Appraisals of self and situation as determinants of upward influencing tactics

Susan A. Geertshuis*
Centre for Continuing Education
University of Auckland

Helena D. Cooper-Thomas
Department of Psychology
University of Auckland

Mnthali Price
Department of Psychology
University of Auckland

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Susan Geertshuis, Centre for continuing Education, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand 1142. Email: s.geertshuis@auckland.ac.nz
Abstract
This study considers subordinate upward influencing as a proactive behavior and applies this lens to an investigation into the contributions of appraisals of self and situation in predicting tactic choice. 178 employees assessed the frequency with which they used influencing tactics in interactions with their direct line manager. The results indicated that favorable appraisals of self were associated with increased use of rationality and unfavorable appraisal of situation were associated with increased the use of ingratiation, assertiveness and upward appeal. While the use of rationality could be explained within approaches to positive proactive work behaviors, the use of the remaining five tactics could not. The results are interpreted within a wider perspective of proactive discretionary behaviors.
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Both proactive behavior and social influence are seen as important determinants of employee success (Anderson, Spataro, & Flynn, 2008; Crant, 2000; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001) and both areas have generated substantial research literatures. However, much work is fragmented (Grant & Ashford, 2008) and within social influence aims to describe rather than explain (Ferris et al., 2009). Recently attempts have been made to produce integrated models of proactive behaviors (Grant & Ashford, 2008) and in this paper we draw on these models in an effort to establish the extent to which antecedents of proactive behaviors in general are also predictive of efforts to influence. The research aims to contribute to the provision of an overarching understanding of upward influencing tactics use.

We begin with a description of proactive behavior and situate the use of upward influencing tactics within this context. We then review the taxonomies of influencing tactics and attempts to identify overarching structures and common and distinguishing antecedents. This is followed by an account of recent generic models of proactive behavior. We then describe three variables relating to the agent and two relating to situation which are drawn from these models of proactive behavior. Finally, we review the literature relating these variables to the use of upward influencing tactics. This leads us to the overall purpose of the study which is to better understand and predict the use of upward influencing tactics.

Definitions of proactivity are broad, for example, (Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006) defined proactive behavior as “self initiated, anticipatory action that aims to change and improve the situation or oneself” (p. 636). It is not surprising, therefore, that the behaviors investigated under the umbrella of proactive behavior are extensive. Grant and Ashford (2008) list 12 types of behaviors by illustration, including: Using initiative (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2007), expressing voice (LePine & Dyne, 2001), problem solving (Parker et al.,
2006), selling issues to leaders (Dutton & Ashford, 1993), revising tasks (Staw & Boettger, 1990), harming others (Griffin & Lopez, 2005) and acting in advance to influence individuals and groups (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988a).

This paper focuses on the last group of behaviors listed above, acting in advance to influence others. Influencing others has not been widely examined within the proactivity literature but voice and issue selling, of which influence is a necessary component, both have (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Within the social influence literature, much has been written about the way managers act to control, motivate or influence others (Dosier, Case, & Keys, 1988; Hoffman & Hegarty, 1993). This study is concerned with influence in the less researched and more fragile direction, upwards. Upward influence involves proactive persuading behaviors “directed toward individuals at higher levels in the organizational hierarchy” (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). The original taxonomies of influencing tactics were built from respondents’ describing how they “got their / boss / co-worker / subordinate / to do something they wanted” (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980b, p. 441).

There is a range of upward influence tactics which the subordinate may choose from with eight primary dimensions of influence being identified by the pioneers of intra-organizational upward influence measurement. They were assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanctions, exchange, upward appeal, blocking, and coalitions (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980a; Yukl, 1989). Subsequent factor analysis of the tactics identified by Kipnis et al. (1980a) confirmed a six factor structure and found no evidence of sanctions and blocking which, because of their infrequent use and conceptual problems, have been omitted in other research (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988b; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Additional taxonomies have included such influence strategies as consultation, pressure and inspirational appeals (Yukl & Falbe, 1990) as well as clandestine tactics and personal negative actions (Rim & Erez, 1980). However, there has been little use of these taxonomies since their
conceptualization. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics and research into the use of rationality, ingratiation, exchange, coalitions, upward appeal, and assertiveness, which are the tactics demonstrated by Kipnis et al. (1980) and confirmed by others, for example, Schreisheim and Hinkin (1990). These influencing tactics fit within definitions of proactive behavior in that they are anticipatory actions designed to effect change, but also overlap to some extent with impression management tactics which in particular encompass ingratiation (Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, & Gilstrap, 2008).

| Explaining Influencing Tactic Use |

It is reasonable to suppose that not all employees will utilize tactics equally in all situations and some efforts have been made to identify which tactics are used and under which circumstances. However, previous research has often failed to examine a range of tactics and their potential predictors concurrently (Ashford & Black, 1996).

Although factor analyses have tended to support the existence of distinct tactics (Farmer, Maslyn, Fedor, & Goodman, 1997), efforts have been made to identify a higher order structure of influencing tactics and to theorize over common antecedents. The logic behind this is that if higher order groupings of behaviors are meaningful then it should be possible to identify common antecedents of tactics in the same grouping which are not shared by tactics in other categories. A number of researchers classify influencing tactics by their strength on a continuum from soft to hard. Direct demands, expressions of anger and gathering support from people in authority are hard tactics. In contrast, ingratiation and rationality are softer tactics and allow the target more latitude in deciding whether to comply. Van Kippenberg and Steensma (2003) report a consistent preference for the use of soft tactics. Hard tactics tend to be used by those in poorer relationships (Barbuto & Moss, 2006), where
no future interaction is anticipated (van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003) and by agents who are of higher relative status and so more powerful (Stahelski & Paynton, 1995).

Not all tactics are viewed as being equally appropriate and social norms determine which tactics may be used when and by whom (Fu & Yukl, 2000). Furthermore, employees using tactics that are viewed as incongruent are viewed as poorer performers (Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993). Payne (2007) suggests that subordinates evaluate the appropriateness of influencing strategies and this determines behavior. In general, harder tactics are viewed as being less appropriate (Kassing, 2007). Additionally, Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams, and Thatcher (2007) note that managers view subordinate use of ingratiation unfavorably. While the hard to soft, and unacceptable to acceptable or legitimate to illegitimate distinctions, have validity in the sense that some distinguishing antecedents have been identified, this does not provide an overarching model explaining tactic choice.

**Explaining upward influencing within a proactive behavior framework**

A number of researchers have noted that investigators persist in examining isolated groups of proactive behaviors, and theorize without reference to closely related fields of work (Parker & Collins, 2010). We propose that greater understanding and explanatory power can be derived by regarding influencing tactics through the broader theoretical lens of proactive behavior.

Crant (2000) suggested that in predicting proactive behaviors, models must include individual motivational states, such as self-efficacy, and contextual factors such as management support, as antecedents. Frese and Fay (2001) identify environmental support, knowledge skills, orientations and attitudes, and personality as categories of antecedents. They argue that the self-appraisals relating to control and efficacy affect initiative taking, whereas personality variables are more distal and affect behavior only through orientations. They note the reciprocal nature of relationships between personality variables and
environmental support and initiative taking. Grant and Ashford (2008), in an effort to build an integrative theory of proactivity, identify three situational antecedents of proactive behavior: Accountability, ambiguity, and autonomy, and propose that dispositional variables moderate the effect of situational antecedents on proactive situational behavior. They highlight the importance of self-evaluations which they categorize as dispositional.

Not all proactive behaviors have the same antecedents, and the purpose of a proactive behavior appears to be an important differentiator. Belshak and Den Hartog (2010) identify aspects of affective work commitment as contrasting antecedents of proactive behaviors which were classified as being pro-self, pro-social and pro-organization. Parker and Collins (2010) also successfully identify common and differentiating antecedents of three categories of proactive behavior, with role breadth self-efficacy and felt responsibility for change predicting proactive behaviors relating to the internal effectiveness of organizations, but not proactive behaviors predicting person environment fit or more strategic actions.

To summarize, efforts to provide frameworks for proactive behaviors have in common an acknowledgement of the importance of both the agent and the situation. There is recognition that orientations or appraisals of self and or situation are important and possibly have greater predictive power than do objective measures of personality or situation. The relationship between self-appraisals and behavior is described as both proximal and causal (Parker et al., 2006) and as a moderating influence (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Recent models claim that it is possible to distinguish between types of proactive behavior and the importance of goals or purpose is emerging. Within the influence literature too, both dispositional and situational variables have been examined. Ferris et al. (2009) note the importance of both and suggest that the environment moderates dispositional tendencies. As will become clear from the literature reviewed below, work within the field of upward influence is somewhat contradictory and limited.
In the research that follows we seek to examine the predictive value of appraisals of both self and situation in predicting the use of influencing tactics. In relation to self, research shows that role breadth self-efficacy and felt responsibility for change predict proactive behavior (Parker & Collins, 2010), and hence we include role breadth self-efficacy and change orientation in our study. Additionally, we include a measure of political skill. Politically skilled individuals should be in a better position to influence successfully, and so may influence more, than less skilled individuals. In relation to situation, the element of the environment that possibly has most impact on subordinates in determining whether and how they communicate upwards is likely to be the relationship they have with their superior. For this reason we have included LMX as an indicator of situational quality. In high LMX relationships, we anticipate that the environment will be supportive and so proactive influencing tactics are more likely to be used. Our second measure of orientation to situation is control appraisal. This measure assesses the extent to which a subordinate feels they have control over their working environment. The literature suggests that subordinates will seek to influence in situations which they perceive as affording them control.

In the sections that follow we summarize research into the proposed appraisals of self and situation and the extent to which they have been found to predict the use of influencing tactics.

**Appraisals of self**

**Role breadth self-efficacy.** Role breadth self-efficacy is a specific type of self-efficacy (Parker, 1998), which applies to the workplace and refers to “the extent to which people feel confident that they can carry out a broader more proactive role, beyond the traditional prescribed requirements” (Parker, 1998; p. 835). Role breadth self-efficacy is identified as an important determinant of a variety of proactive behaviors, such as proactive problem solving (Parker et al., 2006) and making suggestions (Axtell et al., 2000), all of
which tend to involve the use of rationality in efforts to influence. However, the relationship with influencing tactics has not been formally established. Similarly, there are no studies relating general measures of self-efficacy to specific upward influencing tactics use although (Kacmar, Carlson, & Bratton, 2004) found general self-efficacy to predict impression management tactics. There is limited evidence that self-confidence, which is a component within measures of efficacy, can predict influencing behavior (Gelderman, Semeijn, & De Zoete, 2008). Self-confidence has been associated with increased use of rationality (Goodstadt & Kipnis, 1970; Tedeschi, 1972) and decreased use of coercion (Instone, Major, & Bunker, 1983).

**Subordinate Political Skill.** Frese and Fay (2001) note the importance of job skills in predicting personal initiative taking. Grant and Ashford (2008) note that little is known about the impact of ability, knowledge and skills on proactive behavior, although what work there is generally indicates a strong and positive relationship. It seems reasonable to suppose that ability, knowledge, and skills are likely to affect proactivity in two ways: First, expertise in the relevant work area is likely to enhance proactivity. This is supported by repeated demonstrations that efficacy is associated with proactivity (Bandura, 1997). Second, ability, knowledge, and skills in the proactive behaviors themselves may affect when and how a proactive intervention is attempted. Grant and Ashford (2008) note that proactive behaviors are often acquired rather than taught, exist as tacit knowledge, and consequently are difficult to identify and measure. Ferris et al. (2005b) propose that to be successful in the political environment of an organization, an employee must possess “political skill”. Ferris and colleagues provide their own previous definition of political skill as ‘the ability to effectively understand others at work, and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives’ (Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, & Ammeter, 2004, p. 311)(Ferris et al., 2005b, p. 127). Politically skilled
employees have wide social networks, greater ability to modify their behavior according to person and setting, successfully building advantageous partnerships at work and acting in ways that mask their true intentions (Ferris, Davidson, & Perrewe, 2005a; Treadway et al., 2007).

Political skill has been related to proactive behavior and performance. Liu et al. (2007) show significant relationships between proactive personality and political skill. Thompson (2005) suggests that political skill plays a crucial and mediating role in the association between proactivity and performance. Jawahar, Meurs, Ferris and Hochwarter (2008) report self-efficacy to be more strongly related to task than to contextual performance, and political skill to be more strongly related to contextual than to task performance. Contextual performance is the arena where proactive behaviors are considered to be particularly important (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). It seems, therefore, that political skill may be an antecedent of proactive behaviors in general, and it has also been investigated, mainly by Ferris and colleagues, in relation to influencing tactic use (Kolodinsky, Treadway, & Ferris, 2007). Specifically, political skill relates to the use of upward appeal, coalitions and assertiveness in managers (Ferris et al., 2005a; Ferris et al., 2005b), whilst in subordinates, political skill has been found, perhaps, in reflection of the power differential, to directly relate to an increased use of rational influence (Kolodinsky et al., 2007), and apparently sincere ingratiatory behavior (perceived by employers; Treadway et al., 2007).

Change orientation. A high level of change-orientation involves feeling positive about and being actively oriented towards change (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). Frese and Fay, in analyzing the motivators of proactive behavior, note that an active change-orientation is an important motivational state when engaging in initiative taking (Frese & Fay, 2001). Both active orientations to change and felt responsibility for change have been reported to predict proactive behavior (Frese & Pluddeman, 1993, as cited in Frese & Fay, 2001; Morrison &
Phelps, 1999). Parker, Williams and Turner (Parker et al., 2006), though, found that change orientation did not have a unique association with the measured proactive behaviors which were proactive idea implementation and proactive problem solving. However, in 2010, Parker and Collins report that felt responsibility for change is a significant predictor of some proactive behaviors.

It is a fairly commonsensical proposition that positive attitudes to change predict the extent to which influence tactics are used as they are attempts to achieve change, but no investigations have been identified that examine the relationship between change orientation and the use of influencing tactics.

Three predictors have been described: Role breadth self-efficacy, political skill, and change orientation. All are orientations which have been associated with proactive behaviors and there is evidence or argument to suggest that they will similarly predict influencing tactic use. Drawing on expectancy theory, individuals are predicted to engage in activities to the extent that they feel the outcomes will be favorable (Vroom, 1964). High levels of efficacy, political skill and an active orientation to change are all likely to be associated with anticipatory feelings that efforts to influence will be successful and so all are likely to be positively associated with proactive influence tactic use.

**Appraisals of situation**

Appraisals of two aspects of subordinates’ working situation were taken. Research relating to relationship with manager, as assessed by LMX, and perceptions of control of the working environment, as assessed by control appraisal, is summarized below.

**Subordinate-Supervisor Relationship.** Having a supportive environment is an important antecedent of proactive behavior (Crant, 2000; Frese & Fay, 2001). Parker, Williams and Turner (2006) operationalized this as supportive supervision and co-worker trust, and report that co-worker trust but not supportive supervisor was instrumental in their
model of proactive behaviors. The behaviors they measured were not directed solely at supervisors, and focused only on support and not the broader subordinate-supervisor relationship. These factors may explain why the quality of the relationship with the supervisor did not contribute to predicting proactive behavior. In influencing upwards, the target of any attempt at change is the supervisor or manager and so a measure of the quality of relationship as indicated by leader member exchange was included in our study.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory seeks to capture and explain the nature of the leader (superior) and member (subordinate) relationship and consequential behaviors. High-quality LMX relationships are characterized by loyalty, emotional support, mutual trust, and interpersonal interaction. In a low-quality LMX relationship, the subordinates’ interactions are based upon fulfilling contractual requirements, with little emotional involvement (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Furst & Cable, 2008; Wayne, Liden, & Sparrowe, 1994). LMX has been associated with increased and with non-significant associations with the use of both rationality (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Dockery & Steiner, 1990) and ingratiation (Deluga & Perry, 1994; Dockery & Steiner, 1990; Kacmar et al., 2004). In contrast, Waldron (1991) reports impression management, which encompasses ingratiation, increases in low quality relationships. Dockery and Steiner (1990) and Deluga and Perry (1991) report negative relationships between LMX and upward influencing using assertiveness tactics. Kassing (2000) reports that dissent is more likely to be articulated in high LMX relationships but, in low LMX relationships, when dissent is expressed, it is more likely to be aggressive.

**Control Appraisal.** Control appraisal relates to an individual’s assessment of the level of control they have over their environment. Frese and Fay (2001), like others in the field, stress the importance of autonomy in the workplace and contend that individuals who are high in control appraisal actively search for opportunities and information which enable
them to influence their workplace. Parker, Williams and Turner (2006) included control appraisal in their model but failed to demonstrate predictive power. As this is a relatively recent concept, little research has analyzed the effect of control appraisal in the workplace and none of that research relates to the use of influencing tactics. Autonomy features in Ashford and Grant’s (2008) framework as being one of three critical situational antecedents of proactive behavior and individuals who work in environments where they are equipped and permitted to effect change are reported to engage in more proactive behavior (Morrison, 2006).

Expectancy theory enabled us to predict positive relationships between appraisals of self and influencing tactic use, similarly, expectancy theory would predict that those who felt high levels of control over their situation would be more inclined to engage in influencing since their efforts would be more likely to be anticipated as being successful. Expectancy theory does not enable us to make such clear predictions when it comes to LMX as a successful tactic in terms of change achieved may be unsuccessful in terms of relationship quality. That is, in high LMX relationships, hard tactics which jeopardize valued relationships may not be used. Action theory (Hacker, 1985) might lead us to predict that in supportive relationships subordinates would be more likely to act. Action theory purports that individuals plan actions which are guided by goals. Goal oriented actions can be thwarted by difficult situations and supportive situations enable individuals to pursue their goals (Stroppa & Spieb, 2011). Our understanding of proactivity leads us to expect, in line with action theory, that high LMX should facilitate or encourage proactive behavior.

Expectancy theory enabled us to predict positive relationships between appraisals of self and influencing tactic use. Similarly, expectancy theory would predict that those who felt high levels of control over their situation and those in supportive relationships would be more inclined to engage in influencing since their efforts would be more likely to be anticipated as being successful. Action theory (Hacker, 1985) might also lead us to predict that in supportive relationships subordinates would be more likely to act. Action theory purports that individuals plan actions which
are guided by goals. Supportive working environments enable individuals to pursue their goals and unsupportive situations disable actors (Stroppa & Spieb, 2011). Our understanding of proactivity leads us to expect, in line with action theory and expectancy theory, that high LMX should facilitate or encourage proactive behavior.

To summarize, potential individual and situational antecedents of proactive upward influencing tactic use have been described. These variables have been identified in the field of proactive behavior as being associated with a range of proactive behaviors. This study offers an expansion to the literature by simultaneously assessing a range of tactics and the degree to which their use can be predicted by appraisals of self and situation.

**Study Purpose and Hypotheses**

The present study aims to situate the use of upward influencing tactics within the context of proactive behaviors. By capturing potential predictors which are thought to be antecedents of proactive behaviors and assessing a range of tactics we hope to answer the following questions:

Do the different upward influencing tactics share the antecedents reported by others as either being common to or distinguishing between proactive behaviors?

And so:

To what extent can theoretical frameworks derived for proactive behaviors in general explain the use of upward influencing tactics?

The following hypotheses are proposed for the present study:
Our proposal that favorable assessments of self, as indicated by role breadth self efficacy, political skill, and change orientation, will be associated with greater use of influencing tactics leads to the following hypotheses:

H1 Role breadth self-efficacy will be positively associated with the use of upward influencing tactics.

H2 Political skill will be positively associated with the use of upward influencing tactics.

H3 Change orientation will be positively associated with the use of upward influencing tactics.

Our proposal that favorable assessment of situation, as indicated by LMX and control appraisal, will be associated with greater use of influencing tactics leads us to the following hypotheses:

H4 Leader member exchange will be positively associated with the use of upward influencing tactics.

H5 Control appraisal will be positively associated with the use of upward influencing tactics.

Method

Participants

The total sample of 178 participants (149 female, 29 male) were recruited via the University of [Blank] Centre for Continuing Education (CCE). Participants were 16 years or older and worked more than 15 hours per week. This sample was chosen due to its accessibility to the researchers. The respondents represented a range of occupations (e.g. administrators, lecturers, librarians, secretaries, accountants and nurses). The majority of participants were female (84%), aged 50 years or over (39%), had been in their current job roles for three years or more (51%), and were educated to degree level (80%). The full
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demographic profile of this sample can be seen in Table 2. The sample is valuable as much research in this area is restricted to investigations which take place in a limited number of organizations, with a sample that is often more male than female, and younger rather than older. Our current sample, by contrast, is predominantly female, of middle age and drawn from a large range of organizations.

**Measures**

**Demographic questionnaire.** Items with pre-specified categories were used to classify the demographic information of the participants. This included the variables sex, age (5 categories, principally in 10-year brackets, ranging from less than 20 years of age to 50 years or more), job role tenure (4 categories; less than 6 months, 6 – 12 months, 12 months to 3 years, and 3 years or more) and level of education (5 categories; none, school certificate, bursary/form 7, trade qualification, university degree).

**TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE**

**Influence tactics.** Upward influence tactics were measured using the revised version of Kipnis et al.’s (1980b) subordinate influence scale validated by Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990). This scale reflects the six dimensions of upward influence: Ingratiation, exchange, rationality, upward appeal, coalitions and assertiveness. The 18 items (three items per subscale) ask subordinates whether they had tried to influence their superior in the last 12 months on a scale of 1 (*never used this tactic*) to 5 (*used this tactic very often*) using a variety of different behaviors, such as “obtained the support of coworkers to back up my request”. The scale demonstrated sufficient internal consistency (as measured by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient; see Table 3).

**Role breadth self-efficacy.** (*α = .89*). To measure RBSE, seven items were extracted from Parker’s (1998) scale of role breadth self-efficacy. Respondents were asked to rate how confident they would feel using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all confident*) to 5
(very confident) carrying out each of seven tasks, such as “Designing new procedures for your work area”. Hence, this scale measures a participant’s belief in their capability to perform certain tasks if required, as opposed to whether they actually were able to carry out such tasks.

**Political skill.** \((\alpha = .90)\). This was measured using The Political Skill Inventory (PSI; Ferris et al., 2005b). This 18-item scale assesses the four dimensions of political skill determined by Ferris et al. (2005a): Interpersonal influence, social astuteness, networking ability and apparent sincerity. Respondents indicated their responses to statements such as “I understand people very well” on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always, every day). Construct validity for this scale has been demonstrated by Ferris and colleagues.

**Change orientation.** \((\alpha = .60)\). An employee’s orientation to change was assessed by asking to what extent the respondent agreed or disagreed with five items about change (Parker et al., 2006), rated on a five-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For example, “When an organization is running smoothly, there is no need to think about changing things”. Validity and adequate reliability \((\alpha = .74)\) of this scale was demonstrated by Parker et al. (2006), however the current study obtained a marginal measure of reliability of this scale. As such, the results regarding change orientation should be viewed with caution.

**Leader-member exchange.** \((\alpha = .93)\). Scandura and Graen’s (1984) LMX VII scale, as adapted by Furst and Cable (2008) was used to assess the relationship between leaders and followers. For example, “I always know where I stand with my supervisor”. Items are scored on a seven-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Criterion-related validity has been established for this measure (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993).
**Control appraisal.** (α = .80) Parker et al.’s (2006) four-item control appraisal scale was used to assess the belief that one can control or have an impact on work outcomes. Participants were asked to rate, for example, “In my job, most of the problems that I experience are completely out of my hands”. The scale for these items ranged from 1 (*not true at all*) to 5 (*very true*).

Mean scores from each scale and the subscales from the subordinate influence scale were calculated to give an overall score for each variable.

**Procedure**

The data used in this study was part of a larger research project, including both qualitative and quantitative data collected through an online questionnaire. Participants were recruited via an emailed newsletter issued to individuals enrolled in CCE classes, a flyer from a research assistant during a CCE class or by public invitation on the CCE website. Within each avenue, the researchers appealed for people to take part in the current study by completing an online questionnaire. A link was also provided to a website containing a cover letter outlining the questionnaire content, a consent form assuring the voluntary and anonymous nature of their participation, and a link through to the questionnaire. Each questionnaire could be completed in approximately 20 minutes. As motivation to complete the survey, participants were offered the chance to win an iPod Nano by filling in a contact form at completion of the questionnaire.

At the conclusion of data collection, the data file was downloaded from an online server and converted into a SPSS file for analyses.

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Means and standard deviations were computed for all self-report variables. Table 3 displays the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the self-report variables and
the demographic characteristics. As shown in Table 3, subordinates tended to report utilizing rational influence the most (mean=3.89) followed by the soft influence tactic ingratiation (mean=2.63) and coalition (mean=2.22). Upward appeal, exchange, and assertiveness were reported less frequently with the mean scores being 1.68, 1.49 and 1.42 respectively.

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses**

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess the contribution of self and situational variables beyond that of the demographic characteristics. Separate regression analyses were performed for each influence tactic. Independent variables were entered in two steps. The demographic variables age, sex, level of education and job-role tenure were entered simultaneously in Step 1, followed by the self-report variables role breadth self-efficacy, political skill, change orientation, leader-member exchange, and control appraisal as a block in Step 2. The results are presented in Table 4.

**Role breadth self-efficacy.** It was hypothesized that role breadth self efficacy would be associated with increased use of rational influence tactics (Hypotheses 1). A significant positive relationship was evident between role breadth self efficacy and the use of rational influence tactics ($\beta=.20, p<.05$). Individuals with a higher belief in their ability to carry out task role requirements, use an increased level of rational influence compared to those with a lessened level of confidence in their ability to carry out such tasks. RBSE was unrelated to the remaining influence tactics.

**Political skill.** High levels of political skill were hypothesized to be associated with an increased use of tactics (Hypothesis 2). This prediction was largely unsupported, with results indicating that political skill was only significantly associated with one influence
tactic, upward appeal ($\beta=.28, p<.01$). The higher an employee’s level of political skill, the more likely they are to implement upward appeal influence tactics.

**Change orientation.** Subordinates with a positive change orientation were hypothesized to show a greater use of influencing tactics (Hypothesis 3). An active change-orientation was associated with an increased use of rationality by subordinates in order to influence their supervisor ($\beta=.20, p<.01$). Change orientation was unrelated to the remaining influence tactics.

**Subordinate-Supervisor relationship.** Subordinates with high LMX were hypothesized to use influencing tactics more than subordinates in low LMX relationships (Hypothesis 4). LMX was found to be a significant negative predictor of the use of both upward appeal ($\beta=-.31, p<.01$) and assertiveness ($\beta=-.17, p<.05$) influence strategies. As the relationship between a subordinate and supervisor increases in loyalty and trust, an associated decrease in the use of such tactics is seen. LMX was not a significant predictor of ingratiation or rationality.

**Control Appraisal.** Higher control appraisal was hypothesized to be positively associated influencing tactic use (Hypothesis 5). Control appraisal was found to have a significant negative relationship with the use of ingratiation ($\beta=-.34, p<.01$) and assertive ($\beta=-.24, p<.01$) influence strategies. As individuals feel more empowered and in control of workplace situations and organizational outcomes, their efforts to increase their own attractiveness in the eyes of others and their use of demands or threatening tactics is decreased.

**Discussion**

There are three main contributions of this study. First, this research takes a new approach to predicting the use of influence by subordinates and investigates whether the antecedents associated with proactive behaviors are also the antecedents of influencing tactic
use. Second, the findings demonstrate the importance of appraisals of self and situation in the use of upward influencing tactics. Finally, the results suggest that while the use of rationality can be encompassed within frameworks of positive proactive behaviors, the remaining tactics cannot and an explanation is offered.

Five hypotheses were proposed, which all predicted positive associations between antecedents thought to predict proactive behaviors and the use of upward influencing tactics. Hypothesis 1 predicted positive associations between role breadth self-efficacy and tactic use. This was born out only for rationality. High levels of role breadth self-efficacy do not, it seem, motivate subordinates to use any tactic other than rationality in an effort to influence. Hypothesis 2 predicted positive associations between political skill and influencing tactics use. Only one tactic, upward appeal, was associated with political skill. It may be that political skill is unrelated to the use of the remaining influencing tactics use. Equally, or perhaps more probably, political skill may be related to tactic use but predicts effectiveness, style or timing rather than tactic choice and frequency (Grant & Ashford, 2008). That is, political skill may be linked with how well tactics are used, not how often. This argument, that the key issue is adroitness of political skill use, accords with the finding that political skill interacts with influence tactics to predict performance evaluations (Harris, Kaemar, Zivnuska, & Shaw, 2007). A positive association was observed between political skill and the use of upward appeals, that is, appeals by a subordinate to their manager’s superior. Politically skilled individuals have two advantages that may be relevant in explaining this finding: They enjoy wider social networks, and they use influencing tactics more skillfully (Kolodinsky et al., 2007). It may be that politically skilled subordinates by virtue of their networks and/or skills can effect an upward appeal without it being perceived as a hard or an illegitimate tactic, and this may serve to increase the use of an otherwise infrequently used tactic. Previous work by Ferris and associates demonstrated a positive predictive relationship
between political skill and rationality (Kolodinsky et al., 2007) which we failed to replicate. These researchers used the same measurement instruments for political skill and influencing tactics as were used here, their sample was broadly similar to ours but had a more even gender balance (67% female in their study and 86% in ours) although gender did not predict rationality in either study.

Hypothesis 3 predicted positive associations between orientation to change and tactic use but this was observed only for rationality. Thus the relationship between role breadth self-efficacy and tactic use, and between change orientation and tactic use, appear to be similar to each other.

To summarize, it seems that positive appraisals of self are associated with increased, or are unrelated to, tactic use. Rationality, categorized as the most acceptable of tactics, is most clearly linked with efficacy and a positive approach to change. Political skill was found to be positively related to upward appeal but not to rationality as has been reported by others.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 related to assessments of situation. Hypothesis 4 predicted positive associations between LMX and influencing tactics use, however significant negative and non-significant associations were observed between LMX and the different tactics. It appears a good quality relationship with a manager, rather than supporting subordinates’ efforts to influence, may serve to inhibit the use of tactics that the manager would not welcome, such as ingratiatory behaviors or assertiveness. Similarly, Hypothesis 5 predicted a positive association between control appraisal and tactic use, working from the notion that if a situation appears amendable to change then subordinates would be more likely to attempt to effect change. Here again, rather than positive associations, either non-significant or negative associations were observed. It seems that instead of perceptions of situational control fostering efforts to influence, appraisals of high levels of situational control are associated with a decrease in the use of both ingratiation and assertiveness. Frese, Teng and Wijnen
(1999) noted that when subordinates enjoyed autonomy they did not necessarily engage more in the use of reasoning or persuasion, rather they effected the change themselves. Perhaps when situations afford control and support, subordinates do not need to engage in influencing tactics, particularly not those which a manager may not welcome, rather they may have the latitude simply to engage in proactive behaviors to effect a change. Conversely, when situations are unsupportive or constraining, or even ambiguous (Grant & Ashford, 2008), tactics may be used to build, borrow, or force influence.

To recap, the study identified that role breadth self-efficacy and active orientation to change, both of which feature in models of proactive behavior, predicted rationality. Equally importantly, the study failed to establish that positive situational appraisals in the form of high quality relationship with manager or feelings of control predicted rationality, although they are both thought to be important in predicting proactive behaviors and personal initiative taking. Unfavorable appraisal of situation but not unfavorable appraisals of self were associated with increased influencing using ingratiating, upward appeal and assertiveness.

Our effort to predict influencing tactics from appraisals of self and situation which are thought to be predictive of proactive behaviors in general has proved unsuccessful. It is, however, worth re-examining the literature on proactive behaviors to see whether a more nuanced approach can accommodate our findings. Parker and Collins (2010) and Belschak and Den Hartog (2010) differentiate proactive behaviors by purpose. Ralston and Pearson differentiate between subordinate influencing that is intended to be pro-organizational, self serving, or malicious (Ralston & Pearson, 2010), and others argue that goals determine tactic choice (Masylyn, Farmer, & Fedor, 1996). Kipnis et al. (1980) and Yukl, Guinan and Soitolano (1995) examined the associations between purpose and tactic use. Kipnis et al. (1980) report that personal benefit and a desire to influence change in the workplace were the most common goals of subordinate’s attempts to influence their superior. They report that
rationality and coalitions were used more frequently in efforts to bring about change, rationality was used in attempts to convince targets to accept new ideas, and that ingratiation was used to secure assistance. Yukl et al. (1995) examined the associations between purpose and tactic use. They found that over half of upward influencing attempts were effected in order to get support and a third were for personal benefit. Pressure, which is akin to our assertiveness dimension, and ingratiation were used most by subordinates in an effort to achieve a personal benefit. Rationality was used for a wide range of purposes including securing resources, approvals and political support. While there seems to be some convergence in the notions of purpose within the fields of influence and proactivity, particularly in the distinction between work versus self-focus, the relationship between influencing and proactivity clearly requires further research.

One area that may allow a theoretical integration of influencing tactics and proactive behavior is the link between purpose or goal, and behavior toward that end. Parker and Collins (2010) and Belschak and Den Hartog (2010) not only reported categories of proactive behaviors, they also reported differences in their antecedents. In particular, Parker and Collins (2010) report that while role breadth self-efficacy and felt responsibility for change predict proactive work behaviors such as innovation and problem prevention, they do not so clearly predict person-environment fit behaviors such as feedback enquiry and career initiative. Potentially, this could explain why rationality, with its work-related focus, but not the remaining tactics, is predicted by role breadth self-efficacy and orientation to change. Capturing the purpose or objective of efforts to influence would seem to be a useful direction for future studies, as has begun to occur for research on proactive behaviors (Saks & Cooper-Thomas, in press).

Much of the work on proactive behaviors is restricted to, or even defined as, behaviors that are positively viewed by superiors and are pro-organization (Belschak & Den
Hartog, 2010), and the overlap between proactive behavior and organizational citizenship behavior is sometimes noted (Parker & Collins, 2010). However not all proactive behaviors are welcomed or executed with the goal or purpose of benefitting the workplace (Bateman & Crant, 1993) and some are not associated with positive outcomes for either individuals or organizations (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Given that some influencing tactics are identified as being less acceptable than others or illegitimate (Kassing, 2007), the literature that encompasses wider definitions of proactive behavior and includes other discretionary behaviors could well be relevant to our efforts to understand influencing. Unfortunately, as Belschak, Den Hartog and Fay (2010) note, the less attractive side of proactive behavior is not extensively researched. Many counterproductive work activities can be seen as proactive (Fay & Sonnentag, 2010) and researchers have noted similarity in antecedents between organizational citizenship behaviors and counterproductive work behaviors with, for example, job satisfaction and perceived justice being positively associated with citizenship behaviors and negatively associated with counterproductive work behaviors (Dalal, 2005). There seems to be substance to the notion that stressors, such as lack of control, contribute to counterproductive work behavior (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001). Jensen, Opland and Ryan (2010) similarly report that poor relationships predict counterproductive work behavior whereas good relationships promote positive behaviors. In contrast, Spector and Fox (2010), argue that boredom, colleagues’ poor performance, constraints, and injustice contribute to counterproductive work behavior yet can also stimulate citizenship.

It seems, then, that counterproductive work behaviors are predicted by stressors, and lack of control over the environment and poor relationships have both been reported to predict counterproductive behaviors. In our study, unfavorable appraisals of situation predicted ingratiation, upward appeals, and assertive tactics. Other researchers have also found these influencing tactics are predicted by perceptions of lack of control (Barbuto &
Moss, 2006; Canary, Cody, & Marston, 1986; Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973). We find that ingratiation, upward appeals and assertive tactics share common antecedents with counterproductive work behaviors. It is noteworthy that these are also the tactics identified in the literature as being viewed as inappropriate, illegitimate, or unwelcome.

Putting it simply, it appears that positive appraisals of self are associated with an increase in rationality which other researchers identify as the most acceptable of all the influencing tactics. Negative appraisals of situation are associated with the use of tactics that tend to be regarded as less acceptable. We have identified parallels in comparisons of pro-organization and counter-productive work behaviors.

**Methodological Concerns**

The results of this study should be interpreted in light of some methodological concerns. Measurement error represents a potential limitation. Reliance on self-report is a major shortcoming of organizational behavior research (Mersman & Donaldson, 2000) due to the possibility of response bias and common method variance (Treadway et al., 2007). It is possible that participants may not accurately report using upward appeal, as this may be seen as manipulative. However, the mean for this variable in the current study is similar to that of previous studies (Aguinis, Nesler, Hosoda, & Tedeschi, 1994), and is only slightly higher than exchange which, as a tactic, is unlikely to show social desirability. Hence, we do not think inaccurate self-report is affecting our results. The effect of common method variance is debated, with both neutral (Spector, 1987) and negative effects (Williams, Cote, & Buckley, 1989) proposed. It is notable that in our study, of 55 correlations between antecedent variables and influencing tactics, only 30 were statistically significant (55%). This suggests that respondents did discriminate carefully in their responses, and that a method factor did not inflate relationships artificially (Brannick, Chan, Conway, Lance, & Spector, 2010). In spite of this, we note that recent research suggests at least two data sources are required to help
rule out the effects of both self-report bias and common method variance (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). Replication using self-report in conjunction with diaries or observation would reinforce the present results.

The design would have been improved if matched pairs of manager and subordinate were available. This was not possible but our study is weaker for it, particularly in respect of our measures of LMX since measures of dyadic relationship quality are best taken from both parties. However, our focus on subordinates fits the study’s aim to assess the role of appraisals of self and situation in predicting influencing tactics use and these can only be assessed by the agent.

**Directions for Further Research**

Applying a proactivity lens to the use of upward influence has enabled us to identify two important areas for research into the use of upward influencing tactics. The relevance of appraisals of self and situation is established but these relationships could be better understood if research were carried out into the purpose and acceptability of tactic use. This would enable upward influence to be more firmly situated and understood within emerging models of proactive behaviors.

We also feel that further research is needed on the specific dimensions of political skill and their individual effects on and motivators for upward influence. A focus on effective use of tactics rather than on their frequency of use would be particularly productive here (Forgas, 2007). The demographics of this study provide an avenue for future research. Replications involving an even gender distribution and matched pairs of subordinates and managers could provide great insight. The literature demonstrates gender differences in the use of upward influencing tactics (van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003) and LMX (Murphy & Ensher, 1999). Finally, LMX is built upon a series of interactions, and thus develops over time (e.g. Treadway et al, 2007). As this relationship evolves, participants may alter their use
of upward influence (Kipnis et al., 1980). Studies involving a longitudinal design would be valuable in providing insights into the reciprocal relationships between antecedents and the changing use of upward influence tactics.

**Practical Application**

Given the importance of communication and influence within organizations, managers and leaders need to be aware that not all employees will approach them in the same way.

Taking a manager’s perspective, the findings suggest that establishing a positive and trusting relationship with subordinates may reduce the likelihood of them using the hard influencing tactics upward appeal and assertiveness. The results further suggest that politically skilled subordinates may be more inclined to go over managers’ heads – managers be warned! More importantly, those subordinates who attempt to ingratiate, assert or use other unwelcome tactics do so in response to feelings that they lack control of their work situation or are in poor relationships. The implications of this are that efforts to tackle the relationship rather than the behavior itself may be an effective way of managing such exchanges with subordinates.

The use of rationality reflects positive orientation to change and feelings of efficacy. Rationality, it is argued, is the most useful upward influencing tactic and one that managers welcome as helping them make good decisions. Selecting and developing employees to have proactive orientations (Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2006) may reap benefits of greater use of the rational influence tactic.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, our study has shown that that rationality is associated with positive appraisals of self as assessed by role breadth self-efficacy and change orientation. These variables are also predictors of positive proactive behaviors. Our study has also shown that
ingratiation, upward appeal and assertiveness are associated with unfavorable appraisals of situation as assessed by relationship with manager and perceptions of control. These variables are also predictors of counterproductive work behaviors. We tentatively suggest that upward influencing tactic usage can be understood within a theoretical framework of proactive behavior that incorporates a broad definition of proactive discretionary behaviors. We further suggest that an understanding of purpose of tactic use will provide a useful insight into the commonalities and contrasts in antecedents to tactic choice.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
<th>Measures Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationality</strong></td>
<td>Uses logic, factual evidence, and thorough explanations to persuade others to conform (Kolodinsky et al., 2007).</td>
<td>Often used by those with a high job status (Kipnis et al., 1980). Use associated with success and positive work outcomes (Ferris et al, 2003). Managers prefer subordinates to use rationality (Steensma, 2007). Initially found by Kipnis et al. (1980) to be used more in upwards influence, however Yukle &amp; Falbe (1990) results were inconsistent with this, finding no significant directional differences.</td>
<td>Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation</strong></td>
<td>Attempts to increase own attractiveness in another person’s eyes, involving flattery, open support of targets opinion, false modesty, and smiling (Treadway et al., 2007).</td>
<td>Emerges at all target levels – upward, lateral and downward (Kipnis et al., 1980). Ingratiatory behaviours have been used by people in organisations with less power (Poppe, van der Kloot, &amp; Valkenberg, 1999). Often used in employment interviews (Fletcher, 1989, cited in Wayne, Liden, &amp; Sparrowe, 1994).</td>
<td>Influence Behaviour Questionnaire (Furst &amp; Cable, 2008). Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange</strong></td>
<td>Offering an exchange of positive benefits, or offering to make personal sacrifices (Kipnis et al., 1980). May include reminding the target of past favours (Barbuto &amp; Moss, 2006).</td>
<td>Used to influence superiors (Kipnis et al., 1980). There is relatively little research on this influence strategy.</td>
<td>Yukl and Falbe (1990) Influence tactic taxonomy. Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coalition</strong></td>
<td>Using pressure for conformity (Kipnis et al., 1980) by gathering support from others and creating a ‘ganging-up’ effect to influence (Barbuto &amp; Moss, 2006).</td>
<td>Initially stated as a characteristic of rationality (Kipnis et al., 1980), thus classed as a soft tactic. However, the characteristics of this tactic are similar to that of Upwards Appeal, classified as a hard tactic. No significant directional differences (Yukl &amp; Falbe, 1990).</td>
<td>Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies, Form M (Kipnis &amp; Schmidt, 1988). Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upward Appeal</strong></td>
<td>Making formal appeals to, and gaining informal support from, higher levels than the target (Kipnis et al., 1980).</td>
<td>Used by subordinates to influence superiors (Kipnis et al., 1980). There is relatively little research on this influence strategy.</td>
<td>Yukl and Falbe (1990) Influence tactic taxonomy. Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertiveness</strong></td>
<td>Making formal appeals to, and gaining informal support from, higher levels than the target (Kipnis et al., 1980). Demanding, ordering, setting deadlines, and making repeated requests (Kipnis et al., 1980).</td>
<td>No significant directional difference, and used often in large organisations (Kipnis et al., 1980). Often coercive and controlling in nature (van Knippenberg &amp; Steensma, 2003).</td>
<td>Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies, Form M (Kipnis &amp; Schmidt, 1988). Schreischeim and Hinkin (1990) refinement of Kipnes et al. (1980) subscales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in current role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12 months</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months, more than 3 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or more</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary/Form 7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade qualification</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 178*
Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Predictor, Control, and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex (^a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job role tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rationality</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exchange</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Upward Appeal</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coalitions</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Role breadth self-</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Political skill</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Change orientation</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. LMX</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Control appraisal</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(N = 178\). \(^a\) 0 = male; 1 = female. \(*p = <.05; **p = <.01.\)
Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Predicting Influence Tactic Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Rationality</th>
<th>Ingratiation</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Upward Appeal</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change R²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Rationality</th>
<th>Ingratiation</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Upward Appeal</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBSE</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change orientation</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control appraisal</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change R²</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 178. PS = political skill; LMX = leader-member exchange; RBSE = role breadth self-efficacy
*p<.05; **p<.01