

Predictive Model for Influence Strategies in Greek Organizations

Mrs Konstantina Tyrovola M.A

Department of Health Service Management
National School of Public Health
196, Avenue Alexandras 115 21 Athens
Greece.

Prof. Vicky Papanikolaou, PhD

Department of Health Service Management
National School of Public Health
196, Avenue Alexandras 115 21 Athens
Greece.

Dr Dimitrios Adamis MSc, GradStat, MD

Research and Academic Institute of Athens, Greece
27 Themistokleous Street and Akadimias
Athens, 106 77, Greece.

Abstract

Previous studies had found differences in influence tactics used in organizations in different countries and this has been explained by the differences in culture. This is the first study that examines influence tactics in Greek organizations. The aims were to explore the influence tactics used in Greece and to examine their relationship with work values, distance from superior, and demographics. This is a survey of 136 employees using the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ-G). The most often used tactic was Legitimizing and the less often used tactics were Exchange and Personal Appeals. Each tactic was associated with certain variables from those examined. This study supports the notion that the perceived influence tactics are affected by other factors as well than only culture.

Keywords: IBQ-G; influence tactics; distance; work values; culture; Greece.

1. Introduction

Many definitions have been proposed to explain leadership. One definition that has been widely used states that the leadership is a social influence process from an organizationally designated superior to one or more subordinates that is necessary for the attainment of organizational goals (Schmidt & Yeh, 1992).

Influence process is essential for managerial effectiveness (Yukl, 2009). To be successful a manager must be able to influence other people inside the organization (e.g., subordinates, peers, bosses) and outside of it (e.g., suppliers, clients, stockholders, government officials) (Yukl et al., 2005). The success of an attempt by one person (the “agent”) to influence another person (“the target”) depends to a great extent on the influence tactics used by the agent (Yukl et al., 1993; Farrell & Schroder, 1996). Influence tactics can be classified according to the direction of influence to: a) downward tactics which are used when the target of an influence attempt is a subordinate and b) upward tactics which are used when the target of an influence attempt is a superior (Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991; Falbe & Yukl, 1992).

In the last three decades, organizations have moved away from hierarchical forms of structure to more empowered forms (Noypayak & Speece, 1998). New flexible organizational structures, open communications, responsibility without authority, and rapid change have put influence tactics at the centre of management and they have been studied quite extensively (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Barbuto et al., 2002; Fu et al., 2004; Yukl, 2009). Kipnis and his colleagues were among the first to investigate the influence behaviour of managers. They extended the work of French and Raven (1959) about “power tactics” by inductively examining the influence strategies used by employees to influence their supervisors in organizational settings.

They (Kipnis et al., 1980) identified six reliably measured influence tactics (Ingratiation, Rationality, Exchanges, Coalitions, Upward Appeals, and Assertiveness) which were replicated by Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) ten years later. Yukl and Fable (1990) contributed to this line of research by adding several influence tactics not operationalized in the other frameworks (Consultation, Pressure, Personal Appeals, and Inspirational Appeals). This influence typology was revised in later studies (Yukl et al., 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl et al., 1993; Yukl & Seifert, 2002; Yukl et al., 2008) and is evident in most iterations of influence tactic research in the organizational behaviour field.

Furthermore, research on influence behaviour has examined a variety of factors affecting choices of influence tactics. For instance, direction of influence has appeared to be an important determinant of tactic selection (Kipnis et al., 1980; Erez et al., 1986; Yukl & Fable, 1990; Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Xin & Tsui, 2002). Directional differences in frequency of use have been found for almost all of the influence tactics (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Gender differences in influence tactics have demonstrated mixed results (Reimers et al., 2003). While most note the use of different influence tactics by males and females (White, 1988; DuBrin, 1991), many also cite that differences in a variety of circumstances correspond to the expectations of normative influence behaviours for males and females (Lamude, 1993; Carli, 1999; Carothers & Allen, 1999). Work values that function as higher order goals and as individuals' constraints influence individuals' behaviour and commitment (Judge & Bretz, 1992; Barrick & Mount, 1993; Austin & Vancouver, 1996; Blickle, 2000). Moreover, cross-cultural studies of influence tactics (e.g., Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991; Fu & Yukl, 2000; Ralston et al., 2001) have found that cultural values are associated with differences in preferences for the use of different influence tactics across cultures (Fu et al., 2004).

Another factor which seems to affect the use of influence tactics but it has not been received much attention from researchers is the distance from superior. Most research has examined the influence tactics in small groups, so the distinction between direct and indirect (i.e. distance) managerial behaviour has not always been clear (Waldman & Yammarino, 1999). The direct managerial behaviour or the relationship between manager and directly referenced subordinate has been studied extensively, while knowledge and empirical study on indirect managerial behaviour are limited (Napier & Ferris, 1993; Yukl, 1999; Antonakis & Atwater, 2002). The concept of distance from superior can occur in three different and independent dimensions: physical distance (Kerr & Jermier, 1978), social/psychological distance (Shamir, 1995; Waldman & Yammarino, 1999), and interaction based on the frequency of in person contact (Hunt, 1991; Yagil, 1998). Understanding the role of distance is essential for understanding the dynamics that develop in the organization (Napier & Ferris, 1993). These dynamics define the effects of managerial behaviour. In other words, the managerial behaviour and especially the way in which it is perceived and interpreted by subordinates depends on the distance between manager and subordinate (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002).

From the above, it seems that the different perception of use of influence tactics cannot be explained adequately by one or more factors, as the most of the studies had tried until now. Perhaps the perceived influence tactics is the result of a more complicated process where one or more factors or the combination of them can predict each tactic. Similarly, the separate examination of each of the above presented factors may leads to biased results regarding the independent importance of each one in the influence tactic process.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore influence tactics used in Greek organizations and to examine the factors of work values, demographics and distance (physical, social, psychological) in the perceived use of influence tactics. Specifically, this study aims to answer the following research questions a) the frequency of which each tactic used in the investigated Greek organizations, and b) to investigate the relationship of each tactic after adjusting for the factors of work values, demographics and distance (physical, social, psychological).

2. Method

2.1 Participants

Participants were all (136) employees in five public and private organizations and they were asked to rate the influence behaviour of a designated agent (their superior). No exclusion criteria were used.

2.2 Measurements

- 1. Demographics:** Data collected on gender, age, marital status, education (secondary school, university degree, and postgraduate degree).

2. **Data related to work:** sector of work (public or private sector), level of position at work (low level, middle level, high level), work contract (permanent, on-going, limited), monthly salary (less than 1000 Euros, 1000-1500 Euros and 1501-2000 Euros), years of work experience in organization (1-10, 11-20, 21-35 years of work experience in organization), years of work experience in the current position (1-10, 11-20, 21-30 years of work experience in the current position).
3. **Distance from the superior:** physical distance from the superior based on the place of work (work in the same room with superior, work in the same floor, work in the same building), social/psychological distance (subjective differences in social status and power) and interaction based on the frequency of in person contact (every day, every week, every 15 days, every month).
4. **The Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ)** (Yukl, et al., 2008). IBQ measures target perceptions of an agent's use of proactive tactics in attempts to influence the target respondent. The IBQ has 11 tactic scales (Rational Persuasion, Exchange, Inspirational Appeal, Legitimizing, Apprising, Pressure, Collaboration, Ingratiation, Consultation, Personal Appeals, and Coalition). Each scale has 4 items and each item has five anchored response choices: "I can't remember him/her ever using this tactic with me" =1, "He/she very seldom uses this tactic with me" =2, "He/she occasionally uses this tactic with me" =3, "He/she uses this tactic moderately often with me" =4, "He/she uses this tactic very often with me" =5. The scale score for a tactic is the mean of the item scores. The IBQ-G was translated and validated in the Greek language (Tyrovola et al., 2011). The objectives of the IBQ items are to measure attitudes that influence the target person to comply with an unspecified request, to carry out a task, to provide assistance, to support or implement a proposed change, or to do a personal favour for the agent. IBQ-G is a simple and fast to administer tool and can easily identify individual and organizational behaviours, on which the success of an organization partially depends.

2.3 Procedure

The questionnaires were given in person to all the employees in the five institutions during a working day and then they were collected after a maximum of five working days. No reminder was used after the passing of five days and if some of the employees had not completed the questionnaires they were assumed as non-respondents.

2.4 Ethics

As the project did not involve any harm or risk of the participants, approval of Research Ethics Committee was not sought. However, permission was obtained from the Head of Human Resources Department of each organization. Anonymity was ensured by removing the names during the data entry for analyses.

2.5 Analysis of data

All data were coded and entered into PASW (SPSS v18) for Windows. For the first research question (the rate of tactics) the means were estimated and ordered. For the second research question to investigate the relationship of each tactic with the other measured variables appropriate bivariate statistics were used. A multivariate model was conducted to further investigate the effects of each collected variable on the overall eleven tactics after adjusting for each one.

3. Results

The number of participants approached was 152 and the completed questionnaires were 136, thus the response rate was 89.5 %.

3.1 Descriptive statistics

The final analysed sample (136 participants) consisted of 61 (45%) males and 75 (55%) females. The mean age of the sample was 39.62 SD 9.4 (ranging from 22 to 63 years old). Out of them, 93 (68.4%) were working in the public sector and the rest of them in the private sector. Education, level of position at work, type of work contract, monthly salary, work experiences and distances are shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentages
Education	Secondary school	32	23.5
	University degree	69	50.7
	Postgraduate degree	35	25.7
Level of position	Low	105	77.2
	Middle	29	21.3
	High	2	1.5
Work contract	Permanent	58	42.6
	On-going	54	39.7
	Limited	24	17.6
Monthly salary	> 1000 euros	19	14.0
	1000-1500 euros	82	60.3
	1501-2000 euros	35	25.7
Years of work experience in organization	1-10	79	58.1
	11-20	35	25.7
	21-35	18	13.2
Years of work experience in current position	1-10	98	72.1
	11-20	30	22.1
	21-30	4	2.9
Physical distance	Same room	39	28.7
	Same floor	50	36.8
	Same building	47	34.6
Differences in social status	Yes	26	19.1
	No	110	80.9
Differences in power	Yes	92	67.6
	No	44	32.4
Interaction based on the frequency of in person contact	Every day	88	64.7
	Every week	34	25.0
	Every 15days	8	5.9
	Every month	6	4.4

3.2 Rate of influence tactics

Table 2 shows the rate of each tactic from highest to lowest. The most often used tactic was that of Legitimizing and the less often used tactics were those of Exchange and Personal Appeals.

Table 2. Ranking of influence tactics

Influence tactics	Mean	S.D.
Legitimizing	3.58	1.11
Ingratiation	3.31	1.19
Consultation	3.28	1.01
Rational Persuasion	3.26	1.03
Collaboration	3.15	1.01
Inspirational Appeal	3.09	1.15
Apprising	2.81	1.28
Pressure	2.44	1.13
Coalition	2.11	0.97
Exchange	2.07	1.12
Personal Appeals	2.07	1.11

3.3 Bivariate analyses

To examine the relationship between each influence tactic and independent variables of gender, education, field work, position, contract, monthly salary, years of work experience in the same organization and in the current position and distance from the superior, t-tests (for those variables with two categories) and one way ANOVA with Bonferroni correction (for those variables with 3 or more categories) were used. Pearson's correlation was used to examine the relationship between the continuous variable of age and the 11 influence tactics.

- a) Demographics: The gender of participants seemed to affect the use of two tactics, Inspirational Appeals ($t=-2.6$, $df=134$, $p=0.009$) and Apprising ($t=-2.2$, $df=134$, $p=0.030$). In particular, superiors used most often these two tactics when they attempted to influence women subordinates. Age had significant correlations with Ingratiation ($r=0.2$, $p=0.017$), and Consultation ($r=0.26$, $p=0.002$). Thus, the older the participants the more often those two tactics were used on them. Regarding education, only the tactic of Pressure was significantly different among the three categories of education. More specifically, the Pressure tactic was more often used on those who had finished secondary school compared to those with a postgraduate degree ($F_{2,133}=3.21$; $p=0.04$). Marital status had no significant relationship with any influence tactic.
- b) Variables related to work: Sector of work. The sector of work (public/private) seemed to affect the use of four tactics, Legitimizing ($t=1.7$, $df=134$, $p=0.008$), Pressure ($t=-2.2$, $df=134$, $p=0.032$), Collaboration ($t=0.7$, $df=134$, $p=0.029$), and Consultation ($t=2.7$, $df=134$, $p=0.005$). In particular, superiors in the public sector used more often the tactics of Legitimizing, Collaboration and Consultation when they attempted to influence subordinates and superiors in the private sector used more often the tactic of Pressure. Level of position at work. The tactics of Inspirational Appeal, Consultation and Coalition were significantly different between the categories of middle and low level position ($F_{2,133}=5.588$; $p=0.005$, $F_{2,133}=3.245$; $p=0.042$, $F_{2,133}=5.692$; $p=0.004$ respectively). More specifically, three tactics were used on those who worked in a middle level position compared to those with a low level position (Mean diff.=0.73, Std Err.=0.23, $p=0.006$, Mean diff.=0.51, Std Err.=0.21, $p=0.046$, Mean diff.=0.67, Std Err.=0.20, $p=0.003$). Work contract. The tactics of Rational Persuasion, Pressure and Consultation were significantly different among the categories of work contract ($F_{2,133}=4.187$; $p=0.017$, $F_{2,133}=3.066$; $p=0.050$, $F_{2,133}=5.297$; $p=0.006$ respectively). More specifically, Rational Persuasion was used on those who had permanent contracts compared to those with limited ones (Mean diff.=0.70, Std Err.=0.24, $p=0.014$), the tactic of Pressure was used on those who had limited contracts compared to those with permanent ones (Mean diff.=0.67, Std Err.=0.27, $p=0.04$), and the tactic of Consultation was used on those who had permanent contracts to those with on-going ones (Mean diff.=0.59, Std Err.=0.19, $p=0.006$). Monthly salary. The tactics of Pressure, Personal Appeals and Coalition were significantly different among the three categories of monthly salary ($F_{2,133}=4.220$; $p=0.017$, $F_{2,133}=3.870$; $p=0.023$, $F_{2,133}=4.165$; $p=0.018$ respectively). More specifically, Personal Appeals and Coalition were used on those who had a monthly salary of 1501-2000 Euros compared to those with a monthly salary of less than 1000 Euros (Mean diff.=0.61, Std Err.=0.22, $p=0.019$, Mean diff.=0.54, Std Err.=0.19, $p=0.016$). The tactic of Pressure was used on those who had a monthly salary of less than 1000 Euros compared to those with 1000-1500 Euros (Mean diff.=0.80, Std Err.=0.28, $p=0.015$). There were no significant differences among the 3 categories of years of work experience in the organization in relation to the 11 tactics. Years of work experience in the current position. The tactic of Rational Persuasion was significantly different among the three categories of years of work experience in the organization ($F_{2,129}=5.971$; $p=0.003$ respectively). Rational Persuasion was used on those who had 1-10 years of work experience in the current position compared to those with 21-30 years of experience (Mean diff.=1.74, Std Err.=0.51, $p=0.002$). Furthermore, the same tactic was used on those who had 11-20 years of work experience in the current position compared to those with 21-30 years of experience (Mean diff.=1.77, Std Err.=0.53, $p=0.003$).
- c) Variables related to distance from the superior: There were no significant differences in physical distance among the 3 categories (work in the same room with superior, work in the same floor, work in the same building) in relation to the 11 influence tactics. Differences in social status seemed to have a significant effect on the use of Personal Appeals ($t=0.6$, $df=134$, $p=0.007$). In particular, subordinates who believed that they had differences in social status with their superiors perceived that their superiors most often used Personal Appeals on them. Differences in power seemed to affect the use of Consultation ($t=-0.6$, $df=134$, $p=0.029$). In particular, superiors used this tactic most often to those subordinates who believed that they had no differences with their superiors in power. Interaction based on the frequency of in person contact. There were no significant differences among the four categories of interaction (every day, every week, every 15 days, and every month) in relation to the 11 influence tactics.

3.4 Predictive model for the influence tactics used on subordinates

A multivariate general linear model was conducted to estimate the main effects of demographics, variables related to work and variables related to distance (physical and psychosocial) on the eleven influence tactics.

In this model, the eleven influence tactics, as they were measured with the IBQ scale, were the dependent variables and the demographics (age, gender, marital status, education), the variables related to work (position, sector of work, type of contract, monthly salary, years of work experience in the organization and in the same position) and the variables related to distance (physical distance, social status, power, frequency of interaction with the superior). These were used as independent predictors. The final most parsimonious model was evaluated for the assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity and multicollinearity using the Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices, the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances and plots with satisfactory results. The simple Contrast Estimate was used to further investigate the impact of each level of the independent variables on the 11 influence tactics. **Table 3** shows only the significant main effects and the parameter estimates of the final model.

Table 3. Results of Multivariate analysis

Dependent Variable	Parameter	Parameter Estimates				95% Confidence Interval	
		B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rational Persuasion	Intercept	2.13	1.26	1.68	.095	-.38	4.63
	Years of work experience in current position (1-10)	1.64	.74	2.21	.029	.17	3.11
	Years of work experience in current position (11-20)	1.41	.69	2.05	.043	.04	2.78
	Years of work experience in current position (21-30)	0a
	Work contract (permanent)	.63	.29	2.19	.031	.06	1.20
	Work contract (on-going)	.80	.27	2.99	.003	.27	1.34
	Work contract (limited)	0a
Exchange	Intercept	3.93	1.50	2.61	.010	.95	6.91
	Physical distance (same room)	.75	.33	2.25	.026	.09	1.40
	Physical distance (same floor)	.79	.29	2.77	.007	.22	1.36
	Physical distance (same building)	0a
Inspirational Appeal	Intercept	5.17	1.44	3.60	.000	2.32	8.02
	Gender (male)	-.51	.21	-2.42	.017	-.93	-.09
	Gender (female)	0a
	Work sector (public)	.61	.29	2.07	.041	.03	1.19
	Work sector (private)	0a
	Level of position (low)	-2.08	1.00	-2.08	.040	-4.06	-.10
	Level of position (middle)	-1.31	.92	-1.41	.161	-3.14	.53
	Level of position (high)	0a
	Work contract (permanent)	-.76	.33	-2.32	.022	-1.41	-.11
	Work contract (on-going)	-.25	.31	-.83	.407	-.86	.35
	Work contract (limited)	0a
Appraising	Social/psychological distance-power (yes)	.50	.23	2.19	.031	.048	.95
	Social/psychological distance-power (no)	0 ^a
	Intercept	1.21	1.68	.72	.474	-2.13	4.54
	Social/psychological distance-power (yes)	.54	.27	2.02	.045	.01	1.06
Pressure	Social/psychological distance-power (no)	0 ^a
	Intercept	2.97	1.44	2.07	.041	.13	5.82
	Education (secondary school)	.51	.31	1.62	.108	-.11	1.12
	Education (university degree)	.57	.25	2.30	.024	.08	1.07
	Education (postgraduate degree)	0 ^a

Collaboration	Intercept	1.02	1.32	.77	.442	-1.59	3.63
	Years of work experience in current position (1-10)	1.71	.77	2.21	.029	.18	3.24
	Years of work experience in current position (11-20)	1.43	.72	1.99	.049	.01	2.86
	Years of work experience in current position (21-30)	0 ^a
Consultation	Intercept	1.01	1.27	.80	.428	-1.50	3.52
	Age	.03	.01	2.41	.018	.01	.06
Personal Appeals	Intercept	2.75	1.31	2.11	.037	.17	5.34
	Education (secondary school)	.87	.28	3.05	.003	.30	1.43
	Education (university degree)	-.10	.23	-.45	.655	-.55	.35
	Education (postgraduate degree)	0 ^a
	Years of work experience in organization (1-10)	1.12	.47	2.38	.019	.19	2.05
	Years of work experience in organization (11-20)	1.33	.39	3.40	.001	.56	2.11
	Years of work experience in organization (21-35)	0 ^a
	Years of work experience in current position (1-10)	-1.73	.77	-2.26	.026	-3.25	-.21
	Years of work experience in current position (11-20)	-2.13	.71	-2.99	.003	-3.54	-.72
	Years of work experience in current position (21-30)	0 ^a

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

As it can be seen in table 3, the three significant predictors for each influence tactic after adjusting for all the related variables were: years of work in the current position and type of contract for the use of Rational Persuasion, physical distance for Exchange, gender, work sector, type of work contract, and power for the use of Inspirational Appeal, power for Appraising, education for the use of Pressure, years of work in the current position for Collaboration, age for Consultation and finally education, years of work in the same organization, and current position for the use of Personal Appeals.

Thus, females perceived that they are subjected to more Inspirational Appeal to be influenced compared to males, those employees with university degree are subjected to more Pressure as an influence tactic compared to those who have finished secondary school and to those who hold a postgraduate degree, while those who have finished secondary school are subjected to more Personal Appeals compared to other educational categories. Similarly, the Inspirational Appeal as an influence tactic is greater on those working in the public sector compared to those working in the private sector. Furthermore, those with permanent work contracts are subjected to higher Rational Persuasion, but to less Inspirational Appeal compared to other categories, while those with on-going contracts are subjected only to higher Rational Persuasion as an influence tactic compared to the rest. In addition, those with many working years in the current position (21-30 years) are subjected to less Rational Persuasion and Collaboration, but to higher Personal Appeals as influence tactics compared to the other two categories (1-10 and 11-20 years of work in the current position). In the same line, those with many years of work in the same organization (20-35 years) perceived that they are subjected to less Personal Appeals as an influence tactic compared to those with fewer years of work. Furthermore, those who work in the same building with superiors are subjected to less Exchange as an influence tactic compared to those working in the same room or floor with superiors. Finally, employees who believe that they have no differences with their superior in power perceived that they are subjected to less Inspirational Appeal and Appraising as influence tactics compared to the rest.

4. Discussion

As far as the ranking of tactics used is concerned, the Legitimizing tactic is the influence tactic most often perceived that has been used by managers in the examined institutions in Greece, while tactics traditionally used to gain personal benefit, such as Coalition, Exchange, Personal Appeal and Pressure, were among those used the least often. Compared with other studies it seems that the ranking of influence tactics differs among studies in other cultures.

For instance, Fu and Yukl (2000) examined tactics in two different countries with two different cultures. They reported that Chinese managers rated Coalition Formation, Upward Appeal, Giving Gifts/Favors, and Personal Appeals as more effective while Rational Persuasion, Consultation, and Exchange as less effective. In addition, few studies have investigated influence tactics in different countries with similar culture. Schmidt and Yeh (1992) investigated and compared the influence tactics that managers use in four different countries (Australian, UK, Japan and Taiwan), but two similar cultures (Anglo-Saxon and Far East). The influence patterns used by Taiwanese and Japanese leaders were more similar to each other than to the Anglo-Saxon cluster of the British and the Australians. Both the Taiwanese and Japanese leader influence structures reflected the association of assertiveness-authority and reason tactics.

However, studies showed a preference for similar tactics across the same country. Studies investigating the influence behaviour of US managers indicated that the four tactics used most frequently were: Consultation, Rational Persuasion, Inspirational Appeals, and Ingratiation (Yukl & Falbe 1990; Schermerhorn & Bond 1991; Yukl et al., 1996). In contrast, Fu et al. (2004) examined the influence tactics in 12 different countries. They found that the tactic of Rational Persuasion was the most often used universally, but other tactics differed among cultures and nations.

There is no unanimity about the reasons that have been suggested to explain these differences. Fu and Yukl (2000) use the Hofstede's culture model (1980) to explain the differences of Chinese and American managers in the use of tactics. They suggested that the Chinese culture is more collectivistic, feminine, with long-term values while the American culture has values of equality, direct confrontation, and pragmatism. However, Greece has a similar culture with Turkey (Hofstede, 1980), but the influence tactics that are used in Greece are rather different to those used in Turkey (Pasa, 2000). In addition, Fu et al. (2004) have emphasized that the individual social beliefs and national cultural values could explain the different results.

The lack of agreement is perhaps due to the different factors that each study examined. It is possible that differences in influence tactics among cultures are not fully explained only by different social norms and values. In the same line, Kennedy et al. (2003) and van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, (2003) suggested that the Persuasive strategy is used more frequently across cultures, and is considered to be the most effective by managers. In contrast, the Assertive strategy is perceived as evoking resistance. Within this general framework, however, specific patterns of differences may occur across individuals and across cultures. Nevertheless, in the present study when we used multivariate analysis -in contrast to bivariate- we found that each influence tactic also depended on some individual characteristics, work related conditions and physical and psychosocial distance from the superior.

More specifically, for the perceived use of Exchange the physical distance was the most important factor, while other factors seemed to have no significant association. Those who work in the same building with superiors are subjected to less Exchange as an influence tactic compared to those working in the same room or same floor with superiors. Given that Exchange is dependent on a more personal relation this finding was not a surprise. There is a possibility that high level managers work in different buildings from the low level managers and their subordinates and thus the above finding reflects a difference between high -low level managers (Zaccacco, 2002). However, Bass (1990) has also suggested that physical distance can reduce the quality of the Exchange. Moreover, it has been suggested that the physical distance may have a negative effect on leaders (managers in our study) by reducing social interaction and information transmission, and by failing to monitor outcomes and to observe behaviours (Kerr & Jermier 1978; Daft & Lengel, 1984; Bass, 1998; Yagil, 1998).

In addition, employees who felt that they had social/ psychological distance from their superiors rate significantly higher that they were subjected to Inspirational Appeal and Apprising as influence tactics compared to the rest. Appealing to values and emotions of subordinates which arouse enthusiasm and increase their confidence in their abilities, and apprising in which the superiors explain why a request can benefit the subordinate present a great trust between superiors and subordinates. Previous work (Shamir, 1995) has shown that socially/psychologically distant leaders raise attributions of exceptional qualities more easily because of organizational performance cues, and have idealistic behaviours. Distant leaders may develop trust as a function of attributions regarding the leader's ethical, moral, and altruistic orientations (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002). The same explanation can also be applied to another finding of this study that those in lower position rated the Inspirational Appeal as an influence tactic higher compared to those in higher positions.

There is a bulk of research and theoretical work regarding the gender and the influence tactics which has been used (see reviews by Eagly & Johnson 1990; Eagly & Karau 1991; van Engen & Willemssen, 2004). However, most of the studies have investigated the influence tactics that have been used by females compared to males. In our study, after controlling for all other factors we found that the gender difference appears only in the Inspirational Appeal perceived tactic (females rank higher in the Inspirational Appeal compared to males). Our finding is similar to some degree with Reimers et al.'s (2003) finding, but not with Barbuto et al.'s (2007) who found that women were rated as using significantly more Pressure tactics than men (Barbuto et al., 2007). Those discrepancies (along with inconsistent results that appear in gender and leadership studies) may be due to methodological and statistical issues, e.g. the use of bivariate statistics instead of multivariate or as in the two previously mentioned studies in the underrepresentation of male gender.

Furthermore, regarding the distinction of public-private organizations, this study shows that those working in the public sector also rate the Inspirational Appeal as the higher perceived tactic. A previous work by Erez and Rim (1982) did not find any differences in the influence tactics, but they found that in the public sector managers ask less often for assistance from their subordinates than those in private organizations. In contrast, Aydin & Pehlivan (2010) supported that there exist significant differences in downward influence tactics used by superiors of public and private organizations. More specifically, they found that private superiors (in their study, school principals) used the tactics of Reason, Appeal to higher Authority and Assertiveness more than public superiors. On the other hand, public superiors tended to use the Bargaining, a tactic which reflected their perceptions that they did not aim at controlling the target compliance. Those results are similar to the findings from our study but only in the bivariate statistics. When we control for the other factors as well only the Inspirational Appeal tactic was different between public and private sector.

A new finding from this study was that the education of the subordinate has an effect on the influence tactic that he/she perceives from the superior. Only Pressure for those who had a university degree and Personal Appeal for those who had finished secondary school were significant. In contrast, previous studies (Fu & Yukl 2000; Barbuto et al., 2007) found no differences in education and influence tactics. Education is an important factor of how someone can perceive the tactic that is posed to her/him. While a number of studies have investigated education in different organizational aspects including promotability (e.g., Thacker & Wayne, 1995) or organizational politics (e.g., Vigoda & Cohen, 2002), it is surprising that only very few studies have investigated education and influence tactics. It is likely that highly educated people are more effective and independent and thus they may perceive the influence of above as pressure. However, this is only a speculation and further investigations are needed to prove or disapprove it, but before that may it is more important to find out if there is an influence of education on how the tactics are perceived.

Finally, one more new finding from this study is that those with more years of work in the current position perceived that the tactics used on them are less Rational Persuasion, less Collaboration, but higher Personal Appeals. Although there are no previous studies from the literature to support or disapprove this finding it seems that those who stay in the same position for long time are among those of the core employees of the organization but without motivations, with lower education and perhaps those with the simplest tasks. Therefore it is expected that they know better the work environment and thus they have a better personal relationship with other employees in higher or lower positions but as well as, because they carry out simple task there is no need of rational explanations or collaboration for doing them.

To summarize, influence tactics are not only subject to culture or national values but other factors like demographics, organizational, and distance can have an effect as well. It has been suggested that the influence behaviour of managers reflects cultural values and traditions and most of the studies examine only few factors in an individual but many in a cultural/national level. However, cultural factors, as reported above, are not unique in explaining differences. The present study supports the notion that the perceived influence tactics is affected by other factors other than culture. Unfortunately, much of the research until recently has examined two or three variables in isolation, resulting in contradictory results with limited applicability, conclusions, or generalizability. This means that the present work also has limitations. Perhaps, there are also other factors which this study has not measured and which can influence the results in other directions. Another limitation of this study is that we examined only few institutions which may not be representative of Greece and thus the results may be biased and lack generalizability. On the other hand, the strength of this study is that this is the first study -to our knowledge- that examines influence tactics in Greek organizations. However more work is needed to fully evaluate them.

References

- Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader Distance: a review and proposed theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 673-704.
- Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 338-375.
- Aydin, I., & Pehlivan, Z. (2010). Strategies and personality types used by primary school principals in Turkey to influence teachers (Ankara case). *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 2, 3652-3659.
- Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2002). A field study examining two measures of work motivation to predict leader's influence tactics used. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 14, 2, 601-616.
- Barbuto, J. E., Jr., Fritz, S. M., Matkin, G. S., & Marx, D. B. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors, *Sex Roles*, 56, 1-2, 71-83.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. L. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 111-118.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blickle, G. (2000). Do Work Values Predict the Use of Intraorganizational Influence Strategies?, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1, 196-205.
- Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 991-994.
- Carothers, B. J., & Allen, J. B. (1999). Relationships of employment status, gender role, insult and gender with use of influence tactics, *Sex Roles*, 41, 375-387.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1984). Information richness: a new approach to managerial behavior and organizational design. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 191-233). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- DuBrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics of influence. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 635-646.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 685-710.
- Erez, M., & Rim, Y. (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personnel and organizational variables. *Human Relations*, 35, 10, 871-878.
- Erez, M., Rim, Y., & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. Target. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59, 25-39.
- Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 638-652.
- Farrell, M. A., & Schroder, B. (1996). Influence strategies in organizational buying decisions. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 25, 4, 293-303.
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fu, P. P., Kennedy, J., Tata, J., Yukl, G., Bond, M. H., Peng, T.-K., . . . Cheosakul, A. (2004). The impact of societal cultural values and individual social beliefs on the perceived effectiveness of managerial influence strategies: a meso approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35 4, 284-305.
- Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2000). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the united states and china. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 2, 251-266.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: a new synthesis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice and decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261-271.
- Kennedy, J., Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2003). Influence tactics across twelve cultures. In W. Mobley and P. Dorfman (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 127-148). JAI Press.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Exploration in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 4, 440-452.
- Lamude, K. G. (1993). Supervisors' upward influence tactics in same-sex and cross-sex dyads. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 77, 1067-1070.
- Napier, B. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1993). Distance in organizations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3, 4, 321-357.

- Noypayak, W., & Speece, M. (1998). Tactics to influence subordinates among Thai managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13, 5/6, 343-358.
- Pasa, S. F. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21, 8, 414-426.
- Ralston, D. A., Vollmer, G. R., Srinivasan, N., Nicholson, J. D., Tang, M., & Wan, P. (2001). Strategies of upward influence: a study of six cultures from Europe, Asia, and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 6, 728-735.
- Reimers, J. M., Barbuto Jr, J. E., & Matkin, G. S. (2003). Gender Differences in Downward Influence Strategies. URL (last checked 20 January 2012) www.midwestacademy.org/Proceedings/2003/papers/reimers1.doc
- Schermerhorn Jr, J. B., & Bond, M. H. (1991). Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: a comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 8, 2, 147-158.
- Schmidt, S. M., & Yen, R.-S. (1992). The structure of leader influence: a cross-national comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23, 251-262.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 3, 246-257.
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 1, 19-47.
- Thacker, R.A., & Wayne, S.J. (1995). An examination of the relationship between upward influence tactics and assessments of promotability. *Journal of Management*, 21 4, 739-756.
- Tyrovola, K., Papanikolaou, V., & Adamis, D. (2011). Translation and Standardization of the Extended Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ-G) in a Greek Sample. *Psychology*, 2, 7, 754-759.
- van Engen, M. L., & Willemsen, T. M. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 3-18.
- van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Leadership, Identity and Influence: Relational Concerns in the Use of Influence tactics. In D. van Knippenberg and M. Hogg (Eds.), *Leadership, Identity and Power* (pp. 153-167). London: Sage Press.
- Vigoda, E., & Cohen, A. (2002). Influence tactics and perceptions of organizational politics. A longitudinal study. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, 311-324.
- Xin, R.K. & Tsui, S.A. (2002). Different strokes for different folks? Influence tactics by Asian-American and Caucasian-American managers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 1, 109-132.
- Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and Levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 266-285.
- White, J. W. (1988). Influence tactics as a function of gender, insult and goal. *Sex Roles*, 18, 433-448.
- Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 2, 161-176.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An Evaluative Essay on Current Conceptions of Effective Leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 33-48.
- Yukl, G. (2009). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., Chavez, C., & Seifert, C. F. (2005). Assessing the construct validity and utility of two new influence tactics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 6, 705-725.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 2, 132-140.
- Yukl, G., Falbe, C. M., & Youn, J. Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behavior for managers. *Group and Organization Management*, 18, 1, 5-28.
- Yukl, G., Kim, H., & Falbe, C. M. (1996). Antecedents of influence outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 3, 309-317.
- Yukl, G., Lepsinger, R., & Lucia, A. (1992). Preliminary report on development and validation of the influence behavior questionnaire. In K. Clark, M. K. Clark and D. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 417-427). Greensboro: Center For Creative Leadership.
- Yukl, G., & Seifert, C. (2002). Preliminary validation of an extended version of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire. *Proceedings of the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology meetings*, Toronto, Canada.
- Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C. (2008). Validation of the extended Influence Behavior Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 5, 609-621.
- Yukl, G., & Tracey, B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 4, 525-535.
- Zaccaro, S. J. (2002). *The nature of executive leadership*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.