation of knowledge (Crossan et al., 1999). In learning, Nakanishi (2022), utilized the power-based legitimation model, where knowledge is attributed to be the central factor for power accumulation. Essentially, it is a subjective process and happens when individuals gain new insights based on their own experience (Weick, 1991). This is where the generation of ideas is made possible through each of the members of the organization. Interpreting is a cognitive and social process and occurs at both the individual and group levels (Crossan et al., 1999). As Lawrence et al. (2005, p. 182) suggested, “the communication of ideas to others occurs through a process of interpreting that allows individuals ‘ideas to be shared with others’”. This is where ideas are condensed together essentially forming the collective of institutions. Integrating and power dynamics The focus of integrating is on collective action and shared understanding (Crossan et al., 1999). Debates, conversation, dialogue, and mutual adjustment are considered essential factors in the development of this shared understanding (Woods, 2012). After being condensed, the ideas formed are coalesced in a single form which translates the participation and understanding of a collective. Institutionalizing and power

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

dynamics Just as intuiting occurs exclusively at the individual level, institutionalizing occurs only at the organizational level (Crossan et al., 1999). Institutionalizing is the process of ensuring that actions are routinized (Berends and Lammers, 2010). Here is where institutionalization occurs, and organizational change based on these dynamics follow.

Furthering the discussions on organizational change Munduate (2003) argues that many organizations are involved in continuous change processes. In fact, the challenge for modern organizations is to continuously adapt to their constantly changing environments. In this lines, Piero and Melia (2003) using the sources of power by French and Raven, advocated a bifactorial theory of power which focuses on the structure and properties of power bases in organizational settings particularly in effecting new organizational arrangements. Based on Conglomerate Conflict Behavior (de Vliert, 1997)., Emans et. al. (1997) provided a report on power used by leaders (forcing/non-forcing) and its effects on the target behavioral compliance. Ultimately leaning on the positional power of the leader to influence member compliance with organizational rules. In the same vein of positional legitimacy of power, Knippenberg and Steensma (2003) tests the extent to which the expectation of a future interaction between the leader and the target affects the use of hard and soft influence tactics by the leader. In the analysis of influential tactics used by the leader, Yukl and McDonald (2003) puts the locus on organizational change and shifts based on cross cultural differences. Evaluating resistance and initiation of reforms inside the organization. Based on organizational change, the change capacity of organizations especially in effecting far-reaching goals of reform in institutional frameworks (Werkman and Boonstra, 2003). On member participation and compliance, Heller (2003) used structural considerations in examining the correlations in the area of power decentralization. In the Philippine context, institutional attitudes is analyzed to be a synthesis of positional power as a legitimate power source (Maliwanag, 2019).

Sub-question 2: What are the variables that indicate the power relations determined in the studies compiled?

Variables vary in the articles considered, a considerable number focus on institutional aspects that are either upheld or changed through the dynamics of power in organizations. As how it was thematically discussed in the preceding subquestion, we will now proceed to develop the same approach in determining the pertinent variables that these studies consider.

On Agency-Centered Approaches:

Actor-based Variables

The Power Dependency and Balance Model utilized by Emerson (1962), refers to the availability of resources and their utility in offsetting power dynamics in organizations. In

this context of resource availability and utilization, power dynamics rest covertly different through the addition of personal agenda-setting prowess and will in the legitimized leaders of the organization. Jost and Banaji (1994) through the Systems Justification Theory attribute regimes and systemic inherencies and their relationship to the demands of individuals as highly or lowly officiated individuals. Leadership inside the organization is the main point of analysis in Social psychology, which refers to the leader's tendencies and collectively affecting actions in the context of institutional and organizational changes. Organizational changes controlled by the leadership in the system are argued through linear distributions of power and impositions from the authority (Bouwen, 1995).

The intention of the power-holder and his means of power expression are variables considered in Power studies heavily based on agency, as well as the means by which the power is exercised and its function (Schein, 1977; Bradhaw-Campbell and Murray, 1991; Courpasson et. al., 2006). In determining leadership coercion styles, member compliance and forcing and or non-forcing tactics are employed in the analysis (Emans et. al., 1999). The use of soft and hard influence tactics as well as expectations in leader interaction are included in the Conglomerate Conflict Behavior theory (Knippenberg and Steensma, 2003). In the same theoretical approach, the interrelationship of behavioral tendencies to conflict and resistance is also included as the basis of analysis (de Vliert, 1997). While cross-cultural differences and influence tactics are attributed to the study of institutional change by Yukl and McDonald in 2003. Leadership regulation as the focal actor in the regulatory processes as used in the 'Governing inside the Organization: interpreting regulation and compliance (Gray and Silbey, 2014), uses the heterogenous context of organizational actors and social constructions in addressing regulator constructions in organizations.

Collective/Societal Variables

Moe in 2005, advocated a strong position in a cooperationist approach, utilizing cooperation among the members of the organization and social connection as a preview to the milieu of power dynamics. In organizational survival, resources and symbolic resources are considered as the pertinent variables of analysis (Bacharach, 1980). The Capitalism of power advocated by Ocasio et. al., (2019) refers to power sources in different themes, combined into a single political capital which is the basis for organizational action. Economic capital takes into consideration, access to resources and the dependency of these factors by the actors in the power dynamics (Emerson, 1962; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). The analysis of cultural capital considers cross-cultural differences and sources, communication, cognition, and societal exclusionary indications (Lamont and Lareau, 1988; Collins, 1981; Rivera, 2016). On the side of the social capital, societal linkages, social networks, information, and

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

position as yardsticks of analysis (Bourdieu, 1972; Lin, 1999). Symbolic capital as a subset of Power Capitalism, attributes the relations of power dynamics to credentials, categorical indications, position, hierarchal structures, and social perspectives (Bourdieu, 1985;1989; Kilduff and Krackhardt, 1994). Reputational sources anchor on indicative power inequalities and control over resources in attributing the capital (Willer et. al., 2012). Last on Power Capitalism is the Organizational Capital, which renders to actual and legitimate exercise of power, as well as the means utilized in agenda-setting and decision-making functions (Lukes, 1974).

Communicative efforts and existing connections between members of the organizations, as well as time-lingering institutional inherencies are the pertinent variables of the Communicative Action Theory by Habermas in separate years (1972, 1977, 1984). The 4I framework by Crossan et. al. in 1999, takes into consideration individual demands and member adjustment in the analysis of institutional change. Cognitive processes and institutional expositions are considered to be at the intuiting level (Weick, 1991). Ideal condensation, communicative actions, and interpretations for the interpreting phase (Lawrence, 2005). The integration of ideas, conflict, and individual adjustment for the integrating phase (Woods, 2012). Lastly, ideal routinization and practice in the institutionalization phase (Berends and Lammers, 2010). Also, the power decentralization processes examine contextual patterns and characteristics such as law and competent labor, especially in determining the rate of participation among the members (Heller, 2003). Chartering on power decentralization, coordination and performance in decentralized or centralized functions are the variables considered by Dosi and Silbey (2014),

On Structurally-Centered Approaches:

Institutional variables

Institutional change and recruitment point to the institutional status quo and the nature of the population affected by the shift as either homogenous or heterogenous (Pfeffer, 1992; Wilson, 1995). French and Raven's determination of power sources, takes into consideration the means and the target population of power deliverance, drawing from it the Bifactorial Model of Power associates the structure and properties of power bases in understanding power relations (Peiro and Melia, 2003). Existing institutional frameworks and personal demands are the center of analysis in the management of meaning under the context of organizational change (Pettigrew, 1977). Organizational learning as a theoretical framework of analysis brings institutionally legitimized factors as well as actor responses in differing circumstances (Santos et. al., 2015). In determining the culpability of institutional change in the organizational landscape, factors such as the nature of

institutional reforms and actor compatibility are examined (Weick and Quinn, 1999). In the same context, an addition of cultural factors is also important (Munduate and Gravenhorst, 2003). Additionally, the change capacity of such organizations is determined through the inherent characteristics of the organization and the legitimate processes for change (Gravenhorst and Boonstra, 2003). Regulation in legal contexts considers environmental or societal factors as well as symbolic elements that help facilitate regulatory utility (Edelman, 1992).

Positional source

Social positions and the systemic strata inside the organization as sources of legitimized actions or inducements are considered significant variables in Position Legitimacy Studies (Anderson and Brion, 2014). Power Capitalism as determined by Bourdieu (1972;1985;1989) connects Social power to the attribution of credentials and positional power to the members and their means of power expression. Another source of positional context that deals with the linear distribution of power considers a person's formal position in the systemic hierarchy and the means and expression by which he exercises power (Bass, 1960). Also, positional legitimacy and knowledge are accredited to the accumulation of power by individuals inside the organization (Nakanishi, 2022). In lieu of this indicated structural resource of power, institutional frameworks, and practices are also attributed to hierarchical attributions as well as member compliance as accorded in the study of Maliwanag in 2019.

Sub-question 3: How does these inform our understanding of organizational politics with regard to its exercise of power within?

To synthesize, the overall purpose of the study was to determine the literature available in the study of organizational politics, particularly in power dynamics and relations. It was made through asking three sub-queries:

- (1) *What forms of theoretical approaches and designs does the existing literature on power dynamics in organizations contain?*
- (2) *What are the variables that indicate the power relations determined in the studies compiled?*
- (3) *How does this add to our understanding of organizational politics with regard to its exercise of power within?*

In this regard, it can be attributed that for most of the studies considered, a qualitative outlook was the most dominant and according to the findings indicated in the preceding sections, a mix of agency-centered approaches and structurally centered approaches are evident in the studies presented. From this, a plethora of theoretical approaches and models can be synthesized from the listed articles, the studies on organizational politics, particularly in power dynamics, can be thus concluded to have been catered mainly from

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

actor-institution relationships and the dynamics of conflict in institutional change and continuity.

Upon closer inspection of theoretical approaches, agency, and structure are the most prominent ideas in the landscape of the existing literature. For the most part, varying degrees of focus were indeed employed on these concepts leading to varied styles of approaches and theoretical lenses used. However, the articles considered were also a stark description of the all-encompassing characteristic that power dynamics in organizational politics may ensue. As established in the exclusion and inclusion criteria, the outer descriptions of articles aren't seriously considered as long as the discussions center on power dynamics and relations. As a result, a stream of articles draws knowledge using ideas and approaches generally disregarded under the umbrella of Political Science. Evidently, concepts like psychology and managerial studies are integrated in so far as power as the focal point of consideration is the basis of analysis.

Different theoretical inquiries can be inferred from the articles gathered. A stream of these studies stems from organizational change, organizational stability, institutional dynamics, and agency response. The indicated areas of inquiry found in the 2 sub-questions are correlations of these dimensions, which heavily imply that the exercise and expression of power may vary in the divergence of some of these factors. Inversely, independence in these areas may also be the source of power relations, depending on the approach the study is anchored upon. On the variables considered, physical allocations of resources, information, symbolic goods, culture, and communication are the most telling variables that vary from the angle taken in the analysis of the subject.

CONCLUSION

From the synthesis undertaken, surmount attention is attributed to institutional dynamics and agency-response areas of concern. As indicated, heavy attribution to institutional factors were considered the most. This is to say that power dynamics in organizational studies may never be divorced from institutional mechanics and factors. Studies that focus on agency and individual response still borrow institutional dynamics. Examples of these are individual anchored studies that draw insight from institutional change and continuity (Pfeffer, 1992), and institutional frameworks (North, 1990; Keltner et al., 2003; Galinsky et al., 2008). Among others, societal norm formations and clashes exhibit a considerable amount of commentary based on institutional ideas (Jost and Banaji, 1994; Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Clegg et al., 2006; Kärreman, 2010; Lawrence et al., 2012). With this, it is imperative to formally conclude that organizational studies on power dynamics, notwithstanding an agency-centrist approach, draw heavily from institutional designs and dynamics.

However evident, the power of the authority in drawing and producing regulatory mechanisms for member personalities are where these areas of inquiries fall short. Discussions on the matter, particularly on institutional regulation, are bleak in the literature found on power dynamics under organizational politics. Studies by Edelman (1992) open up discussions on national level organizational regulation. However, not enough attention is granted to institutional regulation as a mechanism of power and member compliance as its basis of analysis. Local level instances of academic research on the matter remain ostensibly bleak in the literature, standing as a focal argument based on the articles considered, the singular gap that this review pinnacles.

Conclusively, regulatory policies and rule formulation as an attribute drawn heavily from positional legitimacy were lacking in the literature cited. Thus, from the exhaustive gathering and synthesis of articles, there is a dire need for *institutional regulation and member compliance* focus on furthering the knowledge of Power dynamics under organizational politics. Understanding that coercion and imposition are expressions of power, rule-making and member compliance are seen to be useful insights into the integration of power relations in organizational studies such as this.

Upon due reflection, the conventional disposition indicated in the introduction stands falsified according to the studies gathered. In fact, a large portion of the studies focus solely on member or actor response and leader interactions beneath institutionally mandated frameworks. Studies that delve in positional legitimacy as the simplistic notion of power dynamics are manifested to have occupied a comparatively small amount of attention in the literature cited. In this regard, this review reveals the breadth of organizational dynamics to not have been mainly concerned on positional status, but also to alternative sources of power embedded in institutions and member-centered actions.

Finally, this scoping review fully uncovered the all-encompassing scholarly work in the literature of organizational politics on power relations. It established the broad dynamics of consideration in power studies and theoretical approaches. With this, power in organizations is indeed complex and highly interconnected with alternative sources as symbolic elements and even institutional bases, drawing from them will help uncover significant outlooks of power and how it is expressed in organizational settings.

REFERENCES

1. Ahrne, G. (2009b). *Social Organizations: Interaction inside, outside and between Organizations*.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446222300>

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

2. Anderson, C., & Brion, S. (2014). Perspectives on Power in Organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 67–97. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091259>
3. Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and politics in organizations*.
4. Giroux, C. (1960). Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior, by Bernard M. Bass, Harper & Brothers, New York, 548 pp. *Relations Industrielles*, 15(2), 281. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1022046ar>
5. Berends, H., & Lammers, I. (2010). Explaining Discontinuity in Organizational Learning: A Process analysis. *Organization Studies*, 31(8), 1045–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840610376140>
6. BITTNER, E. (1965). THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATION on JSTOR. *Social Research*, 239. <https://doi.org/40969788>
7. Black, Julia, 'Making Rules', *Rules and Regulators* (Oxford, 1997; online edn, Oxford Academic, 22 Mar. 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198262947.003.0007>
8. Blackler, F. (2011). Power, politics, and intervention theory: Lessons from organization studies. *Theory & Psychology*, 21(5), 724–734. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354311418146>
9. Robinson, S., Ernst, J., Thomassen, O. J., & Larsen, K. (2021). Introduction. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 1–19). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003022510-1>
10. Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00174048>
11. Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.2307/202060>
12. Bradshaw, P., & Boonstra, J. (2004). Power Dynamics in Organizational Change. *Organizational Studies*, 279–300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470753408.ch14>
13. Bradshaw-Camball, P., & Murray, V. V. (1991). Illusions and Other Games: A Trifocal View of Organizational Politics. *Organization Science*, 2(4), 379–398. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2635171>
14. Clegg, S., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). Power and Organizations. *Foundations for Organizational Science*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446215715>
15. Collins, R. (1981). On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(5), 984–1014. <https://doi.org/10.1086/227351>
16. Contu, A., & Willmott, H. (2003). Re-Embedding Situatedness: The importance of power relations in learning Theory. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.14.3.283.15167>
17. Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259140>
18. Dosi, G., & Marengo, L. (2014). The dynamics of organizational structures and performances under diverging distributions of knowledge and different power structures. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 11(3), 535–559. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137414000204>
19. Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of Civil Rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1531–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229939>
20. Emans, B. J., Munduate, L., Klaver, E., & Van De Vliert, E. (2003). Constructive consequences of leaders' forcing influence styles. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 36–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00122>
21. Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-Dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089716>
22. Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-Dependence Relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089716>
23. French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
24. French, J. R. & Raven, B. (1959). The Bases of Social Power. In: Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (eds). *Classics of organization theory*, Cengage Learning
25. French, R. P., and B. Raven. "The Bases of Social Power," in D Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1959), pp. 150-167
26. Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Gruenfeld, D. H., Whitson, J. A., & Liljenquist, K. A. (2008). Power reduces the press of the situation: Implications for creativity, conformity, and dissonance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1450–1466. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012633>
27. Gravenhorst, K. M. B., Werkman, R. A., & Boonstra, J. J. (2003). The Change Capacity of Organisations: General Assessment and Five Configurations. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 83–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00125>
28. Gray, G. C., & Silbey, S. S. (2014). Governing inside the organization: interpreting regulation and

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

- compliance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 120(1), 96–145. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677187>
29. Habermas, J. (1972). Knowledge, and human interests. London: Heinemann.
30. Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action. Boston: Beacon Press.
31. Heller, F. (2003). Participation and Power: a Critical assessment. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 144–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00128>
32. J. Boonstra, J., & Bennebroek Gravenhorst, K. M. (1998). Power Dynamics and Organizational Change: A Comparison of Perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 97–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943298398826>
33. Jaspersen, J., Carte, T. A., Saunders, C. S., Butler, B. S., Croes, H. J. P., & Zheng, W. (2002). Review: Power and Information Technology Research: A Metatriangulation review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(4), 397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132315>
34. Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008>
35. Kärreman, D. (2009). The Power of Knowledge: Learning from ‘Learning by Knowledge-Intensive Firm.’ *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(7), 1405–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00898.x>
36. Kilduff, M., & Krackhardt, D. (1994). BRINGING THE INDIVIDUAL BACK IN: A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNAL MARKET FOR REPUTATION IN ORGANIZATIONS. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256771>
37. Lamont, M., & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural Capital: allusions, gaps and glissandos in recent theoretical developments. *Sociological Theory*, 6(2), 153. <https://doi.org/10.2307/202113>
38. Lawrence, T. B., Malhotra, N., & Morris, T. (2011). Episodic and systemic power in the transformation of professional service firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1), 102–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01031.x>
39. Lawrence, T. B., Mauws, M. K., Dyck, B., & Kleysen, R. F. (2005). The Politics of Organizational Learning: Integrating Power into the 4I Framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 180–191. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.15281451>
40. Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O’Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>
41. Lin, N. (1999). Social Networks and Status Attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 467–487. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/223513>
42. Whitt, J. A., & Lukes, S. (1980). Power: a radical view. *Contemporary Sociology a Journal of Reviews*, 9(1), 116. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2065624>
43. Maliwanag, R. J. (2019). The interaction of Filipino time and informal power dynamics in the university of the Philippines school of economics: A case study.
44. Marabelli, M., & Galliers, R. D. (2016). A reflection on information systems strategizing: the role of power and everyday practices. *Information Systems Journal*, 27(3), 347–366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12110>
45. Moe TM. Power and Political Institutions. *Perspectives on Politics*. 2005;3(2):215-233. doi:10.1017/S1537592705050176
46. Munduate, L., & Gravenhorst, K. M. B. (2003). Power Dynamics and Organisational Change: An Introduction. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00120>
47. Nakanishi, Y. (2022). Politics-based knowledge legitimization model: power exercise in organizational learning. *The Learning Organization*, 30(3), 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tlo-03-2022-0039>
48. Ocasio, W., Pozner, J., & Milner, D. (2019). Varieties of Political Capital and Power in Organizations: A Review and Integrative framework. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 303–338. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0062>
49. Peiró, J. M., & Meliá, J. L. (2003). Formal and informal interpersonal power in organisations: Testing a bifactorial model of power in role-sets. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 14–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00121>
50. Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz. 1962. “Two Faces of Power.” *American Political Science Review* 56 (December): 947–52. Cited 543 times. *American Political Science Review*, 100(04), 670. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055406222561>
51. Pettigrew, A. M. (1977). Strategy formulation as a political process. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 7(2), 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1977.11656228>
52. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. Stanford University Press.
53. Pfeffer, J. (1992). Understanding Power in Organizations. *California Management Review*, 34(2), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000812569203400201>

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

54. R, K. (2014, February 4). Importance of Organizing in an Organisation (7 Points). Essays, Research Papers and Articles on Business Management. <https://www.businessmanagementideas.com/organization/importance-of-organizing-in-an-organisation-7-points/2338>

55. Rivera, L. A. (2016). *Pedigree*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv7h0sdf>

56. Rodriguez-Bailin, R., Moya, M., & Yzerbyt, V. (2000). Why do superiors attend to negative stereotypic information about their subordinates? Effects of power legitimacy on social perception. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(5), 651–671. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0992\(200009/10\)30:5%3C651::aid-ejsp13%3E3.0.co;2-o](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0992(200009/10)30:5%3C651::aid-ejsp13%3E3.0.co;2-o)

57. Santos, J. L. S., & Steil, A. V. (2015). Organizational learning and power dynamics: a study in a Brazilian University. *The Learning Organization*, 22(2), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tlo-10-2011-0055>

58. Schein, V. E. (1977). Individual Power and Political Behaviors in Organizations: An Inadequately Explored Reality. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 64–72. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1977.4409169>

59. Scott, W. R. (2004). Reflections on a Half-Century of Organizational Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110644>

60. Simon, H. A. (1991). Organizations and markets. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(2), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.5.2.25>

61. Van Der Vliert, E. (2013). Complex interpersonal conflict behaviour. In *Psychology Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776049>

62. Van Knippenberg, B., & Steensma, H. (2003). Future interaction expectation and the use of soft and hard influence tactics. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00123>

63. Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 361–386. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.361>

64. Weick, K. E. (1991). The nontraditional quality of organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.116>

65. Willer, R., Youngreen, R., Troyer, L., & Lovaglia, M. J. (2012). How do the powerful attain status? The roots of legitimate power inequalities. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 33(5–6), 355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.2554>

66. Wilson, J. Q. (1995). Political organizations (Vol. 46). Princeton University Press.

67. Woods, J. G. (2012). Using cognitive conflict to promote the use of dialectical learning for strategic decision-makers. *The Learning Organization*, 19(2), 134–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696471211201498>

68. Yukl, G., Fu, P. P., & McDonald, R. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in perceived effectiveness of influence tactics for initiating or resisting change. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00124>

No.	Author (s) and Title	Items	Theory or concepts utilized	Variables of Consideration
1.)	Moe (2005) - Power and Political Organizations	Research Article;	Rational Choice Theory; Cooperationist Approach; Structural Choice	Cooperation as the motivator of the exercise of power and Social Connection.
2.)	Anderson and Brion (2014) - Perspectives on Power of Organizations	Review Article; Review literature on the individual's acquisition and loss of power.	Power Politics centered on Positional Legitimacy of status;	Social Position in the Organization; legitimized actions; Systematic Strata
3.)	Emerson (1962) - Power-Dependence Relations	Sociological Review	Power Dependency and Balance Theory	Individual Action; Resource Availability and Use
4.)	Jost and Banaji (1994) - The role of stereotyping in system justification and	Journal Article	System Justification Theory	Systems/Regimes; low and high power individuals; Status Quo

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

	the product of false consciousness			
5.)	Bachrach and Baratz (1962) - The Two faces of power	Journal Article	Rational Choice and Individualism	Elite politics; Power and individual transformative tendency
6.)	Galinsky et. al., (2008) - Power reduces the press of the situation: Implications for creativity, conformity, and dissonance.	Journal Article	Social Psychology of - Power Approach Theory	Status quo; power relations; change; disconformations
7.)	Pfeffer, J. (1992). Understanding Power in Organizations	Journal Article	Institutional Change in organizations	Institutional Status Quo; Collective/Societal Homogeneity or Heterogeneity nature
8.)	Wilson, J. Q. (1995). Political organizations (Vol. 46)	Published Book	Organizational recruitment; Rationality stance	Organizational Inducements in recruitment; Heterogeneity and Homogeneity in target population
9.)	Bacharach, S. B. (1980). <i>Power and politics in organizations.</i>	Journal Article	Power Studies with Organizational focus; Societal/Collaboration based organizational survival	Resources; Actors (Members and Positional leaders); Symbolic Resources
10.)	Schein, V. E. (1977). Individual Power and Political Behaviors in Organizations: An Inadequately Explored Reality.	Journal Article	Power politics anchored on an agency stance	Resources available and means of the power-holder; intent of the power-holder
11.)	French, R. P., and B. Raven. "The Bases of Social Power," in D Cartwright (Ed.)	Book	Social Power and Power Politics;	Means and target of power; Determination of Power Bases
12.)	Bourdieu, P. (1985). The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups.	Research Article	Social Power and Power Capitalism; Collective Focus	Attribution of Credentials to member individuals; Means of power expression
13.)	Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power.	Research Article	Social Power and Power Capitalism; Institutional Focus	Attribution of Credentials to member individuals; Means of power expression
14.)	Bourdieu, P. (1972). Les stratégies matrimoniales dans le système de reproduction.	Research Article	Social Power and Power Capitalism; Individual - Society Focus	Access to social networks; Means of power expression

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

15.)	Ocasio, W., Pozner, J., & Milner, D. (2019). Varieties of Political Capital and Power in Organizations: A Review and Integrative framework.	Review Article	Capitalism of Power; Institutionalism	Means of power expression and target influence; Power Source
16.)	Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-Dependence Relations	Research Article	Sociological Focus of Power relations	Actor dependency on access of resources; Resources; Economic Power Source
17.)	Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). The External Control of Organizations	Book	Sociological Focus of Power relations; resource dependence perspective	Actor dependency on access of resources; Resources
18.)	Lamont, M., & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments	Research Article	Power Capitalism; Sociological Focus	Culture; Societal Exclusion and social dynamics
19.)	Collins, R. (1981). On The Microfoundations of Macrosociology.	Journal Article	Sociological Focus; Institutional stance on Power capital	Culture; Language; Cognition; Communication
20.)	Rivera, L. A. (2016). Pedigree: How Elite Students Get Elite Jobs.	Book	Sociological Focus; Institutional Stance on Power Capital	Culture; Organizational actors; Absence of Authority
21.)	Lin, N. (1999). Social Networks and Status Attainment.	Journal Article	Sociological Focus; Cooperationist stance on Power Capital	Social Connection and Information; Positional Factor
22.)	Kilduff, M., & Krackhardt, D. (1994). Bringing The Individual Back In: A Structural Analysis Of The Internal Market For Reputation In Organizations.	Journal Article	Sociological Focus; Institutionalism	Member Connections and linkages; Member Reputation and social standing

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

23.)	Willer, R., Youngreen, R., Troyer, L., & Lovaglia, M. J. (2012). How Do the Powerful Attain Status? The Roots of Legitimate Power Inequalities. Managerial and Decision Economics	Journal Article	Managerial and Economic Focus	Power Inequalities; Social Perceptions
24.)	Lukes, S. (1974). Power: A Radical View. London: Macmillan Press	Book	Organizational Studies; Power Capitalism	Actual Authority; Decision-making and Agenda setting capabilities
25.)	J. Boonstra, J., & Bennebroek Gravenhorst, K. M. (1998). Power Dynamics and Organizational Change: A Comparison of Perspectives	Review Article	Organizational Psychology; Organizational change	Power dynamics; Institutional and actual reform
26.)	Bouwen, R. (1995). The reconstruction of power relationships: Four approaches dealing with the new logic and the dominant logic in organizational innovation	Academic Symposium	Organizational Change; Rational Choice	Institutional frameworks and reforms; Positional Authority
27.)	Bass, B.M. (1960). Leadership, psychology and organizational behavior.	Books	Institutionalism; Authoritarianism	Positional Legitimacy and Organizational hierarchy ; Inducements; Coercion and control
28.)	Pettigrew, A.M. (1977). Strategy formulation as a political process	Journal Article	Managerial; institutional change in organizations	Demands; Power expression
29.)	Habermas, J. (1972). Knowledge, and human interests	Book	Communicative Action Theory	Communicative Efforts: Collectivity of Opinions
30.)	Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action	Book	Communicative Action Theory	Communicative Efforts; Collectivity of Opinions; Institutional Change and Management of new Meaning

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

31.)	Santos, J. L. S., & Steil, A. V. (2015). Organizational learning and power dynamics	Review Article	Oragnizational Learning; Power Dynamics	Institutions; Demands; Communication
32.)	Crossan, M., Lane,H. and White,R.(1999),“An organizational learning framework:from intuition to institution”	Journal Article	Economics; Organizational learning; 4I Framework	Institutional frameworks; Individual demand and adjustment
33.)	Weick, K. E. (1991). The Nontraditional Quality of Organizational Learning.	Journal Article	Economics and Managerial study; Organizational Learning	Time; Instututional frameworks; Individual learning
34.)	Lawrence, T.B., Mauws, M.K., Dyck, B. and Kleysen, R.F. (2005), “The politics of organizational learning: integrating power into the 4I framework”	Journal Article	Economics; Organizational learning; 4I Framework	Institutional Frameworks; Individual demand and adjustment
35.)	Woods,J.G.(2012), “Using cognitive conflict to promote the use of dialectical learning for strategic decision-makers”	Research Article	Economics; Organizational learning; 4I Framework ; Cognitive Conflict	Institutional Frameworks; Individual demand and adjustment; Conflict
36.)	& Lammers, I. (2010). ing Discontinuity in ational Learning: A analysis.	Journal Article	Economics; Organizational learning; 4I Framework; Institutionalism	Institutional Frameworks; Individual demand and adjustment; Institutionalization
37.)	Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational Change And Development.	Journal Article	Organizational Change; New Institutionalism	Institutional Reforms; Actor Compatibility
38.)	Munduate, L., & Gravenhorst, K. M. B. (2003). Power Dynamics and Organisational Change: An Introduction	Journal Article	Applied Psychology; Organizational Change	Institutional Reform; Organizational Culture
39.)	Emans, B., Klaver, E., Munduate, L., & Van De Vliert, E. (1999). Constructive consequences of hard	Research Article	Rational Choice and Behavioral Compliance; Conglomerate Conflict Behavior theory	Leader style; Coercion; Member Compliance

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

	power use by leaders in organizations.			
40.)	Van Knippenberg, B., & Steensma, H. (2003). Future interaction expectation and the use of soft and hard influence tactics.	Research Article	Rational Choice and Behavioral Compliance; Conglomerate Conflict Behavior theory	Future Anticipation of interaction; Authoritative Negative Inducements;
41.)	Nakanishi, Y. (2022). Politics-based knowledge legitimization model: power exercise in organizational learning.	Research Article	Knowledge Legitimation Model; Organizational Learning;	Knowledge; Positional Legitimacy
42.)	Yukl, G., Fu, P. P., & McDonald, R. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in perceived effectiveness of influence tactics for initiating or resisting change.	Research Article	Organizational Change; Institutional Focus	Reform policies in organizations; Cross-cultural differences; Influence Tactics used
43.)	Gravenhorst, K. M. B., Werkman, R. A., & Boonstra, J. J. (2003). The Change Capacity of Organisations: General Assessment and Five Configurations	Research Article	Organizational Change; Institutional Focus	Characteristics of the organization; Management and or system of legitimate change; in determining the change capacity.
44.)	Heller, F. (2003). Participation and Power: a Critical assessment.	Research Article	Organizational Participation; Power decentralization	Law or Competent Labor Force; Rates of participation among the members of the organization
45.)	Van de Vliert, E. (1997). Complex interpersonal conflict behavior.	Book	Organizational Conflict Analysis; Conglomerate Conflict Behavior (CCB) theory	Behavioral tendencies that lead to conflict; Resistance and expression; Interrelationship of these variables.
46.)	Peiró, J. M., & Meliá, J. L. (2003). Formal and informal interpersonal power in organisations: Testing a bifactorial model of power in role-sets.	Research Article	Bifactorial Model of Power; from French and Raven's Sources of power model	Structure and properties of power bases

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

47.)	Bradshaw-Camball, P., & Murray, V. V. (1991). Illusions and Other Games: A Trifocal View of Organizational Politics.	Book	Functionalist Perspective	Power expressions in a pluralist setting and a rationalist setting
48.)	Clegg, S., Courpasson, D. and Phillips, N. (2006). Power and Organizations.	Book	Organizational Power Expressions; Power over perspective	Means of expression and intention; Functions of power exercise
49.)	Maliwanag, R. J. (2019). The interaction of Filipino time and informal power dynamics in the university of the Philippines school of economics: A case study.	Research Article	Institutionalism; Positional Legitimacy of power	Hierarchal Attributions; Institutional Facts and prevalence; Member compliance
50.)	Gray, G. C., & Silbey, S. S. (2014). Governing inside the organization: interpreting regulation and compliance.	Research Article	Organizational Governance and regulatory compliance; Behavioral Interpretative; Regulatory perceptions	Collective Perceptions; Regulation mechanics; Social Constructions
51.)	Dosi, G., & Marengo, L. (2014). The dynamics of organizational structures and performances under diverging distributions of knowledge and different power structures.	Research Article	Institutionalism; Authority and Power outcomes	Exercise and means of power and authority; Coordination; Performance
52.)	Edelman, L. B. (1992). Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of Civil Rights law.	Research Article	Institutional regulation; Symbolic elaboration of structures	Laws; Symbolic structures; Environment and or Society

Reil Angelo C. V. et al, Scoping Review on Power Relations and Dynamics Existing in Political Organizations an Expositive Political Science Perspective

Appendix A.

A Simplified Flow Chart of the process of Identifying the relevant studies.

