This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Upward Influence Tactics and Employee Role Change Objectives:
An Exploratory Investigation

presented by

James Olumide Olufowote

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Communication-Urban Studies

Vernon D. Miller
Major professor

Date 11/27/2000

UPWARD INFLUENCE TACTICS AND EMPLOYEE ROLE CHANGE OBJECTIVES: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION

By

James Olumide Olufowote

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication – Urban Studies

2000

ABSTRACT

UPWARD INFLUENCE TACTICS AND EMPLOYEE ROLE CHANGE OBJECTIVES: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION

By

James Olumide Olufowote

This investigation explores employee use of upward influence tactics with supervisors during role making. The study first examines employee reported uses of upward influence tactics with supervisors in achieving pivotal, relevant, or peripheral role changes that differentially benefit the individual or organization. Next, how tactic use varies under high and low-leader member exchange (LMX) relationships is considered. Results of stepwise regressions indicate that among high LMX employees, rationality and coalition tactics are associated with successful role changes benefiting the individual or the organization. In turn, low LMX employees tend to use exchange of benefits, upward appeals, and coalition tactics during successful role changes. Both high and low LMX employees reported avoiding the use of ingratiation tactics during role change.

DEDICATION

In loving memory of my mother
Eunice Yemi Olufowote.
Rest In Peace.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis research project could not have been possible without the assistance and support of my committee members, both the Department of Communication and the Interdepartmental Program in Urban Studies at Michigan State University, and my wonderful family members and friends. First, I would like to acknowledge the guidance of my committee chair Dr. Vernon Miller, of the Department of Communication, for inculcating me into academia and for his relentless and insightful contributions towards this project. I would also like to acknowledge the valuable moral and instrumental support from my remaining committee members Dr. Maxie Jackson Jr. of the Urban Affairs Programs and Dr. Pamela Whitten of the Department of Telecommunication. Second, I must recognize the Urban Affairs Programs at Michigan State University for funding my Master's program. The department educated me on social consciousness and responsibility and the ways to integrate such principles into my daily life and scholarly endeavors. Third, I would like to extend a thank you to my family members for their unconditional love, support, and understanding during this phase in life's journey. Finally, and most importantly, I have to thank God for making this endeavor a possibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

INTRODUCTION

The use of upward influence tactics is an important vehicle for employee voice, empowerment, and change in organizations (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Waldron, 1999; Yukl, Guinan, & Sottolano, 1995; Yukl & Falbe 1990). Employees use requests, rational arguments, coalitions, and a host of other tactics to shape their work setting, manage their boss, and obtain resources (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Kotter, 1985; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Waldron, 1999). Research to date suggests that the frequency and successful use of upward influence tactics varies according to the nature of the supervisor-subordinate relationship, organizational structure, nature of the job, and agent attributes (Barry & Watson, 1996; Fairhurst, in press; Ferris & Judge, 1991; Porter, Allen, & Angle, 1981; Waldron, 1999).

Integral in the selection and use of upward influence tactics is the objective being sought, the particular reason for the influence attempt. Investigators typically consider one of four sets of outcome objectives. One set examines influence tactics across all organizational contexts (i.e., without consideration of employee objectives) (e.g., Cheng, 1983; Deluga, 1991; Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer, 1997; Krone, 1992,1994; Maslyn, Farmer, & Fedor, 1996) or with broad and vague objectives (i.e., "How do you influence others at work?") (e.g., Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, Falbe, & Youn, 1993). A second set explores the role of employee influence tactics in organizational decisional outcomes such as performance ratings, promotability assessments, and budgeting (e.g., Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1978, 1979; Schilit & Locke, 1982; Wayne, Liden, Graf, & Ferris, 1997). A third set considers influence tactic use in light of objectives that benefit the organization or that accrue personal benefits (e.g., Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Waldron, Hunt, & Dsilva, 1993; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984). A final set of studies examine more specific influence objectives such as obtaining a different work assignment, changing supervisor behavior, obtaining assistance, and receiving support in addition to gaining personal benefits (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1995).

An important, yet neglected aspect of upward influence research concerns employee attempts to change their organizational roles. As Waldron (1999) notes, employee upward influence attempts impact their roles and relationships with other organizational members. Employees continually modify their roles to suit their needs, desires, and abilities as part of their role-making efforts (Graen, 1976; Schein, 1968). In fact, message exchanges between employee and supervisor are chief means of influencing others' role expectations (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Jablin, 1987; Miller, Jablin, Casey, Lamphear-Van Horn, & Ethington, 1996). The nature and style of subordinates' role enactment are prominent concerns among supervisors as employee role modification can become a major point of contention (Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997; Tsui, Ashford, St. Clair, & Xin, 1995), a reason for dismissal from the organization (Zurcher, 1983), or a starting point for unit and organizational innovation (Miller, Meiners, Beery, Kim, & Lamphear-Van Horn, 2000; Staw & Boettger, 1990).

This investigation addresses a neglected aspect of research by exploring employee upward influence efforts as part of the role-making process. Specifically, this study examines the upward influence tactics that employees use to change the nature of their roles. First is a review of theory and research associated with employee upward influence tactics. Next is a consideration of employee use of these tactics to achieve personal and organizational benefit during the alteration of pivotal, relevant, or peripheral role components. Later is a report on the study's methodology and results, followed by a discussion on implications for theory, practice, and future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Upward Influence Tactics

From early, popular writings by Dale Carnegie (1930) on influencing others to more contemporary treatises such as "How to Manage Your Boss" (Kotter, 1985), the idea of shaping others' opinions or the work environment has always had great appeal and scholarly implications. Typically, upward influence is broadly conceptualized as the persuasive-communication behaviors of a subordinate facilitating goal achievement during purposeful interactions with superiors. Seibold, Cantrill, and Meyers (1985) define interpersonal influence as "the processes and paths by which individuals reinforce or alter each others' cognitions, emotions, and behaviors...[through] intentionality" (p. 558) for the attainment of instrumental objectives. In turn, upward influence is defined as "How I get my way with my supervisor" (Kipnis et al., 1980, p. 440) and as "a deliberate attempt by a subordinate to select tactics that will bring about change in a more powerful target and facilitate achievement of a personal or organizational objective" (Waldron, 1999, p. 253).

Organizational members' influence efforts and power are well documented (see Barry & Watson, 1996; Cobb, 1984; Ferris & Judge 1991; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1988; Porter, et al., 1981). Of special interest here is the supervisor as target of the influence attempts. Supervisory discretion in terms of hierarchical authority, task/role expectations, and ability to reward or punish (French & Raven, 1959; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1988; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985) acts as a beacon for influence attempts. In turn, employees gain leverage for influence through their ability to produce valuable resources, maintain a distinct set of role expectations, serve in roles critical to unit/organization development, and work in emerging participatory organizational structures (Cobb, 1980; Fairhurst, in press; Graen, 1976; Jablin, 1987; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Waldron, 1999). The interdependence of the supervisor-employee relationship as well as the relationship's quality (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982) and employee communication competences (Jablin, Cude, House, Lee, & Roth, 1994; Jablin & Sias, in press) may also contribute to the ability to secure resources and gain supervisory approval.

Consideration of employee influence tactics typically begins with Kipnis et al.'s (1980) identifying eight upward, downward, and lateral tactics (see Table 1): (a) Ingratiation; (b) Exchange of Benefits; (c) Rationality; (d) Assertiveness; (e)

Table 1.

Influence Tactics and Descriptions[a]

Tactics	Description
Ingratiation	Weak and non-obtrusive influence tactics. Includes acting humble and making the other person feel important.
Exchange of Benefits	Includes offering an exchange, and offering to make personal sacrifices.
Rationality	Includes acts of writing a detailed plan, and explaining the reasons for my request.
Assertiveness	Demanding, ordering, and setting deadlines.
Upward Appeal	Increasing pressure for conformity by invoking influence of higher levels in the organization.
Coalition	Steady pressure for compliance by obtaining the support of subordinates.
Blocking[b]	Attempts to stop the target person from carrying out some action.
Sanctions[b]	Includes the prevention of salary increases and threatening job security.

[a] Adapted from Kipnis et al. (1980)

[b] Items later dropped in Schriesheim & Hinkin's (1990) refinement of Kipnis et al. (1980).

Upward appeal; (f) Coalition; (g) Blocking; and (h) Sanctions. Others (e.g., Yukl & Falbe, 1990) add inspirational appeals (i.e., appealing to the person's values, ideals, and aspirations) and consultation (i.e., involving the target in a decision-making process) to the array. Focusing only on upward influence, Schriesheim & Hinkin (1990) support the use of six upward influence tactics (i.e., ingratiation, exchange of benefits, rationality, assertiveness, upward appeal, and coalition after eliminating irrelevant constructs and revising items from Kipnis et al. (1980).

Recognizing that individuals employ strategic verbal tactic combinations instead of single isolated tactics (Perreault & Miles, 1978), researchers also group tactics into three broad strategies: soft, hard, and rational (Barry & Shapiro, 1992; Deluga, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983). According to Barry & Shapiro (1992), "these three basic strategies form the basis… of the conjunctive effects of verbal tactics within single influence episodes" (p. 1437). For example, Farmer et al.'s (1997) second-order factor analysis indicates that overt assertiveness, upward appeal, and coalition compose hard strategies. Soft strategies consist of ingratiatory and exchange tactics as well as the use of friendliness and covertness, whereas rational strategies consist of using logic and rationality[1]. Other studies focusing on patterns of tactic sequencing after an initial influence denial (Maslyn, Farmer, & Fedor , 1996; Yukl et al., 1993) suggest that employees generally initiate with soft tactics and then progress to hard tactics.

Upward Influence Objectives

Individuals make a variety of requests from their supervisors, ranging from leaving work early to dramatically restructuring the nature of their jobs. Based on essay responses describing success in obtaining "what they wanted from a target person" (p. 441), Kipnis et al.'s (1980) first study identify five common influence objectives: (a) assistance with own job; (b) get others to do their job; (c) obtain benefits; (d) initiate change; and (e) improve performance. As reported in Table 2, the evolution of this profile includes Yukl and Falbe's (1990) eight Likert-type survey items drawn from a review of the literature and Yukl et al.'s (1995) objectives based on participants' descriptions of upward influence incidents. Alternatively, Kipnis and Schmidt (1983), Schmidt and Kipnis (1984) and others (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Waldron, Hunt, & Dsilva, 1993) divide influence objectives into two broad categories, individual/personal goals and organizational goals.

In some respects, research supports the parcelling of upward influence objectives into two broad categories. For instance, in the first of their two studies Kipnis et al. (1980) find that 58% of participating business graduate students report seeking to obtain personal benefits with 26% seeking to initiate change in work. In their second study, initiating change and obtaining benefits are the principal objectives of influence attempts. From a sample of part-time business graduate students, Yukl and Falbe (1990) report requesting advice or help, requesting approval/signoff, and requesting information as frequently targeted objectives when influencing supervisors. Further, Yukl et al. (1995) find that 33%

Table 2.

Employee Influence Objectives

Influence objectives	Kipnis et al. (1980)	Yukl & Falbe (1990)	Yukl et al. (1995)
Job assistance	Obtain the assistance of the target in helping the respondent do his or her job, when it is not part of the target's legitimate job duties.	Ask the person to provide advice or help in solving a problem. Ask the person to give or loan. you additional resources such funds, supplies, materials, or use of equipment, facilities, or personnel. Ask for information needed to do your work.	The objective is to get the person to help you complete an Assignment for which you are responsible, solve a problem, to show you how to do a task, to explain how something works, to provide information you need, or to do some of your work.
Get others to do job	Getting the target to do his or her own work.	Ask the person to do a new. task or work on a new project.	The objective is to get the person to do a new task consistent with current job responsibilities, or to prepare a report or document for you
Improve Performance		Improving the target's on the job performance.	Ask the person to do a task faster or better
Obtain Benefits	Obtaining goals that personally benefit the respondent such as salary increase, promotion, and improved work schedule.	Ask the person to change his/her policies, plans, or procedures to accommodate your needs.	The objective is to get the person to provide something that will benefit you personally (eg. pay increase, better work schedule, better assignments, a promotion), or to get the person to do you a personal favor not directly related to the work.
Initiate Change	Initiating new organizational programs and systems or improving the coordination of organizational activities (eg. Changing a scheduling procedure).	Ask the person to do a. task or work on a new. project.	The objective is to get the person to Make specific changes in work plans or procedures for a task the person is of already doing (eg. do it a different way, do more of something, stop doing something, do it faster or better, change the deadline or schedule, follow a rule or policy, work different days or hours)
Get Program Support		Ask the person to give you a formal approval or signoff on a proposal, product, report, or document. Ask the person to support your proposals in meetings.	The objective is to get the person to formally approve a proposal, suggestion, plan, new product, report or contract, to get the person to give or loan you additional resources.

of employees influenced their supervisors to get personal benefits while 52% sought organizational support.

Research to date on achieving personal and organizational objectives suggest a number of differences in upward influence tactic use. When seeking personal objectives, employees report using personal appeals (Yukl et al., 1995), exchange (Kipnis, et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, et al., 1995), ingratiation tactics (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis, et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl et al., 1995), and coalition (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984). In turn, when initiating organizational change, employees rely on logic and rationality (Kipnis et al., 1980), and rational persuasion and coalition (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, et al. 1995). Similar findings are reported by those selling new ideas through reason and coalition (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984) and obtaining organizational support through rational persuasion and coalition (Yukl et al., 1995). Ansari and Kapoor (1987) also find that employees increase upward appeal, blocking, and rational persuasion tactic use when seeking organizational objectives.

Role Change. While personal and organizational goals capture the broad reasons for employee upward influence forays, this dichotomy creates a false distinction with respect to role change. The merging of individuals' needs, desires, and abilities with their work roles is a constant and pervasive organizational phenomenon (Schein, 1968). As Kipnis and Schmidt (1983) note, "Frequently, a combination of personal and organizational reasons underlies the use of influence in organizations" (p. 304), and "the pursuit of individual and organizational goals are not mutually exclusive" (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984, p. 792).

The difficulty of partialling role change into benefiting either the person or the organization is apparent when considering the basic elements of an organizational role. A cursory examination of Kipnis et al. (1980) indicates that personal objectives are conceptualized at the individual-level (e.g. obtaining better work schedule) while most organizational objectives are conceptualized at the unit-level (e.g. initiate new organizational programs). In contrast, role changes are conceptualized at the individual level of action but have both personal and organizational implications.

Organizational roles have content, manner or stylistic elements, rights, duties, and responsibilities, and can be understood by examining the content of others' role messages and expectations (Jablin, 1987). Through role-sending messages, supervisors, co-workers, and other role-set members socialize new employees toward organizational values, norms, and goals (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In particular, role-sending messages to a certain extent create the nature, purpose, and boundaries of a given role (Graen, 1976; Katz & Kahn, 1978). In turn, employees naturally modify or individualize their roles following role-sending and role-receiving episodes (Graen, 1976; Jablin, 1987; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Importantly, role behaviors and norms have pivotal, relevant, and peripheral components (Schein, 1968), and alterations in these role components may dramatically impact the nature of the role and employees' relationships with others (Miller et al., 1996; Waldron, 1999). Pivotal changes constitute fundamental modifications in role responsibilities while relevant changes involve noticeable and fairly important alterations and peripheral changes are slight to inconsequential. However, in keeping with their authority to reward or sanction subordinates (French & Raven, 1959; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985), at a minimum all role changes must receive tacit supervisory approval (Graen, 1976; Miller et al., 1996).

As noted earlier, role change attempts seek both personal and organizational goals. On a daily basis, employee role change attempts include avoiding certain assignments (Zurcher, 1983), changing job descriptions to include more or fewer responsibilities (Miller et al., 2000), and working around supervisors' expectations when it is not possible to enact the role in a prescribed manner (Jablin, 1987; Miller et al., 2000). The addition (or deletion) of assigned tasks leading to greater (or less) workload variety may meet both personal and organizational-needed changes. Consequently, role change as an upward influence objective should be conceptualized as ranging (a) in the degree of personal and organizational benefit as well as (b) from pivotal to peripheral in nature.

Any role change episode, regardless of the pivotal to peripheral nature of the change or the degree to which the employee and organization benefit, is immersed in the dynamics of the supervisor-employee relationship. As such, role change requests must be considered in the context of social exchanges (Roloff, 1981), of past favors (Blau, 1964), participants' use of powerful and powerless language (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989), relationship maintenance (Lee & Jablin, 1995), and providing the supervisors with sufficient justifications for the change

(Kotter, 1985). In addition, changes in one employee's role configuration, even minute changes, will affect the roles of others in the unit (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

The potential consequences of the role change on the supervisor-employee relationship and work processes are likely to evoke mindfulness (Langer, 1978; Langer, Blank, & Chanowitz, 1978) in how employees approach their supervisors. Whether pivotal role changes benefit the individual or organization, employees must present rational and logical cases to their supervisors to justify substantially altering the nature of the role. Logical arguments or presentations may be necessary to persuade supervisors to allow the change. At other times, employee-supplied arguments are useful to supervisors for justifying the role change to others. Similar justifications are likely to be required of relevant role changes given their noticeable quality. In the case where pivotal and relevant role changes clearly benefit the individual, employees are also likely to court supervisory friendliness, propensity to grant favors, and even their sense of personal obligation. Research indicates that employees successfully pursuing personal benefits report using ingratiation and exchange of benefits tactics (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, et al., 1995).

In cases where pivotal and relevant role changes clearly benefit the organization, employees are likely to present the changes and their benefits in a rational manner as also suggested by earlier research (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, et al., 1995). Employees seeking role changes that benefit the organization are also likely to enlist the support of co-workers through coalition tactics (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl, et al., 1995). In this circumstance, coalitions would indicate the popularity of the role change and unit members' willingness to support its' enactment. Consequently, this study hypothesizes:

H1: Rationality, Ingratiation, and Exchange of Benefits upward influence tactics will be positively associated with pivotal and relevant employee role changes for personal benefit.

H2: Rationality and Coalition upward influence tactics will be positively associated with pivotal and relevant employee role changes benefiting the organization.

As peripheral role changes have little impact on the role or unit (and hence, fewer consequences), supervisory approval is comparatively easier to attain. Outside of supervisory involvement as in the case of mentoring or deep mistrust, supervisors have little reason to invest in their subordinates' peripheral role modifications. In fact, in some cases employees simply proceed with minor role changes without seeking supervisory approval (Zurcher, 1983), and supervisors may not even remark upon noticing (Miller et al., 1996). In the case of requests for personally-benefiting peripheral role changes, the lack of consequences upon others or the work unit highlights the personal relationship between supervisor and employee. Social exchange theories (Blau, 1964; Roloff, 1981) suggest and research indicates that employees ask for small favors through ingratiation and exchange of benefit tactics (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis, et al., 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl et al., 1995). In essence, employees give their supervisors personal reasons through flattery or reciprocity for assenting to the role requested change.

In contrast, peripheral role changes that benefit the organization may present opportunities for employees to enhance their status with the supervisor (Deluga, 1991; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). It is to the employee's benefit to offer an explanation or rationale for how the minor role change benefits the organization. While understated explanations may be most appropriate given the modest benefits to the organization, a rational explanation for the requested change would provide the supervisor with reasons to support the change and might even benefit the employee's standing in the unit (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Consequently, this study hypothesizes:

H3: Ingratiation and Exchange of Benefits upward influence tactics will be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes for personal benefit.

H4: Rationality upward influence tactic use will be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes benefiting the organization.

Leader Member Exchange

A particular aspect of the supervisor-employee relationship that may impact role change influence attempts is the quality of the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) relationship. Graen and Scandura (1987) posit that supervisors selectively "exchange...positional and personal resources for collaboration on unstructured tasks" (p. 182) as they develop and maintain relationships with employees that consequently vary in quality from high to low. Supervisors' distribution of resources creates unique relationships with each employee as well as perceptions of employees having in- or out-group status (Graen & Scandura, 1987). High LMX (or in-group) employees are theorized to receive more information, opportunities to influence supervisory decisions, choice job tasks, In contrast, peripheral role changes that benefit the organization may present opportunities for employees to enhance their status with the supervisor (Deluga, 1991; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). It is to the employee's benefit to offer an explanation or rationale for how the minor role change benefits the organization. While understated explanations may be most appropriate given the modest benefits to the organization, a rational explanation for the requested change would provide the supervisor with reasons to support the change and might even benefit the employee's standing in the unit (Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Consequently, this study hypothesizes:

H3: Ingratiation and Exchange of Benefits upward influence tactics will be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes for personal benefit.

H4: Rationality upward influence tactic use will be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes benefiting the organization.

Leader Member Exchange

A particular aspect of the supervisor-employee relationship that may impact role change influence attempts is the quality of the Leader Member Exchange (LMX) relationship. Graen and Scandura (1987) posit that supervisors selectively "exchange...positional and personal resources for collaboration on unstructured tasks" (p. 182) as they develop and maintain relationships with employees that consequently vary in quality from high to low. Supervisors' distribution of resources creates unique relationships with each employee as well as perceptions of employees having in- or out-group status (Graen & Scandura, 1987). High LMX (or in-group) employees are theorized to receive more information, opportunities to influence supervisory decisions, choice job tasks, autonomy, support, and more attention than low LMX (or out-group) members (Graen & Scandura, 1987). Perhaps for these reasons, meta-analytic results indicate that higher quality relationships are positively related to employee job performance ratings, satisfaction with supervision, job satisfaction, commitment, and role clarity, but negatively related to role conflict and turnover intentions (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

The LMX relationship affects the communication behaviors and influence processes between supervisors and employees in a number of ways. High LMX relationships are associated with opportunities to challenge and disagree (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989), mutual persuasion (Fairhurst, Rogers, & Sarr, 1987), and joint decision making (Fairhurst, 1993). High LMX relationships are also linked to employees' use of open tactics (eg. overtly influencing, giving reasons, providing factual support; Krone, 1992), the diminished use of assertive, upward appeal, and coalition tactics (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997), and the propensity to cease influence attempts after the supervisor's initial denial (Maslyn et al., 1996). In contrast, low LMX relationships are characterized by less employee conversational involvement (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989), powerless speech (Fairhurst, 1991), and adversarial face-threatening acts (Fairhurst, 1993). Employees in low LMX relationships are also likely to employ political tactics (e.g., deceptive tactics, disguising objectives sought; Krone, 1992) and to continue influence attempts after supervisors deny their request (Maslyn et al., 1996).

It is less clear how the supervisory relationship quality impacts employees' influence tactic use in achieving desired role objectives. Waldron et al. (1993) report that, across influence episodes, in-group members are more likely to explain their circumstances and less likely to avoid or deceive than out-group members when pursuing personal goals. When influencing for organizational goals, in-group members are more likely to seek their supervisor's help and persist in their requests, but are less likely to use avoidance tactics than out-group members. Yet, the entree' created by a high LMX relationship may have considerable impact on how employees seek pivotal role changes (Miller et al., 1996). For instance, high LMX employees are likely to use rational upward influence tactics to seek personal- or organizationally-benefiting pivotal role changes. The supervisory support, perceptions of credibility and trust accompanying in-group status enhance the agent's potential success in achieving goals such that an explanation or justification may be sufficiently persuasive. For such reasons, high LMX employees may also not need to exert more effort (i.e., through exchanging benefits) in attaining peripheral (personal or organizational) role changes.

In contrast out-group employees may have a more daunting task in the pursuit of pivotal or peripheral role change as evidenced by their use of stronger (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer et al 1997), more persistent (Maslyn et al., 1996), and political (Krone, 1992) forms of influence to attain objectives. Given the obstacles present in a low LMX relationship, employees seeking personally benefiting pivotal changes may be more likely to use exchange of benefit tactics (Kipnis, et al., 1980) instead of rational explanations. On the other hand, out-group employees seeking pivotal role changes benefiting the organization, at a minimum, must offer rational explanations of how such changes are to the organization's best interest. Yet, low LMX employees' perceptions of the likelihood of resistance/failure (Kipnis et al., 1984; Sullivan, Albrecht, & Taylor, 1990), the need to apply greater pressure for supervisory compliance (Maslyn et al., 1996), the lack of relational leverages for influencing (Deluga & Perry, 1991), and overall powerlessness (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989) suggests their additional use of coalitions and appeals to members higher in the organization. Due to the exploratory nature of relational quality in regards to employee influence and role change objectives, the following is posed as a research question.

RQ1: How does the quality of the leader-member relationship impact how employees influence for role change objectives?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants in this study were 155 of 300 employees at an urban mid-western automotive manufacturing organization. The study's participants were 69.6% male and 30.4% female, averaging 33 years of age. Employees' length of employment ranged from half a month to thirty-six months (M = 9, SD = 7).

Procedure

Human resources and the researcher distributed paper and pencil surveys and stressed the voluntary nature of participation in the study. Interview data was collected to be used in a later study (see Appendix I for interview guide).

Role Change Stimulus. Following Kipnis et al. (1980) and others (eg., Yukl et al., 1990), this study asked participants to describe an incident in the past six months where they influenced their supervisor to achieve a role change (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to report a successful change in the content (e.g., tasks or "what you do"), or manner (e.g., "how you do your job") of their current job that they initiated (i.e., not initiated by the supervisor). For purposes of helping participants recall the role change, they were also encouraged to include such details as the desired aspect of role change, their motivations for change, and how the change impacted the job and others.

Role change independent variables were created post-hoc based on participants' responses to several questions. First, participants indicated the pivotal, relevant, or peripheral nature of the job change through a single-item that asked participants whether their supervisor viewed the role change as "fundamental to my job responsibilities", "fairly important to my job responsibilities," or "not very important to my job responsibilities" (Miller et al., 2000). Second, in keeping with studies assessing how the motivation for personal or organizational benefit impacted employee influence tactic use (e.g., Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984), participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they sought the role change in order to gain personal benefit or for the organization's benefit. Both one-item measures were in Likert-type format, arrayed from to a "very great extent" = 5 to a "very little extent" = 1.

In an effort to identify other factors that may impact upward influence attempts, participants were also asked to provide additional information on several aspects of the role change. Single item measures inquired into the ease of achieving role change in the organization, how much the strategic nature of their job changed in the last six months, and how much the overall manner of performing tasks or the way they did their job change in the last six months.

Survey Measures. The study used seven Likert-type scales to assess employee use of upward influence tactics to achieve the objectives described in the open-ended response and to measure the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship. The study's instruments were pilot tested on 8 building maintenance workers and 24 undergraduate communication students at Michigan State University, resulting in a total of 32 pilot participants. The instrument testing sessions were followed by informal feedback interviews. Participants' responses were not included in the formal study.

The use of upward influence tactics was measured using Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) revision of Kipnis et al.'s (1980) influence tactic scales. Indicators of upward influence tactic use were arrayed from "used this tactic to a great extent" = 5 to "never used this tactic" = 1. Ingratiation is defined as a soft and non-obtrusive influence tactic, which includes acting humble and making the other person feel important (Farmer et al., 1997; Kipnis et al., 1980). In the words of Yukl and Falbe (1990), an employee using ingratiation "seeks to get you in a good mood or to think favorably of him or her before asking you to do something" (p. 133). Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) three item ingratiation scale (Appendix B) had a reliability of $\alpha = .59$.

In the exchange of benefits tactics, employees offer some form of exchange and may even offer to make personal sacrifices (Kipnis et al, 1980). In this case, "the person makes an explicit or implict promise that you will receive rewards or tangible benefits if you comply with a request..., or reminds you of a prior favor to be reciprocated" (Yukl & Falbe, 1990, p. 133). Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) three-item exchange of benefits scale (Appendix C) had an alpha reliability of .78.

With rationality tactics, employees write a detailed plan or explain the reasons for their request in hopes that "logical arguments and factual evidence" (Yukl & Falbe, 1990, p. 133) will be persuasive, seen as viable by supervisors, and result in goal attainment. Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) three item rationality scale (Appendix D) had a reliability of $\alpha = .75$.

Assertiveness tactics refer to the demanding and ordering of requests and the setting of deadlines (Kipnis et al., 1980). At times, this tactic evolves into pressure tactics where individuals resort to threats or intimidation to attain their goals (Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Assertiveness was measured by Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) three item scale (Appendix E), which had a reliability of $\alpha = .68$. This reliability score was obtained after the elimination of 1 unreliable item, thus making the assertiveness indicator a 2-item scale.

When employees use upward appeal tactics, they pressure supervisors to conform to their wishes by invoking the influence of higher-level supervisors (Kipnis et al. 1980). Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) three item (Appendix F) measure of upward appeal tactics had a reliability of $\alpha = .77$.

The use of coalitions involves pressure for compliance or change through persuasion by and the support of others, including co-workers (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Coalition tactics were measured by Schriesheim and

Hinkin's (1990) three item scale (Appendix G) which had a reliability of $\alpha = .65$.

Leader-member exchange theory posits that supervisors vary their distribution of positional and personal resources according to the supervisor-employee relationship (Graen & Scandura, 1987). High quality LMX relationships are characterized by subordinates' perceiving the supervisor understands their problems and needs, would use their power to solve subordinates' work problems, would be satisfied with the subordinates' performance, and recognizes the subordinates' potential (Graen et al., 1982). This study used Klein and Kim's (1998) modified version of Graen et al.'s (1982) LMX-7 measure (Appendix H), where a neutral middle response was added to Graen's four-point response anchors and items were modified to follow a Likert-type format. The seven-item scale had a reliability of $\alpha = .87$. In a preliminary attempt to assess the impact of the differential qualities of the leader-member relationship, high and low LMX conditions were created by computing a mean ($\underline{M} = 3.00$) split. As a result, 40% ($n = 61$) of participants were in the high LMX condition and 60% ($n = 91$) were in the low LMX condition.

With the exception of the ingratiation and the assertiveness scales, reliability scores were in a similar range with those obtained by Kipnis et al. (1980) and Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990). The leader-member exchange scale reported a high reliability similar to those of Klein and Kim (1998) and Gerstner and Day (1997).

<u>Demographic information</u>. In addition, each respondent was asked to report demographic information on age, gender, supervisors' gender, years at

current role, and years with the organization.

Analysis. Hypotheses 1-4 were tested through bivariate correlations and stepwise multiple regressions. Separate regression analyses, with personal - and organizational - benefit as dependent variables and upward influence tactics as independent variables were computed for each of the pivotal, relevant, and peripheral role change conditions. Likewise, the impact of LMX as a moderator was measured in each regression analysis.

RESULTS

Variable means, standard deviations, and the correlations between variables are reported in Table 3. In descending order, employees reported using rationality (M = 3.31) tactics most frequently, followed by ingratiation (M = 2.69), coalition (M = 2.64), upward appeal (M = 2.18), assertiveness (M = 2.04), and exchange (M = 1.96) tactics.

Stepwise Multiple Regressions. The first hypothesis posited that the use of rationality, ingratiation, and exchange of benefits upward influence tactics would be positively associated with pivotal and relevant employee role changes for personal benefit. The second hypothesis stated that the use of rationality and coalition upward influence tactics would be positively associated with pivotal and relevant employee role changes benefiting the organization. Stepwise regression analyses for pivotal role changes to the benefit of either the individual or the organization were non-significant. When seeking relevant role changes for personal benefit, stepwise regression analyses indicated that employees used coalition tactics (β = .40, F (1, 54) = 9.83, p < .01, R^2 = .16). Similarly, regression

Table 3.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients of Study Variables

	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(1) Organizational role change	3.08	1.22	1.00								
(2) Personal role change	3.09	1.23	.54**	1.00							
(3) Leader-member exchange	2.90	0.98	.45**	.22**	1.00						
(4) Ingratiation	2.69	1.09	.08	.14	.17*	1.00					
(5) Exchange	1.96	1.13	.11	.12	.13	.49**	1.00				
(6) Rationality	3.31	1.17	.23**	.14	.21**	.39**	.24**	1.00			
(7) Assertiveness	2.04	1.18	.14	.24**	.12	.45**	.53**	.30**	1.00		
(8) Upward Appeal	2.18	1.14	.17*	.22**	.11	.47**	.63**	.37**	.72**	1.00	
(9) Coalition	2.64	1.17	.22*	.22**	.16*	.49**	.45**	.43**	.57**	.63**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 (2 tailed)

analyses showed that employees seeking relevant role changes for the organization's benefits used coalition tactics ($\beta = .44$, $F(1, 53) = 12.25$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .19$). Thus, stepwise regression analyses did not support the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis was partially supported, with employees using coalition tactics to achieve relevant role changes benefiting the organization (see Table 4).

The third hypothesis predicted that the use of ingratiation and exchange of benefits upward influence tactics would be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes for personal benefit. The fourth hypothesis states that the use of rationality upward influence tactic would be positively associated with peripheral employee role changes benefiting the organization. Stepwise regression analyses were inconclusive for peripheral employee role changes related to these hypotheses.

As posed in Research Question One, this study sought to understand how the quality of the leader-member relationship impacted employees influence tactics when seeking role change objectives. A number of significant patterns emerged from the previously aggregated data and are reported below according to LMX relationship (high/low) and the nature of the successful role change (pivotal, relevant, peripheral).

First, results of stepwise regression analyses indicated that, during pivotal role changes for personal benefit, high LMX employees were likely to use rationality tactics ($\beta = .70$, $F(1, 10) = 8.82$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .49$). When seeking pivotal role changes for the organization's benefit, high LMX employees also

Table 4.

Stepwise Multiple Regression
Relevant Role Change (across all LMX conditions)

Goal	Upward Influence Tactic	Beta	R^2	p
Organizational	Coalition	.44	.19	.001
Personal	Coalition	.40	.16	.003

used rationality tactics (β = .65, F (1, 10)= 6.88, p < .05, R^2 = .43). Conversely, another stepwise regression indicated that low LMX employees pursuing pivotal role changes for personal benefit were likely to use exchange of benefit tactics (β = .47, F (1, 17) = 4.50, p = .05, R^2 = .22). Stepwise regression analyses for low LMX employees pursuing pivotal role changes for organizational benefit were non-significant (see Table 5).

Next, for high LMX employees seeking relevant role changes, stepwise regression analyses failed to identify an upward influence tactic that was significantly predictive of personally-benefiting role changes. When seeking relevant role changes benefiting the organization, stepwise regression analyses revealed that high LMX employees used coalition tactics (β = .54, F (1, 24) = 9.45, p < .01, R^2 = .29). In turn, analyses revealed that low LMX employees altering relevant role components for personal benefit used coalition tactics (β = .92, F (2, 29) = 18.23, p < .01, R^2 = .57), but avoided using ingratiation tactics (β = -.38, F (2, 29) = 18.23, p < .01, R^2 = .57). Low LMX employees seeking relevant role changes for the organization's benefit were likely to use upward appeal tactics (β = .42, F (1, 28) = 5.74, p < .05, R^2 = .17) tactics (see Table 6).

Finally, results of stepwise regression analyses did not identify significant predictors of tactic use among high LMX employees seeking peripheral role change for personal reasons. Yet, stepwise regression analyses revealed that high LMX employees seeking peripheral role change for the organization's benefit avoided using ingratiation tactics (β = -.49, F (1, 16) = 4.84, p < .05, R^2 = .24) (see Table 7). No significant predictors of tactic use were found for low LMX

Table 5.

Stepwise Multiple Regression
Pivotal Role Change

LMX	Goal	Upward Influence Tactic	Beta	R^2	p
High	Organizational	Rational	.66	.43	.03
	Personal	Rational	.70	.49	.02
Low	Organizational				ns.
	Personal	Exchange	.47	.22	.05

Table 6.

Stepwise Multiple Regression
Relevant Role Change

LMX	Goal	Upward Influence Tactic	Beta	R^2	p
High	Organizational	Coalition	.54	.29	.005
	Personal				ns
Low	Organizational	Upward appeal	.42	.18	.02
	Personal	Coalition	.92	.57	.0001
		Ingratiation	-.39	.57	.02

Table

LMT
High
Low

Table 7.

Stepwise Multiple Regression
Peripheral Role Change

LMX	Goal	Upward Influence Tactic	Beta	R^2	p
High	Organizational	Ingratiation	-.49	.24	.04
	Personal				ns.
Low	Organizational				ns.
	Personal				ns.

employees seeking peripheral role changes for their own or the organization's benefit. See Table 8 for a summary of all the stepwise regression results in the pivotal, relevant, and peripheral role change conditions accounting for the quality of the leader-member exchange relationship.

DISCUSSION

One of the most important objectives of upward influence in organizations is the employee's role. Experiences of role conflict, role ambiguity, and inadequate fit of the position to employees' skills and desires heighten the need for change (Jablin, 2001; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Kristof, 1996; Schein, 1968). Employees seek to influence their supervisors toward accepting pivotal, relevant, and peripheral role changes that can have both personal and organizational benefit. While this study finds that successful relevant role changes are associated with the use of coalition tactics for personal and organizational benefit, the quality of the superior-subordinate relationship emerges as a key determinant in employee use of upward influence tactics.

As reported in Table 8, high LMX employees use rationality tactics to achieve pivotal role changes benefiting themselves and the organization. Their successful relevant role changes benefiting the organization are associated with coalition tactics, but they also avoid using ingratiation tactics during successful peripheral role changes benefiting the organization. Yet, low LMX employees report the use of exchange of benefits tactics to achieve pivotal role changes that are personally beneficial. They also use upward appeal and coalition tactics in successful relevant role change attempts that benefit the organization, but avoid

Table 8.

Upward Influence Tactics used to Achieve Organizational and Personal Benefits During Pivotal, Relevant, and Peripheral Role Change

High leader-member exchange quality

Component changed	Goal	Tactic used
Pivotal	Organizational	Rational
Pivotal	Individual	Rational
Relevant	Organizational	Coalition
Relevant	Individual	-----
Peripheral	Organizational	(neg.) Ingratiate
Peripheral	Individual	-----

Low leader-member exchange quality

Component changed	Goal	Tactic used
Pivotal	Organizational	-----
Pivotal	Individual	Exchange
Relevant	Organizational	Upward appeal
Relevant	Individual	Coalition & (negative)Ingratiate
Peripheral	Organizational	------
Peripheral	Individual	------

using ingratiation tactics in successful relevant role change efforts benefiting themselves.

The following discussion considers the importance of these findings to upward influence research and the differential qualities of the leader-member exchange relationship. In particular, this section discusses tactic similarities and differences between high and low LMX employees in light of pivotal, relevant, and peripheral role changes. Also considered are managerial and organizational implications, methodological limitations, and directions for future research.

Upward Influence Tactics and Employee Role Change

Recent reviews indicate that upward influence research continues to increase its breadth and relevance to daily employee behaviors (Waldron, 1999). Notable changes include reconfigurations in the number and array of upward influence tactics (Barry & Shapiro, 1992; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990) and the refinement of employee influence objectives and goals (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl et al., 1995). Although the assessment of personal and organizational goals contributes to the practical relevance of upward influence studies, the conceptualization of goals and the measurement of upward influence tactics remain vague and suffer from their non-specific application to individuals' objectives. Personal and organizational goals are often conceptualized and measured as orthogonal to each other. In this respect, measuring role change as potentially benefiting both the employee and the organization more closely resembles reports of employee motives (Miller et al., 2000; Zurcher, 1983).

Researchers often fail to recognize that not all objectives are equally important to the parties who are targets of influence attempts. Specifying the importance of the sought role change from the perspective of the supervisor being influenced provides a more receiver-based understanding of upward influence. Pivotal role change constitutes a persuasive situation where the likelihood of resistance is high as are the impact on work processes and potential social costs while peripheral role change may require comparatively minor effort and incur few costs (Miller et al., 1996). Specifying the nature and importance of the sought-after role change moves the conceptualization of influence goals from a dichotomous and constant model to one that reflects the realities of upward influence effort, workforce implication, and potential resistance.

In general, upward influence research suggests that rationality and coalition tactics are the primary means employees use to achieve their goals with management (Chacko, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). This study partially supports Yukl and Falbe's (1990) early research, but provides new insights into the pursuit of successful role changes. For example, high LMX employees use rationality and low LMX employees use exchange of benefits to achieve pivotal role changes. These findings corroborate research indicating that high LMX employees often provide factual support and explanations in their influence attempts (Krone, 1992; Waldron et al., 1993). Furthermore, a context featuring rational discussions of desired role changes is expected to provide the greatest opportunity for role negotiation and joint agreements (Miller et al., 1996). In contrast, low LMX employees have less credibility with their superiors (Graen &

Scandura, 1987) and may rely on the overt negotiation of exchanges (incurring subsequent debts) to obtain pivotal changes that primarily benefit the individual. In essence, high LMX employees are able to achieve pivotal changes with fewer potential costs and in such a way that modifications of interdependencies and unit work processes can be anticipated and accommodated.

Another marked difference between high and low LMX employees is their use of tactics to achieve relevant role changes for the benefit the organization. While high LMX employees use coalition tactics, which present a united front to the supervisor, low LMX employees report appealing over the supervisor to those higher in the organization. In this case, the powerlessness of low LMX employee to effect change (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989) requires employees to resort to "stronger" forms of influence (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997; Maslyn et al., 1996) and bypass their supervisors. It is important to note that upward appeal can have lasting negative ramifications on the supervisor-subordinate relationship. As such, the use of upward appeal may attest to the lengths that employees will go (and the potential costs that they are willing to endure) to surpass obstacles and forward ideas that will benefit the organization.

Another notable difference between high and low LMX employees pertain to low LMX employees' varying their tactics depending upon the extent of individual or organizational benefit. For relevant role changes primarily for personal benefit, low LMX employees report success with coalition tactics, whereas those (low LMX) changing relevant roles for organizational benefit report successful influence with upward appeal tactics. While high LMX employees appear to be more consistent in their upward influence tactic use (eg. high LMX employees successfully use rationality for *both* personal and organizational benefit during pivotal role changes), low LMX employees may need to vary their tactics more given their relational obstacles and sensitivity to their supervisors' reactions. Future research should attempt to discern whether the varying of tactics for differing goals is more attributable to the type of goal sought or more shaped by situational variables (e.g., low LMX situations).

Both high and low LMX employees, however, use coalition tactics in seeking relevant role changes. In addition, both sets of employees also avoid using ingratiation tactics. Prior research suggests that coalition tactics tend to be more associated with low LMX employees (Deluga & Perry, 1991). The use of coalition tactics by high and low LMX employees, in this study, calls into question prior interpretations of coalition tactics as a "hard" form of influence associated with negative work attitudes (Christiansen, Villanova, & Mikulay, 1997; Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997). The use of coalitions by high LMX employees is more akin to Johnson and Ford's (1996) finding that supervisors supported by an employee's peers predicted employee use of coalition during upward influence. Given the task interdependencies of employee roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978) and the impact that role changes can have on work processes (Parker et al., 1997), coalition tactics may be a very appropriate means for guaranteeing minimum disruptions of work unit flow.

High and low LMX employees in this study also avoid using ingratiation tactics. While a case can be made for the use of ingratiation tactics in improving the supervisor-subordinate relationship (Deluga & Perry, 1991, 1994), it is possible that ingratiation has little impact on supervisory consideration of changes to employee roles. Although ingratiation may produce some degree of positive supervisory affect in response to employee compliments and praise, creating a mindset that allows for changes in assignments, responsibilities, and performance expectations may be based on task competencies (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991), not affect.

Managerial and Organizational Implications

Due to the pervasive nature of employee role-making activities (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Parker et al., 1997; Zurcher, 1983), organizations invest considerable time in ameliorating role conflicts and resolving incongruencies stemming from differing role expectations (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Hall, 1972). As such, it is management's interest to identify and discuss potential employee role changes. Upward influence behaviors can be viewed as offering an informative and interactive bridge between employees and management that can facilitate mutual understanding and employee role development. Role discussions during the performance appraisal interview (Latham & Wexley, 1993), for example, can facilitate supervisor-approved task restructuring or modification. Such a venue offers discussion of proposed role changes when feedback on employee performance is given. Such forums also allow for desired role changes to be pursued through exchanges featuring rational persuasion and/or exchange of benefit influence tactics. In addition, the routinization of role modifications and changes into the appraisal feedback setting can foster employee role development and unit coordination while concurrently decreasing the upward appeal behaviors associated with powerless positions (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989). Supervisory information-seeking on employee roles may also be enhanced while promoting innovative collaborations and stimulating regular assessments of employee compatibilities with their current assignments (Kristof, 1996).

Organizations should also consider training supervisors in seeking feedback from employees on role-related changes and improvements (Jablin & Miller, in press). Any move toward implementing democratic systems in the workforce (Cheney, 1995; Cheney, Straub, Speirs-Glebe, Stohl, DeGooyer, Whalen, Garvin-Doxas, & Carlone, 1998) that feature participative decision-making and communal goal formations must consider the basic elements on which cooperative systems are based, namely organizational roles (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Until supervisors are trained to discuss proposed role changes and work with employees to set goals that are individually and organizationally beneficial, employees are likely to resort to upward influence tactics other than that of rationality.

<u>Limitations</u>

A number of limitations pertain to the study's exploratory nature and sample size. For example, one-item indicators, typically suspect, are used to assess individual and organizational reasons for role change (see Appendix A). In the case of this study, open-ended responses provide preliminary evidence for the extensiveness of employee role changes and their reasons for seeking these changes. While these one-item indicators are equivalent in many respects to stimuli given to research participants in goal-focused upward influence studies (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl et al., 1990), further validation of these indicators is needed. This study is also limited by the low reliability obtained for the ingratiation subscale. While Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) upward influence measure is well-established, it is possible that participants' social desirability needs (Kerlinger, 1986) may have interfered with the consistency with which they report using this tactic.

Due to the small sample size, the analyses are unlikely to identify small effects pertaining to either pivotal, relevant, or peripheral role changes. While employee changes to pivotal (27%), relevant (45%), and peripheral role change components (28%) are not equally balanced across conditions, the distribution is not expected to be uniform. Rather, it is much more likely that fewer pivotal role changes occur (Schein, 1968) given their potential to alter the strategic nature of the role. Nevertheless, the results obtained form a solid basis for noticing trends, forming theoretical explanations, and constructing future research objectives.

This study is also limited by the use of sampling from a single organization. Although the unit of analysis is the individual and there exists considerable variety of experiences reported by participants, interviews with participants suggest a deep rift between line workers and management. While it is unclear how this animosity affected participants' upward influence efforts with their direct supervisor, future investigations should broaden the participant base to include employees in non-factory settings in order to notice what differences in

tactic use might emerge.

Future Research

As employee influence objectives gain attention in influence studies (Yukl et al., 1995), investigators should consider objectives as a base point for improving theories on upward influence. Employee communication goals, whether consciously realized or not (Motley, 1990), exist in the cognitions (Wilson, Greene, & Dillard, 2000), behaviors (Rao & Schmidt, 1998; Yukl et al., 1993), and collective interactions of organizational life. Influence goals as the primary focus of theory allows researchers to subsume the impact of the agent's personality (Farmer et al., 1997), supervisor-employee relationship (Waldron et al., 1993), perceived resistance (Maslyn, et al., 1996), organizational norms (Christiansen et al., 1997), and work situations as contingent variables affecting and shaping the cognitive, behavioral, and collective pursuit of objectives. These contingent variables, although important, distract researchers from scrutinizing the ultimate aims of upward influence tactics - goals.

Deluga's (1994) findings that employee use of ingratiation predicted higher quality supervisor-subordinate relationships contrasted with this study's finding that ingratiation use was strongly avoided when changing organizational roles (by both high *and* low LMX employees), suggests an important distinction between employee goals. Although researchers need to theorize further, the above data suggests that employee tactics differ significantly for task related goals than for relationally related goals. Past research seems to indicate that relational goals such as impression management, relationship maintenance, and identity negotiations (eg. face work and politeness) (Lee & Jablin, 1995; Morand, 2000; Wilson & Kunkel, 1999) may require more ingratiatory-types of tactics or a different set of tactics than task related goals like role change, performance evaluations, and budgeting decisions (Dulebohn & Ferris, 1999; Mowday, 1978) which may front load on the rational persuasion end of the influence spectrum.

The implications of this are for future research *expansions* of task-related influence tactics and relationally-related influence tactics (see Dulebohn & Ferris, 1999 and Ferris et al., 1994 for preliminary distinctions). Researchers may need to begin expanding the various types of relational tactics that fall under relational goals, and also expand the various types of rational persuasions or coalitions that fall under task-oriented goals (see Yukl, 1999 for differentiations between types of task-related rational persuasions). The difficulty and intrigue, yet important challenge, in such endeavors is that organizational life simultaneously embodies both task and relational goals that inevitably overlap and exist on a continuum. It is the researcher's particular phenomenon of study (eg., performance appraisals, new project teams, etc.) that should dictate which primary category of observation is relevant, where and *how* overlap or contradiction takes place between multiple goals, and how the data (employee upward influence tactics) is subsequently impacted.

ENDNOTE

[1] Although a less prevalent focus in research, upward influence styles are potentially useful for understanding the frequency of employee influence behavior. Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, and Wilkinson (1984) propose that employees who influence extensively with high levels of hard tactics use a shotgun style. A tactician style indicates an employee who uses moderate levels of influence with high amounts of rational tactics. A bystander style refers to employees who avoid influencing altogether. Tactician managers are reported to earn more and report less stress (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988).

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Role Change stimulus

We are interested in learning about one specific incident where you influenced your supervisor to achieve a change in your job – in what you do or how you do your job – within the last six months.

We are interested in:

- One specific change within your job - a change in what you do or how you do your job;
- A change within your current job, not a change to a "new job" or position with a new job title or new supervisor; and
- A change that you initiated, not initiated by your supervisor.

Possible changes include: new assignments, improving the method of performing a job task, adding to or lessening your responsibilities, changing your work schedule, taking over a co-worker's tasks, creating new protocols, etc. Again, we are interested in changes that you initiated.

In the space below, please describe one change in your job that you initiated. While being brief, be sure to describe what you wanted to change, your motivation for the change, and the impact of the change

APPENDIX B

Ingratiation (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Acted very humbly to him or her while making my request.

Acted in a friendly manner prior to asking for what I wanted.

Made him or her feel good about me before making my request.

APPENDIX C

Exchange of Benefits (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Reminded him or her of past favors that I did for him/her.

Offered an exchange (eg., if you do this for me, I will do something for you).

Offered to make a personal sacrifice if he or she would do what I wanted.

APPENDIX D

Rationality (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Used logic to convince him or her.

Explained the reasons for my request.

Presented him or her with information in support of my point of view.

APPENDIX E

Assertiveness (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Had a showdown in which I confronted him or her face-to-face.

Expressed my anger verbally.

Used a forceful manner: I tried such things as demands, the settings of deadlines, and the expression of strong emotion.

APPENDIX F

Upward Appeal (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Obtained the informal support of higher-ups.

Made a formal appeal to higher levels to back up my request.

Relied on the chain of command on people higher up in the organization who had power over him or her.

APPENDIX G

Coalition (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990)

Obtained the support of co-workers to back up my request.

Obtained the support of my subordinates to back up my request.

Mobilized other people in the organization to help me influence him or her.

APPENDIX H

Leader-Member Exchange (Kim & Klein, 1998)

Do you know where you stand (e.g., do you usually know how satisfied your supervisor is with your work)?

How well does your supervisor understands your job problems and needs?

How well does your supervisor recognize your potential?

What are the chances that your supervisor would use the authority that he or she has to help you solve problems in your work?

What are the chances that your supervisor would use the authority that he or she has to "bail you out" at his or her expense?

How would you characterize your working relationship with your supervisor?

What are the chances that you would defend or justify your supervisor's decisions if he/she were not present to do so?

APPENDIX I

Interview Guide

Please tell me about a recent change you initiated in your job or role?

Why did you want this change?

How did you gain approval for this change?

Please describe your interaction(s) with your supervisor concerning this change.

What were the outcomes?

REFERENCES

Ansari, M.A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,40, 39-49.

Barry B., & Watson, M.R. (1996). Communication aspects of dyadic social influence in organizations: A review and integration of conceptual and empirical developments. In B.R. Burleson (Ed.) Communication yearbook 19 (pp. 269-317) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Barry B., & Shapiro, D.L. (1992). Influence tactics in combinations: The interactive effects of soft versus hard tactics and rational exchange. Journal of Applied Social Psychology,22, 1429-1441.

Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.

Carnegie D. (1930). Public speaking and influencing men in business. New York: Association Press.

Chacko, H.E. (1990). Methods of upward influence, motivational needs, and administrators' perceptions of their supervisors' leadership styles. Group and Organization Studies,15, 253-265.

Cheney, G. (1995). Democracy in the workplace: Theory and practice from the perspective of communication. Journal of applied communication research,23, 167-200.

Cheney, G., Straub, J., Speirs-Glebe, L., Stohl, C., DeGooyer, Jr., D., Whalen, S., Garvin-Doxas, K., & Carlone, D. (1998). Democracy, participation, and communication at work: A multidisciplinary review. In M.E. Roloff (Ed.), Communication yearbook,21, pp 35-91. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Cheng, J.L.C. (1983). Organizational context and upward influence: An experimental study of the use of power tactics. Group and Organization Studies,8, 337-355.

Christiansen, Villanova, & Mikulay (1997). Political influence compatibility: fitting the person to the climate. Journal of Organizational Behavior,18, 709-730.

Cobb, A.T. (1980). Informal influence in the formal organization: Perceived sources of power among work unit peers. Academy of Management Journal,23, 155-161.

Cobb, A.T., (1984). An episodic model of power: Toward an integration of theory and research. Academy of Management Review,9, 382-393.

Cook, T.D & Campbell, D.T. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues for field settings. Boston : Houghton Mifflin.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W.J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,13, 46-78.

Deluga, R.J. (1991).The relationship of upward-influencing behavior with subordinate-impression management characteristics. Journal of Applied Social Psychology,21, 1145-1160.

Deluga, R.J., & Perry, J.T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behavior, satisfaction, and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. Joural of Occupational Psychology,64, 239-252.

Deluga, R.J., & Perry, J.T. (1994). The role of subordinate performance and ingratiation in leader-member exchanges. Group and Organization Management,19(1), 67-86.

Dulebohn, J.H., & Ferris, G.R. (1999). The role of influence tactics in perceptions of evaluations' fairness. Academy of Management Journal, 42(3), 288-303.

Erez, M., & Rim, Y. (1982). The relationships between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. Human Relations,35, 871-878.

Fairhurst, G.T. (1993). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry-A discourse analysis. Communication Monographs,60, 321-351.

Fairhurst G.T., & Chandler, T.A. (1989). Social structure in leader-member interaction. Communication Monographs, 56(3) 215-239.

Fairhurst, G. T., Rogers, L. E., & Sarr R. A. (1987). Manager-subordinate control patterns and judgments about the relationship. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), Communication yearbook (Vol. 10, pp. 395-415). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G.T. (in press). The communication between leaders and their followers: A review and commentary. In F.M. Jablin & L.L. Putnam (Eds.), The new handbook of organizational communication. An interdisciplinary perspective. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Farmer, S.M, Maslyn, J.M., Fedor, D.B., & Goodman, J.S. (1997). Putting upward influence strategies in context. Journal of Organizational Behavior,18, 17-42.

Ferris, G.R., & Judge, T.A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. Journal of Management,17, 447-488.

Ferris, G.R., Judge, T.A., Rowland, K.M, & Fitzgibbons, D.E. (1994). Subordinate influence and the performance evaluation process: A test of a model. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,58, 101-135.

French, J., & Raven, B.H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Gerstner, C.R. & Day, D.V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. Journal of Applied Psychology,82, 827-844

Graen, G. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1201-1245). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Graen, G.B., Novak, M.A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction--testing a dual attachment model. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,30, 109-131.

Graen, G., & Scandura, T.A., (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. Research in Organizational Behavior,9, 175-208.

Hall, D.T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: The behavior change of college educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly,17, 471-

486.

Hinkin, T.R., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1988). Power and influence: The view from below. Personnel,65,(5) 47-50.

Ilgen D.R., & Hollenbeck, J.R. (1991). Structure of work: Job design and roles. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. (pp. 165-207). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists, Inc.

Jablin, F.M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F.M. Jablin, L.L. Putnam, K.H. Roberts, & L.W. Porter (Eds.), Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective. (pp. 679-740). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jablin, F.M., Cude, R.L, House, A., Lee, J., & Roth, N.L. (1994). Communication competence in organizations: Conceptualization and comparison across multiple levels of analysis. In L. Thayer & G.A. Barnett (Eds.), Organization communication: Emerging perspectives (Vol. 4, pp. 114-140). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Jablin, F. M. & Miller, V. D. (in press). Interview and feedback training. In B. Burleson & J. Greene (Eds.), Handbook of communication training. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jablin, F.M. (2001). Organizational Entry, Assimilation, and Disengagement/Exit. In F.M. Jablin & L.L Putnam (Eds.), Handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Jablin, F.M., & Sias, P.M. (2001) Communication competence. In F.M. Jablin & L.L. Putnam (Eds.), New handbook of organizational communication Advances in theory, research, and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Johnson, C., & Ford, R. (1996). Dependence, power, legitimacy, and tactical choice. Social Psychology Quarterly, 59(2), 126-139.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd Ed.). New York: John Wiley and sons.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Reinhart, & Winston.

Kipnis, D. (1984). Technology, power and control. Research in the Sociology of Organizations,3, 125-156.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, M. (1983). An influence perspective on bargaining within organizations. In M.H. Bazerman & R.J. Lewicki (Eds.), Negotiating in organizations (pp. 303-319). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, M. (1988). Upward influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluations, salary, and stress. Administrative Science Quarterly,33, 528-542.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, M., & Wilkinson I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Exploration in gettings one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology,65, 440-452.

Klein, H.J. & Kim, J.S. (1998). A field study of the influence of situational constraints, leader-member exchange, and goal commitment on performance. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 88-95.

Kotter, J.P. (1985). Power and Influence. New York: Free Press.

Kristof, A.L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. Personnel Psychology,49.

Krone K.J. (1992). A comparison of organizational, structural, and relationship effects on subordinates' upward influence choices. Communication Quarterly,40, 1-15.

Krone, K.J. (1994). Structuring constraints on perceptions of upward influence and supervisory relationships. Southern Communication Journal,59, 215-226.

Langer, E.J. (1978). Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research (Vol. 2, pp. 35-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Langer, E.J., Blank A., & Chanowitz, B. (1978). Mindlessness of ostensibly thoughtful action – Role of placebic information in interpersonal interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,36, 635-642.

Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1993). Increasing productivity through performance appraisal (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

Lee, J. & Jablin, F.M. (1995). Maintenance communication in superior-subordinate work relationships. Human Communication Research,22, 220-257.

Maslyn, J.M, Farmer, S.M., & Fedor, D.B. (1996). Failed upward influence attempts: Predicting the nature of subordinate persistence in pursuit of organizational goals. Group and Organization Management,21, 461-480.

Miller, V.D., Jablin, F.M., Casey, M.K., Lamphear-Van Horn, M., &

Ethington, C. (1996). The maternity leave as a role negotiation process. Journal of Managerial Issues,8, 286-309.

Miller, V.D., Johnson, J.R., Hart, Z., & Peterson, D. (1999).A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability. Journal of Applied Communication Research,27, 24-.

Miller, V.D., Meiners, E., Beery, S., Kim, E.S., & Lamphear-Van Horn, M. (2000). Self- and Supervisor-Initiated Role Change. Paper presented as the fiftieth meeting of the International Communication Association, Acapulco.

Morand, D.A. (2000). Language and power: an empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used in superior-subordinate communication. Journal of organizational behavior,21, 235-248.

Motley, M.T. (1990). On whether one can(not) communicate: An examination via traditional communication postulates. Western Journal of Speech Communication,54, 1-20.

Mowday, R.T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly,23, 137-156.

Mowday, R.T. (1979). Leader characteristics, self-confidence, and methods of upward influence in organizational decision situations. Academy of Management Journal,22, 709-725.

Parker, S.K., Wall, T.D., & Jackson, P.R. (1997). "That's not my job": Developing flexible employee work orientations. Academy of Management Journal,40, 899-929.

Perreault, W.D., & Miles, R.H. (1978). Influence strategy mixes in complex organizations. Behavioral Science,23, 86-98.

Podsakoff, P.M., & Schriesheim, C.A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. Psychological Bulletin,97, 387-411.

Porter, L.W., Allen, R.W., & Angle, H.L. (1981). The politics of upward influence in organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior,3, 109-149.

Roloff, M.E. (1981). Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Scandura, T.A., & Graen, G.B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. Journal of Applied Psychology,69, 428-436.

Schein, E.H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. Industrial Management Review,9, 1-16.

Schilit, W.K., & Locke, E. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly,27, 304-316.

Schmidt, S., & Kipnis, D. (1984). Managers' pursuit of individual and organizational goals. Human Relations,37, 781-794.

Schriesheim, C.A. & Hinkin, T. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson subscales. Journal of Applied Psychology,75, 487-499.

Seibold, D.R., Cantrill, J.G., & Meyers, R.A.(1985). Communication and interpersonal influence. In M.L. Knapp & Miller G.R. (Eds.) Handbook of interpersonal communication (pp. 551-611). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Staw, B.M., & Boettger, R.D. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. Academy of Management Journal,33, 534-559.

Sullivan, J.J., Albrecht, T.L., & Taylor, S. (1990). Process, organizational, relational, and personal determinants of managerial compliance-gaining communication strategies. The Journal of Business Communication,27, 331-355.

Tsui, A.S., Ashford, S.J., St Clair, L., & Xin, K.R. (1995). Dealing with discrepant expectations: Response strategies and managerial effectiveness. Academy of Management Journal,38, 1515-1543.

Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. Academy of Management Journal,41, 692-703.

Van Dyne, L., Graham J.W., & Dienesch, R.L. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal,37, 765-802.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E.H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. Research in Organizational Behavior,1, 209-264.

Waldron V. R. (1999). Communication practices of followers, members, and proteges: The case of upward influence tactics. In M.E. Roloff (Ed.) Communication yearbook 22 (pp. 251-299).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Waldron, V.R., Hunt, M.D., & Dsilva, M. (1993). Towards a threat management model of upward communication: A study of influence and maintenance tactics in the leader-member dyad. Communication Studies,44, 254-272.

Wayne, S.J., & Ferris, G.R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interaction: A laboratory experiment and field study. Journal of Applied Psychology,75, 487-499.

Wayne, S. J., & Liden, R. C., Graf, I. K., & Ferris, G. R. 1997. The role of upward influence tactics in human resource decisions. Personnel Psychology,50, 979-1006.

Wilson S.R.& Kunkel A.W. (2000). Identity implications of influence goals - Similarities in perceived face threats and facework across sex and close relationships. Journal of Language and social psychology,19, 195-221.

Wilson, S.R., Greene, J.O., & Dillard, J.P. (2000). Introduction to the special issue on message production. Communication Theory,10, 135-138.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C.M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. Journal of Applied Psychology,75, 132-140.

Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M,, & Youn, J.Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behavior for managers. Group and Organization Studies,18, 5-28.

Yukl, G., Guinan, P.G., & Sottolano, D. (1995). Influence tactics used for different objectives with subordinates, peers, and superiors. Group and Organization Management,20, 272-296.

Yukl, G., Kim, H., & Chavez, C. (1999). Task importance, feasibility, and agent influence behavior as determinants of target commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology,84, 137-143.

Zurcher, L.A. (1983). Social roles: Conformity, conflict, and creativity. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.