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The use of influence tactics by sales representatives appears to be related to a number of latent constructs and factors such as, manifest needs, role conflict and role ambiguity, and perception of sales managers' power bases. However, such relationships have not been examined by researchers. These relationships were examined in this study in an effort to improve the current level of understanding of causes and results of the use of influence tactics in a sales environment. The contention of this study was that individuals in work settings engage in a variety of influence tactics, and that the type of influence tactics used are influenced by factors such as personal characteristics of the salespersons, the nature of goals to be achieved, the salespersons' perceptions of their superiors' power bases, and the nature and complexity of the dyadic relationship that exists between supervisor and subordinates.

Hypotheses were developed in order to examine the relationships between sales representatives' use of influence tactics and (1) their personal (personality-
related) characteristics, (2) their perceptions of sales managers' power, (3) situational factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction, and (4) outcomes such as propensity to leave. A self-administered questionnaire was used to gather information relevant to the hypotheses. The final sample included 143 respondents from variety of industries. The response rate was 25.2%.

Parametric tests were used to analyze the data. Pearson's product-moment correlations, T-tests, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and regression analysis were used to test the specified hypotheses. In the analyses, upward influence tactics were treated as dependent variables, while differences in individual characteristics, perceived power bases of superiors, and situational factors were treated as independent variables.

Results of this study revealed that personal characteristics such as need for achievement and self-perception of referent power, situational factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction; and outcomes such as propensity to leave were significantly related to the use of influence tactics. No statistically significant relationships were established between perceptions of sales managers' power and the use of influence tactics. A possible cause for this surprising outcome is the size and heterogeneous nature of the sample.
Future testing of the hypothesized relationships using a relatively homogeneous sample is recommended.

In summary, influence tactics used by sales representatives are not always individually initiated. Influence tactics are also induced by situations, and can affect an organization negatively through employee turnover.
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INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Salespersons occupy a rather unique and unusual position in an organization because the nature of their job requires them to act as boundary spanners. Their boundary-spanning role often creates divergent pressures for salespersons as they attempt to meet their organizations' goals and to satisfy their customers' requirements at the same time. In their attempt to reconcile the sometimes divergent expectations of their superiors and their customers, salespersons often resort to the use of influence tactics with their managers and other role partners. However, the use of interpersonal influence tactics in sales organizations remains relatively unexplored by marketing researchers (Kohli 1985).

In trying to exert the influence necessary for the accomplishment of personal or organizational goals, salespersons may use the authority formally vested in their positions, but they may also use power that emanates from various informal techniques. Thus, salespersons may rely almost exclusively on the formal authority vested in the position they occupy as a basis of power or, on the other
hand, may attempt to influence others through the use of informal influencing tactics (e.g., ingratiation, exchange, or assertiveness).

Although, there is a close association between influence and power, conceptual distinctions have been made between the two constructs (Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990; Kapoor and Ansari 1988; Katz and Kahn 1966). Influence is viewed as the actual manifestation of the inherent capacity of a person, while power is the capacity to influence others.

In research designed to study influence-based relationships, researchers have attempted to establish the domain of influence tactics used in organizations. Instruments have been developed to measure the use of these tactics (Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Mowday 1979; Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990; Yukl and Falbe 1990). Some researchers have gone a step further by focusing on the empirical testing of the relationship of influence tactics to various outcomes, such as job performance, compensation, and job stress (Kipnis and Schmidt 1988).

Issues related to the use of influence tactics by salespersons that deserve immediate attention, however, remain unexplored. For example, it seems apparent that the use of influence tactics in sales force settings would be related to a number of latent constructs and factors such as manifest needs, role stressors, perceived power bases, and
job satisfaction (Fulk and Wendler 1982; House and Kerr 1973; Kapoor and Ansari 1988; Kohli 1985; Mowday 1978). The relationship of these factors with salespersons' proclivity for using influence tactics and the outcomes that follow seem to be rather strong. Organizational researchers have found that the propensity to engage in influence behaviors and their outcomes are closely related to individuals' personal characteristics and their work environment (Liden and Mitchell 1988).

The use of influencing tactics among the salespersons was examined as part of this study in an effort to improve the current level of understanding of the causes and outcomes of the use of influence tactics in a sales environment. This research was based on the premise that the variety of influence tactics used by salespersons is affected by factors such as (1) personal characteristics (e.g., locus of control), (2) the nature of the goals to be achieved, (3) the salespersons' perceptions of managers' power bases, and (4) the nature and complexity of the influence-based relationship.

**Purpose of the Study**

Influence tactics have been examined rather extensively in contexts other than sales. Frazier and Rody (1991) and Kale (1986) explored the use of influence strategies between suppliers and distributors in the distribution channel. In
the sales environment, Kohli (1985) studied the upward-influence behaviors of sales managers and their impact on salespersons' role clarity, task specific self-esteem, job satisfaction, and motivation to work. However, no researchers have directly investigated the use of upward-influence tactics by salespersons or the antecedents and outcomes of these tactics on factors such as role conflict and job satisfaction. Present knowledge about the use of influence tactics in a sales environment is extended by this research. Relationships between salespersons' use of influence tactics and (1) personal characteristics (e.g., locus of control); (2) perception of superiors' power; (3) situational factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction; and (4) job outcomes specifically propensity to leave and compensation are empirically tested.

The research objectives of this study were the following:

1. To identify the influence tactics used by salespersons to influence their superiors.
2. To identify superiors' power bases that salespersons may choose to influence.
3. To investigate whether salespersons' personal characteristics affect their use of upward-influence tactics.
4. To investigate relationships between situational variables--role conflict, role ambiguity and job
satisfaction—and salespersons' use of upward-influence tactics.

5. To identify relationships between the use of upward-influence tactics and specific outcomes such as propensity to leave and compensation.

In order to accomplish these research objectives, literature addressing influence tactics and power typologies was reviewed. Next, an attempt was be made to identify the tactics used by salespersons to influence their superiors. A key relationship which was examined was the relationship between salespersons' use of specific influence tactics and their superiors' power. Hypotheses related to salespersons' perceptions of their sales managers' power and the use of influence tactics were empirically tested, and individual differences among salespersons and situational differences were be examined to assess moderating effects of these variables on salespersons' use of influence tactics. In addition, the relationship between the use of influence tactics and two outcome variables, propensity to leave and compensation, was examined.

The conceptual model provided in Figure 1 contains a summary of the domain of the research study. Data in Figure 2 illustrate the relationships proposed between salespersons' use of influence tactics and (1) personal characteristics, (2) perceptions of superiors' power base, (3) situational factors, and (4) job outcomes.
Figure 1
Conceptual Model Depicting the Domain of Research Study
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Figure 2
Study Framework for Salespersons' Use of Influence Tactics

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Need for Achievement
Need for Power
Locus of Control

SUPERIOR'S PERCEIVED POWER BASE

Referent
Reward

SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER

Referent
Expert

SITUATIONAL FACTORS

Role Conflict
Role Ambiguity
Job Satisfaction

INFLUENCE TACTICS

Ingratiation
Assertiveness
Exchange

Coalition
Rationality
Upward Appeal

Propensity to Leave
These relationships were tested in the form of hypotheses in the data analysis stage. The models used were essentially exploratory in nature. The results of this study provide evidence concerning linkages proposed in the models. A detailed discussion of the models is provided in Chapter II of this study.

Justification for the Study

Researchers have devoted considerable attention to the study of relationships between individual characteristics and variables such as job satisfaction, perceived role conflict, and perceived role ambiguity (Teas 1983; Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1975). Efforts have also been made to predict performance (Bagozzi 1978; Tyagi 1985) and turnover (Futrell, and Parasuraman 1984; Lucas et al. 1987; Sager, Futrell and Varadarajan 1989). However, researchers have focused relatively little attention on salespersons' use of influence tactics (Kipnis and Schmidt 1988; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990; Yukl and Falbe 1990). As mentioned earlier, Kohli (1985) studied the upward-influence behaviors of sales managers and their impact on salespersons' role clarity, task specific self-esteem, job satisfaction, and motivation to work. Kohli's results revealed no significant relationships between the upward-influence behaviors of sales managers and the other study variables. However, the
nonsignificant relationship may have been the result of the operationalizing of the influence tactics construct as unidimensional. Current research suggests that influence tactics are multidimensional construct (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990). In light of these new findings, an urgent need exists to confirm Kohli's (1985) findings.

Researchers in other organizational areas have investigated the use of influence behaviors (Frazier and Rody 1991; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990). Although developing an understanding of salespersons' use of influence tactics seems logical, if not desirable, little research attention has been devoted to the topic.

Investigation of the impact of influence tactics on other aspects of salespersons' behavior enhances the sales management knowledge base in several respects. The use of influence tactics by salespersons is important and warrants investigation regarding their influence on role conflict, role ambiguity, compensation, job satisfaction and propensity to leave. Significant knowledge has accrued regarding salespersons' role conflicts, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. However, a greater understanding of how these variables inter-relate can be gained through study of salespersons' use of influence tactics. For example, salespersons suffer from high conflict and ambiguity due to
their boundary spanning role in their organizations. The use of influence tactics provides a salespersons a means with which to exert control over role conflict and role ambiguity.

This study extends current models of salespersons' behavior by integrating their use of influence tactics. The models shown in Figures 1 and 2 are exploratory in nature. Thus, this study is limited to the objectives identified earlier. However, the results of this study provide a sound knowledge base for future research in this area.

Research Design

This section provides a brief discussion of data collection instruments and the sampling design procedures that were used in conducting this study. Definitions of independent variables and dependent variables are also provided. Study hypotheses and research methodology are presented in Chapter III.

Measures

Information about constructs of interest were gathered using standardized instruments. Table 1 includes a summary of the instruments used as well as a brief description of the scale, developers' names, and reported reliabilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Influencing Tactics</td>
<td>Refined Scale of Kinnis et al. (1990)</td>
<td>Measures 6 sources of Influence Tactics</td>
<td>Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990)</td>
<td>.73-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Situational Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a Role Conflict</td>
<td>Scale of Role Conflict and Ambiguity</td>
<td>Uses 14 items of Likert type questions</td>
<td>House and Rizzo (1972)</td>
<td>.56-.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b Role Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Job Descriptive Index (JDI)</td>
<td>Measures dive facets of Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Roznowski (1989)</td>
<td>.82-.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Manifest Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a Need for Power (nPow)</td>
<td>Manifest Need Questionnaire</td>
<td>Measures 2 Manifest Needs using behavioral based scales</td>
<td>Steers and Braunstein (1976)</td>
<td>.72-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b Need for Achievement (nAct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Locus of Control</td>
<td>Work Locus of Control (WLCS)</td>
<td>16 item summated scale</td>
<td>Spector (1988)</td>
<td>.75-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Propensity to Leave</td>
<td>Staying/Leaving Index</td>
<td>Assesses a person's intention to leave the company after specific period of time</td>
<td>Bluedorn (1982)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement instruments are more extensively discussed in Chapter III.

Sampling Design

The sample used for this study consisted of salespersons who were working in a variety of businesses and industries. Chapter III includes a discussion of the issues involved in developing the sampling design, such as the sampling frame, selection of a sample, sample size, and measures of response facilitators.

Independent Variables

Individual Characteristics

The variables included in this group consist of various aspects of personality, needs, perceptions, expectations, and demographic characteristics. Specific variables investigated in the study are as follows:

1. Need for power (nPow): Need for control over one’s own work or the work of others (McClelland 1961).

2. Need for achievement (nAch): Need to accomplish and demonstrate competence or mastery (McClelland 1961).

3. Locus of control: Generalized expectancy that rewards, reinforcements, or outcomes in a job are controlled by one’s own actions (internal locus of control) or by other
outside forces (external locus of control) (Weiner 1974). In a sales environment, rewards include promotions, salary increases and general career advancement. Outcomes include closing sales, performance and tenure or longevity.

4. Gender of the salesperson.

5. Tenure with the organization: Number of years the salesperson has worked for the organization. Time spent in present job was also measured.

Self-Perception of Power

1. Salesperson’s self-perceptions of referent power (SPP referent): Salespersons’ perceptions that their immediate superiors have a personal liking or an admiration toward them (Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Lindskoled 1972).

2. Salesperson’s self-perceptions of expert power (SPP expert): The degree to which salespersons perceive that their immediate superiors believe them to possess relevant job experience and job related knowledge or talent (Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Lindskoled 1972).

Perceived Power Bases of the Sales Manager

French and Raven (1959) identified five bases of social power. These five power bases were treated as independent variables and were hypothesized to have direct relationships with the use of influenc tactics. When applied to the sales
context, these power bases can be operationalized as follows:

1. Expert power—the salesperson believes that the superior has sales knowledge, technical knowledge or experience.

2. Reward power—the salesperson perceives that the immediate superior can reward desired behavior by way of monetary compensations, promotions or other types of recognitions, such as merit awards and paid vacations.

3. Coercive power—the salesperson believes that the immediate superior has the ability to punish the salesperson for failure to achieve performance objectives.

4. Legitimate power—the salesperson believes that the immediate superior has the right to prescribe and control behavior by way of feedback from customers or assigning sales territories.

5. Referent power—the salesperson perceives an attraction with the immediate superior in the relationship such as similarity in area of specialization, education, or even personal interests.

Situational Variables

Situational variables include job satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity. It has been reported that influence tactics can be employed to gain control over one's environment (situation) which in turn reduces uncertainty,
and has a stress-reducing impact (Thompson 1981). This study investigated the following situational variables:

1. Role conflict—the level to which a salesperson "believes that the demands of two or more of his role partners are incompatible and that he cannot simultaneously satisfy all the demands" (Ford, Walker, and Churchill 1976, p. 403).

2. Role ambiguity—the level to which a salesperson "does not feel he has the necessary information to perform his job adequately; when he is uncertain about what his role partners expect of him, how to act to satisfy those expectations, or how his ultimate performance will be evaluated" (Ford, Walker, and Churchill 1976, p. 403).

3. Job satisfaction—the level to which salespeople are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs, coworkers, supervision, pay, and promotion (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin 1969; Roznowski 1989).

Dependent Variables

Upward Influence Tactics

The literature review in Chapter II includes a detailed explanation of upward influence as a behavioral construct. Briefly, influence tactics are viewed as a multi-dimensional construct (Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). Empirical research has consistently identified six interpretable dimensions for
this construct (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). These six dimensions, which were used in this study as dependent variables to represent salespersons' use of influence tactics, include the following:

1. Rationality—logical or rational presentation of factual evidence that is likely to result in the attainment of the influence agent's objective (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson logically or rationally presenting factual evidence with the intention of attaining an objective.

2. Ingratiation—the source acts humble or praises the agent of influence (e.g., manager), seeking to get the target into a good mood prior to asking the agent to do something (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson acting humble or employing praise to convince the manager to take some specific action.

3. Exchange—the source reminds the target of prior favors, or promises the target tangible benefits if the target supports the request (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson reminding the manager of prior favors or promises in order to gain accession.
4. Upward appeal—the source bypasses a direct supervisor and appeals to another person in a position of authority (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson bypassing the manager and appealing to a person who is higher in the organization’s hierarchy.

5. Coalition—the source seeks the aid of others to persuade the target to comply with his or her request (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson seeking support from coworkers in order to persuade the target to comply.

6. Assertiveness—the source demands or threatens (coercive methods) in order to convince the target to comply with the request (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Schrieshiem and Hinkin 1990). In a sales context, this translates to a salesperson employing demands and threats so that the manager will comply.

**Outcome Variables**

The following two variables were also be treated as dependent variables. Past research suggests relationships between the use of influencing tactics and a person’s propensity to leave as well as compensation.

1. Propensity to leave—an intention to quit a job (Bluedorn 1982; Kipnis and Schmidt 1983). Based on previous research, it appears that the less successful individuals
are in the use of influence tactics, the more likely they are to quit the job (Kipnis and Schmidt 1983).

2. Compensation—yearly gross salary for each of the past two years. Past research indicates that successful use of influence tactics can lead to higher compensation (Kipnis and Schmidt 1983).

Limitations of the Research

The domain of this research is restricted to upward-influence tactics used by sales personnel. However, individuals may use upward, downward, and lateral influencing tactics simultaneously. Because this study is exploratory in nature, it would be premature to assess multiple directions of influence. However, using the information gained from studying upward-influence tactics of salespersons, other forms of influence tactics (downward or lateral) can be studied more rigorously in future studies.

Significance of the Study

Sales literature is replete with studies addressing job satisfaction, role conflict, role ambiguity leader structure, and consideration experienced by salespersons. Causal relationships have been supported between several of these variables (Fry et al. 1986). However, little attention has been devoted to the exploration of
salespersons' use of power and upward influence tactics in superior-subordinate relationships. The concept of influencing tactics to a sales environment is introduced in this study. Within the context of an exploratory model, this study integrates influencing tactics with power perceptions, situational and individual difference variables.

Several hypotheses were tested in order to explore relationships between superiors (e.g., sales managers, area managers) power bases, and upward-influence tactics used by salespersons. In addition, the influence of situational variables such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction on the use of influence tactics was investigated. Finally, relationships were proposed and tested between the use of specific upward influence tactics and outcomes, specifically salespersons' compensation and propensity to leave.

**Organization of the Study**

An overview of the study has been given in this chapter. Literature addressing the use of influence tactics is summarized in Chapter II. The methodology of the study is presented in Chapter III. The research design and statistical hypotheses are major elements of Chapter III. Findings from data analysis are reported in Chapter IV. Descriptive statistics, T-tests and Pearson's product-moment
correlations, factor structure results from factor analysis, and results of regression analysis of the models are also provided. A discusses of the findings in light of research objectives, implications, and suggested directions for future research in the area of salespersons' use of upward influence tactics are included in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature related to influence tactics is discussed in two parts. The first part includes a review of published theoretical and empirical studies addressing conditions that affect an individual's choice of a specific influence tactic. Some power and influence theorists (Kipnis et al. 1984; Perreault and Miles 1978) argued that individuals typically use upward-influence tactics in combination (influence styles). Therefore, the second part of this chapter focuses on studies of influence styles. However, this study did not include an empirical investigation of influence styles.

Power

Power Defined

As a construct, power has been defined in several ways. The word power was derived from the Latin word potere, which means being able (Silver 1982). Russell (1938) defined, power as the ability to bring out intended effects. Weber (1947) updated the definition, characterizing power as the
capability of a person to carry out his or her own will despite others' resistance. Along the same line, Kanter (1979) described power as the ability to mobilize resources to get things done.

Dahl's (1957) definition of power appears to be most widely used in a marketing context. He explained that, "if A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do, then A has power over B" (Dahl 1957, p. 203-204).

Power Bases

In 1959, French and Raven expanded Dahl's (1957) formulation by providing a taxonomy of power bases. The taxonomy identifies five bases of power: expert, referent, legitimate, reward, and coercive.

According to Bush (1980), a sales manager's power base is a source of influence in a relationship. For example, in the sales manager-salesperson relationship, a salesperson may comply with the manager for one, or a combination, of the following reasons:

1. As a superior, the sales manager has authority (legitimate power) to expect a change in the salesperson's behavior.

2. The salesperson recognizes the manager's special task-related knowledge and skill (expert power).

3. The salesperson likes the sales manager (referent power) and wants to maintain a favorable relationship.
4. The salesperson perceives the manager to possess the capacity to provide rewards.

5. As a superior, the sales manager has the capacity to remove rewards or administer punishment.

Perception plays a central role in all of the power bases. The importance of perception makes the concept of power intriguing. A salesperson attributes power to a manager. In reality, the manager may possess little or less power than the salesperson perceives. New salespersons may feel that a sales manager "really knows how to close," whereas the manager may confide that most of the experienced reps "can sell things around me." Because of the intangible, perceptual nature of power, the power base approach is central to this study. Power bases encapsulate the salespersons' perceptions. French and Raven's (1959) five power bases are defined as follows:

1. Reward power—when B perceives that A has the ability to administer rewards;

2. Coercive power—when B perceives that A has the ability to discipline;

3. Expert power—when B perceives that A possesses specialized expertise;

4. Referent power—when B perceives that A's goals are congruent; and

5. Legitimate power—when B perceives that A has a formal right to tell B what to do.
Attempts have been made to expand the set to include other power bases such as information (Brown, Lusch, and Muehling 1983; Kasulis and Spekman 1980; Lush and Brown 1982; Raven and Kruglanski 1970; Tedeschi and Bonoma 1972). Nevertheless, the five bases are the conventionally employed standards (Gaski 1986). They also provide a standardized basis for comparison.

Power Vis-a-Vis Influence

Although power and influence have sometimes been used interchangeably, conceptual distinctions can been drawn (Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990; Katz and Kahn 1966). For researchers who have used the two concepts synonymously, power and influence refer to a generalized ability to change the actions of others in some intended fashion (Dahl 1957; Gamson 1968; Katz and Kahn 1966). Other researchers who have drawn a conceptual distinction between power and influence have used power to refer to the power source and influence to refer to the process of enacting power. For example, Hinkin and Schriesheim (1990) defined influence as a process that involves the display of observable behaviors, and power as involving an inference or attribution (therefore it is unobservable).

A review of literature suggests that power bases and influence are distinct constructs (e.g., Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980).
Therefore, power and influence are treated separately in this study. The concept of power is conceptualized as consisting of intangible power bases that are unobservable, while the concept of influence involves tangible actions that are observable. Influence is used to benefit from a particular compliance behavior by another individual.

Influence Tactics

Influence consists of a wide range of tactical behaviors that are used by individuals to obtain personal benefits or to satisfy organizational goals (Erez and Rim 1982; Kipnis et al. 1984). The tactical behaviors are within the realm of the influence process. The process of influence involves an agent acting so as to obtain particular compliance behaviors on the target's part (Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).

Over time, researchers have identified a number of types of influence tactics that people use individually, or in a group, when trying to exert influence in a work setting (e.g., Gilman 1962; Harsanyi 1962; Rosenberg and Pearlin 1962). Data in Table 2 summarize classificatory scheme for influence tactics.

Data in Table 2 also reveal that, for the most part, classifications of influence tactics have been developed independently of the direction of influence. The direction of the influence can be upward, downward, or lateral. While
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Classification of Influence Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gilman (1962)         | 1. Coercion  
                        2. Manipulation  
                        3. Persuasion  
                        4. Authority |
| Harsanyi (1962)       | 1. Distributing punishment  
                        2. Supply of information  
                        3. Distributing rewards  
                        4. Legitimate authority |
| Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962) | 1. Coercion  
                                     2. Persuasion  
                                     3. Contractual power  
                                     4. Manipulation |
| Cartwright (1965)     | 1. Physical control  
                        2. Information control  
                        3. Control over gains  
                        4. Using same attitudes |
| Steger and Tedeschi (1971) | 1. Threats  
                                   2. Persuasion  
                                   3. Promises  
                                   4. Manipulation |
| Mowday (1975)         | 1. Threats  
                        2. Persuasive arguments  
                        3. Manipulation  
                        4. Legitimate authority  
                        5. Reward |
| Allen et al. (1979)   | 1. Attacking or blaming others  
                        2. Image building  
                        3. Ingratiation  
                        4. Associating with influentials  
                        5. Use of information  
                        6. Support building for  
                        7. Power coalition  
                        8. Creating obligations |
                                      2. Persuasion  
                                      3. Manipulative persuasion  
                                      4. Negation sanctions  
                                      5. Manipulation |
| Jones and Pitman (1982) | 1. Ingratiation  
                                     2. Exemplification  
                                     3. Supplication  
                                     4. Intimidation  
                                     5. Self-promotion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tedeschi and Malburg (1984)</td>
<td>1. Defensive tactics (e.g., apologies, self-handicapping etc.) 2. Assertive tactics (e.g., self-promotion, ingratiation etc.) 3. Defensive strategies (e.g., helplessness, phobias etc.) 4. Assertive strategies (e.g., attraction, status assertion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it is true that most of these schemes can be used in any direction, frequency of use can vary as a function of the direction of use (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Porter, Allen and Angle 1981; Yukl and Falbe 1990). For example, in the relationship between a sales manager and a sales representative ingratiation is more likely to be an upward influence tactic:

Drawing from the classifications in Table 2, a modified categorization of influence tactics can be developed to incorporate both the direction of influence and the target of influence acts. The various tactics can, thus, be reclassified by direction into three broad target categories: downward influence tactics, lateral influence tactics, and upward influence tactics.

Downward influence processes include methods used by individuals to secure compliance from their subordinates. Downward influence has been studied extensively under the general framework of leadership (Mowday 1978; Schilit and Locke 1982). Lateral influence tactics include the methods used by persons, individually or as a group, to influence their colleagues. Lateral influence tactics have been discussed in literature addressing group dynamics and socialization (Porter, Allen and Angle 1981). Upward influence tactics involve ways in which employees influence their superiors in order to enhance or protect their self-interest as individuals or as a group. As previously
discussed, the focus of this study is primarily within the
domain of upward influence. From the perspective of
understanding salespersons' behavior, this domain seems most
important to the determination of how salespersons'
influence managers. Therefore, further discussion is
directed at reviewing the use of upward influence tactics by
employees.

Upward Influence Tactics

Upward influence is defined as "attempts to influence
someone higher in the formal hierarchy of authority in the
Several researchers have devised categorization schemes to
classify these influence attempts. The classification
scheme devised by Schilit and Locke (1982) provides a fairly
comprehensive framework for these upward influence tactics.
Schilit and Locke's (1982) classification scheme is updated
in Table 3, which includes the findings of subsequent
studies that have addressed upward-influence tactics.

Upward influence tactics may be further classified into
one of two (though not mutually exclusive) categories: (a)
non-political (apolitical/functional) influence--carrying
out normal, routine expectations of formal rule; or (b)
political influence--using means not sanctioned by the
organizations (Ralston 1985). In addition, the source of
upward-influence attempts can be classified as individual or
group, depending upon the self-interests of the party
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>Description and Past Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationality</strong>...</td>
<td>Individuals use logical arguments and factual evidence to persuade their immediate superiors that a proposal or request is viable and likely to result in the attainment of task objective (Mechanic 1962; Mowday 1978; Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Porter, Allen and Angle 1981; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Offermann and Schrier 1985; Ansari and Kapoor 1987; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation</strong>...</td>
<td>Individuals seek to get their immediate superiors to think favorably of them before asking them to do something favorable (Mechanic 1962; Kipnis and Vanderveer 1971; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Offermann and Schrier 1985; Ansari and Kapoor 1987; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange</strong>......</td>
<td>Individuals make an explicit or implicit promise of rewards or tangible benefits if their superiors comply with a request or remind them of a prior favor to be reciprocated (Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977; Mowday 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Offermann and Schrier 1985; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>Description and Past Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal.......</td>
<td>Individuals appeal to higher management for assistance in gaining their immediate superiors’ approval of a request (Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Ansari and Kapoor 1987; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness........</td>
<td>Individuals use demands, threats, or intimidation to convince their immediate superiors to comply with a request or to support a proposal (Mowday 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Offermann and Schrier 1985; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition............</td>
<td>Individuals seek the aid of others to persuade their immediate superiors to do something or use the support of others as an argument for their superiors to agree (Mechanic 1962; Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Rim and Erez 1980; Schilit and Locke 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984; Offermann and Schrier 1985; Deluga 1988, 1989; Yukl and Falbe 1990; Hinkin and Schriesheim 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking.............</td>
<td>Individuals use threats or sanctions to stop their immediate supervisors from carrying out some action (Mowday 1978; Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Porter, Allen and Angle 1981; Schilit and Locke 1982).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involved. Based on these two dimensions, and the types of upward-influence tactics identified by previous researchers, the upward-influence process can be examined in terms of the matrix provided in Figure 3.

Rationality, assertiveness, upward appeal, and exchange are examples of political behaviors that are oriented toward seeking individual self-interests. While rationality is nonpolitical because it involves carrying on normal work, coalition and blocking are examples of political acts directed at serving interests of a group. The focus of this study is on the two left-hand cells in Figure 3, with one exception. Coalition is also treated as an individual attempt. This is because an individual has the option of leading a coalition to achieve personal goals, coalition goals, or both personal and coalition goals.

Finally, influence tactics can be classified as coercive or noncoercive. While assertiveness and upward appeal are based on coercive power, ingratiation, exchange, rationality, and coalition are based on noncoercive power, such as expertise, charisma, and likability. For example, to go over one's superior (upward appeal) is likely to have unfavorable repercussions for future relationships with the superior (Yukl and Falbe 1990). However, tactics such as ingratiation and rationality are appropriate tactics when a subordinate (e.g., sales representative) has authority to make decisions that must be supported by the superior.
Figure 3
Upward Influence Tactics Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Self-Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Political</td>
<td>- Rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>- Ingratiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Upward Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assertiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stated Literature Regarding Upward Influence Tactics

As evidenced by the studies cited in Tables 2, 3, and 4 which list the major empirical research done in this area (together with the nature of the scale used in each study, type of sample, and reliability of scales used for measuring influence tactics), study of upward-influence tactics as a research topic has attracted interest over a long period of time. Yet, it is important to note that some studies in this area leave open more issues than they answer, particularly in the area of scale measurement and validity.

1. Some of the instruments used in the studies have very poor reliability coefficients, which raises serious doubt about the validity of results.

2. Most researchers examined a single factor that can affect a specific influence tactic without controlling for other possible extraneous factors (assumption of ceteris paribus). It is important to include all possible predictive factors of influence tactics in the analysis to determine the effects of one factor in the presence of another.

3. Nine of the thirteen studies cited in Table 4 employed student samples. While students definitely influence professions, such a focus limits the ability to generalize results of the studies to other populations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHERS</th>
<th>STUDY AREA</th>
<th>BASIS OF SCALE</th>
<th>TYPE OF SCALE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ITEMS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF POINTS</th>
<th>COEFFICIENT ALPHA</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stogdill (1974)</td>
<td>Upward influence tactics by supervisors</td>
<td>Leadership subordinate interactions</td>
<td>Likert type (Stogdill 1974)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39 - 79</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry (1976)</td>
<td>Upward influence tactics</td>
<td>Self-confidence, personality, and influence tactics</td>
<td>Likert type</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specht and Wohlers</td>
<td>intra-organizational influence tactics</td>
<td>Identity type of influence tactics used in organizations</td>
<td>Likert type</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42 - 78</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot and Kim (1982)</td>
<td>influence tactics</td>
<td>Relationship between influence tactics and goals</td>
<td>Likert type (Kopra et al. 1980)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt and Kopra (1984)</td>
<td>Use of influence Tactics</td>
<td>Effects of goals on the use of influence tactics</td>
<td>Likert type (IPQIS inventory)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53 - 58</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koleh (1985)</td>
<td>Upward influence tactics by sales managers</td>
<td>Effects of influence tactics on sales representative role clarity and self-esteem</td>
<td>Likert type (Stogdill 1974)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulman and Kopra (1985)</td>
<td>Use of influence Tactics</td>
<td>Impact on role and attitude towards power</td>
<td>Likert type</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45 - 82</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammer and Kopra (1987)</td>
<td>Upward influence tactics</td>
<td>Use of influence tactics in different organizational contexts</td>
<td>Likert type</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67 - 83</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluga (1988)</td>
<td>Politics of influence tactics</td>
<td>Task leadership and subordinate influence tactics</td>
<td>Likert type (IPQIS inventory)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89 - 84</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluga (1990)</td>
<td>Influence Tactics</td>
<td>Influence tactics as a shaping mechanism</td>
<td>Likert type (IPQIS inventory)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61 - 80</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuk and Fuller (1990)</td>
<td>Influence Tactics</td>
<td>Influence tactics used in organizations</td>
<td>Likert type</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61 - 79</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IPQIS - Inventory of Organizational Influence Strategies*
It is also interesting to note that it is only during the past decade that the topic has received most of the attention. One of the reasons behind this recent increase in interest can be attributed to the development of reliable scales for measuring the construct. The landmark work of Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980) was the first major effort to empirically derive a taxonomy of interpersonal influence processes. Later, these same researchers developed an instrument that was designed to measure various influence tactics. Subsequently, after modifying the original scale, Kipnis and Schmidt (1982) developed a commercial version of their instrument called, the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS). Despite its relative newness, the scale constructed by Kipnis and Schmidt has been used with increasing frequency and research building on their work has begun to appear with some degree of regularity (e.g., Ansari and Kapoor 1987; Erez and Rim 1982; Erez, Rim and Keider 1986; Kipnis and Schmidt 1983; Kipnis et al. 1984; Rim and Erez 1980; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984).

In addition to the seminal work of Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980), several other researchers have also tried to construct scales designed to measure the upward-influence process in organizations. The original instrument of Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson was trimmed, refined, and validated using confirmatory factor analysis by Schriesheim
and Hinkin (1990) after almost a decade. Compared to other existing instruments, this measure of influence tactics has impressive psychometric properties. The instrument has been tested in four different samples and, on all occasions, the dimensions of the scale were stable. Cronbach's alpha for each dimension exceeded 0.7 at all occasions (Nunnally 1978). The validation of the Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) scale made it an appropriate instrument for use in conducting this research on influence tactics.

**Individual Characteristics of Salespersons as Influence Agents**

Existing literature indicates that individual characteristics have a major impact on the use various influence tactics (Baldridge 1975; Bell 1975; French and Raven 1959; Liden and Mitchell 1988; Patchen 1974; Ralston 1985). Characteristics identified in the literature that have major bearing in the use of influence tactics can be classified under three broad categories: (1) locus of control, (2) motivational factors, and (3) demographic characteristics (Falbo 1977; Goodstadt and Hjelle 1973; Goodstadt and Kipnis 1970; Kipnis and Cosentino 1969; Kipnis and Lane 1962). Briefly, locus of control refers to an agent's beliefs regarding whether success or failure is attributed to external or internal factors. Among the several motivational factors that can be responsible for
promoting upward influence-tactics in organizations are manifest needs, such as the need for achievement (nAch) and the need for power (nPow) (McClelland 1967; McClelland and Burnham 1976). Past research has also seemed to suggest that demographic factors, such as, job tenure and gender, could affect the choice and use of influence tactics. Each type of personal characteristics (locus of control, motivational factors and demographic characteristics) is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Locus of control

Rotter's (1966) theory holds that individuals differ in a systematic manner in their beliefs regarding their personal successes and failures. Internals tend to believe that their outcomes are the result of the ability and effort that they apply, while externals believe that their personal outcomes are the result of factors that are outside their control (e.g., luck, competition, economy) (Weiner 1974). Influence agents with an internal locus of control show more inclination toward affecting the outcomes they receive (Behrman and Perreault 1984). In an upward influence situation an internally-oriented salesperson is expected to make greater efforts to secure desired outcomes than a salesperson possessing an external locus of control.
Motivational Factors

Content theories of motivation are grounded in the premise that individuals have a relatively stable set of needs which encourage them to take actions for their fulfillment (Campbell et al. 1970). The concept of manifest needs, stems from Murray's (1938) pioneering work, and includes twenty needs. Two of the needs have been studied extensively in organizational settings, the need for power and the need for achievement (McClelland and Burnham 1976).

Individuals with a high need for power attempt to control their work environment and to influence other people (McClelland and Watson 1973; Winter 1973). Such individuals can be expected to take an active role in affecting important outcomes through the use of increased influence attempts. This being the case, it seems reasonable to presume that individuals with a high need for power are likely to show greater upward influence attempts than are individuals with a low need for power.

Need for achievement is generally described as aspiration to achieve goals and greater task orientations (Jackson 1967; Steers 1976). A high need for achievement is also viewed as being positively related to self-confidence in influence situations (Tedeschi, Schlenker and Linkskold 1972). Consequently, individuals with a high need for achievement can be expected to initiate influence attempts more often persons with a low need for achievement. In
situations where individuals' attempts to influence their superiors are instrumental in task accomplishment and reward, the need for achievement may be particularly strong.

Mowday's (1978) research supports these findings. He found that persuasive arguments (similar to rationality) as an influence tactic were significantly correlated, positively, with need for achievement. In addition, Mowday found a positive relationship between need for power and upward-influence activity. He found that individuals with a high need for power made greater use of upward influence tactics to influence their superiors. The type of influence tactics used were specifically persuasive arguments and manipulation (similar to ingratiation).

Person Characteristics

Gender

Despite a great deal of attention to gender differences in research addressing leadership and manager behavior styles (Brown 1979; Rigel and Galligan 1980; Terborg 1977), a paucity of studies have been conducted to investigate gender differences in social influence behavior. Both popular and scholarly writings have indicated evidence of gender differences in an agent's use of specific influence tactics (Lips and Colwill 1978; Tavris and Offir 1977).

The few studies that have been conducted to investigate social influence behavior have had two limitations. First,
they were mainly focused on downward-influence tactics, typically those employed by male subjects (Goodstadt and Kipnis 1970; Kipnis and Lane 1962). Second, the researchers have examined gender differences only with respect to a small subset of available influence tactics, such as pay allocations (e.g., Callahan-Levy and Messe 1979).

Sex-based differences in the use of influence tactics are often based on sex role stereotypes in which indirect, manipulative tactics (e.g., helplessness, liking) are seen as more typical of women, and direct tactics based on concrete resources that are independent of relationships (e.g., money, physical strength) are seen as more typical of men (Broverman et al. 1972; Falbo 1977; Johnson 1978; Tedeschi 1972). Furthermore, a wider range of influence tactics is seen as more appropriate for men than for women (Broverman et al. 1972; Johnson 1976). These assumed gender differences in social influence attempts have been attributed to societal, political, and economic inequalities that grant males greater access than females to power resources (Johnson 1978).

In a sales work environment, for example, salespersons typically control personally derived resources (e.g., expertise, referent power) that provide them with power. Several researchers have suggested that men and women in formal work settings differ in their access to their personal power resources (Epstein 1970; Kanter 1977;
Offermann and Schrier 1985; Terborg 1977). However, there is little direct empirical evidence that men and women differ in their actual use of influence tactics in a specific setting such as a sales organization.

Tenure with Organization and Self-Confidence

Previous research suggests a strong relationship between the number of years experience in the job and the type of influence tactic used (Mowday 1979). However, this relationship may not be indirect. Job tenure seems to have a moderating effect between self-confidence and the type of influence tactic used. At least for males, it has been found that the use of influencing tactics by experienced supervisors closely resembles that of high self-confidence individuals (Kipnis and Cosentino 1969; Kipnis and Lane 1962; Mowday 1979).

Self-confidence appears to affect influence tactics in at least two ways. First, self confidence affects the propensity of individuals to exercise influence in a given situation (Mowday 1978; Pollard and Mitchell 1972). Second, self-confidence is likely to affect the type of influence tactic that is used (Goodstadt and Kipnis 1970; Kanter 1977; Kipnis and Lane 1962; Raven and Kruglanski 1970).

Other variables that may affect self-confidence include need for power and need for achievement (Mowday 1978). However, the nature of their relationships remains unclear.
at the present time. Therefore, only the direct relationship between job tenure and the type of influence tactics used was investigated in this study.

**Selection of a Target to Influence**

Engaging in influence tactics necessitates the selection of a target of influence. It is essential that a chosen target possess the control of desired resources (Tedeschi 1972). The basic question therefore is: "Who has the power to allocate the desired resources?" As mentioned earlier, power is frequently partitioned into ostensible sets of mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive subtypes or bases that include expert, reward, coercive, legitimate, and referent power. A person who is trying to use influence tactics is concerned with the identification and selection of a target who (1) possesses an appropriate base of power and (2) whose power is high enough to accomplish the objective that the target agent seeks (Tedeschi, Schlenker and Lindskold 1972).

Potential costs to the person attempting to influence a target are also an important consideration in choosing from various power holders. The target should have sufficient power to accomplish an outcome that is acceptable to the source, at a minimal cost to the agent (source). Otherwise, costs to the agent in this context can have negative outcomes as a result of the influence attempt.
Sales Manager as the Salesperson's Target of Influence

Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Lindskold (1972) suggest that with respect to target selection in organizations, "people have a 'natural' tendency to go through the channels of authority" (p. 314). For example, the most likely target of influence would be the immediate superior. About two-thirds of the respondents in a study reported by Allen, Angle and Porter (1979) selected their immediate superior as a first-choice target of influence.

In a sales manager-salesperson relationship, it is reasonable to expect that the latter will choose the former as the most frequent target of influence. The sales manager plays a pivotal role in the sales organization structure (Stanton 1989). This is because the salesperson's interaction with other individuals in the organization who have power is minimum (more distant interactions) due to salesperson's spending more time outside the organization.

Salespersons as a Source of Power

There is little doubt that the relative power of the influence agent on the target to be influenced greatly affects the choice of influence strategy chosen by the influence agent. First, the degree of personal relationship between the agent and the target affects the type of influence tactic used. Second, the degree of shared
objectives between the agent and the target also affects the type of influence tactics used. When the person who is attempting to influence has less power than the target, it is unlikely that a negative mode of influence would be chosen for use against a relatively powerful target, unless, of course, the intent was a defensive one (Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Lindskold 1972). Use of coercion encourages retaliation and elicits negative reciprocity norms, thus increasing the costs and decreasing the probability of a successful influence. Indirect support for this hypothesis comes from the evidence that verbal aggression against a high-power source decreases as the individual's power increases (Graham et al. 1951; Reiser, Reeves, and Armington 1955; Worchel 1957). Similarly, Lippitt et al. (1952) found that nondirective persuasive influence attempts were used more often by low than by high power children.

An important consideration concerning potential cost in selecting a target is interpersonal attraction between the agent and the potential targets. Costs to the agent are referred to as possible negative outcomes that may be experienced by the target as a result of the influence attempt. For example, Tedeschi (1974) discusses evidence that "liking relationships" tend to arouse expectation and that liked person will "provide benefits or favors of various types and values across a number of situations over time" (p. 198). That is, an interpersonal attraction
reduces the cost of approaching a target, thereby reducing the felt risk of attempting to influence an interpersonally attractive target. French and Snyder (1959) found that the subjects who undertook more persuasive influence attempts than other members of a group rated the source as better liked. If this hypothesis is true, sources direct more influence attempts to targets that have relatively high referent power. This is because referent power is thought of as a satisfying association with a subordinate in the past, and the role partner desires to continue the relationship (Walker, Churchill and Ford 1972).

Homans (1950; 1961) suggests that liking develops from the mutual mediation of rewards. Experimental evidence supports Homans' theory (Berkowitz and Daniels 1963; Berkowitz and Levy 1956; Goranson and Berkowitz 1966; Kleiner 1960; Lerner and Mathews 1967; Myers 1962; Solomon 1960; Zajonc and Marin 1967). Conversely, persons who willingly impede goal attainment or otherwise punish other persons, irrespective of the nature of the relationship, are disliked (Burnstein and Worchel 1962; French, Morrison, and Levinger 1960; Kipnis 1958; Lerner 1965; Zajonc and Marin 1967). Liking produces expectations of cooperative and rewarding interactions (Kaufmann 1967), and hence encourages frequent interactions and ample opportunity for influence. This suggests that sources direct more influence tactics toward targets that have high reward and referent power.
Salespersons' Base of Power

A basic fact about upward influence is that the person attempting to influence possesses less formal authority than the target of influence. Formal authority is derived from the target person's position within the social hierarchy and is also referred to as position power. The fact that the influence agent cannot rely on formal authority means that the agent likely has less power. Influence agents can possess informal authority (e.g., nonpositional power bases) derived from individuals expertise and likability. Informal power bases are likely to explain why persons holding positions with little or no formal authority may be able to exercise much influence in an organization. When the influence agent is the salesperson, in a sales environment, the influencer lacks any kind of formal authority (positional power), which in turn minimizes his or her social power bases of reward, coercive, and legitimate power. However, power bases that are informal can be used by salespersons. These power sources can be determined by level of referent and expert power that has been accumulated by a salesperson over time. Therefore, the present discussion is focused on the referent and expert power bases of influence agents.
Influence Agents' Expert Power

Expertise is customarily considered to be the amount of relevant information or knowledge possessed by one person which is useful to another person's goal achievement. A person's expertise is directly proportional to his or her informational resources (Perreault and Miles 1978). The greater the expertise of the person, the more likely his or her help is sought by others (Homans 1961). An expert's knowledge is a positive resource which can be exchanged for values mediated by others.

The possession of knowledge resources should increase an expert source's probability of success in an influence attempt. Field studies of the interaction of persons in the mental-health profession have shown, the more influential persons were those who were in the more highly trained professions (Hurwitz, Zander and Hymovitch 1968). Coleman, Black, and Mouton (1958) found that key factors related to the effectiveness of expertise as a basis of influence included the difficulty, complexity, or ambiguity of the task. In a sales environment, where a salesperson's task can be high in difficulty, complexity, and ambiguity, it can be anticipated that the information dependence of a sales manager may lead to the seeking and acceptance of information from the salesperson. Expertise of the source in a sales environment refers to special information possessed; and therefore, the expert (agent) prefers
persuasion or informational modes of manipulation as influence attempts to coercive modes. Expertise does not provide the source with the kinds of resources that would be required to manipulate reinforcements or to make threats or promises which prohibit the use of coercive tactics. Therefore, influence attempts such as rationality and ingratiating are more likely to be used more frequently as informational and manipulative modes.

Influence Agent's Referent Power

In a dyadic relationship between a salesperson and a sales manager, some form of interpersonal attraction can result in a greater liking for each other. Past research suggests that a liking can develop from mutual mediation of rewards that are given willingly or which otherwise facilitate the goal attainment of others, whether the nature of the relationship is competitive or cooperative (Berkowitz and Daniels 1963). Liking produces expectations of cooperative and rewarding interactions (Kaufmann 1967) and, therefore, encourages frequent interaction and ample opportunity for influence.

Based on this relationship of liking to expectations of rewarding interactions, subjective expected utility theory may be used to interpret the effects of liking on interpersonal influence. A source's perception that another person likes him or her increases the subjective probability
that the other person will be compliant to influence attempts. Source referent power (attraction) should, therefore, be directly related to the frequency of such influence attempts. In support of this hypothesis, French and Snyder (1959) found that subjects attempted more influence attempts when the other members of the group rated the source as better liked.

Interpersonal attraction (referent power) not only affects the frequency of influence but also affects the mode chosen by the source. Bramel (1969) states that a person should want to give those he or she likes what he or she believes they want. Consistent with this rationale, Walster and Prestholdt (1966) found that social work trainees' offers to help fictitious clients were consistent with the liking expressed for them. Similarly, Krauss (1966) found support for the hypothesis that as interpersonal attraction increases, the frequency with which threats are used decreases.

Situational Factors

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Organizational stress is described as a perceived dynamic status involving uncertainty about something important (Schuler 1984). There are two key aspects of role stress—role conflict and role ambiguity (French and Caplan
A salesperson’s role conflict is "the degree of incongruity or incompatibility of expectations associated with the role" (Miles and Perreault 1976, p. 19). Salespersons are often involved with different role partners (i.e., different customers and managers) who place incompatible demands on them (Ford, Walker and Churchill 1975). Therefore, much of the sales force research has focused on the intersender aspect of the role conflict (Behrman and Perreault 1984). However, other aspects of role conflict, such as work overload (Weiss 1962), intrasender conflict, and personal-role conflict, are also typical of the sales task environment (Franke, Behrman, and Perreault 1982; Teas 1983).

Salespersons are prone to high levels of conflict because of the boundary spanning position of their job. Because they are often in the field and isolated physically and psychologically from day-to-day interactions at the home office, salespersons have a reduced opportunity for communication with their managers, thus resulting in ambiguity. Similarly, salespersons may be attracted to the autonomy of the job, but this autonomy can result in greater role ambiguity if there is no close supervision.

Role ambiguity occurs when a salesperson does not feel that he or she has the necessary information to perform the job adequately. Salespersons may be uncertain about what
some or all of their role partners expect of them in certain situations, how they should go about satisfying their role partners' expectations, or how their performance will be evaluated and rewarded (Walker, Churchill, and Ford 1975).

Most researchers argue that a high potential for role conflict and ambiguity is inherent in the very nature of the sales representative's job (Hise 1970; Pruden 1969; Walker, Churchill and Ford 1972). They must work on the boundary between two independent organizations. They must satisfy divergent interests of both parties in an exchange relationship. They are often expected to produce innovative solutions to new and unusual problems. Therefore, it is understandable that individual sales representatives often feel uncertain about how to do their jobs and that they are caught in the middle between conflicting demands.

Early researchers in the area of organizational behavior treated role conflict and role ambiguity as independent aspects of role stress. Yet, in boundary-spanning positions such as sales jobs, empirical evidence seems to suggest that this is not the case (Fisher and Gitelson 1983; Miles 1976). Some researchers argue that role conflict should be viewed as contributing to higher levels of ambiguity because a sales representative's job is simultaneously being defined by the sales manager, customers, and even competition (Donnelly and Ivancevich 1975; Franke, Behrman and Perreault 1982). The conflicting
expectations' aggregate ambiguity about what activities are most appropriate or important (Behrman and Perreault 1984).

Conceptual (Walker, Churchill and Ford 1977) and empirical (Behrman and Perreault 1984; Fry et al. 1986; Walker, Churchill and Ford 1975) evidence suggest that both role conflict and role ambiguity relate negatively to variables such as job satisfaction, and positively to job turnover, perceived risk, and job anxiety. For example, Miles (1976; 1977) found that employees who possessed low authority suffered the greatest role conflict, suggesting high job stress levels for sales representatives. Coping mechanisms, such as withdrawal and abandoning one's role, may be undesirable in this job stress situation, however. Coping mechanisms that use influence attempts to gain control over one's environment in order to reduce uncertainty may have a stress-reducing impact (Thompson 1981). This finding suggests that sales representatives may attempt to minimize role conflict and ambiguity by targeting influence behavior at their sales managers.

However, examination of recent empirical literature reviews suggests that little previous research has been completed on coping mechanisms for resolving role conflict and ambiguity (Deluga 1989; Fisher and Gitelson 1983; Jackson and Shuler 1985) in any environment. The area has been cited as one of the most promising for future investigation (VanSell, Brief and Schuler 1981).
The level of role conflict and role ambiguity, therefore, should influence both the frequency and type of influence attempts. Intense conflict undermines the trustworthiness of sales managers and can produce enough distrust to discourage the utilization of positive influencing tactics such as rationality, exchange, and ingratiation. As such, negative (coercive) influence modes such as assertiveness, upward appeal, and coalition, are often perceived as the only modes which can be effective in controlling the behavior of the target when a high degree of conflict exists (Goodstadt and Kipnis 1970; Kelley and Thibault 1969).

Job Satisfaction

Traditionally, job satisfaction is defined as an emotional state reflecting an affective response to a job situation (Locke 1976). According to Lawler and Hall (1970), job satisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between what individuals expect to get out of their jobs and what their jobs actually offer. Essentially, then, job satisfaction is a summary perception of employees' perceptions of how well their jobs provide the things which they view as important. In the organizational behavior field, job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude (Vroom 1964). Satisfaction differs notably from a related construct, job involvement, which is defined
as a cognitive belief state reflecting the degree of psychological identification with one's job (Kanungo 1982; Lawler and Hall 1970; Locke 1976; Rabinowitz and Hall 1977).

Job satisfaction represents several related attitudes. Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) have suggested that there are five job dimensions of satisfaction with a job. These dimensions are: (1) work itself—the extent to which the job provides an individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and a chance to accept responsibility; (2) pay—the amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable to others in the organization; (3) promotion opportunity—the employee's chances of advancement in the hierarchy; (4) supervision—the ability of supervisors to provide technical assistance and behavioral support; and (5) coworkers—the degree to which fellow workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

Many sales force researchers have identified factors that affect job satisfaction in organizational settings. However, little if any empirical research on job satisfaction and the use of upward-influence tactics in a sales environment has been reported. Intuitively, there should be a relationship between job satisfaction and the frequency of upward-influence tactics, because influences are used to obtain compliance behaviors and such compliance behaviors are desired when there is a discrepancy between
what is expected and what is actually offered (e.g., dissatisfaction).

**Upward Influence Styles**

The first part in this chapter was focused on the attempt trying to answer two related questions. First, what are some of the influence tactics used by subordinates to influence sales managers? Second, Under what circumstances are salespersons most likely to choose one specific influence tactic over another? The next logical question to be answered is, Do will salespersons typically use upward influence tactics in combination when attempting to gain favorable outcomes from their sales managers? And, if so, What is the relationship between these influence styles and other factors such as perception of superiors' power bases, individual need variables such as the need for achievement and the need for power, situational variables such as role conflict, role ambiguity and job satisfaction, and outcome variables such as propensity to leave, and compensation?

Power and influence theorists such as Kelly (1988) have reasoned that individuals typically use various upward influence tactics in combination when attempting to gain compliance from individuals at higher organization levels. Unfortunately, very little research has been designed to
empirically identify these mixes of influence styles and their reaction to outcome variables.

Influence attempts can reflect different styles of behavior. These styles of behavior can consist of different mixes of influence tactics, and the composition of these mixes can be influenced by such factors as characteristics of the target person and the dyadic relationship with the target person (Perreault and Miles 1978). A pioneering study by Perreault and Miles (1978), identified five clusters of employees, each composed of individuals who used similar influence tactics. The first influence style cluster consists of individuals who use multiple influence tactics. The second cluster consists of individuals who use their expert knowledge as a basis for influencing others. The third cluster consists of individuals who use friendly tactics. The fourth cluster consists of individuals who use their position in an organization, and the fifth cluster consists of employees who do not use influence of any kind. Their research also revealed that choices of a particular influence style were significantly related to the characteristics of the person and of the dyadic relationship between the source and the agent (target) person.

However, choices of influence style can be affected by other factors that were not considered in Perreault and Miles’ study. Patchen (1974) suggested that individual differences of the source should also be considered. The
work of Adams (1976) concerning the structure and dynamics of organization boundary roles has demonstrated that the prediction of the influence style that a source will employ against a target can be enhanced if the context in which these two parties are engaged is taken into account.

Kipnis and Schmidt (1983) adopted Perreault and Miles' (1978) procedure to identify combinations of management influence tactics. They identified the following three influence styles by using hierarchical cluster analysis: (1) shotgun-managers, who use the most influence and emphasize assertiveness and bargaining (similar to exchange); (2) tactician-managers, who use an average amount of influence and emphasize reason (similar to rationality); and (3) bystander-managers, who use little influence with their superiors. These influence styles corresponded to the three influence mixes (styles) identified by Perreault and Miles—multiple influence users, expertise users, and nonusers. Their study revealed that the use of influence styles varies with sources' control of power and their objectives. Other variables, such as organizational climate or culture (Adams 1976; Kipnis et al. 1984), stress level (Kipnis and Schmidt 1988), and perception of target characteristics (Perreault and Miles 1978), can also have a determining effect on the process. However, no attempt has been made to empirically identify the relationship of these mixes of influence and other variables.
CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Information concerning the empirical aspects of the research study are included in this chapter. Definition of variables, description of research design, and outline of analysis procedures comprise the major sections of this chapter.

Hypotheses

The objectives stated for this study relate to relationships between six types of influence tactics (ingratiation, rationality, coalition, upward appeal, exchange, and assertiveness) and other variables such as target characteristics (e.g., power base), agents characteristics (e.g., need for power, need for achievement, and locus of control), situational factors (e.g., job satisfaction, role conflict, role ambiguity), and outcomes (e.g., compensation, propensity to leave) as summarized in Figure 2. Several hypotheses were developed regarding these relationships. Most of the hypotheses involve only two constructs (e.g., self-perception of power and the use of influencing tactics). Bivariate relationships are proposed
because prior research on salespersons' use of upward influence tactics is practically nonexistent.

Hypotheses Related to Sales Managers' Perceived Power Bases

Past research indicates that relatively powerful sources are the most frequent targets of influence attempts (Cohen 1958; Hurwitz, Zander and Hymovitch 1968; Kelley 1951). As the premise to employing influence tactics, individuals believe that managers possess or control important rewards; therefore, a salesperson's use of influence attempts on a sales manager who has a high level of power should exceed from a sales manager who has low level of power. Sources having higher levels of perceived power are reportedly the ones who use the greatest number of influence tactics (Guetzkow 1968). Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize that, in a sales environment, salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will direct more influence attempts at managers that salespersons perceive as having high levels of power.

H1: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of influence tactics toward managers whom they perceive as having high levels of power than toward managers whom they perceive as having low levels of power.
A salesperson's likelihood of using influence tactics is greater if the manager likes the salesperson (French and Snyder 1959; Kaufmann 1967). The salesperson's perception that the target likes him or her will, therefore, increases the salesperson's subjective probability estimate that the manager will be compliant to the influence attempt (Tedeschi 1972).

The salesperson's perception of the target-liking corresponds to referent power. Therefore, the frequency of noncoercive influence tactics directed toward a sales manager who has a high level of referent power is high.

H1A: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of non-coercive influence tactics (e.g., rationality, exchange) toward managers whom they perceive as having high referent power than toward managers whom they perceive as having low referent power.

A salesperson using influence tactics expects the manager to control important rewards. Therefore, the frequency of influence attempts on a manager who has high reward power is expected to be greater than the frequency on managers who have low reward power (Tedeschi, Schlenker and Bonoma 1973).
H1B: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of influence tactics toward managers whom they perceive as having high reward power than toward managers whom they perceive as having low reward power.

When a salesperson has less power than a sales manager, the salesperson is unlikely to choose a negative or aggressive mode of influence (Graham et al. 1951; Reiser, Reeves and Armington 1955; Tedeschi, Schlenker and Lindskold 1972; Worchel 1957). The observation has also been made that non-directive persuasion attempts (similar to ingratiation) are used more often by individuals with low power (Lipitt et al., 1952). Therefore, it is hypothesized that salespersons with low self-perception of power use less aggressive influence tactics, such as ingratiation, coalition, and upward appeal, more often.

H2: Salespersons with low self-perceptions of power will show greater use of upward appeal, ingratiation, and coalition as influence tactics than will salespeople with high self-perceptions of power.

If a source with less perceived power is likely to choose a positive or a less aggressive mode of influence (Reiser, Reeves and Armington 1955; Tedeschi, Schlenker and Lindskold 1972), it is logical to assume that a source with high perceived power is more likely to employ a more aggressive mode of influence such as assertiveness,
rationality and exchange. Therefore, it is hypothesized that salespersons with high self-perceptions of power direct influence tactics, such as assertiveness, rationality and exchange, more often than do salespersons with low self-perceptions of power.

H3: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of rationality, assertiveness, and exchange as influence tactics than will salespersons with low self-perceptions of power.

Hypotheses Related to Individual Differences

The personal characteristics of individuals also affect the use of influence tactics (Baldridge 1975; Bell 1975; French and Raven 1959; Patchen 1974). According to Tedeschi and Lindskold (1976), the factors associated with influence attempts include (1) what the source is like, (2) what resources the source possesses (i.e., expertise), and (3) the intentions attributed to the source by the target.

Porter, Allen and Angle (1981) suggest that several motivational factors account for upward influence activities in organizations. Important among these are manifest needs, locus of control, and self-perception of power.

Manifest Needs

Manifest needs consists of factors such as, need for achievement and need for power (McClelland 1961). According
to Mowday (1978) individuals with a high need for power and with a high self-perception of power were rated high in upward influence activity by their superiors. Therefore, it is hypothesized that sales representatives with high need for power and high need for achievement will exhibit greater use of influence tactics.

H4: Salespersons with high need for power and high need for achievement will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with low need for power and low need for achievement.

Locus of Control

According to Rotter (1966) internals tend to believe that job outcomes are the results of personal ability and effort. Therefore, salespersons who possess an internal locus of control are more likely to be inclined toward influencing the outcomes they receive (e.g., performance, compensation). Applying the logic to a sales context, it appears reasonable to hypothesize that in an upward influence situation, such as a change in territory or achieving a promotion, salespersons with an internal locus of control use influence tactics more frequently to secure the desired outcomes.

H5: Salespersons with internal locus of control will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with external locus of control.
Self-Perception of Power

The frequency of influence attempts by the source also depends upon the source's self-perception of power (Mowday 1978; Tedeschi et al. 1973). Because, high self-perception of power is likely to affect the perceived probability of successfully exerting influence, salespersons who perceive high referent and expert power can be expected to use influence tactics more frequently.

H6: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of expert and referent power will show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics than will salespersons with low perceptions of expert and referent power.

The influence tactics used by source's with high self-perceptions of power are more persuasive (e.g., rationality) rather than coercive in nature (e.g., assertiveness). The use of coercive tactics may encourage retaliation and elicit negative reactions, thus increasing the cost while decreasing the probability of a successful influence. It is awkward for a weak person to threaten a powerful person (e.g., manager with high perceived power) because a weak person seldom possesses rewards which can be promised to the powerful person.
Hypotheses Related to Situational Variables

**Job Satisfaction**

According to Lawler and Hall (1970), job satisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between job expectations in terms of rewards sought and job incumbents' needs and what the job actually provides. If job expectations are met, individuals have high job satisfaction. However, if there are unmet expectations, individuals have low job satisfaction.

In light of the relationship between unmet expectations and job satisfaction, an influence tactic is used when salespersons attempt to gain favored outcomes from a sales manager (target) in order to satisfy their goals. Therefore, it is hypothesized that salespersons who have low job satisfaction (high expectations), use influence tactics more frequently.

**H7:** Salespersons with low job satisfaction will show greater use of influence tactics than salespeople with high job satisfaction.

**Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity**

Salespersons are likely to experience more role conflict and role ambiguity than other organization members because they occupy boundary role positions (Bagozzi 1978;
Some members of the salesperson's role set his (customers) are located outside of his or her own organization. As a result, salespersons receive demands from different organizations which have diverse goals, policies, and problems. Under a situation characterized by role stress, the most likely choice available to salespersons is to find a compromise or balance that they believe is acceptable to both partners (Karman 1970). One way for a salesperson to achieve balance involves using upward influence tactics such as rationality, exchange, upward appeal, or ingratiation when dealing with the sales manager.

**H8**: Salespersons with high role conflict and high role ambiguity will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with low role conflict and low role ambiguity.

**Hypotheses Related to Outcome Variables**

**Propensity to Leave**

No prior research has been done to test the relationship between the use of influence tactics and an individual's propensity to leave. More frequent use of influence tactics reflects dissatisfaction with existing job outcomes. Salespersons who frequently use influence
attempts may or may not succeed in their endeavor. Those who do not succeed are more likely to quit. Therefore, it is hypothesized that salespersons who are more-frequent users of influence tactics are more prone to leave.

H9: Salespersons that show a greater use of influence tactics have a higher intent to leave.

Compensation

Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) found that managers who use shotgun (use most influence and emphasize assertiveness and bargaining) and ingratiator (use ingratiation most often) influence styles made more money than managers who were tacticians (use average amount of influence and emphasize rationality) and bystander (use little influence) styles. It was also found that managers who used shotgun and ingratiator styles used influence tactics more frequently than managers who used tactician and bystander styles. Therefore, it is hypothesized that salespersons who are frequent users of noncoercive influence tactics receive higher salaries than do salespersons who use noncoercive influence tactics less frequently. This hypothesis does not include coercive tactics because they are infrequently used in an environment where salespersons have less power unless they plans to quit.
H10: Salespersons that show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics receive higher salaries than do salespersons who show less use of noncoercive influence tactics.

**Measures**

Information about different constructs of interest were sought using standardized instruments developed by various researchers. This section provides a brief description of each of the scales used in this study, together with reported validities and reliabilities of the instruments. The instrument used for measuring each of the constructs, together with the name, brief description, source of instrument, and names of the authors, are provided in Table 1.

The scale that was used to measure salespersons' use of influence tactics was, developed by Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990). This scale is a revised and revalidated version of the scale developed by Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980). Results of previous studies indicate acceptable internal consistency (between .73 and .83) and construct validity. Use of influence tactics is measured using eighteen, five-point Likert type scales with response categories ranging from one for never to five for very often.

Salespersons' perceptions of their superiors' power bases were assessed in terms of the five dimensions of power
suggested by French and Raven (1959). A scale developed by Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989) to measure respondents' perceptions of superiors' power bases provided the expected five dimensions—reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent. This scale has been factor analyzed using three different samples. On each occasion, the hypothesized dimensions have clearly emerged. The scale has also demonstrated good concurrent validity. The instrument uses twenty items on a Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from one for strongly agree to five for strongly disagree.

Locus of control, the generalized expectancy that rewards, reinforcements, or outcomes in life are controlled by one's own action or by other forces, was measured using the Work Locus of Control Scale developed by Spector (1988). Spector reported alpha reliabilities between .75 and .85 for the scale. The scale has demonstrated significant correlations with other theoretically meaningful variables in a number of samples. The mean score on the scale varied from 36.8 to 41.7, with the standard deviation ranging from 9.0 to 11.9. The instrument uses a sixteen-item summated scale ranging from one for disagree very much to six for agree very much.

The Manifest Needs Questionnaire, developed by Steers and Braunstein (1976), was used to measure individual salespersons' need for achievement and need for power. The questionnaire measures the two needs within work settings.
Items are phrased using behaviorally anchored scales. Results of both laboratory and field studies indicate that the instrument exhibits acceptable levels of convergent, discriminant, and predictive validities, as well as high test-retest reliability (0.72 and 0.86) and internal consistency (0.66 and 0.83). This scale has been used extensively in sales research (Bagozzi 1978).

Although, the original Manifest Needs Questionnaire used a seven-point scale (ranging from one for always to seven for never), the number of response points were lowered from seven to five to assure uniformity throughout the questionnaire; a measure suggested by Churchill (1987) and Nunnally (1978). According to Cox (1980), the number of points does not affect the reliability of measurement when set between five and nine.

Situational variables were also measured using scales validated by previous researchers. First, role conflict and role ambiguity were measured using items developed by House and Rizzo (1972). Their measures have been widely used in work settings. Internal consistency reliability for the two scales ranges from .63 to .87 for role ambiguity (median .79) to .56 to .82 (median .74) for role conflict (Cook et al. 1981). The scale consists of fourteen items with and uses a five-point, Likert-type scale with choices varying from one for very infrequently to five for very frequently.
Next, job satisfaction was measured using the Job Descriptive Index developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969), and later revised by Roznowski (1989). This instrument is viewed by many investigators as one of the most thoroughly researched and developed measures of its kind (Campbell et al. 1970; Vroom 1964). Items in the instrument relate respondents' satisfaction with five aspects of the job: work, coworkers, supervision, pay, and promotion (Smith, Kendall and Hulin 1969). Each facet is measured with nine or eighteen adjectives. These are scored three for yes, one for not sure, and zero for no for positively discriminating items, and zero for yes, one for not sure, and three for no for negatively discriminating items.

Propensity to leave was measured by four items, each of which rated a salespersons' perceived chance of quitting within the next three months, six months, one year or two years (Bluedorn 1982). Responses on the scale are scored as five for excellent, four for good, three for so-so, two for not so good, and one for terrible. As a manipulation check, a single item was included to measure how often the salesperson thought of quitting the job. The scale was scored as one for no extent, two for small extent, three for some extent, four for considerable extent, and five for very great extent. The propensity to leave measures used in this study are equal to, if not better than, those used by
previous researchers (Busch 1980; Futrell and Parasuraman 1984; Parasuraman and Futrell 1983).

Compensation was measured using four items. The first two items measured salespersons' yearly gross salary without incentives and with incentives. The other two items measured the overall percentage of increase or decrease in sales for the last two years. These two items were used as a manipulation check for the previous two questions. All four questions required open responses.

Research Design

Self-administered questionnaires (Appendix) were mailed to 600 salespersons working for a variety of organizations. The list of subscribers to a specialized selling magazine was used as the sampling frame. A letter providing a brief description of the study accompanied the questionnaire (Appendix). The cover letter also asked the salespersons to complete the questionnaire in private and to return it using the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Anonymity was assured. Two weeks after the initial mailout, a reminder letter and another copy of the survey were sent (Appendix).

Data Analysis

Preliminary statistical analyses included descriptive statistics and Pearson's product-moment correlation
coefficients. Descriptive statistics were compared with reported norms. Correlations between measures were examined to see if they were in the expected direction and to assess the possible presence of multicollinearity.

Specified hypotheses were tested using a series of Pearson's product-moment correlations, T-tests, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedures. Regression analysis was used to examine hypothesized relationships from the theoretical model. Each influence tactic was treated as a dependent variable. Personal characteristics and power perceptions were used as independent (predictor) variables. The effects of attitudinal variables were taken into account in the regression analysis procedure.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

A discussion of the characteristics of the data gathering techniques used in this study is provided in this chapter. An explanation of the study design and sample characteristics is also provided in order to enhance the value of the findings. The sampling frame and methods of data collection used are discussed first. The next section includes a summary of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, characteristics of the organizations in which they worked, and information related to their jobs. The final section, which presents the study findings, include a review of (1) the descriptive statistics, and correlations, (2) the reliability and validity of measures, (3) the tests of specified hypotheses, and (4) the multiple regression analysis.

Data Collection

Subscribers to a specialized selling magazine were used as the sampling frame for the study. Even though a majority
of the subscribers were sales representatives, the sample was heterogeneous in terms of such characteristics as industry, product, and selling cycle. Data concerning the respondents' industry, primary product sold, selling cycle, type of sales job (e.g., missionary sales, trade sales, technical sales), and salary structure for subsequent grouping and comparative analyses were gathered from the sample.

Questionnaires were mailed to 600 individuals who were randomly chosen from the mailing list. Each respondent received a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and assurance of confidentiality and anonymity, a two page questionnaire, and a postage-paid return envelope.

A copy of the cover letter and questionnaire are included in the Appendix. Ten days after the initial mail-out, a reminder letter, another survey, and a postage-paid return envelope were sent (Appendix). Data collection occurred over the three-week period from September 3, 1991 to September 21, 1991. From the 600 questionnaires that were mailed, 32 (5%) were undeliverable. Of the remaining 568 questionnaires, 98 completed and returned. The follow-up mailing provided an additional 48 responses. Of the 146 questionnaires returned, three surveys were unusable. Hence, the responses of 143 sales personnel (25.2%) were analyzed.
An indirect assessment of nonresponse bias was conducted using a time-trend extrapolation test (Armstrong and Overton 1977). The assumption underlying this test is that nonrespondents are more like late respondents than early respondents. To implement the procedure, the sample was split into quartiles based on temporal order in which questionnaires were returned. The first and last quartiles' responses were evaluated using demographic characteristics (e.g., age, number of times they had changed positions in the sales profession). No systematic differences in responses were evident using T-tests for differences between group means.

**Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

Table 5 provides a summary of the demographic and sales job related characteristics of the respondents. Respondents were predominantly male (107 respondents; 75 percent of the sample). Sales representatives also constituted 75 percent of the sample (106 respondents). The remaining 37 respondents were sales managers or managers of sales related areas (e.g., product managers, district managers, vice presidents etc.).
Type of Job and Compensation Plan

Salespersons included in the sample held several types of jobs. Missionary salespersons, who sell to new business and develop existing accounts, made up 45.5 percent of the sample; technical salespersons, who provide customers with detailed information regarding products and product applications, made up 22.4 percent of the sample; consultative salespersons, who provide advice and counseling in service related areas such as finance, insurance, and real estate, made up 16.1 percent of the sample; trade salespersons, who sell products to wholesale distributors and retail chain stores made up 10.5 percentage of the sample; and new business salespersons, who are involved in selling exclusively new business made up 5.6 percent of the sample.

Most of the salespersons surveyed (91 percent) were compensated using some type of incentive plan. The products and services sold by respondents were quite heterogeneous, and included medical equipment, office equipment, business services, and construction equipment.

Age, Tenure and Organization Size

The respondents' average age was 35 years. Their average number of years of work experience in selling or sales management was 10 years. The median number of
### Table 5
**Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of sales job:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales managers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers (other than sales)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation plan:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary plus bonus</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary plus commission</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Commission</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (draw commission)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General overall product category:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and publishing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food products</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of employees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 1000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time in position with Present employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change of positions in sales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of selling cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income in 1990 (before taxes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>42500</td>
<td>50209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employees in the organizations they worked for was 200. On an average, respondents had changed jobs 2.5 times. The average selling cycle for the products they sold was 22.83 weeks, and the median was 8 weeks. The median annual income of the respondents was $42,250. Thus, the salespersons in the sample were relatively experienced, worked for fairly substantial companies, sold products where the buying cycle was fairly extensive, and earned incomes comparable to those of other quasi-professional employees.

Assessing Response Bias

The potential effects of several demographic characteristics on variables of interest were assessed. Independent T-tests and oneway analysis of variance suggested no significant differences in response based on gender, position, job type, or compensation system. Results related to differences in gender and position differences of the analyses are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

The absence of differences in the use of influence tactics between males and females was contrary to findings reported by Instone, Major and Bunker (1983) and Offermann and Schrier (1985). This difference might be attributed to the proportion of females included in the study (25 percent), the composition of the sample, or the fact that the other studies used student samples. Thus, differences
TABLE 6
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES IN THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Appeal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: None of the variables were significant at P < .05. Sample Size: Male = 107, Female = 38

in findings regarding influence tactics may be influenced by population differences.

Appropriateness of the Sample

The data base used in this study has two major strengths. First, because the sample consisted of salespersons from approximately 143 different companies, contextual factors peculiar to a single source are greatly lessened, if not eliminated. Second, the companies included
TABLE 7
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SALES REPRESENTATIVES AND SALES MANAGERS
IN THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales representatives</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Managers</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. None of the differences were significant at P < .06. Sample Size: Sales Representatives = 106, Sales Managers = 31.

in this study marketed at least 20 or more different product categories. Therefore, the impact of industry-specific factors (e.g., economic cycle, seasonality) is balanced or lessened. The heterogeneous nature of the sample should increase the potential for generalizability of the study results across types of sales jobs and industries.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 8 includes a summary of the means, standard deviations, and correlations for all constructs included in this study. In cases where constructs were multidimensional (e.g., influence tactics, job satisfaction), separate correlations are provided for each dimension. While the highest correlation was between salespersons' expert power and perceptions of the manager's referent power \( (r = .91, \ p < .001) \), correlation between several variables approached zero (e.g., ingratiation and need for power, coalition and need for achievement).

The correlations observed in this study are in the same direction as those reported by previous researchers. For example, job satisfaction related positively with salespersons' perceptions of managers' reward, referent, and expert power but was negatively correlated with role conflict, role ambiguity, and propensity to leave. Salespersons who were internals (internal locus of control) were more satisfied with their jobs.

Correlation between the six influence tactics (rationality, ingratiation, coalition, upward appeal, exchange, and assertiveness) and other constructs being studied differed in direction. While some influence tactics correlated positively with some constructs, others related negatively, demonstrating the differences in the use of
### TABLE 8

**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, CORRELATIONS, AND RELIABILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchange</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coalition</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rationality</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expert (PSP)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Referent (PSP)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Legitimate (PSP)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reward (PSP)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coercive (PSP)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Expert (SPP)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>89</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>13. Referent (SPP)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88</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>14. Need for power (nPow)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Need for achievement (nAch)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Locus of control</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Role ambiguity</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Role conflict</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Work (JS)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Pay (JS)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Promotion (JS)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Coworkers (JS)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Supervisor (JS)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Propensity to leave</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Income (in thousands)</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSP = perception of superior's power; SPP = self perception of power; JS = job satisfaction.

Decimal points have been omitted. Correlations of 0.23 or higher are significant at \( P < .01 \). Correlations between 17 and 23 are significant at \( P < .05 \). The underlined values provide the reliability coefficients.
influence tactics. Of particular note, the relationship between influence tactic of rationality and other constructs (e.g., role conflict, need for achievement) was most often opposite to the relationships noted between coalition, upward appeal, ingratiation, exchange, and assertiveness and other constructs. For example, while rationality had a positive relationship with perception of superior's power and self-perception of power, the remaining five influence tactics had negative correlations. The direction of some of these correlations was unexpected. Further discussion of unexpected correlations is included in Chapter V.

Reliability and Validity of Measures

Alpha reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) for all scales are provided on the diagonal of the correlation matrix (Table 8). Aside from the scale measuring ingratiation, all scales exhibited suitable internal consistency (Nunnally 1978).

While the reliability and validity of most of the measures used in this study had been previously assessed by other researchers (e.g., role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction), some of the constructs have never been employed in a sales environment. Therefore, psychometric properties, specifically the discriminant validity of the untried measures, are discussed in the sections that follow.
Influence Tactics

Items used to measure ingratiation provided a low alpha reliability (alpha = 0.51). One reason for such a low scale reliability may be the number of items used to measure the construct. Findings reported by Kumar and Beyerlein (1991) suggest that ingratiation is a multi-dimensional construct. If so, measuring this four dimensional construct with three items may have created considerable systematic error reducing substantially the internal consistency of the measure (Churchill 1979; Peter 1979).

In order to investigate the dimensionality of the construct influence tactics, items were assessed using principle component analysis. Varimax rotation of the 18 items measuring influencing tactics resulted in 7 factors explaining 68 percent of item variance. However, only 6 factors were expected. An item concerning the influence tactic upward appeal had an item loading of 0.80 with the last factor (seventh factor). No other item loaded on this seventh factor. The item was dropped, and another principle component analysis was performed on the remaining 17 items. The items provided the expected 6 factors explaining 65.3 percent of the variance (see Table 9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 (Exchange)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (Assertiveness)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (Coalition)</th>
<th>Factor 4 (Rationality)</th>
<th>Factor 5 (Ingratiation)</th>
<th>Factor 6 (Upward appeal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reminded him of past</td>
<td>.77342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered an exchange</td>
<td>.75454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained in the chain of</td>
<td>.73827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to make a</td>
<td>.54805</td>
<td>.33000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a showdown in</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed my anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained the support</td>
<td>.84158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained the support</td>
<td>.72609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.380352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilized other people</td>
<td>.69276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented him (her) of</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed the reason</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used logic to convince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acted very humbly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84909</td>
<td>.77348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acted in a friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained the informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a formal appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item 8 is related to ingratiation
Perception of Superior's Power and
Self-Perception of Power

In order to assess discriminant validity for the two scales, each scale was examined using principle component analysis. Both the perception of superior's power measure and the self-perception of power measure demonstrated the expected dimensionality (Tables 10 and 11).

Perception of superior's power items explained 70% of the item variance while those measuring SPP explained 68% of item variance. Since the reliabilities of these factors were also satisfactory, both instruments were considered psychometrically acceptable.

Use of Influence Tactics: Comparison of Three Studies

Prior to testing of the hypotheses, the frequency of the use of influence tactics reported by salespersons was compared with that reported in previous studies. Table 12 includes a comparison of the results of this study with the results studies by of Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson's (1980) and Yukl and Falbe (1990). While all three scales had identical responses, ranging from 1 for never to 5 for always, the number of items used in the three scales and the contents of the scales were different.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1 (referent)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (coercive)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (expert)</th>
<th>Factor 4 (legitimate)</th>
<th>Factor 5 (reward)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel like</td>
<td>.84203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel important</td>
<td>.81088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel accepted</td>
<td>.79085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel valued</td>
<td>.70341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel that I</td>
<td>.48804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide me with special</td>
<td>.30155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make things unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td>.88156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make being at work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my work difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me undesirable job</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide me with needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me good technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share with me his (her)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide me with sound</td>
<td>.40785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56802</td>
<td>.33592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the feeling I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel like I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me recognize that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase my pay level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make me feel like I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence my getting a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item 5 is related to legitimate power
** Item 16 is related to reward power
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likes me ............... (3)</td>
<td>.85351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't enjoy working ... (10)</td>
<td>.83463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is friendly to me ........ (2)</td>
<td>.82573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respects me as a ........ (1)</td>
<td>.71471</td>
<td>.34277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approves of me .......... (11)</td>
<td>.67246</td>
<td>.39740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I have ......... (9)</td>
<td>.65173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I am skilled ........ (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I am ............ (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.86538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I am ............ (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I have the .......(8)</td>
<td>.45343</td>
<td>.70698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinks I am qualified ... (6)</td>
<td>.42338</td>
<td>.70147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX -- SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER
TABLE 12
MEAN COMPARISON OF THE USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS: RESULTS OF THREE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>This Study</th>
<th>Yukl and Falbe (1990)</th>
<th>Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In both studies, students were used as samples.

The means suggest that salespersons employed each influence tactic more frequently than did the populations in the other two studies, which were conducted in nonsales environments. Thus, salespersons seem to employ influence tactics more frequently than do persons working in other organizational settings. The mean frequency for the use of various influence tactics shows that rationality is the most widely-used influence tactic and that exchange is the least used influence tactic by salespersons.
Tests of Hypotheses

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to test hypotheses H1 through H8. Hypothesis H9 was tested using Pearson's product-moment correlation. Hypothesis H10 could not be tested due to the lack of valid data. A complete list of hypotheses tested in this study is provided in the Appendix.

The six influence tactics (ingratiation, coalition, rationality, upward appeal, exchange, and assertiveness) were treated as dependent variables in all analyses. The independent variables differed by hypothesis. Hypotheses H1, H1A, H1B and H6 had two independent variables, creating four subgroups (high/high, high/low, low/high, low/low). After a subgroup was selected for analysis (e.g., high self-perception of power), the oneway MANOVA was employed to test for group differences between high and low groups of the other group variable on the use of influence tactics. If the model was significant, T-tests were employed to test for significance for each influence tactic (see Tables 13 and 14 in pages 94 and 95).

When one independent variable was involved for hypotheses H2, H3, H4, H5, H7, and H8, the oneway MANOVA was employed. As in the two-independent-variable situation mentioned previously, independent T-tests were employed to test for group differences (high/low) on the use of influence tactics if the oneway MANOVA was significant.
Creation of Salespeople Groups for Hypothesis Testing (H1 to H8)

Respondents were divided into two groups on the basis of their scores on each of the independent variable measured (high/low). The groups were created using a median split. Scores below median value were classified as low and scores equal to or above the median were classified as high.

When two independent variables were present in the hypothesis (H1, H1A, H1B and H6), four groups were identified (high/high, low/high, high/low, low/low) using the median value for each independent variable separately.

It is important to note that the literature on moderator variables does not offer any specific guidelines regarding the number of subgroups to be formed (Futrell and Parasuraman 1984). Therefore, using two groups (high/low) is consistent with the techniques employed in studies of this nature (e.g., Ingram, Lee and Lucas 1991). In addition, the recommendation that more subgroups be used in subgroup-type moderator analysis has demonstrated to be of questionable merit because it increases the incidence of type-II error (Stone and Hollenbeck 1989).

Hypotheses Related to Perceived Power

H1: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of influence tactics toward managers whom they perceive as having high perceptions of superiors'
power compared to managers whom they perceive as having low perception of superior's power.

Multivariate analysis of variance between high and low perceptions of superiors' power by influence tactics (controlling for salespersons with high self-perception of power) was significant ($F = 2.71, P = 0.021$). Differences in group means provided a significant difference ($T = 2.08, P < 0.01$) between high perceptions of superiors' power and low perception of superiors' power for the exchange influence tactic (Tables 13 and 14).

**TABLE 13**

**MANOVA RESULTS OF SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER AND PERCEPTION OF SUPERIOR'S POWER ON SALESPERSONS' USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>$F$ (1,140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Statistics**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Criterion</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .05$
TABLE 14
GROUP MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER
AND PERCEPTION OF SUPERIOR'S POWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>High Self Perception of Power</th>
<th>Low Self Perception of Power</th>
<th>T (Group Differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 35)</td>
<td>Low (N = 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .01

Salespersons with high self-perception of power directed more exchange influence tactics toward managers whom they perceived as having low overall power. The direction of the relationship was contrary to what was hypothesized; therefore, H1 was unsupported.

H1A: Salespersons with high SPP will show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics (e.g., rationality, exchange) toward managers whom they perceive as having high referent power compared to managers whom they perceive as having low referent power.
Multivariate analysis of variance tests between high perceptions of superiors' referent power and low perceptions of superiors' referent power by salespersons' influence tactics (controlling for high self-perception of power) was not significant ($F = 0.80, P = 0.57$). Therefore, the hypothesis was unsupported (Table 15).

**TABLE 15**

MANOVA RESULTS OF SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER AND PERCEPTION OF SUPERIOR'S REFERENT POWER ON SALESPERSON'S USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>F (1, 138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Statistics**

- Pillai's Criterion: 0.80
- Hotelling's Trace Criterion: 0.80
- Wilks Lambda: 0.80

*Note: The model was not significant at $P < .05$*

**H1B:** Salespersons with high self-perception of power will show greater use of influence tactics toward managers whom they perceive as having high reward power compared to managers whom they perceive as having low reward power.
Multivariate analysis of variance tests between high perceptions of superiors' reward power and low perceptions of superiors' reward power (controlling for high self-perception of power) by influence tactics was not significant ($F = 1.51, P = 0.18$). Therefore, H1B was unsupported (Table 16).

**TABLE 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>F (1,140)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Statistics**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais Criterion</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: None of the variables were significant at P < .05*
Hypotheses H2 and H3 were tested together. Hypothesis H2 stated that:

H2: Salespersons with low self-perception of power will show greater use of upward appeal, ingratiation, and coalition as influence tactics than will salespersons with high self-perceptions of power.

and Hypothesis H3 stated:

H3: Salespersons with high self-perception of power will show greater use of rationality, assertiveness, and exchange as influence tactics than will salespersons with low self-perception of power.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for self-perception of power and the six influence tactics was significant ($F = 2.90, P = 0.04$). Differences in group means provided a significant difference ($T = 2.23, P = 0.01$) for the influence tactic rationality (Table 17). Therefore, H3 was supported. However, comparison of means for low self-perception of power were insignificant, therefore, H2 was unsupported.
TABLE 17
MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSON'S SELF-PERCEPTION OF POWER AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Self Perception of Power</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>T (Group Differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 67)</td>
<td>Low (N = 73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratation</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Lambda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05

Hypotheses Related to Salespersons' Personal Characteristics

H4: Salespersons with high need for power and high need for achievement will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespeople with low need for power and low need for achievement.

Multivariate analysis of variance design for need for achievement and influence tactics was statistically
significant \((F = 2.80, P = 0.01)\) (Table 18). Multivariate analysis of variance design for need for power and influence tactics was statistically insignificant \((F = 1.82, P = 0.10)\) (Table 19). Thus, hypothesis H4 was partly supported.

**TABLE 18**

**MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>High ((N = 67))</th>
<th>Low ((N = 69))</th>
<th>T (Group Differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>(F) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais Criterion</td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>2.80*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\(** P < 0.01  
* P < 0.05**
TABLE 19
MANOVA RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' NEED FOR POWER AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic:</th>
<th>Need for Power:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais Criterion</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoteling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The model was insignificant at P < .05

H5: Salespersons with internal locus of control will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with external locus of control.

Multivariate analysis of variance revealed an insignificant difference between locus of control and the use of influence tactics (F = 1.28, P = 0.27); therefore, this hypothesis was unsupported (Table 20).
TABLE 20
MANOVA RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' LOCUS OF CONTROL AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>High (N = 60)</th>
<th>Low (N = 73)</th>
<th>F (1,131)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais Criterion</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This model was not significant at P < .05. High locus of control = "externals"; low locus of control = "internals".

H6: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of expert and referent power will show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics than will salespersons with low perceptions of expert and referent power.

The multivariate analysis of variance test for the main effects of self-perceptions of expert power and referent power with influence tactics was significant for referent power (F = 2.33, P = 0.04) but was not significant for expert power (F = 1.06, P = 0.39). Hence, hypothesis H6 was
partly supported. Differences in group means provided a significant difference for the perception of referent power and use of influence tactics assertiveness ($T = 2.16, P = 0.01$), and rationality ($T = 2.23, P = 0.01$). Results are provided in Table 21.

### TABLE 21

**MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' PERCEPTIONS OF REFERENT POWER AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Salesperson's Referent Power</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High ($N = 67$)</td>
<td>Low ($N = 73$)</td>
<td>$T$ (Group Differences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Statistics**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's trace criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks lambda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .05$
Hypotheses Related to Situational Variables

H7: Salespersons with low job satisfaction will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with high job satisfaction.

Significant differences were observed in respondents’ use of influence tactics between those with high and with low job satisfaction in their use of influence tactics ($F = 3.09, P < 0.001$). Therefore, hypothesis, H7 was supported. Differences in group means suggest that assertiveness ($T = 2.52, P < 0.01$) and rationality ($T = 2.96, P < 0.01$) influence tactics at a statistically significant level (Table 22). Surprisingly, rationality was significant in a direction contrary to that hypothesized.

H8: Salespersons with high role conflict and high role ambiguity will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with low role conflict and low role ambiguity.

Significant differences were observed between the use of influence tactics in high and low role conflict groups ($F = 4.00, P < 0.001$). Differences in group means for role conflict suggest that assertiveness ($T = 3.58, P < 0.01$), upward appeal ($T = 2.94, P < 0.01$), ingratiation ($T = 2.66, P < 0.01$), coalition ($T = 2.29, P < 0.01$), and exchange ($T = 2.21, P < 0.01$) are statistically significant (Table 23).
TABLE 22
MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' JOB SATISFACTION AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactic</th>
<th>High (N = 64)</th>
<th>Low (N = 66)</th>
<th>T (Group Differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Criterion</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace Criterion</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>3.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .01

Significant differences were observed between the use of influence tactics by high and low role ambiguity groups (F = 4.19, P < 0.01). Differences in group means by influence tactics suggest that coalition (T = 2.85, P < 0.001), exchange (T = 2.68, P < 0.01), and rationality (t = 2.08, P < 0.05) are statistically significant (Table 24). Rationality was in a direction opposite to what was hypothesized.
TABLE 23
MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS’ ROLE CONFLICT
AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>High (N = 62)</th>
<th>Low (N = 80)</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.34**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

- Pillais criterion: 4.00**
- Hotelling's trace criterion: 4.00**
- Wilks Lambda: 4.00**

* P < .05
** P < .01

Hypotheses Related to Outcome Variables

H9: Salespersons that show a greater use of influence tactics have a higher intent to leave.

Pearson’s product-moment correlations provided in Table 8 suggests that influence tactics assertiveness (r = 0.25, P = 0.00) and upward appeal (r = 0.23, P = 0.01) were positively and significantly related to salespersons’ propensity to leave. Therefore, this hypothesis was supported.
TABLE 24
MANOVA AND T-TEST RESULTS OF SALESPERSONS' ROLE AMBIGUITY AND THEIR USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Tactics</th>
<th>Role Ambiguity</th>
<th>T (Group Differences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (N = 62)</td>
<td>Low (N = 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatiation</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward appeal</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multivariate Statistics

- Pillai's Criterion: 4.19**
- Hotelling's Trace Criterion: 4.19**
- Wilks Lambda: 4.19**

* P < 0.05
** P < 0.01

H10: Salespersons that show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics receive higher salaries than do salespersons who show less use of noncoercive influence tactics.

This hypothesis was not tested because valid data from the respondents could not be obtained using the type of survey that was administered.
Summary of Hypotheses Tests

Table 25 includes a summary of the results of the hypothesis tests. Hypotheses H3, H7, H8 and H9 were supported. Hypotheses H4 and H6 were partly supported. However, hypotheses H1, H1A, H1B, and H2 were unsupported. Contrary to hypotheses in H1 and H1B, two unexpected relationships were identified. They are provided in the following section.

Unexpected Findings

This section includes a summary of unexpected findings related to the hypotheses investigated. Unexpected findings are as follows:

H1: Salespersons with high self-perception of power direct exchange as an influence tactic toward superiors whom they perceive as having low power (Table 14). Aside from rationality, the pattern seems to be that salespersons with high self-perception of power direct all other influence tactics (ingratiation, coalition, upward appeal, exchange, and assertiveness) toward superiors whom they perceive as having low power, but at an insignificant level.

H7: Salespersons with high job satisfaction use rationality as an influence tactic more often than do salespersons with low job satisfaction (Table 22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Group variables</th>
<th>Univariate F-test (two groups)</th>
<th>Hypothesis test result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived power:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Self-perception of power</td>
<td>F = 1.32, p = 0.25</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of superior's power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1A</td>
<td>Self-perception of power</td>
<td>F = 2.80, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of superior's referent power</td>
<td>F = 1.51, p = 0.18</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1B</td>
<td>Self-perception of power</td>
<td>F = 1.28, p = 0.27</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of superior's reward power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 and H3</td>
<td>Self-perception of power</td>
<td>F = 2.30, p = 0.04</td>
<td>partly supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual differences:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
<td>F = 3.09, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for power</td>
<td>F = 1.22, p = 0.10</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>F = 1.56, p = 0.07</td>
<td>not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>job satisfaction</td>
<td>F = 4.09, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role conflict</td>
<td>F = 4.00, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role ambiguity</td>
<td>F = 1.19, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>assertiveness</td>
<td>r = 0.25, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upward appeal</td>
<td>r = 0.23, p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** See Figure 2 for Configuration of Variables.

H8: Salespersons with high role ambiguity use rationality as an influence tactic more often than do salespersons with low role ambiguity (Table 24).
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

In order to assess the relationships summarized in Figure 2, a regression model was evaluated. Influence tactics were used as the dependent variables in each model. Personal characteristics, perception of superior's power bases, situational factors, and outcome variables were employed as independent variables. Stepwise regression was used because it is relatively robust to potential multicolinearity.

Table 26 contains a summary of findings of the regression analysis. Low adjusted R² for models suggests that other factors are needed to explain large proportions of variation in the use of various influence tactics. Despite the low proportion of variation explained, several variables were key predictors.

Assertiveness: Need for power, and role conflict were significant predictors. Both beta coefficients were positive, demonstrating the pattern of the relationship with assertiveness. The adjusted R² was .15.

Ingratiation: Role conflict and locus of control were significant predictors. Both beta coefficients were positive, demonstrating the pattern of the relationship with ingratiation. The adjusted R² was .08.
Coalition: Only role conflict was picked as a significant predictor. While the beta coefficient was once again positive, the adjusted R² was .09.

Upward Appeal: Perception of superiors power and need for power were significant predictors. While the beta coefficient was negative for superior’s reward power, it was positive for need for power. The adjusted R² was .11.

Rationality: Need for achievement, role conflict, and role ambiguity were significant predictors. While the beta coefficient was negative for role ambiguity, it was positive for role conflict and need for achievement. The adjusted R² was .13.

Exchange: Only role conflict was picked as a significant predictor variable. The beta coefficient was positive and the adjusted R² was .05. Thus, it could be said that role conflict is the most consistent predictor of salespersons’ use of influence tactics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Ingrecation</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Upward Appeal</th>
<th>Rationality</th>
<th>Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.230*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.95**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R² 0.41 0.31 0.32 0.35 0.38 0.24
Adjusted R² 0.15 0.08 0.09 0.11 0.13 0.05
F 8.10** 6.40** 13.17** 8.38** 6.77** 7.51**

1 = self perception of power; 2 = perception of superior’s referent power; 3 = need for power; 4 = need for achievement; 5 = locus of control; 6 = job satisfaction; 7 = role conflict; 8 = role ambiguity; 9 = propensity to leave;
* P < .05
** P < .01
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Key findings of the study and implications relative to future research are included in this chapter. Limitations of the study are also presented.

Rationale for the Study

The intention for this study was to empirically investigate a set of factors potentially associated with the use of influence tactics by salespersons. Salespersons' use of influence tactics in an organizational setting has received little attention from marketing scholars. Since most published empirical studies pertaining to influence tactics have been conducted in social psychology, an understanding of the area remains relatively new to marketing theorists.

In an attempt to fill this void, two objectives were set for this study. First, in order to present a comprehensive framework for understanding salespersons' use of influence tactics in a sales environment, a theoretical framework was created (Figure 1). The framework included a
synthesis of several theoretical viewpoints and incorporated findings from the studies of social psychologists.

The second objective was to partially test the framework. Ten hypotheses were developed and, subsequently, tested. These research hypotheses were directed at developing an understanding about how salespersons use influence tactics on their managers.

Discussion

Results of this study revealed that personal characteristics such as need for achievement and self perception of referent power, situational factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction and outcomes such as propensity leave had significant relationships with the use of influence tactics. Given the distinctive task characteristics and roles performed by salespeople, the results of this study are conceptually sound and are consistent with common sense. They discussed in detail in the following sections.

Individual Differences

Hypotheses H4, H5, and H6 tested the effect of differences in salespersons' personal characteristics on their use of influence tactics. The personal variables included (1) their need for achievement, (2) their need for
power, (3) their locus of control, (4) their gender, and (5) their self-perception of power.

While these individual differences were noted to be related to the frequency of use of influence tactics, only need for achievement and self-perception of referent power showed statistically significant relationships.

Need for Achievement

It was hypothesized that salespersons with a high need for achievement would use influence tactics more frequently. Findings suggest that salespersons with a high need for achievement used rationality more often than other influence tactics (Table 18). However, no significant difference was observed between the level of need for achievement and the use of other influence tactics (e.g., upward appeal, coalition).

It was interesting to note that salespersons with low need for achievement used ingratiation, coalition, exchange, and assertiveness more often than did salespersons with high need for achievement, although the frequency of use was statistically insignificant. This pattern suggests that while salespersons with high need for achievement use apolitical influence tactics (e.g., rationality) more often, the salespersons with low need for achievement tend to use a wide range of political upward influence tactics (e.g., coalition, ingratiation etc.) in nature. This pattern has
been suggested by the findings of other researchers (Kapoor, Ansari and Shukla 1986; Mowday 1979).

Need for Power

Salespersons with a high need for power used both political and non-political influence tactics more often than did salespersons with low need for power; however, none of these differences were statistically significant (P < 0.05). This finding runs contrary to findings of researchers using nonsales samples, such as Mowday (1979) and Kapoor, Ansari and Shukla (1986). One reason for this divergence may be the contexts between the research studies. Although, the job environment of salespersons mandates a high need for achievement, power orientation is not particularly necessary (Mean, need for achievement = 4.09; Mean need for power = 3.60) for salespersons because their evaluation and rewards are based primarily on goals and objectives and the extent to which they meet them. Thus, need for power is secondary to them.

Locus of Control

The results of this study did reveal any statistically significant difference in the use of influence tactics between salespersons with internal and external locus of control. Relationships between locus of control and other constructs including job satisfaction and role conflict were
similar to those reported in previous studies (Behrman and Perreault 1984; Spector 1988).

The pattern of findings relative to locus of control suggests that the salespersons with external locus of control tended to use influence tactics more frequently. Salespersons with internal locus of control employed rationality more often although the difference in use was statistically insignificant. One explanation for the pattern of results may be that internals, who view themselves as being in control of events and circumstances, employ influence tactics such as rationality more often than externals, who view outcomes as being largely beyond their control.

The cause for nonsignificant differences between salespersons with external and internal locus of control may be that locus of control interacts with other personal variables such as need for power, self-perception of power and perception of superiors' power bases, and that statistical methods used in this study were not capable of capturing these effects. For example, salespersons who have high need for power and are internals may use influence tactics more often to enhance their power. The reason why salespersons with external locus of control use more political influence tactics may be that the use of influence tactics is a function of how successful the user of such a tactic expects to be in influencing their target. Because
internals are generally in control of the events that effect them, they are able to evaluate more critically how successful they are going to be in influencing their targets. Therefore, they may use nonpolitical influence tactics, such as rationality, because the outcomes of such a tactic are easy to predict. On the other hand, salespersons with external locus of control may believe that certain important outcomes are largely beyond their control, and, therefore, may be unable to critically evaluate how successful they will be in influencing their targets. Thus, they tend to use influence tactics that are more political and, therefore, more risky, but that may result in a positive outcomes.

Gender

While the findings of previous researchers on the use of influence tactics among males and females have been mixed (DuBrin 1989; Instone, Major and Bunker 1983; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Offermann and Schrier 1985), the findings of this study suggest no significant differences between males and females in the use of influence tactics. This absence of differences between males and females contradicts conventional wisdom, cultural stereotypes, and the findings of earlier researchers (Instone, Major and Bunker 1983; Offermann and Schrier 1985), who noted that males are more likely to exert strong (e.g., assertiveness)
influence tactics while females are more likely to use soft influence tactics (e.g., ingratiation). These results imply that males and females have a similar propensity toward engaging in the use of influence tactics, a fact that is consistent with the modern image of career women, who are growing in rank and in number (DuBrin 1989).

Self-Perception of Power

Differences were evident in the use of rationality and assertiveness as influence tactics between salespersons who had a high self-perception of referent power and salespersons who had a low self-perception of referent power. Salespersons who had high self-perception of referent power employed rationality more often, and salespeople who had low self-perception of referent power employed assertiveness more often. Similar findings were reported by Tedeschi, Schlenker and Lindskold (1972).

Salespersons who perceived themselves to be liked by their superiors (high referent power) used nonpolitical influence tactics, such as rationality, more frequently. However, salespersons who perceived themselves to be less liked by their superiors (low referent power) used political influence tactics more often, possibly because negative outcomes of using such tactics were less important to them.

It is important to note that no significant difference was found between the salespersons' self-perception of
expert power and their use of influence tactics. One possible reason for the lack of a significant difference could be that the nature of the job implies that salespersons are experts in a field. Therefore, dividing salespersons into two groups of high and low expertise is inappropriate (mean = 4.16; median = 4.2). Second, results show a high ($r = 0.91, P < 0.001$) correlation between self-perceptions of expert power and perceptions of managers referent power. Although this finding is post hoc, it suggests that salespersons who are experts in their fields are taken seriously, well-liked and cared for in the assigning of sales territories and the provision of incentives by their superiors. Thus, it is not necessary for these salespersons to use apolitical or political influence tactics as a means of getting their way in their organization.

In conclusion, based on the distinctive task characteristics and roles performed by salespersons, the results of this study are conceptually sound and are consistent with common sense. Some of the conclusions in this segment were:

1. Salespersons are, by nature, more high achievement oriented than power oriented. Therefore, they employ tactics such as rationality that are nonpolitical more often.
2. Because of the uncertainty involved in using tactics that are political, salespersons who have external locus of control tend to employ political influence tactics more often.

3. There are no differences between males and females in the use of influence tactics, in view of the fact that female salespersons are as carrier-minded as their male counterparts.

4. Although, salespersons who perceive themselves to be liked by their superiors (high referent power) use non-political influence tactics such as rationality, more frequently, salespersons who perceive themselves to be less liked by their superiors are prone to use political tactics more often.

Perception of Superior's Power

Results related to this aspect of the study (Hypotheses H1A, H1B, H2, and H3) were consistent to those found concerning the personal characteristics of salespersons. Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power employed rationality as an influence tactic more often than salespersons with low self-perceptions of power. Since there was no difference in the use of any of the other coercive or noncoercive influence tactics, it is clear that rationality is the tactic most frequently employed by salespersons with high self-perceptions of power.
As mentioned before, the use of rationality may be attributed to the nature of the sales job. Salespersons practice persuasion as a trade. Rational argument skills are natural components of a successful salesperson's arsenal. Reports from researchers who have examined job context as a determinant of the type of influence that is used by individuals, confirm this view (Cheng 1983; Kapoor, Ansari and Shukla 1986).

Perception of Managers' Power

Although it was hypothesized that salespersons with high self-perception of power would direct more influence tactics toward the managers that they perceived as having high referent power, this hypothesis was not supported. However, by combining the findings discussed, it can be concluded that salespersons with high self-perception of power use rationality more often than do salespersons with low self-perception of power, and their use of this tactic is not dependent upon their perceptions of managers' referent power. No significant differences were found between salespersons with high self-perception of power and their perceptions of superiors' reward power on the use of influence tactics. Once again, this nonsignificant difference may be due to the fact that salespersons with high self-perception of power are experts in their field and are well liked by their superiors. Thus, they are well
looked after by their superiors and have no need to employ upward influence tactics.

In conclusion, salespersons with high self-perceptions of power use rationality as an influence tactic more often. The use of rationality as an influence tactic is not dependent upon salespersons' perceptions of managers' referent power or reward power.

Situational Factors

Hypotheses H7 and H8 were tested to examine the effects of situational factors on salespersons' use of influence tactics. The situational factors included job satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity. Results show that all three situational factors affect the type of tactics and their frequency of use.

Job Satisfaction

Significant differences were found between the use of assertiveness and rationality as influence tactics and the level of job satisfaction of salespersons. Salespersons with lower levels of job satisfaction use assertiveness more often to get their way in their organization. Since satisfaction with pay, the job itself, supervisors, promotion, and coworkers contributes to job satisfaction, a salesperson who is less satisfied with his superior or coworkers is less likely to display assertiveness (a strong
tactic). Exchange, ingratiation, coalition and upward appeal were all used more frequently by the salespersons with less job satisfaction, although these relationships were not significant.

While the use of rationality as an influence tactic was also significant, it was in the direction contrary to that which was hypothesized. Salespersons with high levels of job satisfaction used rationality more often. This may be due to the fact that salespersons who are satisfied with their jobs tend to operate within the normative framework of the organization and try to get their way by reasoning within this environment.

**Role Conflict**

Higher levels of role conflict were associated with increased use of all influence tactics. The relationship of role conflict with every influence tactic except rationality was statistically significant (Table 24). The increased use of influence activity may represent employees' efforts to cope with organizational stress that is associated with role conflict. In situations of role conflict, salespersons may use influence tactics to exert control over their environment. One possible explanation for rationality not being significant as an influence tactic can be attributed to the fact that salespersons may initially try to minimize role conflict and the incompatible sets of demands
associated with it by directing socially desirable influence tactics toward their superiors (Kipnis and Schmidt 1985). However, when confronted with resistance or failure, salespersons may reduce the use of rationality (reasoning and logic) and resort to more political influence tactics. Also, intense conflict undermines the trustworthiness of superiors and can produce distrust which discourages the utilization of positive influence tactics such as rationality. Other influence modes, such as upward appeal, assertiveness, and coalition, may be perceived as the only mode which can be effective in controlling the behavior of superiors when high degrees of conflict exist (Goodstadt and Kipnis 1970).

Role Ambiguity

High levels of role ambiguity were associated with increased use of ingratiation, coalition, and exchange. The use of a wide range of influence tactics shows how salespersons may cope with role ambiguity by attempting to have control over their situation. It is quite possible that salespersons with high role ambiguity may attempt to cope with it by using mild influence tactics such as exchange and ingratiation in the initial stages, and when these tactics prove insufficient, they tend to use coalitions. This helps them maintain a favorable image with their superiors while improving their understanding and the
superiors' responsiveness to role ambiguity. The finding that the use of strong tactics such as assertiveness and upward appeal were not significant seems to support this line of thinking.

While the use of rationality as an influence tactic was also significant, it was in the direction contrary to that hypothesized. Salespersons with low role ambiguity employed rationality more often. This may once again, be due to the fact that salespersons who have less ambiguity tend to operate within the normative framework of an organization and try to achieve their objectives by reasoning within this set-up.

In conclusion, all three situational factors had a significant effect on the type of influence tactic employed. As noted earlier, conditions for using rationality as an influence tactic were different than for using all of the other influence tactics. The salespersons, generally seemed to use influence tactics to reduce role conflict and role ambiguity or increase job satisfaction.

Job Outcomes

The results of this study indicate that the use of assertiveness and upward appeal as influence tactics is a significantly related to salespersons' intentions to leave their jobs. This is not surprising, given the nature of the
two tactics. While assertiveness involves using a forceful manner, upward appeal involves obtaining the support of HIGHER-UPS. Both tactics are strong and could be considered coercive if used in such contexts where there is significant difference in the power levels of the target and the sender. The target who is exposed to the tactic, in turn, retaliates to the user of these tactics with equal or more force, making it difficult for the sender to stay in the organization. This line of thinking also explains why other influence tactics (e.g., ingratiation, rationality, exchange, and coalition) did not show significant relationships between their use and the salespersons' propensity to leave their organizations.

Summary of Discussion

Influence tactics used by salespersons are not always individually initiated. They are sometimes induced by situations, and can result in negative outcomes for an organization through employee turnover. Results of this study reveal that personal characteristics such as need for achievement and self perception of referent power; situational factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction; and outcomes such as propensity to leave were significantly related to the use of influence tactics. Because no relationship was evident between the perceived power of the superior and the self-perception of
salespersons' power and the use of influence tactics, results of this study should be considered inconclusive until further studies are conducted to confirm or disapprove these findings.

**Limitations**

Important limitations to the findings of this study are related to (1) the sample, (2) the scales, (3) uncontrolled factors, (4) possible interactions, and (5) direction of the influence. These limitations are discussed in the sections that follow.

**Limitations Related to the Sample**

First, because both the independent and dependent variables were self-reported measures from the same persons, it is likely that a common method variance was present that could result in the overstatement of the strength of some of the relationships. Second, even though the results of the study are generalizable, effects of factors that are organization-specific cannot be controlled; therefore, some of the results may have limitations if used to make inferences about specific organizational settings. Third, the sample for the study was very heterogeneous, and was limited in number (143). This number may not have provided sufficient power for some of the hypotheses to hold true.
Finally, the use of political as well as nonpolitical influence tactics are dependent on salespersons' self-perceptions of power. While industrial salespersons, due to the nature of their job, perceive a high level of self-perception of power, other salespersons (e.g., insurance) perceive low self-perceptions of power and, thus, use influence tactics less frequently. Therefore, this sample, which consisted of both industrial and non-industrial salespersons, may not be appropriate for testing the hypotheses related to self-perception of power and superiors' perceptions of power. For this reason, results should be considered inconclusive.

Limitations Related to Scales

As seen in Table 8, some scales showed low reliability coefficients that could result in high systematic error. In addition, it is likely that some of the scales did not possess construct validity; for example, ingratiation was measured by three items and upward appeal was measured by just two items, thereby increasing the potential for measurement error. This could be one of the reasons why some of the hypotheses were not supported. Lack of reliable and valid instruments to measure these constructs in a sales environment could be one of the reasons why use of influence tactics have been given little attention in marketing literature. However, these limitations do not reduce the
contribution of this study as being an important step in understanding this phenomenon in the sales environment.

Limitations Related to Uncontrolled Factors

Extraneous factors, such as effects of organizations and the type of goals to be achieved, were not controlled in this study. Studies in related fields have shown the effects of organization context to determine the type of influence tactic being used (Baum 1989; Cheng 1983; Kapoor, Ansari and Shukla 1986). In a sales environment, this could relate to differences between companies that sell industrial products or those that sell consumer products, or to manufacturing-oriented companies as opposed to service oriented companies. Studies have also shown that individuals' use of influence tactics depends on whether a goal is personal or group related (Erez and Rim 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984).

Limitations Related to Possible Interactions

In all behavioral studies, there is the possibility of interactions among independent variables. The discussion of findings of this study includes highlights of some of the interactions that were present. Future research studies should be designed to test for other possible interactions that are theoretically justifiable.
Limitations Related to the Direction of Influence

The domain of this research study was restricted to upward influence tactics used by salespersons. However, individuals may use upward, downward, and lateral influence tactics simultaneously and the outcome of these may be different from those found through investigation of one at a time.

Direction for Future Research

Future studies should be designed to attempt to overcome the limitations in this study and to examine other issues that may be affected by the use of influence tactics. Some of the issues that need to be addressed in future studies include the following:

1. Validation of the findings of this study using a sample of industrial salespeople.—Due to the heterogeneous nature of the sample used in this study, the unsupported hypotheses, those related to power bases, should be considered inconclusive. This is because the variance due to uncontrolled extraneous factors could have confounded the results of the study. The hypotheses which were not supported should be tested using a homogeneous sample of industrial salespersons preferably from a single company.
2. Improvements in the influence tactic scale.—

Improvements are needed in the scale used to measure the use of influence tactics. Even though the reliability of over .6 is considered sufficient for early stages of research such as this study, in many applied settings, a reliability of .9 is desirable (Churchill 1979; Nunnally 1978). This could be achieved by refining the existing scale (Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990) by including additional items that are relevant to a sales environment. In addition, the possibility of redefining some dimensions should be explored (e.g., assertiveness could take the form of blocking information in a sales environment; exchange could take the form of bargaining, etc.) which, in turn, can be considered a coercive tactic.

3. Testing the effects of other moderator variables.—

Some of the findings of this research as well as past research suggest that factors such as: (1) organizational context (Ansari, Tandon and Lakhtakia 1989; Cheng 1983), and (2) type of goals (individual or organizational) could have a moderator effect on the type of influence tactic used (Erez and Rim 1982; Schmidt and Kipnis 1984). This idea needs to be explored further.

4. Testing for interactions between independent variables.—Past research suggests possible interactions between independent variables (Ansari, Tandon and Lakhtakia
1989; Kapoor, Ansari and Shukla 1986). Possible interactions, highlighted in this study, should be tested in future studies.

5. Testing for other forms of influences.— Salespersons can also use influence tactics downward, toward their customers, with an intent of gaining approval or securing favorable outcomes. This possibility should be investigated. While the effects of sales managers' use of upward influence tactics on salespersons' outcomes, such as job satisfaction and performance has been identified (Kohli 1985), future researchers should investigate the effects of sales managers' use of downward influences on subordinate salespersons' outcomes, such as job performance.

6. Testing existing sales models, including influencing tactics.—Considerable variance remains unexplained in models that measure salespersons' (1) motivation (Oliver 1974; Teas 1981; Tyagi 1982), (2) role stress such as role conflict and ambiguity (Teas 1983; Behrman and Perreault 1984), (3) job satisfaction and performance (Tyagi 1985; Dubinsky and Hartley 1986), and (4) propensity to leave (Parasuraman and Futrell 1983). Results of this study show that influence tactics are a function of personal and situational factors and, therefore, could act as moderating factors in explaining some of this unexplained variance. This possibility needs to be researched further.
APPENDIX
PART I

Below is a list of statements which may be used in describing behaviors that your IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR can direct towards you. First carefully read each description statement thinking in terms of your IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR. Then decide to what extent you agree that he/she COULD do this to you. Mark the number which most closely represents how you feel. Use the following answers.

1. STRONGLY DISAGREE  2. DISAGREE  3. NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE  4. AGREE  5. STRONGLY AGREE

MY IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR CAN...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. increase my pay level</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. make me feel valued</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. give me undesirable job assignments</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. make me feel like he/she approves of me</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. make me feel that I have commitments to meet</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. make me feel personally accepted</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. make me feel important</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. give me good technical suggestions</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. make my work difficult for me</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. share with me his/her concerns</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. make things unpleasant here</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. make being at work distressing</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. influence my getting a pay raise</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. make me feel like I should satisfy my job requirements</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. provide me with sound job-related advice</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. provide me with special benefits</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. influence my getting a promotion</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. give me the feeling I have responsibilities to fulfill</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. provide me with needed technical knowledge</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. make me recognize that I have tasks to accomplish</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART II

This section asks you questions about your feelings toward your job. Please CIRCLE the appropriate NUMBER to indicate HOW OFTEN the following situation applies to you. Use the following responses:

1. VERY INFREQUENTLY  2. INFREQUENTLY  3. SOMETIMES  4. FREQUENTLY  5. VERY FREQUENTLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have to do things that should be done differently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I work on unnecessary things</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My job has clear, planned goals and objectives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know that I have divided my time property</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I know what my responsibilities are</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I know exactly what is expected of me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel certain about how much authority I have</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Explanation of what has to be done is clear</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I receive an assignment without manpower to complete it</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III

This part of the questionnaire is a way of obtaining information about how you go about changing YOUR IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR's mind so that he or she agrees with you. Below described are various ways of doing this. Please CIRCLE the appropriate NUMBER

Do NOT answer in terms of what you would like to do. Use the following responses:

(1) = NEVER  (2) = SELDOM  (3) = OCCASIONALLY  (4) = OFTEN  (5) = VERY OFTEN

I HAVE...

1. Acted very humbly to him/her while making my request
2. Obtained the support of co-workers to back up my request
3. Used logic to convince him/her
4. Acted in a friendly manner prior to asking for what I wanted
5. Obtained the informal support of higher-ups
6. Relied on the chain of command
7. Reminded him/her of past favors that I did for him/her
8. Made him/her feel good about me before making my request
9. Explained the reasons for my request
10. Obtained the formal support of my subordinates to back up my request
11. Mobilized other people in the organization to help me in influencing him/her
12. Offered an exchange e.g., if you do this for me, I will do something for you
13. Presented him/her with information in support of my point of view
14. Had a showdown in which I confronted him/her face to face
15. Used a forceful manner
16. Offered to make personal sacrifice if he/she would do what I wanted
17. Explained the reasons for my request
18. Made a formal appeal to higher levels to back up my request

PART IV

This part of the questionnaire is a way of obtaining information about how you go about changing YOUR PROSPECTIVE CUSTOMER'S mind so that he or she agrees with you. Below described are various ways of doing this. Please CIRCLE the appropriate NUMBER

Do NOT answer in terms of what you would like to do. Use the following responses:

(1) = NEVER  (2) = SELDOM  (3) = OCCASIONALLY  (4) = OFTEN  (5) = VERY OFTEN

I HAVE...

1. Acted very humbly to him/her while making my request
2. Obtained the support of co-workers to back up my request
3. Used logic to convince him/her
4. Acted in a friendly manner prior to asking for what I wanted
5. Obtained the informal support of higher-ups
6. Relied on the chain of command
7. Reminded him/her of past favors that I did for him/her
8. Made him/her feel good about me before making my request
9. Explained the reasons for my request
10. Obtained the formal support of my subordinates to back up my request
11. Mobilized other people in the organization to help me in influencing him/her
12. Offered an exchange e.g., if you do this for me, I will do something for you
13. Presented him/her with information in support of my point of view
14. Had a showdown in which I confronted him/her face to face
15. Used a forceful manner
16. Offered to make personal sacrifice if he/she would do what I wanted
17. Explained the reasons for my request
18. Made a formal appeal to higher levels to back up my request

PART V

When one of the items below describes a particular aspect of your job, indicate your answers in the following manner:

Circle Y when an item DESCRIBES a particular aspect of your job
Circle N when an item DOES NOT DESCRIBE a particular aspect of your job
Circle ? if you CANNOT DECIDE if an item describes a particular aspect of your job

1. PAY
   Y N ? Income adequate for normal expenses
   Y N ? Unfair
   Y N ? Barely live on income
   Y N ? Bad
   Y N ? Enough for what need
   Y N ? Insecure
   Y N ? Less than I deserve
   Y N ? Well paid
   Y N ? Underpaid

2. PROMOTION
   Y N ? Good opportunity for advancement
   Y N ? Opportunity somewhat limited
   Y N ? Promotion on ability
   Y N ? Good and job
   Y N ? Regular promotions
   Y N ? Good chance of promotion
   Y N ? Easy to get ahead
   Y N ? Infrequent promotions
   Y N ? Not very good chance for promotion
Below are 10 statements that describe various things people do or try to do on their job. Which of these statements you feel most accurately describes YOUR OWN behavior when you are at work. Circle the most appropriate category's number following each statement.

### CO-WORKERS

1. I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult
2. I see an active role in the leadership of a group
3. I try very hard to improve on my past performance at work
4. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way
5. I try to perform better than my co-workers
6. I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work
7. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others
8. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way
9. I try to perform better than my co-workers
10. I strive to be a "team player" when I am working in a group

### SUPERVISION

1. My supervisor is dynamic and new ideas come from him
2. My supervisor is quick to provide new ideas and new directions
3. My supervisor is quick to provide new ideas and new directions
4. My supervisor is quick to provide new ideas and new directions
5. My supervisor is quick to provide new ideas and new directions
6. My supervisor is quick to provide new ideas and new directions

### WORK

1. I work hard when my job assignments are fairly difficult
2. I see an active role in the leadership of a group
3. I try very hard to improve on my past performance at work
4. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way
5. I try to perform better than my co-workers
6. I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work
7. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others
8. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way
9. I try to perform better than my co-workers
10. I strive to be a "team player" when I am working in a group

### BELIEVE THAT...

1. A job is what you make of it
2. In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places
3. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune
4. When it comes to finding a really good job, what you know is more important than what you know
5. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job
6. To make a lot of money, you must know the right people
7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort
8. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do
9. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck

---

**PART VI**

The following statements relate to beliefs people hold in their work setting. Circle the most appropriate category's number following each statement which YOU feel most accurately describes YOUR OWN belief about work.

1. I disagree very much
2. I disagree slightly
3. I agree slightly
4. I agree moderately
5. I agree very much

---

1. A job is what you make of it
2. In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places
3. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune
4. When it comes to finding a really good job, what you know is more important than what you know
5. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job
6. To make a lot of money, you must know the right people
7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort
8. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do
9. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck

---

**PART VII**

The following statements relate to beliefs people hold in their work setting. Circle the most appropriate category's number following each statement which YOU feel most accurately describes YOUR OWN belief about work.

1. I disagree very much
2. I disagree slightly
3. I agree slightly
4. I agree moderately
5. I agree very much

---

1. A job is what you make of it
2. In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places
3. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune
4. When it comes to finding a really good job, what you know is more important than what you know
5. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job
6. To make a lot of money, you must know the right people
7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort
8. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do
9. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck
PART VIII

Below is a list of statements which may be used in describing attitudes that your IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR has about YOU. Mark the number which closest represents what you think your sales manager feels. Use the following answers:

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly Agree

MY IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR...

1. respects me as a person.
2. is friendly to me.
3. likes me.
4. thinks I am knowledgeable.
5. thinks I am experienced.
6. thinks I am qualified.
7. thinks I have the "know how" to get the job done.
8. thinks I have a pleasing personality.
9. doesn't enjoy working with me.
10. approves of me.

PART IX

We need some classification information which will enable your answer to be combined with others in the study. Remember, your individual answers will be kept STRICTLY ANONYMOUS. Please answer each question by circling the appropriate NUMBER.

1. Are you: Male 1  Female 2 (please circle one):
2. What is your age?
3. How long have you been in sales and/or sales management?
4. How long have you been in sales and/or sales management with your present employer?
5. The number of employees in my organization is approximately ___________.
6. How many times have you changed positions in the sales profession?
7. Your sales job most accurately falls into which category specified below? (please circle one)
   A. New business
   B. Missionary salesperson
   C. Technical salesperson
   D. Trade salesperson
   E. Consultative

8. The average length of selling cycle for the primary product you sell is ___________ weeks.
9. Under what GENERAL OVERALL category does your product fall? (e.g., construction, computer, medical, etc.)?
10. What is your job title? (please circle one)
    A. Sales Representative
    B. Sales Manager
    C. Other; please specify

11. Which of the following MOST accurately represents your compensation plan? (please circle one)
    A. Salary
    B. Salary plus bonus
    C. Salary plus commission
    D. Full commission
    E. Other; please specify

12. What was your total income in 1990 before taxes?
13. What is your overall percentage sales increase or decrease for the year 1991?
14. What was your overall percentage sales increase or decrease for the year 1990?

15. The following number responses should be circled in answering the next four questions.

   Excellent = 5  Good = 4  Unsure = 3  Bad = 2  Terrible = 1

How would you rate your chance of quitting your job...
A. in the next three months ... ___________ 1 2 3 4 5
B. in the next six months ... ___________ 1 2 3 4 5
C. in the next one year ... ___________ 1 2 3 4 5
D. in the next two years ... ___________ 1 2 3 4 5

E. How often do you think of quitting your job? (please circle one below)
August 30, 1991

Dear Sir/Madam:

I need your help!

As a former sales representative, I am interested in studying relationships between salespeople and their supervisors. This topic is relatively unexplored, and the results will provide a better understanding of strategies that can help to improve relationships in the sales environment.

You are one of a small number of salespersons and managers that are being asked to give their opinion on these matters. Your name was drawn at random from a list of over 60,000 salespeople and managers. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of sales personnel, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality and anonymity. Please complete and return the questionnaire in the postage paid envelope that has been included for your convenience so that your response can be included in the study. Please mail the questionnaire by September 23.

Please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Joe Welch (817) 565-3127 or me (501) 972-3430 if there are any questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Alban S. Nonis
Assistant Professor of Marketing
Arkansas State University

Dr. Joe Welch
Professor of Marketing
University of North Texas
September 13, 1991

Dear Sir/Madam:

About ten days ago, I requested your help in filling out a questionnaire for a study that we are conducting. The study is related to improving interpersonal relationships in the sales environment.

If you have already completed the questionnaire and mailed it, please accept my sincere thanks for your valuable time and immediate response. Also, disregard the material enclosed with this letter.

However, if you have been unable to complete the survey, please take a few minutes to do so as soon as possible. It is critical that each questionnaire is completed and returned so that the results of the study will truly represent the thinking of sales personnel.

For your convenience, the questionnaire and a postage paid envelope is once again enclosed. You are assured of complete confidentiality and anonymity.

Please contact Dr. Joe Welch (817) 565-3127 or me (501) 972-3430 if there are any questions.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours truly,

Alban S. Nonis
Assistant Professor of Marketing
Arkansas State University

Dr. Joe Welch
Professor of Marketing
University of North Texas

P.S. PLEASE DO NOT FORGET TO MAIL THE QUESTIONNAIRE BY SEPTEMBER 23
LIST OF HYPOTHESES

H1A: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of non-coercive influence tactics (e.g., rationality, exchange) toward managers whom they perceive as having high referent power than toward managers whom they perceive as having low referent power.

H1B: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of influence tactics toward managers whom they perceive as having high reward power than toward managers whom they perceive as having low reward power.

H2: Salespersons with low self-perceptions of power will show greater use of upward appeal, ingratiatiion, and coalition as influence tactics than will salespeople with high self-perceptions of power.

H3: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of power will show greater use of rationality, assertiveness, and exchange as influence tactics than will salespersons with low self-perceptions of power.

H4: Salespersons with high need for power and high need for achievement will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with low need for power and low need for achievement.

H5: Salespersons with internal locus of control will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with external locus of control.

H6: Salespersons with high self-perceptions of expert and referent power will show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics than will salespersons with low perceptions of expert and referent power.

H7: Salespersons with low job satisfaction will show greater use of influence tactics than salespeople with high job satisfaction.

H8: Salespersons with high role conflict and high role ambiguity will show greater use of influence tactics than will salespersons with low role conflict and low role ambiguity.

H9: Salespersons that show a greater use of influence tactics have a higher intent to leave.

H10: Salespersons that show greater use of noncoercive influence tactics receive higher salaries than do salespersons who show less use of noncoercive influence tactics.
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