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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present research was to investigate managerial influence processes in Turkey and the USA. Two survey studies were conducted to explore three objectives. First, the role of core tactics (rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, and inspirational appeals) in target commitment was examined. Second, the impact of target commitment on the relationship between influence tactics and leadership effectiveness was investigated. Third, whether previous findings of earlier cross-cultural research with scenarios can be verified with a stronger research method was explored.

Unlike most prior research, which used data from the same source for all variables, data for the two types of variables were provided independently by different respondents. The influence tactics used by middle- and low-level managers were evaluated by subordinates, and leadership effectiveness of the managers was rated by bosses. Findings for both samples showed that the core tactics were related to target commitment and the ratings of managerial effectiveness. Target commitment partially mediated the effects of the influence tactics for the combined sample. Although the samples were not adequate to reach a conclusion about cross-cultural differences, the results seem to demonstrate that the core tactics are frequently used by both Turkish and American leaders. Implications of the study and suggestions for future research are provided.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives (Yukl, 2010). Influencing others is the essence of leadership, and one important form of influence for managers in organizations is the use of proactive influence tactics. An influence tactic is defined as the type of intentional behavior to change the attitudes and behaviors of another person (Yukl, 2010). Proactive tactics are used to influence subordinates, peers, and bosses.

Researchers have conducted field studies with questionnaires, incident studies, laboratory experiments, and scenario studies to identify distinct influence tactics, determine how and when they are used, and assess their effectiveness for different purposes. The most comprehensive and best validated taxonomy of proactive influence tactics includes eleven tactics that can be used by a leader (the "agent") with a target person such as a subordinate (Yukl, 2010). The success of an influence attempt depends on several things, including the combination and sequence of tactics that are used by a leader, the influence objective, and the agent’s position power, expertise, interpersonal skills, credibility, and integrity. To be successful in influencing people, it is helpful for the agent to accurately perceive the attitudes, values, and emotions of target persons and to have the skill to know which tactics are relevant and how to use them effectively.

The primary research objective in the current study is to determine the role of the core tactics in target commitment and investigate whether influence outcomes mediate the effects of leader influence behavior on ratings of leader effectiveness. A secondary objective is to replicate earlier studies and verify our current knowledge about the
influence tactics. Survey field studies were conducted in Turkey and the USA, and alternative models of casual effects of commitment on leadership effectiveness were compared.

The dissertation consists of six chapters. Research programs to identify influence tactics, effects of tactics on influence outcomes, and cross-cultural findings on influence behaviors are reviewed in Chapter 2. The research models and hypotheses to be tested are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 comprises the methodology of the research including the sample, the measures, and data collection procedures. Statistical analyses and evaluation of findings are explained in Chapter 5. The conclusion of the research along with the limitations and future research opportunities are discussed in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review includes several relevant topics. The first topic is research to identify distinct and relevant proactive influence tactics. The second topic is research on the effectiveness of different tactics, the third topic is cross-cultural research on influence tactics, and the fourth topic is single culture studies on the use of influence tactics.

Research to Identify Influence Tactics

Kipnis and Colleagues

The first systematic approach to measure the use of influence tactics in an organizational setting was made by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980). In their initial study to identify distinct influence tactics, 165 graduate students (75% men) employed in managerial roles as engineers, technicians, and professionals were asked to describe an incident in which they successfully influenced their boss, a co-worker, or a subordinate. Then, the researchers sorted these written incidents based on the following five goals sought from the target person when exercising influence: (1) obtaining the assistance of the target; (2) getting the target to do his or her own work; (3) obtaining personal benefits; (4) initiating change in work; and (5) improving target’s job performance. The respondents reported 370 influence tactics. Then, the researchers classified these tactics into 14 categories which were also found modestly reliable by the three raters.

The findings of the first study suggested that the choice of influence tactics were related to the expected objective of an influence attempt, the power of agent, and the resistance level of the target person. Depending on the target person’s status, the agent person sought different goals. The primary goal of influencing superiors was to obtain
personal benefits. To get assistance from the target was the main goal for influencing co-workers. The agent person exercised influence on subordinates when getting them to do their jobs. Initiating change was sought from superiors during job-related organizational changes, and the goal of improving target performance was sought from subordinates.

Some of the tactics identified in the first study were overlapping. In order to solve this problem, the researchers conducted a second study. They developed 58 tactic items from the first study for use in a preliminary questionnaire administered to 754 employed graduate students. Through the results of factor analyses, eight influence tactics were identified: assertiveness, friendliness or ingratiation, rationality or reason, bargaining or exchange, upward appeal, coalitions, blocking, and sanctions. Kipnis and Schmidt (1982) used the results to develop a questionnaire called the Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS). Several researchers later used the POIS to examine determinants and outcomes of the influence tactics (e.g. Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Erez & Rim, 1982; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988).

Schriesheim and Hinkin

Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) examined the validity and reliability of the Kipnis research. They criticized the research of Kipnis et al. (1980) because of using combined three subsamples to develop scales, having problems with the factor analysis, and not reaching acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability on several scales. The researchers conducted four studies to explore theoretical content validity and the factor structure of the scales. In the first study, the six influence strategies and 27 relevant items were taken from the Kipnis et al. (1980) study. The survey was administered to 34 senior business students during normal class time. The researchers used the definitions of six
influence strategies from the Kipnis et al. (1980) study, but they modified the definition of ingratiation which had not been defined adequately. The results of the first study showed that six items did not have strong content validity. To ensure these findings, 33 MBA students judged the content validity of the items. The same results were obtained from the judging process as well.

The second study was conducted to test the six Kipnis et al. (1980) scales with confirmatory factor analysis. The POIS were administered to 251 upper-level business undergraduates. The researchers factor-analyzed the 27 items and found only 21 items with strong construct validity. The results of Study 2 showed that the 21-item version (GFI= 0.86) was superior to the 27-item version (GFI=0.81). After deleting four additional items, the researchers found much better factor structure (GFI=0.89).

In Study 3 the original 58 scale items from the Kipnis et al. (1980) study along with eight additional items were used with a sample consisting of 281 MBA students. The initial analyses showed that tactics called Sanctions, Blocking, and Unclassified were weak and could be deleted. The replication analyses on the remaining 47 items (41 items from Kipnis et al. and six new items) supported the findings of Study 2. Confirmatory factor analyses showed that the scales of the 17-item instrument (GFI= 0.92) were better than either the 27-item scales (GFI= 0.85) or the 21-item scales (GFI= 0.87).

The researchers conducted the fourth study for the purpose of improving the 17-item scales. After considering the results of Study 3, some items were deleted or replaced by new ones. The final questionnaire with 18 items was administered to 181 university staff personnel. With a good factor structure and high goodness of fit index (0.93), this revised POIS verified psychometrically valid six tactics: assertiveness, ingratiation,
rationality, coalition, exchange, and upward appeal. In their conclusion, Schriesheim and Hinkin evaluated their study as a starting point for the future research.

**Hochwarter and Colleagues**

Hochwarter et al. (2000) reexamined the Schriesheim and Hinkin’s (1990) measure to see if the scale is psychometrically sound. First, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to assess the construct validity of scores. Second, convergent and discriminant validity were assessed to evaluate the nomological utility of the scale scores. In this respect, the relationship between the measure and related constructs such as need for power, self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, locus of control, and collective efficacy were investigated to assess the convergent validity of the scale. Two different measures of influence (Wayne & Green, 1993; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991) were used to demonstrate discriminant validity of Schriesheim and Hinkin’s (1990) scale. Finally, the survey data were gathered from four independent samples at two different periods to assess the factor structure, convergent, and discriminant validity of scores on the measure. 279 working undergraduate students (43 % female) in Sample 1 and 110 clerical personnel (99 % female) of a large university in Sample 2 completed surveys. The data were gathered from 331 administrative personnel (61 % female) for Sample 3 and from 418 technical and support employees (85 % female) for Sample 4.

The results across four samples showed that internal consistency reliability estimates of eight out of 24 subscales failed to meet the .70 minimum threshold suggested by Nunnally (1978). The researchers considered a variety of goodness-of-fit indices to examine the construct validity of the Schriesheim and Hinkin’s (1990) 18-item scale. The results of confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the fit indices were only
marginally within the ranges of acceptability. The correlations between Schriesheim and Hinkin’s (1990) factors and related constructs were low to moderate, so the convergent validity assessment for the four samples demonstrated reasonable consistency. Finally, in discriminant validity assessment, the researchers found that Schriesheim and Hinkin’s (1990) scale correlated with the factors of other measures of social influence. In summary, with low reliability estimates and as a result of the problems with research design (e.g. gathering data from undergraduate students, examining the limited range of variables, and using a single survey to measure all variables), the researchers found very limited psychometric support for the revised version of POIS.

**Yukl and Colleagues**

Yukl and Falbe (1990) conducted research with two methods to extend the earlier research on influence tactics and identify additional influence behaviors and objectives. The researchers used new items to develop the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ). Some of the items in the IBQ represented six of the tactics in the POIS, including assertiveness, rationality, ingratiation, exchange, upward appeals, and coalitions. Two new influence behaviors inspirational appeals and consultation were identified and included in the IBQ. Blocking and sanctions items from the Kipnis et al. (1980) research were not included in the IBQ because of conceptual problems and infrequent use. The preliminary questionnaire was administered to 293 MBA students and managers in several companies. After a variety of analyses, the researchers revised and shortened the questionnaire.

Another important contribution of Yukl and Falbe (1990) study was to examine a broader list of influence objectives, including important objectives from the managerial
literature that were not represented in Kipnis et al. study. In the preliminary analyses, Yukl and Falbe considered 12 influence objectives. Then, the list was shortened and the following eight objectives were included in the revised questionnaire as a separate section: (1) ask the person to do a new task or work on a new project or account; (2) ask the person to do a task faster or better; (3) ask the person to change his/her policies, plans, or procedures to accommodate your needs; (4) ask the person to provide advice or help in solving a problem; (5) ask the person to give or loan you additional resources such as funds, supplies, materials, or use of equipment, facilities, or personnel; (6) ask the person to give a formal approval or signoff on a proposal, product, report, or document; (7) ask the person to support your proposals in a meeting with other managers or clients; and (8) ask for information needed to work do your work.

Yukl and Falbe (1990) developed agent and target versions of the IBQ and used both of them in their research to examine directional differences for influence objectives. The results addressed the limitations of earlier research efforts, provided a better understanding of influence attempts from the perspective of an agent and a target, and discovered frequently used tactics regardless the status of target person. Follow-up studies (Yukl, Falbe, & Youn, 1993; Yukl, Guinan, & Sottolano, 1995; Yukl, Lepsinger, & Lucia, 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) provided additional evidence for the validity of the initial 9 tactics.

Yukl, Chavez, and Seifert (2005) conducted multi-method research to examine the construct validity and effectiveness of two new tactics called collaboration and apprising. The extended target IBQ was used with subordinates and peers, and a confirmatory factor analysis found that the two new tactics were distinct from the 9 tactics in the earlier
version of the IBQ. The researchers also conducted an incident study, and the findings provided more evidence for the construct validity of the new tactics. Finally, an experiment study was conducted to assess the differential causal effect of selected tactics on target commitment. Overall, the results from the different methods demonstrated very consistent results, providing strong support for the new tactics.

Yukl, Seifert, and Chavez (2008) evaluated a version of the extended IBQ with items grouped into tactic scales in a survey study with samples of target subordinates and peers. The confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the convergent and discriminant validity of the 11 tactic scales of the target IBQ. The researchers also found adequate convergent validity of the target IBQ with similar tactics in the target version of the revised POIS for a sample of evening MBA students with daytime jobs. Consistent with the findings of the earlier research (Yukl & Tracy, 1992; Yukl et al., 2005), criterion-related validity for target commitment showed that the 11 tactics are distinct and relevant for influencing subordinates, peers, and bosses. Stability of tactic scale scores, relation of tactics to the quality of leader-member exchange relationship, relation of tactics to agent effectiveness, and lack of bias from rater characteristics also indicated that the reliability and validity of the 11 scales of the target IBQ were adequate. Yukl and colleagues concluded that the target IBQ is a better measure than the POIS for research interpersonal influence behavior in organizations. The target IBQ is more accurate than the agent version, and the validation evidence for it is extensive (Yukl, Seifert & Chavez, 2008). Definitions of the 11 proactive influence tactics are shown in Table 1, and a comparison of different types of tactics from the reviewed research programs is presented in Table 2.
Table 1

Definitions of the Influence Tactics (Adapted from Yukl, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rational Persuasion:</strong></th>
<th>The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show a proposal or request is feasible and relevant for attaining important task objectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apprising:</strong></td>
<td>The agent explains how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or help advance the target person’s career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Appeals:</strong></td>
<td>The agent makes an appeal to values and ideals of seeks to arouse the target person’s emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation:</strong></td>
<td>The agent encourages the target to suggest improvements in a proposal, or to help plan an activity of change for which the target person’s support and assistance are desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange:</strong></td>
<td>The agent offers an incentive, suggests an exchange of favors, or indicates willingness to reciprocate at a later time if the target will do what the agent requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration:</strong></td>
<td>The agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Appeals:</strong></td>
<td>The agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation:</strong></td>
<td>The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an influence attempt or expresses confidence in the target’s ability to carry out a difficult task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimating Tactics:</strong></td>
<td>The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify authority to make it by referring to rules, formal policies, or official documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressure:</strong></td>
<td>The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent reminders to influence the target person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coalition Tactics:</strong></td>
<td>The agent seeks the aid of others to persuade the target to do something of uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Comparison of Research Programs on Influence Tactics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>Rational Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Appeal Coalition</td>
<td>Upward Appeal Coalition</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apprising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effects of Tactics on Influence Outcomes

An influence attempt can result in one of three different outcomes called commitment, compliance, and resistance (Yukl, 2010). Commitment is achieved when the target person internalizes the request and carries it out enthusiastically. Compliance occurs when the target person is willing to do what the agent asks but just put the minimal effort. Resistance occurs when the target person opposes the request and actively tries to avoid carrying it out.

The outcome of influence attempt depends on the situation and whether the agent is trusted by the target and perceived to have integrity (Yukl, 2010). Commitment is the most desirable outcome for a difficult and complex task, whereas the influence attempt may result in compliance for a simple and routine request. Resistance is usually regarded as an undesirable outcome. However, it can be beneficial if the target person has valid reasons, helps the agent to make a better decision, and/or avoids a harmful mistake (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). Several research methods have been used to investigate the effectiveness of influence tactics and outcomes of influence attempts.

Yukl and Tracey

Yukl and Tracey (1992) conducted a survey field study to assess the effectiveness of different influence tactics for influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors. Target task commitment and performance ratings for the agent-manager were the criteria of influence success. The researchers used the 1990 version of the IBQ to measure influence tactics. To measure target commitment, the respondents were asked to evaluate how many influence attempts by the agent resulted in their complete commitment. Managerial effectiveness was measured with another item with nine-response choices. The results
indicated that rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and consultation were the tactics with the strongest relationship to task commitment in all influence directions. Similarly, effectiveness ratings were correlated positively with those three tactics, whereas the remaining tactics were negative or insignificant.

**Falbe and Yukl**

Falbe and Yukl (1992) conducted a study using critical incidents research to assess the outcome of each tactic used alone and in combination. The results showed that hard tactics were generally less effective than soft tactics with regards to the influence outcomes. Consultation and inspirational appeals usually resulted in commitment, but rational persuasion was not strongly related to target commitment. Rational persuasion was found more effective when used with other soft tactics. Legitimating, coalition, and pressure tactics usually resulted in compliance or resistance, and the remaining tactics (ingratiation, personal appeals, and exchange) were most likely to result in compliance.

**Yukl, Kim, and Falbe**

Yukl, Kim, and Falbe (1996) conducted another incident research in order to investigate why the outcomes for rational persuasion were not stronger in the earlier study. They classified rational persuasion into strong and weak forms. Strong rational persuasion was defined as providing a clear and detailed explanation of the request and analyzing costs and benefits of the request with the supporting evidence. Weak rational persuasion was defined as a brief explanation of reasons without supporting evidence. The findings showed that strong rational persuasion usually resulted in target commitment, as did consultation and inspirational appeals. The lack of a significant relationship between weak rational persuasion and target commitment explained the

**Yukl, Kim, and Chavez**

The follow-up experimental research by Yukl, Kim, and Chavez (1999) confirmed the effectiveness of strong form of rational persuasion as well. The multi-method study by Yukl et al. (2005) found that collaboration was highly effective and often resulted in target commitment. The other new tactic, apprising was not as effective, but it usually resulted either in compliance or commitment.

**Schilit and Locke**

Schilit and Locke (1982) conducted a critical incident study to investigate the upward influence process from the perspectives of both the supervisor and the subordinate. The researchers generated a comprehensive list of strategies used by subordinates, and then two sets of undergraduate students collected data. In the first set (83 students), each student interviewed a subordinate to determine the influence methods she used to influence her supervisor. In the second sample (70 students), each student interviewed a supervisor to determine the influence methods used by his subordinates to influence him.

The results indicated that both subordinates and supervisors considered “logically to present ideas” as the most common method of influence in successful situations than in unsuccessful situations. This tactic is similar to rational persuasion. Both supervisors and subordinates agreed on the outcomes of influence attempts, and the adoption of a new policy and an increase in productivity were found as the most common outcomes of successful influence attempts. The results also showed that structural differences (e.g. small or private vs. large or public) affected the influence process.
Kipnis and Schmidt

Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) investigated the effects of influence tactics on performance evaluations, salaries, and reported stress for the subordinates. The researchers first grouped managers into four influence styles based on the tactics they reported using to influence their subordinates. Shotgun managers gave greater importance to influence and used assertiveness and bargaining tactics. Ingratiators frequently used the friendliness strategy to influence others. Tactician managers used more reasoning and logic. Bystander managers did not attempt to influence others and had low scores on all of the strategies.

After developing this way to classify agents in terms of their influence strategies, the researchers conducted three studies to test to examine the consequences for agents of using each strategy. In Study 1, the data were gathered from 59 blue-collar subordinates and their immediate supervisors. The sample for Study 2 included 113 more skilled, white collar subordinates. The results of these two studies indicated that the upward influence strategies of subordinates affected their performance evaluations by bosses. Shotgun-style individuals both male and female subordinates received less favorable evaluations. Among the men, tacticians received the highest ratings. Among the women, ingratitators in the first study and bystanders in the second study received the highest evaluations.

To find out the impact of influence styles on salary and stress, 108 CEOs of profit and nonprofits hospitals were surveyed in the third study. The researchers found that salary was associated with influence style. Tacticians earned more than CEOs with the other three influence strategy profiles. Job tension and personal stress were also found to be
related to influence style. Shotguns reported more job tension and personal stress than the other groups. Tacticians experienced the least amount of job tension and personal stress. Overall, the researchers concluded that upward-influence strategies played an important role on individual outcomes from work.

Summary

The overall pattern of findings in several types of studies showed that consultation, inspirational appeal, collaboration, and strong forms of rational persuasion were more likely than the other tactics to elicit target commitment to a request made to subordinates or peers. The research found that apprising, ingratiation, exchange, and personal appeal are moderately effective tactics, whereas coalition, legitimating, and pressure are the least effective influence tactics. Rational persuasion was also very effective in upward influence attempts, but results for using the other core tactics to influence bosses were less clear (few studies examined upward influence using all 11 tactics in the Yukl taxonomy). How well a leader uses the 11 influence tactics to influence subordinates, peers, and bosses is related to indicators of leadership effectiveness (Yukl, 2010).

Cross-Cultural Findings on Influence Behaviors

Cross-cultural leadership research has been used to determine the extent to which effective leadership practices differ across cultures (Smith & Peterson, 2002; Yukl, 2010). Because of the complexity and diversity of cultural attributes affecting leadership, research on this subject is difficult to conduct and progress has been slow (Yukl, 2010; Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003). Although cross-cultural research studies have expanded in the last 20 years to fill this knowledge gap (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997; Dorfman, 1996), theoretical and methodological problems are substantial and it is
difficult to find strong, consistent relationships (Dorfman, 2004; Smith, 2006; Earley, 2006).

Not much is known yet about the effectiveness of different influence tactics in diverse cultural settings. Most of the research on influence tactics has been conducted in the USA or western Europe, and the survey measures of tactics were all developed in the USA. However, in the past two decades several researchers have examined the effectiveness of proactive influence tactics in other cultures.

**Kipnis and Colleagues**

Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, and Wilkinson (1984) surveyed 121 British, 126 Australian, and 113 American managers. The researchers used the POIS to measure the use of seven tactics described by Kipnis et al. (1980). The results showed that the frequency of tactics was identical for managers in these three English-speaking countries. The researchers also found three variables that affected a manager’s selection of influence strategies, namely relative power, the influence objectives, and the agent's expectation of the target person’s willingness to comply.”

**Hirokawa and Miyahara**

Hirokawa and Miyahara (1986) compared the influence tactics used by 75 American and 65 Japanese managers. The managers were given two work-related scenarios and asked to respond in writing how they would influence subordinates in each situation. One scenario described an obligatory task and the other scenario described a non-obligatory task. The results revealed that for obligatory actions, American managers used punishment-based strategies such as threat or warning, while Japanese managers relied on duty or counseling. For non-obligatory actions, the researchers found some differences
as well. Japanese managers preferred to use altruism or duty, whereas direct request, promise, and ingratiation were preferred by American managers.

**Schermerhorn and Bond**

Schermerhorn and Bond (1991) designed a comparative scenario study of influence tactics used by Hong Kong Chinese and American managers. In downward influence attempts, consistent with the prior research, both American and Hong Kong Chinese managers preferred to use ingratiation, assertiveness, blocking, exchange, upward appeal, and sanctions. Hong Kong Chinese were more likely than Americans to prefer the assertiveness, whereas Americans preferred ingratiation, rationality, and exchange more than Hong Kong Chinese managers.

**Fu and Yukl**

Fu and Yukl (2000) conducted an exploratory study to examine how Chinese and American managers perceive the effectiveness of different tactics and whether there are culturally-specific influence tactics. Scenarios were used to assess perception of tactic effectiveness in various conditions. In order to strengthen the research design, subsamples of Chinese and American managers were interviewed to make sure the perception of an influence tactic were related to the actual use of the tactic. The researchers gathered data from two different samples from each country. The first sample included 41 American and 42 Chinese managers from the same multinational company that had two manufacturing facilities both in China and the USA. The scenario questionnaire was administered to the managers in the focal country, and then the researchers interviewed with 30 managers. To generalize the findings of the study, the second sample consisting of 42 American middle and lower level managers in four
different companies and 46 Chinese managers in six state-owned companies were obtained. Consistent with cross-cultural differences (Hofstede, 1980), the results showed that American managers evaluated rational persuasion and exchange more effective than their Chinese counterparts. Coalition, upward appeals, and gifts received higher ratings from Chinese managers. American and Chinese managers were similar in their ratings of likely effectiveness for pressure and ingratiation.

Yukl, Fu, and McDonald

Yukl, Fu, and McDonald (2003) conducted two exploratory studies to understand the perceived effectiveness of various influence tactics for initiating and resisting change in different cultures. The first scenario study compared the influence behaviors of 83 American, 88 Chinese, and 43 Swiss middle and lower-level managers from manufacturing companies. Respondents evaluated the effectiveness of each tactic for influencing the target person to accomplish the objective described in the scenario. The results showed that the influence tactics (e.g. rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, objections, substitution) that involved direct confrontation to resolve a disagreement were rated highly by American and Swiss managers, but the Chinese managers preferred tactics (e.g. upward appeals, use of an informal context) involving the use more indirect approaches.

The second study was conducted to replicate the findings of the first study for American and Chinese managers. The researchers revised the scenarios and gathered data from different samples. The respondents were 135 American, 157 Hong Kong, and 170 mainland China middle and lower-level managers from different organizations. Most of the results found in Study 1 were replicated successfully in Study 2. Direct
tactics had higher effectiveness ratings from American and Hong Kong managers than from mainland China managers, but indirect forms of influence tactics had higher effectiveness ratings by the mainland Chinese managers than by American and Hong Kong managers. The researchers concluded that perceptions and use of influence tactics were consistent with cultural values and traditions.

**Fu, Kennedy, Tata, et al.**

Fu, Kennedy, Tata, et al. (2004) investigated the impact of societal cultural values and individual social beliefs on the perceived effectiveness of different influence strategies. The initial set of 16 influence tactics was categorized into three meta-categories. Rational persuasion, inspirational appeal, and consultation were counted as part of the persuasive strategy. The assertive strategy included persistence, pressure, and upward appeals. The relationship-based strategy included giving gifts, personal appeal, socializing, and exchange. The findings showed that individual social beliefs and national cultural values affect the perceived effectiveness of the three types of influence strategies. The persuasive strategy received the highest effectiveness ratings whereas the relationship-based strategy was rated the lowest. This study showed that despite some cross-cultural differences, the "most effective" tactics were the same in each country included in the sample.

**Fu, Peng, Kennedy, and Yukl**

Fu, Peng, Kennedy, and Yukl (2004) compared the use of influence tactics in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and mainland China. Using scenario-based questionnaires, the researchers tried to understand the perceived effectiveness of 16 influence tactics. Rational persuasion, apprising, and collaboration were rated as the most effective tactics in all
three countries. However, significant differences among the three groups of managers were found for inspirational appeal, consultation, and ingratiation. Unexpectedly, the relationship-building tactics such as personal appeal, gift-giving, socializing, and informal approach were rated as ineffective. The researchers pointed out the importance of being sensitive when interacting with Chinese managers and not to ignore the variation within the Chinese diaspora.

**Kennedy and Colleagues**

Kennedy, Fu, and Yukl (2003) conducted a cross-cultural study to explore the following research questions: (a) identifying influence tactics that were universally accepted effective across cultures, (b) identifying tactics that were universally considered ineffective across cultures, and (c) investigating whether perceptions of tactic effectiveness are related to cultural values and country clusters. The researchers collected data from 12 different countries with a scenario-based questionnaire administered to managers from various industries in each country. Some scenarios involved influencing subordinates, some involved influencing peers, and some involved influencing bosses. Each scenario included a brief description of the influence situation followed by a list of several influence tactics that may be relevant for that situation. Respondents were asked to rate the likely effectiveness of each tactic for influencing the target persons in that situation. The mean effectiveness rating for each type of tactic was computed for each direction of influence and for each country subsample.

The results showed that the four core tactics (rational persuasion, consultation, collaboration, and apprising) were perceived by managers in all 12 nations to be effective tactics for influencing subordinates and peers. Gift-giving, socializing, use of an
informal setting, and the use of pressure were relatively ineffective tactics. There was a consistent relationship between the tactic effectiveness ratings and cultural values. This study was the first cross-cultural study on influence tactics to include Turkish managers. The 106 Turkish managers in the sample rated the core tactics more effective and ranked these tactics in the top five. Similarly, American managers (N = 103) rated the core tactics as the most effective tactics.

Summary

Cross-cultural research on influence tactics has provided limited insights to us because of methodological and theoretical issues. The findings from different studies were sometimes inconsistent. In general, scholars used the Hofstede’s cultural model or GLOBE’s cultural values to explain the variation of influence behaviors in different cultures (e.g. Fu & Yukl, 2000; Fu et al., 2004). Sometimes, it can be hard to explain all differences with these two seminal cross-cultural projects. Thus, more cross-cultural research is needed to investigate differences in the actual pattern of leadership behavior in each country and differences in the relationship of leadership behavior to outcomes.

Single Culture Studies outside the USA on Influence Behaviors

Greece

Tyrovola, Papanikolaou, and Adamis (2012) recently examined influence tactics in Greek organizations. Their sample of 136 employees (45 % males) in five public and private organizations were asked to rate the influence behavior of their bosses with the IBQ. The researchers explored the perceived use of influence tactics and the relationship of each tactic with demographic variables including gender, age, education level, and salary. The most often used tactics were legitimating (M = 3.58), ingratiation (M = 3.31),
consultation (M = 3.28), and rational persuasion (M = 3.26) whereas the least frequent tactics were coalition (M = 2.11), exchange (M = 2.07), and personal appeals (M = 2.07).

**Spain**

Corts, Jace, and Diaz (2009) investigated the effectiveness of different combinations of downward influence tactics in Spain. Considering the prior studies (Yukl et al., 1991; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985), the researchers identified four broad influence patterns: strong pattern (intensive use of hard tactics), rational pattern (intensive use of rational and soft tactics), active pattern (intensive use of all hard, soft, and rational tactics), and passive pattern (less use of influence tactics). The effectiveness of these patterns was explored in terms of subordinates’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and psychological well-being. The Spanish version of 36-item IBQ was used to measure the influence behaviors of Spanish managers. The sample included 209 employees (52% female) from seven different hotel chains.

The results showed that majority of Spanish managers preferred to use soft or rational tactics or not use any influence tactics. The number of managers using the active or intensive patterns was very low. The study also provided new insights about the effectiveness of patterns. Managers’ influence patterns were found to be related to the criterion variables. In this respect, when managers employed active and rational influence patterns, it helped to enhance organizational commitment, satisfaction, and well-being among the subordinates. However, the use of strong and passive patterns did not have favorable outcomes. The researchers concluded that those who combined most influence tactics were the most effective.
Netherlands

Bennebroek Gravenhorst and Boonstra (1998) investigated the use of influence tactics in constructive change processes. First, the influence behaviors of four groups including line managers, staff specialists, consultants, and works council delegates were examined. Second, differences in direction of influence were explored. The sample consisted of 479 participants, and the Dutch version of the IBQ was used to measure the influence tactics.

The overall rankings showed that line managers, staff specialists, and consultants employed the same tactics. For these three groups, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and consultation were the most frequently used tactics, whereas personal appeals, exchange, and coalition were the least used tactics. Pressure was the most frequently used tactic for work council delegates. Some of the results about the direction of influence attempts were consistent, but some of them were inconsistent with the findings of the previous studies (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993). The researchers underlined the situational factors and cultural differences between the USA and the Netherlands to justify and explain their unexpected results.

Summary

Single culture studies outside the US have provided more detailed explanation on leader influence behaviors in certain cultures than cross-cultural studies. However, inconsistent findings with the cross-cultural research raise some questions about the construct validity of single culture studies and the generalizability of findings. Therefore, researchers should conduct more research to verify and replicate the actual pattern of leadership behavior in each country.
Influence tactics are aimed at getting the target person to carry out a request, complete a task, support a proposed change, or provide assistance on a project (Yukl, 2010). Leaders must influence other people in order to achieve desired organizational outcomes and to be perceived as effective. As noted in the preceding chapter, the research on effects of tactics found that the four core tactics are closely related to organizational outcomes in US. Because one objective of this study is to replicate earlier studies and verify our current knowledge about the influence tactics, the following hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis 1:** The core tactics are positively related to leadership effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 2:** The core tactics are positively related to subordinate commitment to a request.

Target commitment is the desired outcome of most influence attempts. When target persons are committed to carry out a request, they are more likely to do it effectively. As long as the requests are relevant ones for carrying out the mission of the leader's work unit, target commitment will enhance the performance of the work unit. A few studies have examined the implications of target commitment for leadership effectiveness, and they found a positive relationship (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl et al., 2005). To verify this finding, the following hypothesis was tested in the current study:

**Hypothesis 3:** Subordinate commitment is positively related to leadership effectiveness.

The mediating role of influence outcomes for subordinates on leader effectiveness has not been investigated in prior research. Researchers generally have conducted exploratory studies, but there is not an integrative model or theory to describe how...
influence tactics and other factors jointly determine leader effectiveness. In this respect, there is a strong need to develop theories about the mediating processes and facilitating conditions for influence tactics (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). A major objective of the present research was to explore the links among the core influence tactics, target commitment to a request, and leader effectiveness, so the following hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis 4a:** The relationship between the core tactics and leadership effectiveness is partially mediated by the subordinate commitment to a request.

**Hypothesis 4b:** The relationship between the core tactics and leadership effectiveness is entirely mediated by the subordinate commitment to a request.

The relationships can be described in terms of the three alternative causal models that are shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3. The direct effects described in Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are depicted in Figure 1. The mediation effects described in Hypotheses 4a and 4b are represented in Figures 2 and 3.
Figure 1
Direct Effects Model

Figure 2
Partial Mediation Model

Figure 3
Full Mediation Model
CHAPTER 4: METHODS

Two survey field studies were conducted to test the research objectives. The data were gathered from the US and Turkey. Group-level relationships among managers, subordinates, and bosses were examined to find out how middle-level and low-level managers interact with subordinates and superiors. This chapter describes the samples, data collection procedures, and measures.

Sample and Procedures

Sample 1

Influence behaviors of Turkish managers were examined in the first study. The sample included 138 subordinates and 46 bosses of middle- and low-level managers from nine Turkish companies in different industries (e.g. transportation, education, retail stores, telecommunication, and medical). Bosses evaluated the overall effectiveness of the managers, and three randomly chosen subordinates who had worked with the manager at least six months rated the manager's use of the influence tactics and the level of commitment to requests by the manager.

The average age of respondents was 40 for managers, 32 for subordinates, and 34 for bosses. The gender composition of managers was 55 percent females and 45 percent males. The gender composition of subordinates was almost equal, and a slight majority of the bosses were females. A majority of the managers and bosses were college graduates whereas subordinates were a mix of high school and college graduates. The average tenure of the managers was two years. The average working time together for a manager and boss was 2.0 years, and for a manager and subordinate it was 2.5 years.
Sample 2

The second sample was from a large regional grocery retailer in the USA. The sample included 27 store managers and 130 of their subordinates. This sample was part of a study on the effects of behavioral feedback to managers, but the data used for my study was obtained from the premeasure survey before any intervention was used. Subordinates rated how often their manager used the 11 proactive influence tactics in influence attempts with them, and subordinates also indicated their commitment to carry out the manager's requests. Immediate bosses for each focal manager evaluated the overall effectiveness of managers (some bosses supervised more than one of the focal managers). The age of the focal managers varied from 30 to 54, and the mean age was 44. In the sample of focal managers, 69 percent were males and 31 percent were females. Because of confidentiality concerns, demographic information was not obtained for the subordinates and bosses who provided the data for the study.

Data Collection Procedure

Snowball sampling is not generally used within a quantitative research strategy because the sample is unlikely represent the entire population. However, it is a better approach when investigating relationships and tracing connections between people (Bryman, 2004). In this respect, snowball sampling was used to collect the Turkish sample. The researcher contacted his friends who were working in various Turkish companies, and they in turn contacted other people who could provide relevant data. Then, the researcher met with each focal manager to explain the research objectives. If a manager agreed to participate in the study, the questionnaires were administered to the person's boss and subordinates at a convenient time.
The US sample was part of a separate study on the effects of leadership training. The researchers met the participants in a room and administered the survey. To protect confidentiality, participants were identified with a specific code number in both the Turkish and US samples, and aside from demographics, no personal information was requested.

**Measures**

**Measure of Influence Behavior**

A focal manager's use of influence tactics was measured with the Influence Behavior Questionnaire. The recent article by Yukl, Seifert, and Chavez (2008) can be examined for detailed information about the validity of the IBQ. The target version of the questionnaire measures how often a manager uses different proactive influence tactics. The data used in this study were from 16 items on the four core tactics. Sample items for the core tactics are shown in Table 3. Each item has the following five-choice response format:

1. I can’t remember him/her ever using this tactic with me
2. He/she very seldom uses this tactic with me
3. He/she occasionally uses this tactic with me
4. He/she uses this tactic moderately often with me
5. He/she uses this tactic very often with me
Table 3
Sample IBQ Items for the Core Tactics

- Uses facts and logic to make a persuasive case for a request or proposal (Rational Persuasion)
- Explains clearly why a request or proposed change is necessary to attain a task objective (Rational Persuasion)
- Asks you to suggest things you could do to help him/her achieve a task objective or resolve a problem (Consultation)
- Consults with you to get your ideas about a proposed activity or change that he/she wants you to support or implement (Consultation)
- Says a proposed activity or change is an opportunity to do something really exciting and worthwhile (Inspirational Appeal)
- Describes a clear, inspiring vision of what a proposed project or change could accomplish (Inspirational Appeal)
- Offers to provide any assistance you need to carry out a request (Collaboration)
- Offers to provide resources you would need to do a task for him/her (Collaboration)
For the sample used in Turkey, the questionnaires were translated to Turkish and back translated to English to check in the accuracy of the translation. The name of some tactics and items in the Turkish questionnaire were slightly changed to avoid any misunderstandings. The coefficient alpha for the core tactics composite score for Turkish sample was .92 and for the US sample it was .83. Each subordinate individually evaluated how often the manager uses each tactic in influence attempts with the subordinate, then the scores for a manager's subordinates were aggregated in order to obtain a composite group-level score for each manager.

**Measure of Influence Outcomes**

Target commitment to a request was measured with a three-item scale. The coefficient alphas for the Turkish and the US versions were .89 and .84 respectively. In both samples, subordinates rated how many influence attempts by the manager resulted in their complete commitment. This scale has been widely used by other researchers, and the findings in the literature showed that the scale provides accurate scores about target commitment (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl et al., 2005). Subordinates rated the following three items with five-point response choices, then the individual scores were aggregated to obtain a group-level commitment score for each manager.

- How many influence attempts by this person resulted in your complete commitment?
- How often did the person successfully influence you to do something?
- How effective is this person in influencing you to carry out requests and support proposals?
Measure of Overall Leader Effectiveness

Overall leader effectiveness was measured with a single item scale. The boss of the manager rated the overall effectiveness of the manager in carrying out his/her job responsibilities. The findings in the literature showed that this scale provides accurate scores about leader effectiveness (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl et al., 2005, 2008). The response choices on the scale are as follows:

1. The least effective manager I have known.
2. Well below average, in the bottom 10%.
3. Moderately below average, in the bottom 25%.
4. A little below average, in the bottom 40%.
5. About average in effectiveness.
6. A little above average, in the top 40%.
7. Moderately above average, in the top 25%.
8. Well above average, in the top 10%.
9. The most effective manager I have known.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

The results are presented in two sections. Some analyses were conducted separately for the Turkish and the US samples. Then, the two samples were combined and relationships were examined for the larger, more diverse sample. The analyses were made at group level (see Appendix for individual level correlations among variables).

The means and standard deviations for the 11 influence tactics are shown in Table 4 for the Turkish and American managers. Even though the samples were too small for a good cross-cultural comparison, the t-tests for differences in means were computed. This part of the study was exploratory and no hypotheses were tested. The results are shown in Table 4. American managers used rational persuasion and consultation more often than Turkish managers. The Turkish managers used legitimating, exchange, personal appeals, pressure, and coalition tactics more often than did the American managers. There was no significant difference for rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and consultation. Hard or supplementary tactics such as legitimating, pressure, or exchange were frequently used by Turkish managers. These results should be verified in future research with larger, more equivalent samples, and the reasons for any differences explored.

The means, standard deviations, and correlations for variables used in the test of hypotheses are shown separately for each sample in Tables 5 and 6. Consistent with Hypotheses 1 and 2, the core tactics were significantly related to target commitment and leader effectiveness both in Turkish and the American samples. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, there was also a significant correlation between target commitment and leader effectiveness in both samples.
Table 4  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Mean Differences of Influence Tactics for the Turkish and American Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish Managers</th>
<th>American Managers</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 46</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimating</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Persuasion</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprising</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Appeal</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Appeals</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01
### Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Key Variables in the Turkish Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Tactics</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 46 groups.

* p < .05

** p < .01

### Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Key Variables in the US Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Tactics</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 27 groups.

* p < .05

** p < .01
Although there are significant relationships among variables, bivariate correlations do not provide evidence about joint effects of the correlated independent variables on the dependent variable. Therefore, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted, and the Baron and Kenny’s (1986) criteria were used to evaluate whether target commitment fully or partially mediates the relationship between core tactics and leadership effectiveness. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), four criteria need to be completed for full mediation. First, the independent variable and the mediator must be significantly correlated. Second, there must be a significant relationship between the mediator variable and the dependent variable. Third, the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable must be significant. Fourth, for full mediation, after controlling the mediator variable, the independent variable and the dependent variable should not be significantly correlated. If the independent variable and the mediator are both significantly related to the dependent variable after the mediator variable is included, then the results support partial mediation.

As already noted, the first three conditions were supported by the bivariate correlations. In order to test the fourth requirement, a two-step hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. Tables 7 and 8 show the results for each sample. In the second step, target commitment to a request was significantly related to leadership effectiveness, while the core tactics were not significantly correlated to the dependent variable. These results from two different samples showed that consistent with Hypothesis 4b, commitment as an influence outcome appears to be a full mediator between the core tactics and leadership effectiveness.
Table 7

Result for Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Predictors of Leader Effectiveness for the Turkish Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |        | .35    | .41    |
| R²            |        | .34    | .38    |
| Adjusted R²   | 23.63**|        | 14.73**|
| F Change      |        |        |        |

Note. N = 46 groups.

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table 8
Result for Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Predictors of Leader Effectiveness for the US Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Tactics</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.88**</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>15.07**</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 27 groups.

* p < .05
** p < .01

Although it was not hypothesized, the influence behaviors of Greek managers from the Tyrovola et al.’s (2012) study and Turkish managers from the present research were also statistically tested. Results of Wilcoxon Singed Ranks non-parametric test showed no difference (z = -.31, p > .05) between the ranked mean scores of Greek and Turkish managers. In other words, how frequently the influence tactics were used in Greece and Turkey was similar.

The Turkish and the US samples were relatively small for testing mediation effects. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores for the two samples. As shown
in Table 9, there were no significant differences between samples for any of the means on the 
three variables used for this analysis. Therefore, the two samples were combined and research 
hypotheses were retested for the larger sample.

Table 9

Mean Differences for Key Variables in the Turkish and the US Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>TURKEY</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Tactics</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 46 groups for the Turkish sample and 27 groups for the US sample.

Degrees of freedom for the Core Tactics, Commitment, and Effectiveness are 71, 71, and 71 
respectively.

Table 10 shows descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for the combined sample. Consistent with Hypotheses 1 and 2, the core tactics were significantly related to commitment and 
leader effectiveness. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, the relationship between target commitment to 
a request and leader effectiveness was significant as well. Similar to the independent analyses on 
separate samples, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted and Baron and 
Kenny’s criteria were used to test the hypothesized mediation models. As we can see in Table 10, 
the core tactics, commitment, and leader effectiveness were significantly correlated. In other
words, the first three criteria in Baron and Kenny’s approach were supported. A two-step hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to test the fourth criteria. In the second step, both core tactics and commitment were significantly related to leadership effectiveness (see Table 11). Therefore, consistent with Hypothesis 4a, commitment partially mediates the relationship between the core tactics and leadership effectiveness.

Table 10
Means, Standard Deviations, Coefficient Alphas, and Correlations for the Combined Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core Tactics</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 73 groups.

* p < .05
** p < .01
Table 1

Result for Hierarchical Regression Analysis for the Combined Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Effectiveness</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Tactics</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>6.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>37.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.83**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 73 groups.

* p < .05

** p < .01
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

There has been considerable research on the influence tactics and leadership effectiveness over the past thirty years. Scholars successfully defined 11 influence tactics and developed reliable and valid scales. However, we are still in need of more efforts to expand our perspective about influence behaviors. The present research was the first study to investigate joint effects of the core tactics and target commitment on leader effectiveness. The survey studies from Turkey and the US provided insightful findings about the influence process in the leadership literature.

As discussed in the literature review, scholars found out that the use of four core tactics increases leadership effectiveness. Similarly, analyzing the Turkish and the US samples separately showed that effective leaders use the four core tactics when influencing their subordinates and the core tactics resulted in target commitment. The significant relationship between target commitment and leadership effectiveness was also consistent with findings in the previous research.

An important contribution of the present study was to examine target commitment to a request as the mediator between the core tactics and leader effectiveness. However, results for the separate country samples were not the same as the results for the combined samples. In the larger combined sample, only partial mediation was found for target commitment instead of the full mediation found for the separate country samples.

The findings of the separate sample analyses for Hypothesis 4 are questionable in light of previous research findings about effective leadership practices. It is not reasonable to expect that committed subordinates are the only determinant of leadership effectiveness. Testing the hypothesized relationship with an adequate sample can be more explanatory.
and appropriate. Since the Turkish and the US samples were equivalent as a result of statistical analysis, testing the hypothesized relationships with the combined sample helped us to verify the results of the independent analyses. The combined sample provided us more meaningful and consistent results with the literature. Leaders may perform much better if they have committed employees. However, having committed employees would not be sufficient if leaders do not build strong relationships with superiors and peers. Thus, leadership effectiveness depends not only on downward influence but also on upward and lateral influence. Future research should examine all these variables to explain the role of influence outcomes on effective leadership in detail.

Another contribution of the present research is related to the cross-cultural leadership literature. Although the samples were not adequate to reach a conclusion about cross-cultural differences, the results seem to demonstrate that the core tactics are frequently used by both Turkish and American leaders. These findings are moderately consistent with the scenario study of Kennedy et al. (2003). However, it is important to point out that the scenario data included a combination of downward, lateral, and upward influence situations, and the scenarios only measured manager perceptions of tactic effectiveness, not managers’ actual use of tactics or measures of actual effectiveness. Moreover, the legitimating tactic was not included in the tactics that were reported in Kennedy et al.’s (2003) study. Therefore, several differences between the two studies make it more difficult to directly compare the results for them.

The comparison of Turkish and Greek managers provided us new insights. The influence behaviors of Greek managers from Tyrovola et al.’s (2012) study and Turkish managers from the present research were found to be very similar, and legitimating was
the most frequently used tactic in both countries. This similarity supports the Hofstede’s cultural analysis on these two Mediterranean countries. He considered the Greek and Turkish cultures similar, so common values and practices between two cultures might be one of the reasons for the resemblance of influence behaviors in both countries (Hofstede, 1980). Observing similar outcomes from two different countries emphasizes a need for conducting more cross-cultural research on the influence process.

Similarities of tactic frequency and outcomes for Turkish and Greek managers raise questions about culture clusters in the literature. Turkey is generally categorized in the Middle-Eastern culture cluster. Turkey literally as well as symbolically bridges Asia to Europe. As a secular Muslim country, Turkey is a democratic republic, and Turkish business practices are more westernized than the other middle-eastern countries. Considering the recent turmoil in the Muslim world, financial crisis in Europe, and the role of emerging markets in the world economy, it is obvious that we need more sensitive and updated culture clusters and dimensions in the literature. Thus, in this changing world, the cross-cultural leadership literature must be reviewed critically and researchers should reassess previous findings to determine if they can be verified. Developing more specific cultural dimensions and statistically supported culture clusters would be helpful to overcome these types of methodological problems in cross-cultural leadership research.

The present study has a number of strengths. Unlike most prior research, which used data from the same source for all variables, data for predictor and outcome variables were provided independently by different respondents. Testing competing models to explain the joint effects of variables is a second strength of the study. A third strength of the
study is the use of a sample from a country seldom included in research on effective leadership. Including a different cultural-setting expands our understanding about global leadership practices. The results of this survey study with an independent criterion moderately verified findings from research on Turkish managers using manager ratings of perceived tactic effectiveness in scenarios.

The present study also has limitations. One is the small sample size in each country. A larger sample with managers from the same type of organizations would facilitate cross-cultural comparisons of Turkish and American managers and allow a more accurate test of the mediation models for each country. In addition, it would be useful in future research to include some objective measures of leadership effectiveness. It is also desirable to use more than one method for measuring use of the influence tactics, such as diaries or observation (recorded interactions coded for the tactics), and the analyses should take into account other determinants of tactic outcomes such as how the tactics are combined and sequenced, the influence objective and reasons for target resistance, and contextual variables such as the agent-target relationship, and the relative power of the agent and target.
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Appendix A
Individual Level Correlations among Variables for the US Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>.04</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. Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.44**</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. Rational Persuasion</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inspirational Appeals</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consultation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Apprising</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legitimate</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pressure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coalition</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Composite Core Tactics</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 130 individuals

** p < .01
*p < .05
Appendix B
Individual Level Correlations among Variables for the Turkish Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Effectiveness</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. Commitment</td>
<td>.33**</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. Rational Persuasion</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.65**</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. Inspirational Appeals</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.73**</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. Consultation</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Apprising</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Exchange</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Legitimate</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Appeals</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pressure</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Coalition</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Composite Core Tactics</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 210 individuals

**p < .01
*p < .05