

Influence Tactics and Objectives in Upward, Downward, and Lateral Influence Attempts

Gary Yukl and Cecilia M. Falbe
Management Department
State University of New York at Albany

Two studies were conducted to replicate and extend previous exploratory research by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) on influence tactics and objectives in organizations. A new questionnaire was developed that included measures of important influence tactics and objectives omitted in the earlier research. Whereas the earlier research used only agent self-reports of influence behavior, the present research used both agent and target reports. Differences in downward, lateral, and upward influence attempts were replicated more for data from agents than for data from targets. Direction of influence had a stronger effect on influence objectives than on influence tactics. Despite some differences due to data source and direction of influence, the relative frequency of use for the 8 influence tactics was remarkably similar across conditions. Consultation and rational persuasion were the tactics used most frequently, regardless of the direction of influence.

One of the most important determinants of managerial effectiveness is success in influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors. Despite the obvious importance of this subject, there has been very little empirical research on the influence behavior of managers. Considerable research has been conducted on sources of managerial power (see Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985), but only a few studies have examined issues such as the types of influence tactics used by managers and the objectives of their influence attempts (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Mowday, 1978; Schilit & Locke, 1982).

In the exploratory study by Kipnis et al. (1980), a questionnaire was developed to measure categories of influence behavior (called *influence tactics*) and common reasons for making influence attempts in organizations (called *influence objectives*). The questionnaire was administered to a sample of night students, and each respondent described how often he or she used the influence tactics in influence attempts with a particular subordinate, peer, or superior. On the basis of the results of their exploratory research, Kipnis et al. concluded that managers tend to use different tactics and to have somewhat different objectives depending on the direction of influence. This study was an important first step but, like all exploratory research, the findings need to be verified and the potential limitations examined. Up until now the conclusions have been reported in many textbooks as established facts about influence tactics in organizations rather than as tentative findings from a single exploratory study. Moreover, subsequent studies have used the influence questionnaire to examine other types of research questions (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Erez & Rim, 1982) and as the basis for developing a typology of managers based on patterns of tactics (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988).

There are a number of limitations and potential problems in the Kipnis et al. study. First, the items in their questionnaire

were based on examples described by students, and the range of influence tactics measured by the questionnaire is too narrow. Their questionnaire does not include some influence tactics found to be relevant for leadership effectiveness. Second, their list of influence objectives needs to be extended to include others central to managerial work. Third, the research examined only self-perception of influence tactics and objectives. The possibility of systematic biases in these self-reports has not been examined. For example, respondents may have exaggerated their use of socially desirable influence tactics, such as rational persuasion, and understated their use of less acceptable tactics, such as coercive pressure. Likewise, respondents may have been biased to select as their target someone toward whom they were more likely to use socially desirable influence tactics.

The present research had the following two major objectives: (a) to determine if the major findings in the Kipnis et al. study could be replicated with differences in methodology, and (b) to extend the research to include additional types of influence behavior and objectives. This article describes preliminary research to develop new measures and two studies designed to address the potential limitations in the earlier research by Kipnis et al.

Development of the Measures

Influence Tactics

Preliminary research was conducted to pretest and refine a more comprehensive questionnaire for measuring influence tactics. All of the items in our questionnaire were new, but included among them were items representing six of the eight scales in the Kipnis et al. study: assertiveness, rationality, ingratiation, exchange, upward appeals, and coalitions. Two of their scales ("sanctions" and "blocking") were not represented in our questionnaire because of conceptual problems and infrequent use. Most of their sanctions items (e.g., giving a pay increase or promotion, suspending or firing the target) are reactions to something the target has already done rather than specific, pro-

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gary Yukl, Management Department, School of Business, SUNY, Albany, New York 12222.

active influence attempts. In their study, sanctions were used infrequently with subordinates (the mean item score in their study was 1.3 on a scale of 1 to 5) and not at all with peers or superiors (the mean item score was 1.0). Their blocking tactic was used infrequently with coworkers (mean item score was 1.7) and almost never with superiors and subordinates (mean item scores were 1.1). The three blocking items with highest factor loadings appear to be examples of pressure tactics (threaten to stop working with the person, engage in work slowdown, threaten to notify an outside agency). In their more recent research, Kipnis and his associates (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988) no longer include blocking as one of their influence tactics. Thus, there seemed little point to include either sanctions or blocking when the questionnaire space could be devoted to more relevant influence tactics.

The new questionnaire included items representing two influence tactics not found in the Kipnis et al. questionnaire but likely to be important, namely, inspirational appeals and consultation. The major source of behavior examples for items representing these tactics was the literature on managerial leadership. Inspirational appeals to values and emotions are an important aspect of charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; House, 1977; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). Inspirational appeals include (a) use of emotional, symbolic language to emphasize the importance of a new project or task, (b) appeals to the target person's sense of justice, humanitarianism, or organizational loyalty, and (c) appeals to the person's desire to excel, to beat competitors, or to accomplish an important, challenging task. Research on inspirational behavior by leaders is still in the exploratory stage, but there is strong indication that this influence tactic may be an effective approach for gaining subordinate commitment to a leader's objectives and strategies.

Consultation is a form of leadership behavior that has been studied extensively during the last 3 decades (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1989). It is widely accepted that managers are sometimes able to influence people to accept a decision by involving them in the process of making it, or at least in the process of planning how to implement it (Bradford & Cohen, 1984; Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, & Jennings, 1988; Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The mechanism for influence through participation is not very well understood, but when a person is invited to help decide what to do and how to do it, the person is likely to identify with the decision and try to make it successful. Although consultation is not always successful, it is an important, widely used tactic for influencing commitment to a decision (Heller, 1971).

As in the Kipnis et al. study, the response choices for each item in our questionnaire indicated the frequency of use for the type of influence behavior described by the item. The preliminary questionnaire was administered to a sample of 293 target respondents that included both night master's of business administration (MBA) students and managers in several companies. Respondents were asked to use the questionnaire to describe the influence behavior of a peer or their boss. The questionnaire was revised and shortened after a variety of analyses, including factor analysis, item analysis, Q-sorts, and classification of items into predetermined scales by judges. Because the purpose was to replicate and extend the Kipnis et al. research,

Table 1
Scale Definitions of Influence Tactics

Scale	Definition
Pressure Tactics	The person uses demands, threats, or intimidation to convince you to comply with a request or to support a proposal. (Similar to <i>assertiveness</i>)
Upward Appeals	The person seeks to persuade you that the request is approved by higher management, or appeals to higher management for assistance in gaining your compliance with the request. (Similar to <i>upward appeal</i>)
Exchange Tactics	The person makes an explicit or implicit promise that you will receive rewards or tangible benefits if you comply with a request or support a proposal, or reminds you of a prior favor to be reciprocated. (Similar to <i>exchange</i>)
Coalition Tactics	The person seeks the aid of others to persuade you to do something or uses the support of others as an argument for you to agree also. (Similar to <i>coalitions</i>)
Ingratiating Tactics	The person seeks to get you in a good mood or to think favorably of him or her before asking you to do something. (Similar to <i>ingratiation</i>)
Rational Persuasion	The person uses logical arguments and factual evidence to persuade you that a proposal or request is viable and likely to result in the attainment of task objectives. (Similar to <i>rationality</i>)
Inspirational Appeals	The person makes an emotional request or proposal that arouses enthusiasm by appealing to your values and ideals, or by increasing your confidence that you can do it.
Consultation Tactics	The person seeks your participation in making a decision or planning how to implement a proposed policy, strategy, or change.

the grouping of items into scales was strongly influenced by their scale definitions and item content.

The revised questionnaire had scales measuring eight influence tactics, the definitions of which are shown in Table 1. The correlations among scales (see Table 2) indicate that the eight tactics are sufficiently independent to be regarded as distinct forms of influence behavior.

Each of the scales in the revised questionnaire had four or five items. Parallel versions of the questionnaire were developed for agents and targets. Both versions had the same items, but minor changes in wording were needed to make the questionnaire suitable for respondents to describe someone else's influence tactics rather than their own. The only other difference between the two versions was a *not applicable* option in the target version that did not appear in the agent version. The following response choices were used in the target version of the revised questionnaire:

- NA Not applicable; the behavior is something this person cannot do in my organization.
- 1 Never uses this tactic under any circumstances
- 2 Seldom uses this tactic (only once or twice a year)
- 3 Uses this tactic occasionally (several times a year)

Table 2
Intercorrelations of Influence Tactics

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Pressure tactics	—							
2. Upward appeals	.50	—						
3. Exchange tactics	.11	.18	—					
4. Coalition tactics	.16	.31	.15	—				
5. Ingratiation tactics	.19	.17	.44	.27	—			
6. Rational persuasion	.03	.10	.20	.51	.25	—		
7. Inspirational appeals	.20	.11	.31	.37	.44	.49	—	
8. Consultation	-.24	-.16	.15	.37	.18	.52	.36	—

- 4 Uses this tactic moderately often (every few weeks)
 5 Uses this tactic very often (almost every week)

A sample item from each scale in the target version is listed as follows:

1. Confronts you and demands that you carry out a requested action promptly. (pressure)
2. Complains to someone in higher authority if you do not carry out a requested action. (upward appeal)
3. Indicates that he/she will do a favor for you in return for doing what he/she wants. (exchange)
4. Gets other people to provide evidence to you supporting a plan or proposal that he/she wants you to help implement. (coalition)
5. Compliments you on past accomplishments before asking you to do another task. (ingratiation)
6. Provides evidence that the actions he/she is proposing will lead to the successful completion of a task or project. (rational persuasion)
7. Describes a proposed task or project with enthusiasm and conviction that it is important and worthwhile. (inspirational appeal)
8. Tells you what he/she is trying to accomplish and asks if you know a good way to do it. (consultation)

Influence Objectives

Another purpose of the preliminary research was to develop a more comprehensive and relevant list of influence objectives. Studies on the nature of managerial work (Kanter, 1982; Kaplan, 1986; Kotter, 1982; McCall & Segrist, 1980; Mintzberg, 1973; Pavett & Lau, 1983) suggest that an important component of this work is influencing other members of the organization. A manager's effectiveness depends on success in influencing others to (a) modify their plans and schedules, (b) approve and support the manager's plans and proposals, (c) provide additional resources needed to accomplish major tasks, (d) accept and carry out new assignments, and (e) provide relevant and timely information. Some of these influence objectives are not represented as separate items in the Kipnis et al. questionnaire.

The preliminary questionnaire had 12 influence objectives. This list was shortened and revised after examination of frequency scores, intercorrelations among objectives, and judges' ratings of relevance. The following eight objectives were selected for the revised questionnaire, as compared with only five in the Kipnis et al. study:

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.
8. Ask for information needed to do your work.

The questions about influence objectives appeared in a separate section of the questionnaire following the section on influence tactics. Respondents were asked to indicate how often their influence attempts have each type of objective. Response choices in the revised version were as follows:

- NA Not applicable
 1 Never
 2 Seldom (only once or twice a year)
 3 Occasionally (several times a year)
 4 Moderately often (every few weeks)
 5 Very often (almost every week)

For both the influence tactics and objectives, a *Not Applicable* response was recoded as 1 before doing any analyses.

Study 1

This study is essentially a replication of the Kipnis et al. (1980) research on agent self-reports of influence attempts, using a new questionnaire with a broader range of influence tactics and objectives. As in their research, the primary design in this study was a comparison of influence tactics used in upward, downward, and lateral relations.

Hypotheses

The exploratory research by Kipnis et al. did not propose formal hypotheses, and their findings on directional differences were not interpreted. In any replication there is the implicit hypothesis that the same relationships will be found, but it is useful to consider whether there is a credible rationale for these

findings. Prior theory and research were examined to determine if sufficient basis existed for making a priori hypotheses. Although prior research suggests the feasibility of the eight influence tactics for influence attempts in all three directions, there was a credible rationale for proposing six hypotheses about expected directional differences.

Hypothesis 1: Pressure tactics are used most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts. Pressure tactics are based on coercive power, and there is growing evidence that coercive power is used more frequently with subordinates than with peers or superiors (e.g., Kim & Yukl, 1989). The strongest directional difference found by Kipnis et al. was for assertiveness, which is similar to pressure tactics. Hypothesis 1 reflects their findings.

Hypothesis 2: Upward appeals are used more often in downward and lateral influence attempts than in upward influence attempts. Upward appeals are an attempt to invoke the authority and power of higher management by (a) telling the target you are acting on behalf of higher management, (b) threatening to go over the target's head (also a pressure tactic), or (c) directly asking superiors to help you influence the target (also a coalition tactic). Upward appeals are easier to use with subordinates and peers and are more likely to be successful (Sayles, 1989). When an agent claims to have the approval of higher management and the target is the agent's boss, the target is more likely to question the agent's credibility. Threats to go over the target's head and overt attempts at upward bypassing are more likely to have unfavorable repercussions for future relationships if the target is one's own boss rather than a peer or subordinate.

Hypothesis 3: Exchange tactics are used more often in downward and lateral influence attempts than in upward influence attempts. The concept of exchange implies that there is something of value to be traded. Managers usually have control over resources desired by subordinates, but it is less common for subordinates to control resources desired by a superior. Furthermore, it is awkward for subordinates to initiate an exchange with a superior, because resources under subordinate control are usually things they are expected to provide without additional rewards. With peers, the potential for exchange depends on the extent of task interdependence between them and their control over complementary resources. The potential for using exchange tactics is considerable when peers depend on each other for information, assistance, resources, approvals, political support, and cooperation to accomplish their task and personal objectives (Cohen & Bradford, 1989; Kaplan, 1984).

Hypothesis 4: Coalition tactics are used more often in upward and lateral influence attempts than in downward influence attempts. Managers usually have sufficient power and authority to influence subordinates without using coalitions. However, for (a) introducing innovations in an organization, (b) convincing superiors to change an unpopular policy or plan, and (c) influencing a peer over whom one has no authority, coalitions may be one of the most effective influence strategies (Israeli, 1975; Kanter, 1982; Kotter, 1985; Mechanic, 1962; Pfeffer, 1981; Strauss, 1962).

Hypothesis 5: Inspirational appeals are used more often in downward influence attempts than in lateral or upward influence attempts. Inspirational appeals appear to be most appropriate for influencing somebody to (a) support an innovative proposal or change in strategy, (b) accept a difficult task or as-

signment, or (c) increase efforts on a task for which success is in doubt. The first type of influence objective may occur in downward, lateral, or upward influence attempts, but the latter two objectives are more likely to occur in downward influence attempts (Kipnis et al., 1980). Thus, inspirational appeals are most likely to be used in influence attempts with subordinates.

Hypothesis 6: Consultation is used most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts. Consultation appears to be most appropriate when a manager has authority to make a decision that must be implemented or supported by the target person (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Because of the nature of authority relationships in hierarchical organizations, this situation is most likely to occur for a manager in relation to subordinates and least likely to occur in relation to superiors.

With regard to influence objectives, theoretical support was found for five hypotheses about directional differences. In formal organizations, work objectives and standards are usually determined by a top-down process, and influence attempts concerning them tend to follow the chain of command. Most managers have the authority to assign work to subordinates and establish performance standards for them. However, it is rare for work assignments to be made in an upward direction, and it is awkward for subordinates to request faster or better performance by their boss. In the case of interdependent units, a manager may have authority to ask peers to carry out their part of a joint activity, and the inputs provided by peers may be evaluated according to established standards of performance. Thus, the following two hypotheses appear reasonable and are consistent with results from the Kipnis et al. study.

Hypothesis 7: Requests to get someone to do a new task occur most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts.

Hypothesis 8: Requests for faster or better performance occur most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts.

The target of influence attempts involving resource allocation and approvals is usually the person who has authority to make these decisions. In hierarchical organizations, the authority to allocate resources, authorize decisions, and give formal approvals is greatest for managers in relation to subordinates, and least in relation to superiors. Although these objectives were not included in the Kipnis et al. research, the following hypotheses are reasonable.

Hypothesis 9: Requests for resources occur most often in upward influence attempts and least often in downward influence attempts.

Hypothesis 10: Requests for approvals or signoffs occur most often in upward influence attempts and least often in downward influence attempts.

The process of coalition formation includes attempts to get others to support one's proposals in meetings where the proposals will be accepted or rejected (Cohen & Bradford, 1989; Stevenson, Pearce, & Porter, 1985). Support is more likely to be sought from people who have considerable political power. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 11: Managers seek support for proposals more often from superiors and peers than from subordinates.

Table 3
Mean Frequency of Influence Tactics as Reported by Agents

Influence tactic	Direction of influence attempt			F(2, 194)	Eta ²
	Downward (N = 62)	Lateral (N = 75)	Upward (N = 60)		
Pressure tactics (Assertiveness)	2.2 _a (2.4 _a)	1.9 _b (1.6 _b)	1.5 _c (1.4 _c)	17.4** (243.9**)	15%
Upward appeals (Upward appeal)	2.1 _a (1.8 _a)	2.2 _a (1.7 _a)	1.6 _b (1.4 _b)	16.4** (37.2**)	14%
Exchange tactics (Exchange)	1.6 _a (2.0 _a)	1.7 _a (2.0 _a)	1.4 _b (1.7 _b)	6.5** (13.5**)	6%
Coalition tactics (Coalitions)	2.2 (2.2)	2.2 (2.2)	2.3 (2.3)	0.2 0.1	
Ingratiation tactics (Ingratiation)	2.6 _a (2.6 _a)	2.6 _a (2.7 _a)	2.2 _b (2.4 _b)	6.1** (16.7**)	6%
Rational persuasion (Rationality)	3.3 (3.5 _b)	3.2 (3.4 _b)	3.3 (3.7 _a)	0.5 (7.2**)	
Inspirational appeals	2.9 _a	2.8 _{ab}	2.5 _b	4.2*	4%
Consultation	3.6 _a	3.4 _{ab}	3.3 _b	3.7*	4%
Multivariate F test					
Pillais criterion				5.2**	
Hottelling's trace criterion				5.4**	
Wilks's lambda				5.3**	

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level by the Duncan multiple range test. Results from Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) are shown in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Method

The sample consisted of 197 respondents, including evening MBA students who worked in regular jobs during the day and managers who were attending management development courses. Respondents filled out the agent self-report version of the revised influence questionnaire in class. Respondents were asked to describe their own influence attempts with an upward, lateral, or downward target. The direction of influence in each case was determined randomly by the researchers. People not in their current job for at least 6 months were instructed not to answer the questionnaire. Respondents were assured that their responses would remain confidential.

Results

Scale reliabilities for the eight influence tactics, computed in terms of Cronbach's alpha, were as follows: .67 for pressure tactics, .67 for upward appeals, .61 for exchange, .70 for coalition tactics, .63 for ingratiation, .70 for rational persuasion, .79 for inspirational appeals, and .71 for consultation. The scale reliabilities are comparable with those found in the Kipnis et al. study. Table 3 shows the results for the multivariate and univariate analyses of variance (MANOVAS and ANOVAS). Results from the Kipnis et al. study for corresponding scales (expressed in terms of mean item scores) are also shown in Table 3 to facilitate comparison.

Most of the results found by Kipnis et al. for influence tactics were successfully replicated. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, pressure tactics were used most frequently in downward influence attempts and least frequently in upward influence attempts. Consistent with Hypotheses 2 and 3, upward appeals and exchange tactics were used less often in upward influence attempts than in downward or lateral influence attempts. Con-

trary to Hypothesis 4, but consistent with the findings by Kipnis et al., there were no significant directional differences for coalition tactics. Results for rational persuasion were also nonsignificant, and they failed to replicate the Kipnis et al. finding that this tactic was used more in upward influence attempts.

The eta squared values in Table 3 indicate the percentage of variance in each influence tactic accounted for by direction of influence. Kipnis et al. did not report effect magnitudes for their ANOVA. However, estimates of eta squared values based on their means and standard deviations suggest that, except for assertiveness, the effect magnitudes were smaller in their study than in ours, despite their larger *F* values.

Turning to the two new scales not included in the Kipnis et al. research, significant differences were found in each case. Consistent with Hypotheses 5 and 6, inspirational appeals and consultation were used more frequently in downward influence attempts than in upward ones, with results for lateral influence attempts in between.

Results for influence objectives are shown in Table 4 and are compared with results for objectives in the Kipnis et al. study. Consistent with the Kipnis et al. research and Hypotheses 7 and 8, assigning work and requesting faster or better performance were most likely to occur in downward influence attempts and least likely to occur in upward influence attempts. Requests for resources were significantly more likely to be made in upward and lateral influence attempts than in downward attempts, which is partially consistent with Hypothesis 9. This objective is closest to requests for benefits in the Kipnis et al. study, although the benefits in our study are job-related resources, not things like a better job or a pay increase.

Other results for objectives were less consistent with the re-

Table 4
Mean Frequency of Influence Objectives as Reported by Agents

Influence objective	Direction of influence attempt			F(2, 194)	Eta ²
	Downward (N = 62)	Lateral (N = 75)	Upward (N = 60)		
Assign task or project (Assign work)	3.6 _a (4.1 _a)	2.8 _b (2.5 _b)	1.9 _c (1.9 _c)	39.9** (329.7**)	29%
Request better performance (Improve performance)	3.3 _a (3.9 _a)	2.5 _b (2.9 _b)	1.8 _c (2.4 _c)	28.9** (135.2**)	23%
Request changes (Seek changes)	2.7 _a (3.5 _a)	2.4 _{ab} (3.3 _b)	2.1 _b (3.5 _a)	4.4** (6.7*)	4%
Request advice or help (Seek assistance)	3.6 (3.2 _a)	3.6 (2.8 _b)	3.5 (2.1 _c)	0.1 (64.4**)	
Request resources (Request benefits)	1.7 _b (1.3 _c)	2.4 _a (1.7 _b)	2.6 _a (2.4 _a)	11.9** (90.4**)	11%
Request approval/signoff	1.9 _c	2.7 _b	3.2 _a	17.7**	15%
Request proposal support	2.0 _b	2.5 _a	2.6 _a	4.1*	4%
Request information	4.0	3.7	3.5	2.9	
Multivariate F test					
Pillais criterion				7.7**	
Hotelling's trace criterion				10.5**	
Wilks's lambda				9.1**	

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level by the Duncan multiple range test. Results from Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) are shown in parentheses.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

sults found by Kipnis et al., although the discrepancies may be due to subtle differences in the definition of objectives. In our study, requests for changes in plans and procedures occurred most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward attempts. In the Kipnis et al. study, trying to get someone to change the way the work is done or to accept an innovation occurred more often in upward and downward influence attempts than in lateral ones. In our study, no significant differences were found with respect to requests for advice or help in solving problems. In the Kipnis et al. study, the objective "assist me on my job" occurred most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts. However, their objective included getting the target person to "do some of your work."

With regard to the three influence objectives not included in the Kipnis et al. study, requests for approvals were made most often in upward influence attempts and least often in downward influence attempts, consistent with Hypothesis 10. Attempts to gain support for the agent's proposals occurred more frequently with peers and superiors than with subordinates, consistent with Hypothesis 11. No significant directional differences were found with respect to frequency of requests for information.

In summary, a large majority of the results found by Kipnis et al. for influence tactics and objectives were replicated, despite the many differences in methodology between the studies and the much lower power of our study (197 respondents vs. 754). The results also indicate that some relevant tactics and objectives were missing in the Kipnis et al. research. Consultation and inspirational appeals were among the tactics people reported using most frequently in their influence attempts. Among the influence objectives, requests for information

ranked first in terms of frequency, regardless of the direction of influence, and the other new objectives had moderately high frequency scores.

Study 2

The major purpose of the second study was to determine if the results could be replicated with a data source other than agent self-reports. Study 2 was carried out at the same time as Study 1, but with a different sample. The research design was similar, and the same hypotheses were tested. However, all data in Study 2 were obtained from targets of influence attempts rather than from agents.

Method

The sample consisted of 237 respondents, including evening MBA students with regular jobs during the day and managers in management development courses. Respondents filled out the target version of the questionnaire anonymously in class. All respondents were asked to describe the influence behavior and objectives of an agent designated as a superior, a peer, or a subordinate. The type of agent to be described by each respondent was randomly assigned by the researchers. If the agent was a peer or subordinate, the respondent was asked to select a person with whom he or she had interacted frequently over the past 6 months. When the agent was a superior, respondents were asked to describe their immediate supervisor if they had worked under that person for at least 6 months. People who were new on their jobs were instructed not to answer the questionnaire.

Results

Scale reliabilities for the influence tactics, computed in terms of Cronbach alphas, were as follows: .65 for pressure tactics, .45

Table 5
Mean Frequency of Influence Tactics as Reported by Targets

Influence tactic	Direction of influence attempt			F(2, 234)	Eta ²
	Downward (N = 87)	Lateral (N = 71)	Upward (N = 79)		
Pressure tactics	2.0 _a	1.5 _b	1.5 _b	12.9**	10%
Upward appeals	1.7 _a	1.7 _a	1.5 _b	5.6**	5%
Exchange tactics	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.0	
Coalition tactics	1.9	1.9	2.0	0.1	
Ingratiation tactics	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.5	
Rational persuasion	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.1	
Inspirational appeals	2.7 _a	2.2 _b	2.4 _b	6.4**	5%
Consultation	3.2	3.1	3.1	0.3	
Multivariate F test					
Pillais Criterion				5.0**	
Hotellings Trace Criterion				5.0**	
Wilks's Lambda				5.0**	

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level by the Duncan multiple range test.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

for upward appeals, .65 for exchange tactics, .57 for coalition tactics, .56 for ingratiation, .62 for rational persuasion, .70 for inspirational appeals, and .75 for consultation. Reliabilities were within acceptable limits for most of the scales but on the low side for a few scales.

Table 5 presents the mean scale scores for influence tactics used in downward, lateral, and upward influence attempts, as reported by targets, and the results for the MANOVAS and ANOVAS. In general, the data from target respondents yielded fewer significant differences than data from agent respondents. The results provide partial support for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5, but Hypotheses 3, 4, and 6 were not supported. Significant differences consistent with those in Study 1 were found for pressure tactics, upward appeals, and inspirational appeals. The nonsignificant differences for coalition tactics and rational persuasion are consistent with the findings in Study 1. Contrary to Study

1, there were no significant differences for exchange tactics, ingratiation, or consultation.

Table 6 shows results for objectives of influence attempts, as reported by targets. There were significant differences for most influence objectives, and most of the hypotheses about objectives received at least partial support. Assigning work and requesting faster or better performance were more likely to occur in downward influence attempts than in lateral or upward influence attempts, which is partially consistent with Hypotheses 7 and 8. Requests for resources and approvals were more likely to occur in upward influence attempts than in downward influence attempts, which is partially consistent with Hypotheses 9 and 10.

The other four influence objectives yielded less consistent results for agents and targets. Directional differences involving requests for information and requests for advice were signifi-

Table 6
Mean Frequency of Influence Objectives as Reported by Targets

Influence objective	Direction of influence attempt			F(2, 234)	Eta ²
	Downward (N = 87)	Lateral (N = 71)	Upward (N = 79)		
Assign task or project	3.7 _a	2.3 _b	2.2 _b	49.0**	30%
Request better performance	2.5 _a	1.5 _b	1.7 _b	20.0**	15%
Request change in plans	2.7 _a	2.1 _c	2.4 _b	6.7**	5%
Request advice or help	3.4 _b	3.3 _b	4.1 _a	12.8**	10%
Request resources	1.4 _b	2.0 _a	2.3 _a	15.7**	12%
Request approval/signoff	2.1 _b	2.0 _b	3.1 _a	15.9**	12%
Request proposal support	2.0	1.9	2.2	1.2	
Request information	3.7 _b	3.1 _c	4.1 _a	17.1**	13%
Multivariate F test					
Pillais criterion				13.1**	
Hotelling's trace criterion				14.7**	
Wilks's lambda				13.9**	

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at the .05 level by the Duncan multiple range test.
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 7
Rank Order of Tactic Frequencies

Influence tactic	Downward		Lateral		Upward	
	Agents	Targets	Agents	Targets	Agents	Targets
Consultation	1	1	1	1	2	1
Rational persuasion	2	2	2	2	1	2
Inspirational appeals	3	3	3	4	3	3
Ingratiating tactics	4	4	4	3	5	4
Coalition tactics	5	6	5	5	4	5
Pressure tactics	6	5	7	7	7	6
Upward appeals	7	7	6	6	6	7
Exchange tactics	8	8	8	8	8	8

Note. Kendall's coefficient of concordance, $W = .96$, $p < .001$. Ranks were based on means carried out to two decimal places.

cant for the target data but not for the agent data. Directional differences involving requested support for a proposal were significant for the agent data but not for target data. Directional differences involving requested changes in plans or procedures were significant for both data sources, but the results for the target data actually supported the Kipnis et al. findings better than the results for agent data.

Supplementary Analyses in Studies 1 and 2

The focus so far has been on results from the ANOVA comparing downward, lateral, and upward influence attempts. An alternative focus is to examine the relative frequency of the eight influence tactics. Table 7 shows the rank order of scale means in each condition for Studies 1 and 2. It is evident that substantial agreement occurred between agents and targets on the relative use of the influence tactics. Kendall's coefficient of concordance among the rankings was .96 (Siegel, 1956). The four tactics used most frequently were consultation, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and ingratiation. Exchange tactics were used least often. Except for the distortion caused by the greater use of pressure tactics in downward relations, the frequency ranking of tactics was remarkably similar regardless of data source or direction of influence. Looking more closely at the Kipnis et al. results, we discovered a similar pattern of frequency rankings. This pattern in their results may have been obscured by their computation of scale scores as the sum of the items in a scale rather than as the mean item score; it is difficult to compare scale sums when the number of scale items varies from 2 to 6.

With regard to the frequency rankings for influence objectives, there was no consistent pattern across conditions. Requests for information and requests for advice or help were most common, but beyond this there was little similarity in rank order for objectives across data sources and directions of influence. Likewise, in the Kipnis et al. study, frequency rankings for influence objectives varied considerably across conditions.

Discussion

The Kipnis et al. conclusion that managers have different reasons for influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors was strongly supported, and the nature of these differences was fur-

ther clarified by use of a more specific and comprehensive list of objectives derived from descriptive accounts of managerial work. Most hypotheses about directional differences for influence objectives were supported by data from both agents and targets. The results are consistent with prevailing conceptions about role relationships and the distribution of authority in organizations. The larger number of influence objectives in our study fills in some gaps in the list proposed by Kipnis et al. and provides a clearer picture of the variety and mix of influence attempts made by managers.

Our research only partially replicated the Kipnis et al. findings for differences in upward, downward, and lateral use of influence tactics. Contrary to their findings, no significant directional differences were found for rational persuasion, not even for agents. The directional differences they found for exchange and ingratiation were replicated for agents, but the effects were weak and could not be replicated for targets. Of the six influence tactics from their study, only pressure and upward appeals had significant results for both agents and targets. The relatively weak effects due to direction of influence were overshadowed by the similarity in frequency rankings for the influence tactics. The overall pattern of results suggests that the Kipnis et al. conclusions for influence tactics are considerably overstated. The big story is not directional differences but rather the discovery that some tactics are used more than others, regardless of whether the target is a subordinate, peer, or superior.

The present research also demonstrated that consultation and inspirational appeals are an important addition to the list of influence tactics identified by Kipnis et al. Agent and target respondents agreed that these two tactics were among the ones used most frequently by managers, regardless of the direction of influence. Consultation and inspirational appeals are relevant and meaningful influence tactics that help to bridge the gap between power research and research on leadership. These tactics appear to be important for understanding the process by which leaders influence follower commitment to new objectives, strategies, and projects.

Although many results were consistent for agents and targets, some inconsistent results also occurred. Social desirability biases in the agent self-reports are one possible reason for these discrepancies. However, to account for the obtained pattern of results, the biases would have to differ depending on the direc-

tion of influence attempt, and there is no evidence of such an interaction. A more likely possibility is that the target data were generally less accurate because of attributions and judgmental errors made when respondents retrospectively described the influence behavior and intentions of another person. This explanation is consistent with the finding that pairwise comparisons for agent data usually provided stronger support for the hypotheses than the corresponding comparisons for target data. Also consistent with this explanation is the finding that scale reliabilities were usually higher for agent data than for target data. However, the reason for inconsistent findings across the two data sources is still only a matter of speculation. Additional research is needed to resolve and explain the discrepancies, and this research may have to use another method of data collection, such as diaries or observation.

Future research should examine the relative effectiveness of different influence tactics for different objectives, targets, and situations. The relevance of the eight tactics identified in our research should be further substantiated by direct evidence that use of these tactics has important consequences for individuals and organizations. Finally, researchers should consider the sequences and combinations of influence tactics used in different situations, not just the relative frequency of individual tactics.

References

- Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 39–49.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bradford, D., & Cohen, A. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Cohen, A., & Bradford, D. (1989). Influence without authority: The use of alliances, reciprocity and exchange to accomplish work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 17, 5–17.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cotton, J., Vollrath, D., Froggatt, K., Lengnick-Hall, M., & Jennings, K. (1988). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 8–22.
- Erez, M., & Rim, Y. (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. *Human Relations*, 35, 871–878.
- Heller, F. (1971). *Managerial decision-making: A study of leadership style and power sharing among senior managers*. London: Tavistock.
- House, R. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Izraeli, D. (1975). The middle manager and the tactics of power expansion: A case study. *Sloan Management Review*, 16, 57–70.
- Kanter, R. (1982). The middle manager as innovator. *Harvard Business Review*, 60, 95–105.
- Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(4), 37–52.
- Kaplan, R. (1986). *The warp and woof of the general manager's job* (Technical Rep. No. 27). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1989). The importance of different types of power for influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors. In W. A. Ward & E. G. Gomolka (Eds.), *Managing for performance: Proceedings of the 26th annual meeting* (pp. 4–6). Portland, ME: Eastern Academy of Management.
- Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. (1988). Upward influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluation, salary and stress. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 528–542.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440–452.
- Kotter, J. (1982). *The general managers*. New York: Free Press.
- Kotter, J. (1985). *Power and influence: Beyond formal authority*. New York: Free Press.
- McCall, M., & Segrist, C. (1980). *In pursuit of the manager's job: Building on Mintzberg* (Technical Rep. No. 14). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Mechanic, D. (1962). Sources of lower participants in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 349–364.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mowday, R. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 137–156.
- Pavett, C., & Lau, A. (1983). Managerial work: The influence of hierarchical level and functional specialty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 170–177.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Boston: Pitman.
- Podsakoff, P., & Schriesheim, C. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 387–411.
- Sayles, L. (1989). *Leadership: Managing in real organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schilit, W., & Locke, E. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 304–316.
- Siegel, S. (1956). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stevenson, W., Pearce, J., & Porter, L. (1985). The concept of "coalition" in organization theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 256–268.
- Strauss, G. (1962). Tactics of lateral relationship: The purchasing agent. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 161–186.
- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Vroom, V., & Jago, A. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V., & Yetton, P. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making: A revised normative model*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Received May 17, 1989

Revision received October 3, 1989

Accepted October 3, 1989 ■