This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

Getting one's way vs. Maintaining the relationship: Effects of
LMX quality on upward influence message production across
two cultures

presented by

Isabel C. Botero

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D.	degree in	Communication

Major Professor's Signature

February 4, 2005

Date

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
	JUL 2 5 2007	

GETTING ONE'S WAY VS. MAINTAINING THE RELATIONSHIP: EFFECTS OF

LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE (LMX) QUALITY ON UPWARD INFLUENCE

MESSAGE PRODUCTION ACROSS TWO CULTURES

By

Isabel C. Botero

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Communication

2005

ABSTRACT

GETTING ONE'S WAY VS. MAINTAINING THE RELATIONSHIP: EFFECTS OF LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE (LMX) QUALITY ON UPWARD INFLUENCE MESSAGE PRODUCTION ACROSS TWO CULTURES

By

Isabel C. Botero

This cross cultural study examines how leader-member exchange (LMX) affects message production in situations in which an employee is trying to gain compliance from a supervisor to obtain a personal benefit. Competing hypothesis were tested. The relationship maintenance hypothesis states that when trying to gain compliance from a supervisor, employees use messages that reflect a greater concern with maintaining and therefore are more polite. Conversely, the idiosyncrasy credit hypothesis states that when trying to gain compliance from a supervisor, employees use messages that reflect a greater concern for getting their way and therefore can be less polite. One hundred and twenty-three employees from different organizations in the Midwest United States of America and 147 employees from different organizations in Medellín-Colombia participated in this study. Employees wrote hypothetical email messages (EMMs) to their supervisor asking for a change in work schedule for the following month (high imposition) and for authorization for vacation time (low imposition). These EMMs were coded for politeness. Under high imposition conditions data were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis for the United States sample; whereas in the low imposition condition data were not consistent with either hypothesis. Additional results and implications are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 5

CHAPTER 6

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

Social influence is an important process for understanding organizational behavior. Power shifts and flattening of structures are prevalent in today's organizations (Ilgen, 1994). These shifts have implications for employees' need to influence others, especially supervisors, to accomplish their tasks and individual goals (Pfeffer, 2003). A variety of research has explored the downward, lateral, and upward influence processes in organizations (See Porter, Angle, & Allen, 2003 for a complete review). Research in upward influence has concentrated on two issues: (1) how can upward influence messages best be described (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, & Wilkinson, 1984; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990), and (2) what factors predict an employee's use of upward influence messages (Farmer, Maslyn, Fedor, & Goodman, 1997; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Braxton-Brown, 1989; Maslyn, Farmer, & Fedor, 1996). Although several studies have examined how employees gain compliance from their supervisors and what message tactics they use, there is no clear understanding of why employees use these message tactics. This study examines why employees use different messages to influence their supervisors, and how those reasons might differ across two different cultures: The United States and Colombia.

Research suggests that one of the factors that affects upward influence message production is the nature of the relationship between the employee and the supervisor (Ansari, Tandon, & Lakhtakia, 1989; Barry & Watson, 1996; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Higgins et al., 2003; Krone, 1991, 1992). This study addresses how the relationship

between employee and supervisor affects message production in situations in which an employee is trying to gain compliance from a supervisor. This study has two primary purposes. First, it aims to examine why the type of relationship between employee and supervisor affects the production of upward influence messages. And, second, it examines the consistency of these results across cultures. Competing hypotheses will be presented and tested to determine whether employees choose certain upward influence messages because of their concern in maintaining their relationship with supervisor, or because they want to get their way.

Initially, upward influence will be discussed. Second, a summary of how upward influence has been studied will be provided. Third, the relationship between employee and supervisor is discussed as a predictor of upward influence message selection. Fourth, the relationship maintenance and the idiosyncrasy credit frameworks and their predictions for upward influence message selection are presented. Finally, the impact of culture on upward influence is discussed.

CHAPTER 1

UPWARD INFLUENCE

Most empirical work describes upward influence as a "deliberate attempt by a subordinate to select messages that will bring about change in a more powerful target and facilitate the achievement of personal or organizational objectives"(Waldron, 1999) . Upward influence is an intentional and strategic action. Upward influence in organizations is inherently risky for at least two reasons: (1) the differences in power between supervisor and employee, and (2) in organizations the relationship between supervisors and employees may be long-lasting with both history and future (Waldron, Hunt, & Dsilva, 1993). In upward influence situations the supervisor's status may be threatened by the ideas that an employee presents. Moreover, in organizational contexts more powerful others often control the resources that employees need to complete their work, and they may set the rules that subordinates must follow (Porter, Allen, & Angle, 1980; Waldron, 1999). It is possible that if a supervisor is threatened by what an employee says (e.g., an upward influence attempt) the employee may suffer negative consequences. Furthermore, in organizations the relationship between supervisors and employees may be long lasting with both history and future. When the supervisor does not like how an employee behaved, this negative feeling may be long lasting and have negative consequences for the employee, compounding the risk of engaging in upward influence attempts.

Research on upward influence in the organizational context has concentrated on understanding the types of messages employees use to gain compliance from their

supervisors and the antecedents of message selection. Studies looking at the types of messages employees use in upward influence have concentrated on the varying message tactics used by employees (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Farmer et al., 1997; Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Guinan, & Sottolano, 1995). Studies looking at antecedents of message selection have focused on understanding how the type of relationship between employee and supervisor (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Deluga & Perry, 1991; Krone, 1991, 1992; Waldron, 1991; Waldron et al., 1993), goal of the influence attempt (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Yukl et al., 1995; Yukl, Kim, & Falbe, 1996), and personality characteristics (Barry & Shapiro, 1992; Barry & Watson, 1996) affect employee selection of upward influence messages.

Research examining upward influence situations suggests that there are at least three situational factors that may affect the perceptions of risk for employees when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors: (1) the influence goal of the employee, (2) employee's perception of supervisor's benefit from compliance, and (3) the type of relationship between supervisor and subordinate. Situations in which employees are trying to gain compliance from supervisors for actions that would benefit the organization (e.g., increase in productivity, better ways for doing the job) are expected to be perceived as less risky than situations in which an employee is trying to get a personal benefit (e.g., salary raise, days off, less work). Similarly, in situations in which an employee perceives that the supervisor can benefit from complying with the employee's request, it may be less risky for an employee to try to gain compliance from the supervisor compared with situations in which the employee perceives that the supervisor will not benefit from

4

complying with the employee's request. Additionally, in situations in which the supervisor and employee have a very favorable working relationship, it may be less risky to try to gain compliance from a supervisor, compared with situations in which the relationship between employee and supervisor is not as favorable. This study focuses primarily on how the relationship between employee and supervisor affects the production of upward influence messages.

LMX Quality as an Antecedent of Upward Influence Message Selection

In organizational settings the type of relationship between supervisor and subordinate can determine employee socialization and advancement opportunities (Graen & Ginsburgh, 1977; Jablin, 1987; Lee & Jablin, 1995; Waldron, 1991). One way to look at this relationship is by considering leader member exchange (LMX). LMX is a framework to conceptualize relationships between subordinates and supervisors. It suggests that within work units different types of relationships develop between supervisors and their subordinates (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). The relationship that develops is predictive of outcomes at the individual, group, and organizational level (Gerstner & Day, 1997). In-group, or high LMX, exchanges are relationships that involve more communication opportunities and administrative activities, and in which subordinates enjoy greater work support and responsiveness from supervisors (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Krone, 1991). High LMX relationships are characterized by mutual trust, respect, reciprocal influence, strong loyalty, obligation, and liking between subordinates and supervisors (Deluga, 1998; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Yukl, 1998). Out-group, or low LMX, dyads tend to develop

more formal, restricted relationships (Graen, 1976). These relationships exhibit low trust, support, and rewards, and are based strictly on employment contracts (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen, 1976). Subordinates in low LMX relationships have less access to the supervisor, fewer resources, and restricted information (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001).

The LMX model is grounded in role theory (Liden et al., 1997). Role theory suggests that employees act in a manner that is expected from occupants of a particular position in an organization, and that occupants of different positions may have differing sets of expectations. The LMX model suggests that roles are not determined solely by written job descriptions or formal documents (Graen, 1976). Instead, roles develop through the role-making process. Therefore, it follows that the behavioral expectations of occupants in similar positions may differ to some extent. The role making process begins when members start in their new position, and it involves their supervisors. It consists of three phases: role taking, role making, and role routinization (Graen & Scandura, 1987). Role taking involves the supervisor communicating expected behavior to an employee, the employee receiving the information, and the employee reacting to it. The supervisor evaluates the reaction and initiates another action. In the second phase, role making, the supervisor provides the opportunity for the employee to attempt an unstructured task. If employees accept the opportunity and perform well, they begin to develop a high LMX relationship with the supervisor. If the opportunity to act is not accepted or performance is poor, they begin to develop a low LMX relationship. Finally, in the role routinization phase employee and supervisor become dependent on each other, or not, and after this point the quality of the relationship stabilizes.

A central premise underlying predictions concerning LMX relationships is that roles based strictly on employment contracts will result in less positive consequences for employees than roles that develop beyond the contract (Graen, 1976). Consequently, members who receive more information and support from the supervisor, and who engage in tasks that are challenging and require responsibility, develop more positive job attitudes compared with employees whose roles are based on the employment contract. Therefore, LMX quality is related to employee satisfaction, promotions, rating of performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and communication behaviors (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden et al., 1997).

Few studies have examined LMX quality as an antecedent of message selection in upward influence situations (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997; Krone, 1991). Results from these studies focus on what type of message tactics subordinates in high LMX relationships choose to try to gain compliance from their supervisors, with little emphasis placed on the types of choices that low LMX subordinates use to gain compliance from supervisors. Krone (1991) suggests that in-group subordinates select tactics in which the desired outcomes are disclosed fully, common opinions are stressed, and ideas of what is important for the supervisor are made known, whereas out-groups select manipulative upward tactics more frequently than in-groups. Deluga and Perry (1991) complement these findings by suggesting that, when compared with low LMX employees, high LMX employees are less likely to use bargaining, assertiveness, coalition, and upward appeal. Although this research provides some idea of the different types of messages used by subordinates to influence their supervisors, it remains uninformative as to why employees make these choices. This study is an attempt to

7

understand how LMX quality affects subordinate upward influence message choices in situations in which employees pursue personal goals. The following section describes two frameworks that can promote understanding of why LMX quality affects message selection in upward influence situations.

Relationship Maintenance Framework

Relationship maintenance communication refers to messages and behavior used to preserve an acceptable and lasting relational state (Waldron, 1991). As LMX research suggests, advancement and other important employee opportunities depend on the type of relationship that employees have with supervisors. Consequently, the maintenance of a supervisor relationship is a critical objective to consider when trying to gain compliance from a supervisor. Given this fact, for employees with high LMX quality (i.e., good relationship with supervisors) the superordinate objective is to maintain close relationships with the supervisor, whereas the objective for low LMX subordinates is to preserve a sense of civility and politeness and to avoid negative sanctions.

This framework suggests that in upward influence situations subordinates are primarily concerned with maintaining a good relationship with the supervisor with the secondary concern of getting their way. Therefore, the higher the perceptions of LMX quality by subordinates the more likely employees are to produce messages that are more polite and reflect their concern with maintaining a good relationship with the supervisor. By choosing more polite messages, employees create positive affect when trying to gain compliance from a supervisor. This positive affect helps subordinates avoid producing negative affect in the supervisor, affect that may lower the quality of the relationship. On the other hand, in relationships characterized by lower quality LMX, subordinates will

8

choose polite messages. These messages can produce neutral affect, as well as positive affect, in supervisors. By choosing messages that produce neutral and positive affect in the supervisor, low LMX employees avoid producing negative affect on the supervisor and avoid conflict that may result in negative consequences for the employee. In other words, the higher the perceptions of LMX quality by an employee the more polite the messages they will produce to try to gain compliance from their supervisor.

Although relationship maintenance is a plausible explanation of why LMX quality affects the type of messages employees choose to gain compliance from their supervisors, a competing model provides a different description of why employees choose different types of messages to influence their supervisors.

Idiosyncrasy Credit Framework

The idea of idiosyncrasy credit was invoked by Hollander (1958) to explain how status (legitimacy) in a group changes, and how status can be used to influence other members. Idiosyncrasy credits "represent an accumulation of positively disposed impressions residing in the perception of relevant others" (Hollander, 1958, p. 120). Credits accrue by demonstrating competence in helping to achieve the group's task goals and by conforming to group norms.

Borrowing from this idea it is possible that because employees in higher LMX relationships have shown commitment, loyalty, ability to perform their tasks, and have developed interpersonal trust with their supervisor, they are perceived positively by the supervisor. These positive impressions provide higher LMX employees more latitude to use messages that reflect a greater concern with getting their way than maintaining the relationship. Put differently, having already gained the supervisor's trust and respect by

9

performing work effectively and by demonstrating commitment, employees in higher LMX relationships can be more risky with the type of messages they use to gain compliance from supervisors and can use less polite messages when trying to gain their supervisor's compliance. These high LMX employees know that they can use messages that are less polite and still be valued because of their past quality of work, commitment and loyalty to the supervisor. These employees also know that if they have done an important job for the supervisor in the past, the supervisor might highly value their work and their input, giving high LMX employees the ability to use messages that are more risky (i.e., less polite) when making a request. On the other hand, for employees in lower LMX relationships the situation is very different. The idiosyncrasy credit framework suggests that employees in lower LMX relationships are concerned primarily with trying to avoid punishment and a lower quality of work life. Because, in the perceptions of the supervisor, these employees have not invested as much time and effort in the goals of the team, they do not have sufficient idiosyncrasy credit to allow them to deviate from what is expected of them. Thus, employees in lower LMX relationships will only use very polite messages. These messages will produce neutral or positive affect in the supervisors, and will help lower LMX employees avoid possible negative consequences that could worsen their situation. Said differently, the idiosyncrasy credit hypothesis suggests that the higher the perceptions of LMX quality by an employee the less polite the messages they will produce to try to gain compliance from their supervisors.

In summary, the idiosyncrasy credit framework suggests that the higher employees' perceptions of LMX quality, the higher their concern for getting their way. Therefore, employees will use messages that are more risky (i.e., less polite) when trying

to gain compliance from their supervisor. In contrast, the relationship maintenance framework suggests that the higher the perceptions of LMX quality by an employee the more likely they are to be concerned with maintaining their relationship, therefore choosing more polite messages that produce positive affect in the supervisor.

CHAPTER 2

IMPACT OF CULTURE ON UPWARD INFLUENCE MESSAGE PRODUCTION

Research that addresses how employees in different cultures try to influence or gain compliance from supervisors is lacking. Very few studies have examined if cross-cultural differences affect the selection of influence messages (Burgoon, Dillard, Doran, & Miller, 1982; Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986; Holtgraves & Yang, 1990, 1992; Kipnis, 1984; Ralston, Giacalone, & Terpstra, 1994; Ralston et al., 2001; Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991; Schmidt & Yeh, 1992; Xin & Tsui, 1996). Studies examining how cultural differences affect the selection of influence messages often suggest that culture does have an impact on the selection of compliance gaining messages, but there is no clear understanding of what it is that culture affects. For example, Burgoon and colleagues (1982) compared the types of compliance gaining strategies used by members of Asian and American cultures. The authors found that Asians use a wider variety of strategies than Americans, and tend to rely on positive oriented strategies (e.g. "promise", "positive expertise", and "positive esteem"). Subsequently, and concentrating primarily on downward influence, a study by Kipnis and colleagues (1984) suggested that there were no differences in how managers exercised their influence. Although their study included a sample of United States, British, and Australian managers, their results can be explained when considering that these countries share a similar cultural heritage (Hofstede, 1980). Additional studies looking at downward influence suggest that culture does affect the influence messages that supervisors are willing to use when trying to gain compliance from their subordinates (Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986; Schermerhorn &

CHAPTER 2

IMPACT OF CULTURE ON UPWARD INFLUENCE MESSAGE PRODUCTION

Research that addresses how employees in different cultures try to influence or gain compliance from supervisors is lacking. Very few studies have examined if cross-cultural differences affect the selection of influence messages (Burgoon, Dillard, Doran, & Miller, 1982; Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986; Holtgraves & Yang, 1990, 1992; Kipnis, 1984; Ralston, Giacalone, & Terpstra, 1994; Ralston et al., 2001; Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991; Schmidt & Yeh, 1992; Xin & Tsui, 1996). Studies examining how cultural differences affect the selection of influence messages often suggest that culture does have an impact on the selection of compliance gaining messages, but there is no clear understanding of what it is that culture affects. For example, Burgoon and colleagues (1982) compared the types of compliance gaining strategies used by members of Asian and American cultures. The authors found that Asians use a wider variety of strategies than Americans, and tend to rely on positive oriented strategies (e.g. "promise", "positive expertise", and "positive esteem"). Subsequently, and concentrating primarily on downward influence, a study by Kipnis and colleagues (1984) suggested that there were no differences in how managers exercised their influence. Although their study included a sample of United States, British, and Australian managers, their results can be explained when considering that these countries share a similar cultural heritage (Hofstede, 1980). Additional studies looking at downward influence suggest that culture does affect the influence messages that supervisors are willing to use when trying to gain compliance from their subordinates (Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986; Schermerhorn &

Bond, 1991; Schmidt & Yeh, 1992; Xin & Tsui, 1996). In one of the few studies looking

at the effects of culture on upward influence message selection, Ralstone and colleagues

(2001) examined how managers from six different countries (United States, Netherlands,

Germany, India, Hong Kong, and Mexico) differed on the types of messages they were

willing to use to gain compliance from their supervisors. Although participants from

these six countries viewed soft strategies (i.e., more polite messages) as the best way to

gain compliance from their supervisors and hard strategies (i.e., less polite messages) as

the worst way to gain compliance from supervisors, participants from the six countries

differed from each other in how acceptable they found each strategy. Given these mixed

findings, there is a need for an explanatory mechanism to help understand the effect of

culture on upward influence message production. This explanatory mechanism might be

Politeness Theory.

Politeness Theory. Brown and Levinson (1988) offered a universal model

designed to explain how different cultures use language in similar ways. Politeness

theory suggests that when communicating people are concerned about their face (i.e., the

self-image they present to others), and they recognize that others are too. There are two

types of face: Positive face, which indicates whether one feels liked, respected, or valued

by others, and negative face, which indicates whether one feels constrained or restricted

in one's actions with loss of autonomy or freedom. Any communication act is a potential

face threat. Requests, threats, compliments, and apologies are examples of possible face

threatening acts (FTA). Politeness is used to try to diminish the threats of communication

acts. And, when contemplating performing a FTA, one may select among five strategies

that vary in level of politeness. The first strategy (bald on record), and the least polite, is

to state the information without politeness to soften the message. The second strategy (positive politeness) involves indicating solidarity with the target. The third strategy (negative politeness) involves respecting the target's freedom, using restraint, and being formal and self-efficacious. The fourth strategy (off-record) involves stating the information by using hints, metaphors, irony, or understatements. And, the fifth strategy (no communication), and the most polite of all, is not engaging in any communication act so there cannot be any FTAs (See Table 1 for definitions and examples).

A speaker's choice of which strategy to use depends on three factors: social distance between the speaker and the target, power of the target relative to the speaker, and the level of imposition of the request. Social distance refers to the extent to which the speaker and the target know each other, perceive themselves as similar, like each other, and interact with each other (Brown & Levinson, 1988) . Power, in this case, refers to the degree to which targets can impose their own plans and own face at the expense of the speaker's plans and face (Brown & Levinson, 1988). Finally, the level of imposition of the request refers to the degree to which the speaker and the target consider the message or request to be costly in energy, time, or money (Brown & Levinson, 1988). By considering these three factors speakers determine the threat of the communication act (i.e. *weightness*) and decide which strategy to use. Increases in social distance, power, and imposition of the request will each result in the need for the speaker to use less threatening strategies (i.e., more polite strategies) or to opt not to perform a communication act.

Politeness theory also provides a framework for explaining cultural similarities and differences in communication acts (Holtgraves & Yang, 1992). Similarities come

14

from at least two factors. First, they arise from the assumption that, independent of culture, persons are concerned with saving their own face and that of the target. If those from different cultures are concerned with their face and that of the target, they will try to maintain face by being polite in their communication acts. The second similarity comes from similar perceptions of social distance, power, and level of imposition. To the extent that people from two different cultures perceive the social distance, power, and level of imposition to be similar the greater the likelihood they will use similar politeness strategies. On the other hand, differences between cultures can arise form at least three factors (Holtgraves & Yang, 1992). First, different cultures might perceive social distance, power, and level of imposition in different ways. These differences in perceptions may explain why persons from different cultures use different politeness strategies in similar situations. Second, those from different cultures might weight social distance, power, and level of imposition in different ways. Therefore, an increase in the weight on one dimension will result in more variability in politeness strategy selection as a function of this dimension (Holtgraves & Yang, 1992). Finally, some cultures might be more concern with face than others. Thus, those cultures in which saving face is very important are more polite in their communication acts compare to those cultures in which saving face may be less important.

Studies by Holtgraves and Yang (1990, 1992) have examined how politeness theory works across cultures. Results from their studies suggest that across cultures verbal strategies for FTAs can be ordered on a politeness continuum based on the concern for face (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990), as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1988). Additionally, their studies suggest that at least for Americans and Asians the relationship

15

between power, social distance, request size, and politeness use is similar. Power and social distance did not combine additively to predict perceived likelihood of politeness strategy use, however. In this case, the effects of power on the selection of a politeness strategy was effective only when the perceived social distance was large; and the effects of distance on politeness strategy selection only emerged when power was perceived as equal. Borrowing from this framework it is possible to think that to the extent that employees from two countries have different perceptions of power, social distance, and degree of imposition of a request they will use messages that differ in politeness when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors.

Additional Considerations for Upward Influence Message Production

Additional factors expected to affect upward influence message production include job satisfaction, voice behavior, and union membership. Job satisfaction refers to the employee's affective reactions to a job based on a comparison of actual outcomes with desired outcomes (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Job satisfaction might be related to the concern for maintaining the relationship, and to the concern with getting one's way. It is possible to think that employees who are satisfied with their job would want to maintain their job. One way to maintain one's job is to have a good relationship with the supervisor. Therefore, employees who are satisfied with their job might be interested in maintaining their relationship with their supervisors and to do so they choose messages that do not hurt their relationship with their supervisor (i.e., more polite messages) when trying to gain compliance. Similarly, employees who are not satisfied with their job might not be interested in keeping this job and might be willing to choose messages that

16

could hurt their relationship with their supervisor (i.e., less polite messages), indicating a greater concern for getting their way.

Voice behavior and union membership might also affect the production of upward influence messages. Voice behavior describes the propensity of employees to make proactive suggestions for change in the organization (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Employees who engage in voice behavior are more likely to say what they think to others in a group (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Therefore, it is possible that those employees who often engage in voice behaviors are also going to be more likely to say what they think and be less concerned with how polite they sound when they try to gain compliance from their supervisor. On the other hand, employees who do not engage in voice behavior are less likely to say what they think or engage in any form of communication when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor. Thus, those employees who do not engage in voice behavior often will be more concerned with being polite when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor. Regarding union membership, employees who belong to a union might have specific procedures they must follow when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor. Therefore union membership might also affect the likelihood of an employee choosing a message to gain compliance from a supervisor, although the direction of the effect is likely dependent upon specific union strictures.

CHAPTER 3

THIS STUDY

This study considers how and why LMX quality affects employee's choice of compliance-gaining messages when attempting to gain compliance from their supervisors. Employees from different companies in Colombia and in the United States were asked to participate in a web survey designed to understand how they communicate and present ideas to their supervisors. Participants responded to questions inquiring about their relationship with their supervisor, their perception of power distance, work attitudes, demographic information about themselves and their supervisors, and information about the type of organization for which they work. Additionally, participants were asked to put themselves in two situations. One situation described an instance in which employees need to ask their supervisor for a change in work schedule for the next month to deal with an important personal matter (high level of imposition). The second situation described an instance in which employees need to ask their supervisor to authorize their vacation time (low level of imposition). After reading each situation participants wrote a mock EMM to their supervisor asking for time off. The mock EMMs were coded for the degree of politeness used in each message.

Competing hypotheses as to why employees choose different messages when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors were tested. If the data were consistent with the Relationship Maintenance Framework, the higher employee's perception of LMX quality the more the mock EMMs would reflect higher levels of politeness. Higher politeness would produce positive affect in the supervisor, and would be less risky

18

therefore helping the employee maintain a good relationship with the supervisor. Conversely, if data were consistent with the Idiosyncrasy Credit Framework, the higher the employee's perception of LMX quality the more the mock EMMs would reflect moderate levels of politeness. Moderate politeness would not produce negative affect in the supervisor but would emphasize the importance of getting what the employee wants from the supervisor.

To test predictions from Politeness theory participants from two countries: Colombia and United States of America participated in this study. These two countries represented differences in power distance necessary to test the generalizability of predicted effects in this dimension. According to Hostede (1980), the United States and Colombian cultures differ on their perceptions of power distance. On one hand, the United States represents a culture low on power distance, therefore in the United States' organizational environment employees perceive that their supervisors have minimal influence on their behavior. On the other hand, Colombia represents a culture high on power distance. Thus, in Colombia employees perceive that their supervisors have a significant influence on their behaviors. Given this difference, and to examine the generalizability of these results across countries, and politeness theory, it was expected that perceptions of social distance (i.e., LMX quality), power (i.e., power distance), and degree of imposition of the request (i.e., asking for a change in schedule vs. asking for vacation time) would affect compliance gaining message selection. More specifically, it was expected that participants from the United States and Colombia would differ on how polite their messages are when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors,

Colombia being more polite that the United States because of the differences in power distance.

Finally, this study also included job satisfaction, voice behavior, and union membership as control variables to understand more thoroughly the effects of LMX quality on upward influence message production. In regards to job satisfaction, it was expected that participants who were more satisfied with their job would produce messages that were more polite because of their concern with maintaining the relationship and maintaining a job they like. It was also expected that employees who are likely to engage in voice behavior would be more likely to say what they think or want without high concerns for how polite it sounds to the supervisor, whereas those who engage less in voice behavior would be more concerned with how polite messages are when trying to gain compliance from the supervisor. Additionally, it was expected that participants who belonged to a union would differ on how polite they were when engaging in upward influence message production, compare to those who did not belong to a union.

CHAPTER 4

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 123 employees from different organizations in the United

States and 147 employees from different organizations in Colombia. Participants were

selected using a snowball sampling technique. For the United States sample the average

age was 30.29 years (SD = 9.55), 63% were female, 76% were Caucasian, 77% were born

in the US, and 70% had a Bachelor's, Masters, or Ph.D. degree. On average, United

States employees had worked 4.46 years (SD = 5.84) in the organization and 2.62 years

(SD = 3.11) in the position. For the Colombian sample the average age was 39.43 years

(SD = 9.98), 63 % were female, and 74% had a Bachelor's, Masters, or Ph.D. degree. On

average, Colombian employees had worked 8.66 years (SD = 7.64) in the organization

and 6.52 years (SD = 6.20) in the position. Differences between samples in age (t (246) =

7.30, p < .001), tenure in the organization (t (245) = 4.74, p < .001), and tenure in the

position (t (241) = 5.96, p < .001) where significant.

In the United States sample 46% of the participants worked for public

organizations, 30% worked for private organizations, and 11% worked for non-profit

organizations. Thirty-five percent of these organizations employed less than one hundred

employees, 13 % employed between one and three hundred employees, 7% between three

and six hundred, 5% between six hundred and one thousand, and 30% employed more

than one thousand employees. In the Colombian sample 49% of the participants worked

for public companies, 37% worked for private companies, and 8% worked for non-profit

organizations. Twenty-three percent of these organizations employed less than 100 employees, 12% employed between one and three hundred, 8% between three and six hundred, 11% between six hundred and one thousand employees, and 40% employed more than one thousand employees.

Participants in the United States sample had an average of 4.33 (SD = 4.12) supervisors in the past, and currently had 1.62 (SD = 1.17) supervisors. Additionally, 43% of the United States sample had a women as a supervisor, and, on average, each supervisor was responsible for 26.08 (SD = 45.9) employees. Participants in the Colombian sample had and average of 4.39 (SD = 3.3) supervisors in the past, and currently had 1.57 (SD = 1.26) supervisors. Thirty percent of the Colombian participants had a woman as a supervisor, and each supervisor was responsible for 31.39 (SD = 52.02) employees.

Procedure

Participants received an invitation by electronic mail to participate in a study about communicating and presenting ideas to supervisors. This EMM presented participants with a link to the survey designed for this study. When participants visited the survey cite, they were brought to a page explaining the study and then a second link that took them directly to the survey (See Appendix A). The survey was divided into five sections: (1) Describing the relationship with supervisor, (2) Communicating with the supervisor part 1, (3) Communicating with your supervisor part 2, (4) Perceptions of themselves at work, (5) Demographic information about themselves, their supervisor, and the organization for which they worked.

In the first section of the survey, participants responded to questions regarding their perception of LMX quality. In the second section participants were asked to put themselves in two different situations: (1) to ask for a change in schedule for next month (high imposition), and (2) to ask for authorization for vacation time (low imposition). Participants were asked to write a mock EMM to their supervisor to make these requests. In the third section of the survey participants were asked about their likelihood of use of influence tactics, concern for maintaining the relationship, concern for getting their way, and perceptions of power distance. In the fourth part of the survey, participants were asked about their job satisfaction and voice behavior. Finally, in Section Five participants answered demographic information about themselves and their supervisors and questions concerning the type of organization for which they worked.

Compliance Situations

In order to understand how and why LMX quality affects employees trying to gain compliance from their supervisors, and the consistency of these results across cultures, participants were provided with two situations and asked to write a mock EMM describing what they would say to their supervisors to gain compliance. The first situation required the employee to ask the supervisor for a change in work schedule, and the second situation required the employee to ask the supervisor to authorize vacation time. The two situations were selected from among a set of 19 alternative situations that were generated in a focus group conducted by the experimenter. These 19 alternative situations were pre-tested with a sample from the United States and another from Colombia. In the pretest 20 workers in each country rated the situations on a seven-point scale (1=low, 7=high) to indicate their perceptions of the degree of imposition of each

23

request. For a situation to be selected it had to be perceived similarly in both countries, there had to be little variability in these perceptions, and one had to reflect a high level of imposition, whereas a second situation had to reflect a low level of imposition. The two situations that were selected were change in work schedule (United States: $M = 4.20$, $SD = 2.08$; Colombia: $M = 3.93$, $SD = 2.19$) as the high level of imposition situation, and asking for authorization of vacation time (United States: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.35$; Colombia: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.93$) as the low level of imposition situation. These two situations were presented to participants the following way, and were not counterbalanced:

Situation 1. To deal with an important personal matter it has become very important that you change your work schedule for the next month. You need to ask your supervisor to help you by changing your work schedule for the next month. In the following space please write an e-mail indicating what you would say to your current supervisor to obtain this change of work schedule.

Situation 2. You and your family are ready to take your annual vacation, and you need to ask your supervisor to authorize your vacation time. In the following space please write an e-mail indicating what you would say to your current supervisor to authorize your vacation time.

Translation of Materials

After all the materials were created in English, they were translated into Spanish. The compliance situations and other measures were translated into Spanish by two bilingual speakers. Subsequently, a back translation was prepared by the experimenter. Adjustments were made when there were differences between the original items and the back translated items, keeping all items equivalent and consistent with the English

version. Most of the English version scales used in this study had been previously used by other researchers, therefore consistency with these measures was necessary to compare with previous studies.

Coding of Mock EMMs.

Two independent bilingual coders who were blind to research hypotheses analyzed each of the mock EMMs. Coders analyzed the degree of politeness used in each message. Using the coding scheme from Holtgraves and Yang (1992) each message was divided into three components: (1) address form (i.e., how did the employee start the e-mail), (2) the request, and (3) the adjuncts (i.e., any additional information or sentences used to gain compliance from the supervisor). Dividing the messages this way allowed for a more accurate assessment of politeness because the message was divided into three different parts and each part was assessed for its politeness independently. The coding of each of these three components was based the superordinate strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1988).

Coders were first trained on the coding system by the principle investigator. Coders were trained using 10 messages. First, it was explained how to divide the messages into the three different components (i.e., address, request, and adjunct). Once they were able accomplish this task accurately the politeness codes for each message component were explained, and coding instructions provided (see Appendix B). Coders were then trained on how to use the coding procedure, and practiced on sample requests. The coders then independently coded the entire set of EMMs in Spanish and English. If coders had any questions in regards to the coding they met with the principle investigator to discuss the issue. When messages were coded, each coder created an overall politeness

score by adding the politeness score of the address, the request and the adjunct. This score was arrayed on a nine point scale to measure politeness. A one indicated low levels of politeness and a nine indicated the highest degree of politeness. The mean of the two coder's politeness rating served as the message politeness measure in this study.

Intercoder reliabilities were obtained by correlating the measures taken from the two independent codings across all EMM, and adjusting them with the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula to obtain the estimated reliability of the average (Ebel, 1951). For the Colombian sample the reliabilities for situation 1 were .91 for address, .89 for request, and .93 for the adjunct. The reliabilities for situation 2 in Spanish were .95 for address, .91 for request, and .95 for the adjunct. For the United States sample the reliabilities for situation 1 were .93 for address, .93 for request, and .91 for the adjunct. And, the reliabilities for situation 2 were .90 for address, .88 for request, and .96 for the adjunct. (See Table 2 for coding frequencies)

Measures

LMX Quality. Fifteen items (United States sample: $M = 5.60$, $SD = 1.17$, $\alpha = 0.95$) from Borchgrevink and Boster (1994) were used to assess participants' perceptions of LMX quality for the United States sample. For each of these items participants indicated their level of agreement using a 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree). The scale was translated to Spanish, and 16 items (Colombian sample: $M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.13$, $\alpha = 0.93$) were used to assess the LMX quality perceptions of Colombian employees. The Colombian measure had one more item because of translation. The item "My supervisor likes me" required two items to be translated. Given

the difference in number of items, an LMX quality score was created by averaging across all items for each of the samples. The items are presented in Appendix C.

Power Distance. This measure was used to assess perceptions of power differences across cultures. Power distance is "the difference between the extent to which a supervisor can determine a behavior of an employee, and the extent to which an employee can determine the behavior of a supervisor" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 99). Power distance was measured with three items (United States: $M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.31$, $\alpha = 0.87$; Colombia: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.46$, $\alpha = 0.68$) from Dorfman and Howell (1988). For each of these items participants indicated their level of agreement using a 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree). The items are presented in Appendix C.

Overall Concern for getting one's way. To measure the extent to which employees expressed concerned with getting their way six items (United States: $M = 5.70$, $SD = 0.82$, $\alpha = 0.75$; Colombia: $M = 6.12$, $SD = 0.79$, $\alpha = 0.76$) were created. For each of these items participants indicated their level of agreement using a 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree). The items are presented in Appendix C.

Overall Concern for maintaining the relationship. To measure the extent to which employees are concerned with maintaining the relationship with their supervisor five items (United States: $M = 5.30$, $SD = 1.18$, $\alpha = 0.83$; Colombia: $M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.19$, $\alpha = 0.79$) were developed. For each of these items participants indicated their level of agreement using a 7-point Likert scale (1= Strongly disagree, and 7= Strongly agree). The items are presented in Appendix C.

Job Satisfaction. Information about the participants' job satisfaction was collected as a control variable. Job satisfaction was measured with four items (United States: $M = 5.57$, $SD = 1.41$, $\alpha = 0.91$; Colombia: $M = 6.15$, $SD = 1.14$, $\alpha = 0.80$) from the job satisfaction survey developed by Spector (1985). Participants indicated their level of agreement on a 7 point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree). The items are presented in Appendix C.

Voice Behavior. Voice behavior was measured with six items (United States: $M = 5.39$, $SD = 1.15$, $\alpha = 0.90$; Colombia: $M = 5.50$, $SD = 1.21$, $\alpha = 0.85$) from Van Dyne and LePine (1998). For each of these items participants indicated their level of agreement with each statement using a 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, and 7= strongly agree). The items are presented in Appendix C.

Demographic Information. Participants also answered questions about their own, and their supervisor's, demographic characteristics. Regarding supervisors, participants indicated their sex, ethnic background, and the number of employees for whom the supervisor was responsible. Regarding the participant's demographics, participants completed information about their age, sex, ethnic background, tenure in the organization, tenure with the supervisor, union membership, type of position in the organization, type of organization, and size of the organization. The items are presented in Appendix C.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Measurement

Confirmatory factor analyses (Hunter & Gerbing, 1982) were employed to ascertain the validity of the LMX quality, power distance, job satisfaction, voice behavior, concern for getting one's way, and concern for maintaining the relationship scales. Analyses were conducted employing the total sample and then separately by country. Tests of internal consistency and parallelism for the three analyses indicated that the data were consistent with the predicted six factor solution. For the combined sample the root mean squared error was .09, for the Colombian sample it was .10, and for the United States sample it was .12. Correlation among the factors and reliabilities are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Evaluation of Hypothesis

To test whether the data were consistent with the relationship maintenance or the idiosyncrasy credit hypotheses LMX quality was first categorized into three levels. Participants who scored less than one standard deviation below the mean were considered low LMX quality, participants who scored more than one standard deviation above the mean were considered high LMX quality, and all others were treated as moderate LMX quality. Subsequently, the impact of LMX quality, country, and imposition on message politeness was estimated in a 3 (LMX quality: low vs. medium vs. high) by 2 (Country: Colombia vs. United States) by 2 (Imposition: high vs. low) mixed repeated analysis of variance with the first two factors factor occurring between groups, and the imposition

29

factor occurring within groups. Power distance, job satisfaction, and sex were treated as covariates (see Table 6). Only participants who responded to both of the two situations were considered for these analyses (Colombia = 128; United States = 98). As expected, in the high imposition condition (M = 4.11, SD = 1.32) participants used more polite messages than in the low imposition condition (M = 3.41, SD = 1.30), F (1,217) = 14.309, $p < .001$, η^2 =.01. If the data were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis, participants with high LMX relationships would develop more polite messages when trying to gain compliance from the supervisor, whereas participants with low LMX relationships would develop messages that were less polite compared to those in the higher LMX relationships. On the other hand, if data were consistent with the idiosyncrasy credit hypothesis, participants with high LMX relationships would develop less polite messages when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors, whereas participants with low LMX relationships would develop more polite messages when trying to gain compliance from the supervisor. Results suggest that there was no main effect for LMX quality F (2,217) = 0.25, ns. Therefore, participants with low LMX relationships (M = 3.67, SD = 1.30) were equally polite as those with moderate LMX relationships (M = 3.73, SD = 1.31) and those with high LMX relationships (M = 3.88, SD = 1.20) when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors. LMX quality did interact with imposition, F (2,217) = 3.843, $p < .05$, when imposition was high and LMX quality increased (low M = 3.81, moderate M = 4.12, high M = 4.41) politeness increased; under conditions of low imposition as LMX quality increased (low M = 3.52, moderate M = 3.34, high M = 3.34) politeness remained similar. Although there was not a statistically significant three-way interaction between LMX quality, country, and imposition, F

(2,217) = 1.88, *ns*, observation indicates that these variables did affect outcomes when combined (refer to Tables 7, 8, and 9). For the Colombian sample in the high imposition condition perceptions of LMX did not strongly affect message politeness ($r = .07$, *ns*), whereas for the United States sample increases in LMX quality substantially increased the use of politeness ($r = .21$, $p < .05$). In the low imposition condition perceptions of LMX quality did not affect the use of politeness for either the Colombian ($r = -.09$, *ns*) or the United States ($r = .03$, *ns*) sample. Therefore these results indicate that in the high imposition condition the data were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis for the United States sample only, whereas in the low imposition condition the data were not consistent with either the relationship maintenance or the idiosyncrasy credit hypotheses for the Colombian or the United States sample.

To analyze cross-cultural differences in this study the main and interaction effects for country were examined. It was expected that Colombia and the United States would differ on how polite their messages were when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor, Colombia being more polite than the United State. Results indicate that participants from Colombia ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.10$) and the United States ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.12$) were equally polite when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor, F (1,217) $= 0.11$, *ns*. Additionally, there was an interaction between country and imposition, F (1,217) $= 4.805$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$. In Colombia there was a slightly bigger difference in message politeness between participants in the high ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.39$) and the low imposition ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.35$) conditions than in the United States (High: $M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.15$; low: $M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.16$). There was no interaction between LMX quality

and country, F (2,217) = 0.177, ns, or between LMX quality, imposition, and Country, F (2,217) = 1.88, ns.

Job satisfaction, sex and power distance were used as covariates in the analyses. Job satisfaction did not affect message politeness, F (1,217) = 2.19, ns. Sex had a main effect on imposition, F (1,217) = 5.46, $p<$ .05, η^2 =.02. Females (M = 3.87, SD = 1.31) generated more polite messages than men (M = 3.49, SD = 1.21) when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor. Finally, power distance interacted with imposition, F (1,217) = 10.899, $p<$ .01, η^2 = .05. The power distance interaction indicated that in the high imposition condition participants who scored lower on power distance used the most polite messages (r = -.13, p < .05), whereas in the low imposition condition power distance did not affect the use of politeness in compliance gaining messages (r = .06, ns). When considering the interaction effect of power distance and politeness for each country separately, results indicate that for the Colombian sample in the high imposition condition the lower the perceptions of power distance the higher message politeness (r = -.20, p < .05), whereas in the low imposition condition power distance did not affect message politeness (r = -.04, ns). For the United States sample in the high imposition condition power distance did not affect message politeness (r = .01, ns), and in the low imposition condition increases in power distance resulted in increases in message politeness (r = .24, p < .05). Therefore, these results indicate that the effect of power distance on politeness was different for the Colombian and the United States sample. More specifically, in the high imposition condition data from the Colombian sample were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis, whereas in the low imposition condition the data from the United States sample were consistent with the idiosyncrasy

credit hypothesis. Union membership and voice behaviors were removed from the analyses because they did not have any effect on message politeness, and did not help predict the dependent variable. Additional analyses including age, tenure in the organization, tenure in the job and sex of supervisor as covariates were also conducted and results did not differ.

Additional Analysis

Overall measures for concern in maintaining the relationship with a supervisor and concern for getting one's way constitute an additional test of the proposed hypotheses. If the data were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis, LMX quality would be a strong and significant predictor of the overall concern for maintaining the relationship (OCMR). Similarly if data were consistent with the idiosyncrasy credit hypothesis, LMX quality would be a strong and significant predictor of the overall concern for getting one's way (OCGW). To test cross cultural differences country was included as an independent variable. To test these competing hypotheses a multiple regression analyses was conducted to determine how LMX quality and country affected both the concern for maintaining the relationship and the concern for getting one's way. Job satisfaction, power distance and voice behavior were included in the regression equations as control variables. LMX quality ($\beta = .55$, $p < .001$) and power distance ($\beta = .14$, $p < .05$) were important predictors of overall concern for maintaining the relationship, whereas voice behavior ($\beta = -.04$, $p = .504$), job satisfaction ($\beta = .09$, $p = .138$), and country ($\beta = -.02$, $p = .680$) were not important predictors, $F(6,243) = 19.163$, $p < .001$, $R = .572$ (see Table 10). When analyzing the predictors for overall concern for getting one's way work satisfaction ($\beta = .23$, $p < .01$), country ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .01$), and

voice behaviors ($\beta = .15, p = .055$) were important predictors, but LMX quality ($\beta = -.01$,

$p = .582$) and power distance ($\beta = -.06, p = .125$) were not, $F (5,241) = 10.620, p < .001, R$

$= .572$ (see Table 11). These results are consistent with the relationship maintenance

hypothesis. LMX quality was a strong and significant predictor for overall concern for

maintaining the relationship and not for the overall concern for getting one's way.

Country was not a significant predictor for neither of these dependent variables.

Although there were no strong and significant effects of country on overall

concern for maintaining the relationship (OCMR) or the overall concern for getting one's

way (OCGW) analyses of the samples independently reveal some differences in the

variables that affect OCMR and OCGW in the United States and Colombian Sample.

When considering the United States sample independently, LMX quality ($\beta = .55, p <$

$.001$) and power distance ($\beta = .27, p < .01$) become the strong predictors of the overall

concern for maintaining the relationship, $F (4,104) = 16.954, p < .001, R = .628$ (see

Table 12), and job satisfaction ($\beta = .19, p = .06$) and voice behavior ($\beta = .36, p < .01$) are

important predictors of overall concern for getting one's way, $F (4,104) = 7.162, p <$

$.001, R = .465$ (see Table 13). For the Colombian sample LMX quality ($\beta = .52, p < .001$)

and job satisfaction ($\beta = .15, p = .07$) were strong predictors of overall concern for

maintaining the relationship, $F (4,133) = 14.224, p < .001, R = .547$ (see Table 14). And,

job satisfaction ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) was the only important predictor of concern for getting

one's way, $F (3,133) = 2.682, p < .05, R = .273$ (see Table 15).

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

Findings and Implications

The purpose of this study was to examine why the type of relationship between employee and supervisor (i.e., LMX Quality) affects the production of upward influence messages in situations with high and low levels of imposition. Competing hypotheses were tested to determine whether employees used more polite messages because of their concern in maintaining their relationship with supervisor, or because they want to get their way. Results indicate that imposition had an effect on politeness such that messages in the high imposition condition were more polite than messages in the low imposition condition. Additionally, there was a substantial interaction between imposition and LMX quality. Further analysis of the interaction indicated that in the high imposition condition, increases in the perceptions of LMX quality resulted in increases in the use of politeness when trying to gain compliance from supervisors, a result consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis. When the sample was separated by country, the effect of LMX quality on politeness was substantial only for the United States sample. For the low level of imposition, LMX quality did not affect the use of politeness, indicating that the data were not consistent with either of the hypotheses.

Two control variables also had substantial effects on the use of politeness when trying to gain compliance from supervisors. Sex had a direct effect on politeness. Results indicate that, overall, women were more polite than men when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors. The other control variable that had an effect on politeness was

35

power distance. Imposition interacted with power distance such that in the high imposition condition lower perceptions of power distance led to the use of more polite messages, whereas in the low imposition condition power distance did not affect message politeness. When the sample was separated by country to examine this interaction, in the high imposition condition, power distance had the effect on politeness only for the Colombian sample, and in the low imposition condition the effect was reversed for the United States sample. These results indicate that the data were consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis in the high imposition condition for the United States sample and data were inconsistent with both hypotheses in the low imposition condition.

These results have at least two implications for understanding how and why LMX quality affects upward influence message production. First, the type of relationship between employee and supervisor does affect how polite employees are when trying to gain compliance from their supervisors. Employees who perceive they have better relationships with their supervisors are very concerned with keeping that type of relationship and therefore are more polite when trying to gain their compliance. Second, the results from this study contradict those suggested by Politeness Theory. According to Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1988) increases in social distance (i.e., LMX quality), power (i.e., power distance), and imposition of the request will result in the need for the speaker to be more polite. In this study imposition was the only factor that made a difference in message politeness in the same way predicted by politeness theory. In regards to LMX quality, the results were contradictory to the theory. In this study the higher the perceptions of LMX, the higher the politeness used by participants and

politeness theory would suggest that the higher the perceptions of LMX quality the less polite messages would be. In regard to the effects of country in message production, this study did not provide a strong test of cultural differences because both the Colombian and United States samples scored similar in the regards to power distance. Politeness theory suggests that social distance (i.e., LMX quality), power (i.e., power distance), and imposition of the request have an additive effect on politeness, and this study indicates that at least social distance does not have an additive effect on politeness. Thus, future research on politeness theory should examine the independent effects that social distance, power and imposition of the request have on politeness.

Cross-cultural Findings and Implications

It was expected that participants from Colombia and the United States would differ on how polite their messages were when trying to gain compliance from a supervisor. More specifically and according to politeness theory, because of higher scores on power distance, participants from Colombia were expected to use more polite messages than participants from the United States. In this study these results did not occur. Participants from Colombia and the United States were equally polite when trying to gain compliance from their supervisor. One of the reasons for why this result was that participants from Colombia ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.46$) scored similar on power distance compared to those in the United States ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.31$). These power distance findings are different from those by Hofstede (1980), in which Colombia scored high on the power distance index (PDI = 67) and the United States scored low on the power distance index (PDI = 40). There might be at least two reasons for why the scores for power distance in this study differ from those in the Hofstede (1980) study. First, the

Hofstede study was done before 1980 and the workforce in Colombia was very different then, being mostly males in power. The present study was done 24 years later and the work force in Colombia is more diverse now, having more female workers and more females as subordinates (Lora, 2003). Given this fact, the differences in power distance might have been due to the changes in work force composition over time. A second reason for the differences in power distance might be the number of organizations involved in the sample. Hofstede (1980) only looked at employees in the IBM Company but this study included many different companies. Therefore, the results from Hofstede (1980) might reflect only the IBM culture whereas the present study might be more reflective of the Colombian culture.

Results from this study also indicate that there was an interaction between country and imposition. This interaction showed that in Colombia there were higher differences in politeness between the high and low imposition conditions compared to the United States, but neither in the high nor the low imposition conditions was there a difference between the Colombian and the United States Sample. Taken all together these results indicate that there were no substantial differences between the two countries in perceptions of power distance, imposition of the request, and LMX quality. Consequently, it is not surprising that both countries were similar in message politeness.

Additional Analysis and Implications

Overall measures for concern for maintaining the relationship and concern for getting one's way were developed for this study. These measures assessed the overall concern that employees may have when communicating with their supervisors. Although no specific hypotheses about overall concern for maintaining the relationship, or overall

concern for getting one's way, were proposed these two measures can help clarify the reasons employees are concerned for getting their way or maintaining the relationship when communicating with their supervisors. For the overall sample, LMX quality and power distance were strong predictors of overall concern for maintaining the relationship, and job satisfaction, country, and voice behavior were strong predictors of concern for getting one's way. When separating the sample by country, results indicated that for the United States sample LMX quality and power distance were strong positive predictors of concern for maintaining the relationship and job satisfaction and voice behavior were important predictors of concern for getting one's way. For the Colombian sample results indicate that LMX quality and job satisfaction are positive predictors of concern for maintaining the relationship, and work satisfaction is a positive predictor of concern for getting one's way.

Taken together these results have at least two implications for understanding why people are concerned with getting their way or for maintaining the relationship. First, it may be that the concern for getting one's way, and the concern for maintaining the relationship are predicted by different variables. If these two processes have different predictors, LMX quality might only affect the concern for maintaining the relationship, therefore producing no evidence consistent with the idiosyncrasy credit hypothesis. A second implication is that both of these processes may occur simultaneously. That is, employees are both concerned with maintaining the relationship and for getting their way. If so, then this study might not be able to capture how the two processes happen simultaneously because the way the dependent variable is measured. Therefore, this issue needs to be addressed in future studies.

Limitations

This study has several important limitations. The first limitation is the type of sample used. The use of a convenient sample may limit the generalizability of the results. Because participants in this study were similar in education, types of job, and organizations for which they worked, this sample is overly homogeneous, so that future research may benefit from using employees from different organizations or from multinational organizations with offices in different countries.

A second limitation may come from the use of scenario situations. One issue about the scenarios is the perceptions of realism, and although participants were asked about what they would say to their current supervisor, some employees might not perceive the situation as applicable. A second issue related to the use of scenarios is that although participants indicated that they would communicate a certain way with a supervisor, when faced with the situation they might respond differently. Therefore, future research can consider archival data that indicates how employees make different written requests to their supervisors and direct observations of how employees make requests from a supervisor.

A third limitation is related to the translation of questionnaires and scenarios. The translation of questionnaires and scenarios can be an issue because there are some words and questions that do not have an equivalent translation in Spanish. This translation issue can be a problem because participants from the Colombian sample might interpret questions or their meaning in different ways. To address this issue the experimenter had two bilingual speakers independently translate the questionnaire and scenarios into Spanish and then a back translation was prepared by the experimenter to English. This

resulted in the need to add extra questions into the Spanish version of the questionnaire to try to capture the meaning for each language. Adding new questions helped the keep equivalence in the meaning and understanding of the questions and situations. A second aspect of translation being a limitation is the fact that most of the scales employed in this study were developed in English speaking countries therefore showing high scale reliabilities for English speakers. In this study, reliabilities from the power distance and job satisfaction scales were very different for the Colombian (power distance $\alpha = 0.68$, job satisfaction $\alpha = 0.80$) and the United States sample (power distance $\alpha = 0.87$, job satisfaction $\alpha = 0.91$). Differences in the reliabilities might indicate that participants in the Colombian sample interpreted questions differently than those in the United States sample. These differences in interpretation can be due to translation difficulties or to construct meaning. Further research is necessary to see how reliabilities in the power distance and job satisfaction scales can be improved.

Summary and Future Research

Overall, findings from this study indicate that perceptions of LMX quality affect message politeness only in high imposition conditions. In these situations, increases in perceptions of LMX quality lead to increases in message politeness when employees are making requests from supervisors. These findings are consistent with the relationship maintenance hypothesis. Further analysis also indicate that the overall concern for maintaining the relationship with a supervisor and the overall concern for getting one's way might be two different processes that are simultaneous and have different predictors. Future research would benefit from identifying if these two processes happen

41

simultaneously and, if so, what are the different predictors that affect each process when

an employee is producing messages to gain compliance from a supervisor.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORMS

This study concerns how employees communicate with their supervisors. If you choose to take part in this study, you will answer questions describing your interactions with your immediate supervisor at your work. You will also answer some questions describing your relationship with your supervisor, some of your perceptions about your work environment, and some demographic characteristics. All the information you provide in this study will be confidential and your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

Full participation in this study will take 20 minutes or less, and your participation is voluntary. Although participation in this study is not expected to produce discomfort or stress, please note that you may refuse to answer certain questions or <u>withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.</u> The experimenter can answer any questions you have about the study to help you choose whether to participate.

All information will be used only for research purpose and reports will include aggregate data only. Your name will never appear in any report and the report will not include any information that will allow anyone to identify you or your response. Only members of the research team will have access to the data, which will be stored in a locked file and in a password protected computer file. The surveys will be destroyed after five years.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please contact Isabel C. Botero (e-mail: boterois@msu.edu; phone: 517 353 0666; Office: 459 CAS building, East Lansing, MI 48824-1212). If you have any questions concerning your rights as a study participant, or if you are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact – anonymously, if you wish - Peter Vaselinko, Ph.D., Chairman of University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone (517-355-2180), fax (517-432-4503), email (ucrihs@msu.edu), or regular mail (202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824).

You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate in this study by completing the following on-line survey.

Consent Form – Spanish Version

Esta es una investigación que busca entender la comunicación entre empleados y sus jefes inmediatos. Si usted decide participar en este estudio, responderá preguntas acerca de la interacción con su jefe inmediato. Además, responderá preguntas acerca de su relación con su jefe, su ambiente de trabajo, algunas características personales y de la institución donde trabaja. Esta encuesta es anónima, todas sus respuestas serán confidenciales y su privacidad será protegida en todo sentido.

Su participación en esta investigación es voluntaria, y debe tomar cerca de 20 minutos. Aunque su participación no le producirá estrés, puede dejar de contestar alguna pregunta si así lo considera, o podrá interrumpir su participación en el momento que lo considere conveniente.

Toda sus respuestas en esta encuesta serán usadas con el propósito de la investigación, y los reportes que se produzcan serán creados agregando las respuestas de todos los participantes. Su nombre nunca aparecerá en ningún reporte, y el reporte no tendrá información que facilite la identificación suya o de alguna de sus respuestas. Solo miembros del equipo investigativo podrán ver las respuestas. Esta información será almacenada en un archivo protegido con clave para acceso, y las encuestas serán destruidas en cinco años.

Si usted tiene preguntas acerca de esta investigación, por favor contacte a Isabel Cristina Botero Laverde (e-mail: boterois@msu.edu; teléfono: 517 353 0666; Dirección: Michigan State University, 459 CAS building, East Lansing, MI 48824-1212, USA). Si usted tiene alguna pregunta con relación a sus derechos como participante de esta investigación, o si usted no esta satisfecho con alguna parte de esta encuesta, usted puede contactar – anónimamente si desea- a Peter Vaselinko, Ph.D., Chairman of University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) Michigan State University, teléfono (517-355-2180), fax (517-432-4503), email (ucrihs@msu.edu), o correo normal (202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA).

En el momento que usted empiece a contestar la encuesta, el grupo de investigadores entiende que usted ha aceptado las condiciones antes descritas. Gracias por su participación.

APPENDIX B

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

General Instructions

This coding system is designed to code mock e-mails. These e-mails are directed to supervisors to request a change in the work schedule and time off for vacation. Coders will determine the extent to which each e-mail reflects a degree of politeness.

Before you start the coding process please determine the amount of words used in each e-mail, and enter this number in the coding sheet as shown below.

Survey	E-mail 1	E-mail 2	TW1	TW2
1	I have had some important personal matters come up and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month. If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have time that would be great. Thanks.	My family and I have finalized our annual vacation plans. I have submitted the appropriate request to you in our Outlook email calendars. Can you please approve the request or notify me if there are conflicts.	44	36
2	I need to meet with you to discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to an important personal matter. Let me know when we can discuss this matter. Thank you	[Name] I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for vacation time in the coming month. I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes.	33	45
3	Hey (name) I've had (whatever) just happen at home. I need to adjust my hours here at work for the next month to be able to take care of the situation - if that's ok with you?	My family is coming to visit and I will need to spend time with them. They will be here for one week and I will need to take off a Tues- Thursday. But I will be available on my cell and will stop by the office in the evenings.	37	48

Note: TW stands for total words, and the number that follows indicates the e-mail (whether it is E1 or E2).

To count the number of words please view the e-mails in a word document, select highlight each e-mail and, under the tools menu, choose word count.

Coding for Degree of Politeness

To determine the degree of politeness of each e-mail, you need to first divide each e-mail in three parts:

1. **Address.(ADD)** This is the part of the e-mail that indicates to whom the message is directed to, and it is frequently found at the beginning of the e-mail.

2. **Request.** This is the part of the e-mail where the employee asks for what he or she needs.

3. **Adjunct.** This is any additional part of the e-mail used to gain compliance from the supervisor. Please divide the e-mail as indicated below:

Survey	E-mail	Add	Request	Adjunct
1	I have had some important personal matter and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month. If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have a time that would be great.	None	I have had some important personal matter and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month.	If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have a time that would be great.
2	Name, I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for my vacation time in the coming month I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes.	Name	I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for my vacation time in the coming month	I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes
3	Mr. X, I need to meet with you and discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to a personal matter. Let me know when we can I discuss this matter. Thank you	Mr. X	I need to meet with you and discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to a personal matter.	Let me know when we can I discuss this matter. Thank you

Coding the Address Term

Once you have identified the address term for each e-mail, use the following information to code each term:

Code	Address Term	Example
0	No address	No name that represents to whom the e-mail is directed.
1	Informal	First names like Jim, Tom, or Chuck.
2	Formal	Title, Mr., Dr., Boss, Supervisor or Professor

Codes should be assigned in the coding sheet the following way:

Survey	ADD	Request	Adjunct	ATC1
1	None	I have had some important personal matter and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month.	If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have a time that would be great.	0
2	Name	I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for my vacation time in the coming month	I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes	1
3	Mr. X	I need to meet with you and discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to a personal matter.	Let me know when we can I discuss this matter. Thank you	2

Coding the Request

Once you have the request part of each e-mail identified, please use the following information to determine which strategy it best represents.

Code	Strategy	Definition	Example
1	Bald	Sentences that are direct and use imperatives	This is what I need.
2	Positive Politeness	Sentences that indicate the reasons for why the supervisor should comply	This is what I need, and this is why I need it
3	Negative Politeness	Sentences that try to lessen the imposition of the request on the supervisor	I am sorry, but please I need this, and this is how I can make it up to you.
4	Off the record	Sentences that use a non-direct form of request	Hints, clues, ambiguous questions
5	No Request	When a person indicates that they would not ask for this request	

Codes should be assigned in the coding sheet the following way:

Survey	ADD	Request	Adjunct	ATC1	RTC1
1	None	I have had some important personal matter and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month.	If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have a time that would be great.	0	2
2	Name	I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for my vacation time in the coming month	I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes	1	4
3	Mr. X	I need to meet with you and discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to a personal matter.	Let me know when we can I discuss this matter. Thank you	2	2

Coding the Adjunct

Once you have the adjunct part of each e-mail identified, please use the following information to determine which strategy it best represents.

Code	Strategy	Definition	Example
0	No Strategy	No additional information for why the supervisor should comply with the request is provided.	
1	Positive Politeness	Information that reflects that the employee is aware of the imposition of the request, or where the employee attempts to minimize the imposition of the request. These include asking for forgiveness, and giving reasons for the request.	I need this favor because I will be going on vacation with my family.
2	Negative Politeness	Information that reflects an attempt to show closeness between employee and supervisor. It also includes providing alternatives or exchanges for the favor.	This is what I can offer you so you can help me with my request xxx.

Codes should be assigned in the coding sheet the following way:

Survey	ADD	Request	Adjunct	ATC1	RTC1	ADC1
1	None	I have had some important personal matter and need to look at the possibility for changing my work schedule for a month.	If we could sit down and have a talk about this when you have a time that would be great.	0	2	2
2	Name	I wanted to write to let you know I am intending to put in for my vacation time in the coming month	I'll be by your office with the forms and times I just wanted to let you know about it for your management purposes	1	4	2
3	Mr. X	I need to meet with you and discuss changing my work schedule for the next month due to a personal matter.	Let me know when we can I discuss this matter. Thank you	2	2	2

Instrucciones para Codificar E-mails

Instrucciones Generales

Estas instrucciones están diseñadas para codificar e-mails escritos para este trabajo de grado. Estos dos e-mails están dirigidos a los supervisores para solicitar un cambio en el horario de trabajo, y la autorización para las vacaciones. Los codificadores determinarán el grado de cortesía que refleja cada e-mail.

Pero, antes de que usted comience el proceso de codificación por favor determine la cantidad de palabras usadas en cada E-mail, e incorpore este número a la página de Excel, como es demostrado a continuación:

Encuesta	E-mail 1	TW1	E-mail 2	TW2
1	Buenos días Nombre: por favor tu colaboración para la programación el próximo mes del horario de 7:00 a 4:00, según conversación pasada	22	Dr. X. solicito a usted en forma respetuosa autorizar mis vacaciones a partir del 20 de diciembre del presente año, para compartirlas con mi familia. Por su atención gracias	29
2	Jefe: tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal, pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	36	Jefe: hace 3 años no saco vacaciones, le solicito a usted me autorice un período de vacaciones, para pasarlo con mi familia	22
3	Dr. X como es de su conocimiento el próximo mes requiero hacer la capacitación en administración de servicios, por lo tanto solicito a usted autorizar el cambio de horario de mi jornada laboral	32	Buenos días: según programación de vacaciones para el mes de noviembre, exactamente el 15 hasta el día 8 de diciembre están programadas mis vacaciones, por favor tu colaboración con la autorización para la entrega del formato a gestión humana	39

Nota: TW significa número de palabras (Total words) y el número que siga denota el número del e-mail.

Para determinar el número de palabras por e-mail por favor observe cada e-mail en un documento de word. Seleccione el contenido de cada e-mail, y bajo el menú de herramientas elija la opción para contar palabras.

Codificación Para el Grado de Cortesía de Cada Mensaje

Para determinar el grado de cortesía de cada E-mail, usted necesita primero dividir cada E-mail en tres porciones:

1. *Dirección. (DIR)* Esta es la parte del E-mail que indica a quién va dirigido el mensaje se dirige, y se encuentra con frecuencia al principio del E-mail.
2. *Petición.* Esta es la parte del E-mail donde el empleado pide lo que él o ella necesita.
3. *Adjunto.* Esta es cualquier parte adicional del E-mail usado para persuadir al supervisor.

Divida por favor el E-mail según lo indicado a continuación

ENC	E-mail 1	DIR	Petición	Adjunto
1	Dr. xxx: el fin es con el objetivo de pedirle mis vacaciones las cuales tengo ya vencidas. Ud. Me dirá a partir de cuando. Agradeciéndole la atención a la presente	Dr.	El fin es con el objetivo de pedirle mis vacaciones las cuales tengo ya vencidas.	Ud. Me dirá a partir de cuando. Agradeciéndol e la atención a la presente
2	Juan: tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal, pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	Juan	pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal,
3	Solicito se me autorice vacaciones a partir del 31-12-04. Gracias		Solicito se me autorice vacaciones a partir del 31-12-04. Gracias	

Códigos para Dirección del Mensaje

Una vez haya identificado la dirección de cada e-mail, use uno de los siguientes códigos para determinar que tipo de dirección es.

Código	Tipo de dirección	Ejemplo
0	Sin dirección	El e-mail no esta dirigido a ninguna persona en especial
1	Informal	Esta dirigido al nombre del supervisor. Ejemplos serían: Juan, Mauro, Andrés
2	Formal	En esta oportunidad el e-mail esta dirigido al Dr. Señor, Licenciado, Profesor.

Estos códigos deben ser asignados en la página Excel de la siguiente manera:

ENC	DIR	AC	Petición	Adjunto
1	Dr.	2	el fin es con el objetivo de pedirle mis vacaciones las cuales tengo ya vencidas.	Ud. Me dirá a partir de cuando. Agradeciéndole la atención a la presente
2	Juan	1	pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal,
3		0	solicito se me autorice vacaciones a partir del 31-12-04. Gracias	

Códigos para la Petición del Mensaje

Una vez se haya identificado la parte que indica la petición en el mensaje, utilice uno de los siguientes códigos para determinar cual estrategia esta mejor representada en este e-mail.

Código	Estrategia	Definición	Ejemplo
1	Bald	Oraciones que son directas y usan imperativos.	Esto es lo que yo necesito.
2	Positive Politeness	Oraciones que indican las razones por las cuales el supervisor debe decir si a la petición.	Esto es lo que necesito y esta es la razón por la cual lo necesito.
3	Negative Politeness	Oraciones que tratan de disminuir la imposición de la solicitud del empleado.	Perdone la molestia, pero yo necesito este favor. Yo le puedo pagar de la siguiente manera.
4	Off the record	Oraciones que utilizan formas indirectas para hacer la solicitud.	Será que de pronto puedo faltar a esa reunión (en vez de pedir el día libre)
5	No request	Cuando la persona indica que ellos no haría ese tipo de solicitud.	

Los códigos deben ser asignados de la siguiente manera:

Encuesta	DIR	AC	petición	RC	Adjunto
1	Dr.	2	el fin es con el objetivo de pedirle mis vacaciones las cuales tengo ya vencidas.	2	Ud. Me dirá a partir de cuando. Agradeciéndole la atención a la presente
2	Juan	1	pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	3	tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal,
3		0	solicito se me autorice vacaciones a partir del 31-12-04. Gracias	1	

56

Códigos para Adjuntos

Una vez haya identificado el adjunto en el mensaje, por favor clasifíquelo en una de las siguientes categorías:

Código	Estrategia	Definición	Ejemplo
0	Sin estrategia	Ninguna información adicional es incluida en el mensaje	
1	Positive Politeness	información que indica que el empleado sabe el nivel de imposición de la imposición. Esta estrategia incluye pedir perdón y dar razones por la cual debe hacer la petición.	Yo se que este es un momento difícil para nuestro departamento, pero necesito su ayuda.
2	Negative Politeness	Información que indica el deseo de demostrar que el empleado y el supervisor son amigos. Esta estrategia también incluye ofrecer alternativas para obtener una respuesta positiva a la petición del empleado	Yo puedo llegar una hora más temprano para cumplir con las ocho horas de trabajo diarias.

Los códigos deben ser asignados de la siguiente manera:

Encuesta	DIR	AC	Petición	RC	Adjunto	ADC
1	Dr.	2	el fin es con el objetivo de pedirle mis vacaciones las cuales tengo ya vencidas.	2	Ud. Me dirá a partir de cuando. Agradeciéndole la atención a la presente	1
2	Juan	1	pero requiero de su autorización para el cambio de horario durante este tiempo. Le agradecería que me lo autorizara	3	tengo la oportunidad de hacer un trabajo extra por espacio de 2 meses, en capacitación de personal,	1
3		0	solicito se me autorice vacaciones a partir del 31-12-04. Gracias	1		0

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONAIRES

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The purpose of this survey is to understand how employees communicate with their supervisors at work. This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete and it is divided into 5 parts:

1. Describing your relationship with your supervisor.

2. Communicating with your supervisor (Part 1)

3. Communicating with your supervisor (Part 2).

4. Perceptions about yourself at work

5. Demographic Information

We are very interested in your candid impressions, so please provide honest answers to the following questions.

PART I. *Describing Your Relationship with Your Supervisor.*

For the following questions, please choose a number from the scale below that indicates your degree of agreement with each statement.

1 :	2 :	3 :	4 :	5 :	6 :	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

LMX (Borchgrevink & Boster, 1994)

1. I know how satisfied my supervisor is with what I do.

2. My supervisor understands my job needs.

3. Regardless of how much authority my supervisor has, my supervisor would use his/her power to help me solve problems at work.

4. My working relationship with my supervisor is better than average.

5. My supervisor recognizes my potential.

6. I often share my good ideas with my supervisor.

7. If my supervisor had to divide workers into two groups, with one being the most preferred, and the other being the least preferred, I would be a member of the most preferred group.

8. My supervisor and I have a strong working relationship.

9. My supervisor thinks that I am performing well beyond my job duties.

10. My supervisor does not trust me.

11. My supervisor thinks I help my work unit achieve its goals.

12. My supervisor likes me.

13. I feel close to my supervisor.

14. My supervisor thinks I do a better than average job.

15. If I had to make a decision for my supervisor, s/he could count on me to make the same decision he/she would make.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Speak with Supervisor (Borchgrevink & Boster, 1994)

16. I speak often with my supervisor about job related issues.

17. I speak often with my supervisor about issues not related to work.

18. My supervisor and I speak about job operations.

19. My supervisor and I speak to each other about management issues.

Supervisor Social Support (Borchgrevink & Boster, 1994)

20. It is easy to talk to my supervisor.

21. My supervisor can be relied on when things get tough at work.

22. My supervisor is willing to listen to my personal problems.

Supervisor Satisfaction (Blau 1999)

23. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.

24. My supervisor is unfair to me. (R)

25. My supervisor shows little interest in the feelings of subordinates. (R)

26. I like my supervisor.

PART II. *Communicating with your supervisor.*

Please read the following scenarios and imagine yourself in a situation like the one described below. After reading, please answer the questions that follow.

Situation 1:

> *To deal with an important personal matter it has become very important that you change your work schedule for the next month. You need to ask your supervisor to help you by changing your work schedule for the next month.*
In the following space please write an e-mail indicating what you would say to your

current supervisor to obtain this change of work schedule.

Situation 2:

>*You and your family are ready to take your annual vacation, and you need to ask your supervisor to authorize your vacation time.*

In the following space please write an e-mail indicating what you would say to your current supervisor to authorize your vacation time.

PART III. *Communicating with your supervisor.*

For the following questions, please choose a number from the scale below that indicates your degree of agreement with each statement.

1	:	2	:	3	:	4	:	5	:	6	:	7
Strongly Disagree		Disagree Somewhat		Disagree Slightly		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Agree Slightly		Agree Somewhat		Strongly Agree

When asking your supervisor to do something for you, how likely are you to

Upward Influence Tactics

27. Act very humble while making the request to your supervisor.

28. Act in a friendly manner prior to asking for what you want.

29. Make your supervisor feel good about you before making your request.

30. Remind your supervisor about previous favors you did for him or her

31. Offer an exchange (if you do this for me I will do this for you) before making your request.

32. Offer that you make a personal sacrifice (e.g., work late, work harder, do more work) if he or she would say yes to your request.

33. Use a logical explanation to convince him or her.

34. Explain the reasons for your request.

35. Present him or her with information that supports why your supervisor should say yes to your request.

36. Confront your supervisor face to face so he or she would say yes to your request.

37. Express with anger why your supervisor should say yes to your request.

38. Use a forceful manner to ask your supervisor to say yes to your request.

39. Obtain the informal support of other higher up in the organization to convince your supervisor to say yes to your request

40. Make a formal appeal to higher ups in the organization to get your supervisor to say yes to your request.

41. Obtain support from co-workers to back up your request.

42. Obtain the support from your subordinates to back up your request

43. Ask other people in the organization to help you influence your supervisor to say yes to your request.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Concern for getting your way

44. When I ask for a favor from my supervisor it is very important for me to get what I want.

45. I have specific goals in my job that I need to achieve.

46. Achieving my goals at work is very important for me.

47. My work goals are important to get where I want in this company.

48. It is important for me to achieve my personal goals.

49. I will do anything that I can to achieve my goals in this organization.

50. It is important that I get what I ask for, when I ask a favor from my supervisor.

Concern for maintaining the relationship

51. My relationship with my supervisor is important to me.

52. I have a good relationship to maintain with my supervisor.

53. When I ask for a favor from my supervisor it is very important for me to maintain a good relationship with him or her.

54. It is important for me to maintain a good relationship with my supervisor especially when I ask for a favor from him or her.

55. I will do anything I can to maintain a good relationship with my supervisor.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Adaptation of Hershey and Blanchard Scale

Relationship

56. I often act friendly with my supervisor.

57. I respond favorably to all suggestions made by my supervisor.

58. I communicate often with my supervisor.

59. I show concern for the personal well being of my supervisor.

60. I often disclose my thoughts and feelings about work to my supervisor.

61. I try to get along well with my supervisor.

Task

62. I set the standards of performance in my work group.

63. I often develop a plan of action that I follow to achieve my goals.

64. I have a clear plan for how the work needs to be done to achieve my goals.

65. I always follow a plan of action to achieve what I want

66. I strive to do the best job that I can in everything I do.

Power Distance Scale Maznevski Et Al. (1997), A=.90

67. People in higher positions in the organization should make significant decisions for people below them.

68. People at higher positions in an organization must look after those below them.

69. People at lower levels in a group or organization should carry out the decisions of people at higher levels.

70. The hierarchy of groups in a society should remain consistent over time.

71. People in higher positions in the organization should expect to have more privileges than those at lower levels.

72. People at lower levels in an organization should not expect to have much power.

73. Organizations work best with clear and formal hierarchies.

Items from Dorfman and Howell (1988)

74. It is better not to disagree with management decisions.

75. When my supervisor makes a decision with which I disagree I prefer to accept the decision rather than question it

76. I believe that it is not right to disagree with my boss.

PART IV. *Perceptions of your-self at work.*

For the following questions, please choose a number from the scale below that indicates your degree of agreement with each statement.

1	:	2	:	3	:	4	:	5	:	6	:	7
Strongly Disagree		Disagree Somewhat		Disagree Slightly		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Agree Slightly		Agree Somewhat		Strongly Agree

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Pay Satisfaction

77. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.

78. In my job raises are too few, and far between (R)

79. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases in this organization.

Promotion Satisfaction

80. There are few chances for promotion on my job. (R)

81. Those who do well on their job stand a fair chance of getting promoted.

82. People get ahead as fast in this organization as they do in other organizations.

83. I am satisfied with my chances of promotion.

Other items

84. Possibilities of getting promoted in this organization, depend on my relationship with my supervisor.

85. My supervisor has a lot to say in my promotion possibilities.

86. The relationship with my supervisor does not affect my opportunities of being promoted in this organization (R)

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements
Rewards Satisfaction

87. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.

88. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. (R)

89. There are few rewards for those who work hard in this organization. (R)

90. I do not feel that my efforts are rewarded the way they should be (R)

Operating Procedures Satisfaction

91. Many of the rules and procedures in the organization that I work make doing my job difficult. (R)

92. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by others in the organization.

93. I have too much to do at work.

94. I have too much paperwork.

Co-worker Satisfaction

95. I like the people I work with.

96. I find that I have to worker harder than I should at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. (R)

97. I enjoy working with my co-workers.

98. There is too much fighting between my colleagues at work. (R)

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

Work Satisfaction

99. I feel my job is meaningless (R)

100. I like doing the things I do at work.

101. I feel a sense of pride in doing my work.

102. My job is enjoyable.

Communication Satisfaction

103. Communication seems good within this organization.

104. The goals of this organization are not clear to me. (R)

105. I often feel that I do not know what is going on in this organization. (R)

106. Work assignments are often not fully explained. (R)

Voice Behavior

107. I develop and make recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work.

108. I speak up and encourage others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work.

109. I communicate my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me.

110. I keep well informed about issues at work where my opinion can be useful.

111. I get involved in issues that affect the quality of life in my work unit.

112. I speak up to my supervisor with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures at work.

PART V. *Demographic information.*

Please answer the following questions about **yourself**

113. Sex (*circle one*):   Female   Male

114. Indicate your age in years? _____

115. What is your ethnic background?

- Caucasian
- Black/ African American
- Hispanic
- Asian
- American Indian
- Pacific Islander
- Mixed
- Other _____

116. What country were you born in?

117. What is your native language?

118. Please indicate your level of education?

- Primary School
- High school
- Some college
- Finished University
- Master
- Ph. D.

119. How long have you been employed in your current organization (in years)? _____

120. How long have you worked in your current position? _____

121. Please choose the option that best describes your job:

- Officials or Manager
- Professional
- Technician
- Science, engineer and computer professional
- Healthcare practitioner or professional
- Administrative support
- Sales
- Craft worker
- Production
- Other _____

122. Do you belong to a union? Yes No

123. How many different supervisors have you had in the past?

124. How many supervisors do you currently have?

125. Have you been a supervisor?

126. Are you currently a supervisor?

127. For how long have you been one?

128. How many employees do you supervise?

129. How long have you worked with your current supervisor?

Please answer the following questions about your *supervisor*

130. Sex of supervisor: Female Male

131. What is the ethnic background of your supervisor?

- Caucasian
- Black/ African American
- Hispanic
- Asian

- American Indian
- Pacific Islander
- Mixed
- Other _____

132. Please indicate the level of education of your supervisor?

- Primary School
- High school
- Some college

- Finished University
- Master
- Ph. D.

133. How many employees is your supervisor responsible for?

Please answer the following questions about the *organization for which you currently work.*

134. Please indicate the sector that best describes your organization:

- Public
- Private
- Non for profit

135. Please choose the option that best describes the type of organization you work for:

- Education
- Manufacturing
- Banking & Insurance
- Service

- Real State & Construction
- Agriculture
- Communications
- Other _____

136. How many people currently work in your organization?

- 0-50
- 50-100
- 100-300
- 300-600

- 600-1000
- 1000-2000
- 2000 or more

Encuesta - Comunicándose con sus superiores

Gracias por su participación en esta encuesta. El propósito de esta investigación es entender como empleados y jefes inmediatos se comunican en el ambiente de trabajo. Su participación no debe tomar más de 20 minutos. Esta encuesta esta dividida en 5 partes:

1. Descripción de su relación con su jefe inmediato

2. Comunicadote con su jefe. Parte 1.

3. Comunicándose con su jefe. Parte 2.

4. Percepciones de su ambiente de trabajo.

5. Características suyas y de su empresa.

Nosotros estamos interesados en sus opiniones, por lo cual le pedimos el favor que responda honestamente a las siguientes preguntas.

PARTE I. *Descripción de la relación con su jefe.*

A continuación encontrará una serie de afirmaciones, seleccione un número del 1 al 7 que este más de acuerdo con su percepción. Por favor tenga en cuenta el 1 indica el mayor grado de desacuerdo, el 4 indica que usted no esta ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, y el 7 indica estar totalmente de acuerdo.

1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7
Totalmente   Ni de acuerdo   Totalmente
En desacuerdo   ni en desacuerdo   De acuerdo

Por favor indique su grado de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones.

LMX (Borchgrevink & Boster, 1994)

1. Yo se cuan satisfecho esta mi supervisor inmediato con mi trabajo.

2. Mi jefe entiende cuales son mis necesidades en el trabajo.

3. Independiente de cuanta autoridad tiene mi jefe, él o ella usaría su poder para ayudarme a resolver cualquier problema en mi trabajo.

4. Mi relación de trabajo con mi jefe es mejor que la del promedio de mis compañeros de trabajo.

5. Mi jefe reconoce mi potencial en el trabajo

6. A menudo yo comparto mis buenas ideas con mi jefe.

7. Si mi jefe tuviera que dividir a todos sus trabajadores en dos grupos: un grupo para los trabajadores preferidos y otro con sus trabajadores menos preferidos, yo sería parte del grupo de los preferidos.

8. Mi jefe y yo tenemos una buena relación de trabajo.

9. Mi jefe cree que yo trabajo mas de lo que esta especificado en el contrato de trabajo

10. Mi jefe no confia en mí.

11. Mi jefe cree que yo le ayudo a mi grupo de trabajo a alcanzar sus objetivos.

12. A mi jefe le gusta mi forma de ser.

13. A mi jefe le gusta mi forma de trabajar.

14. Mi jefe y yo somos amigos.

15. Mi jefe cree que la calidad de mi trabajo es mejor que la del promedio de otros empleados.

16. Si yo tuviera que tomar una decisión por mi jefe, él o ella podría estar segura de que mi decisión sería la misma que la que él o ella tomaría.

Speak with Supervisor

17. Yo hablo frecuentemente con mi jefe acerca de los distintos aspectos del trabajo que realizo.

18. Yo hablo frecuentemente con mi jefe acerca de aspectos que no están relacionada con mi trabajo.

19. Mi jefe y yo hablamos frecuentemente acerca de los distintos aspectos de funcionamiento necesarios para completar mi trabajo.

20. Mi jefe y yo hablamos frecuentemente a cerca de asuntos administrativos.

Supervisor Social Support

21. Para mí es fácil hablar con mi jefe.

22. Yo puedo contar con mi jefe cuando las cosas se ponen difíciles en el trabajo.

23. Mi jefe esta dispuesto a escuchar cuando tengo problemas personales.

Supervisor Satisfaction

24. Mi jefe es hábil en el trabajo que realiza.

25. Mi jefe es injusto conmigo.

26. Mi jefe no esta interesado en los sentimientos de sus empleados.

27. Mi jefe me cae bien.

28. Mi jefe es un buen jefe.

PARTE II. *Comunicándose con su jefe.*

Por favor lea la situación descrita a continuación e imagínese en una situación similar.

Situación 1:

Para resolver un asunto personal e importante usted necesita cambiar su horario de trabajo para el mes entrante. Usted necesita solicitarle a su jefe que lo/la ayude con el cambio de horario que usted esta solicitando.

En el espacio a continuación por favor escriba un e-mail que indique usted como le solicitaría a su jefe inmediato que le otorgue el cambio de horario para el mes entrante.

Situación 2:

Usted y su familia estan listos para irse de vacaciones, y usted necesita pedirle a su jefe que autorice sus vacaciones.

En el espacio a continuación por favor escriba un e-mail que indique usted como le solicitaría a su jefe inmediato que le otorgue sus vacaciones.

Parte III. *Comunicándose con su jefe.*

A continuación encontrará una serie de afirmaciones, seleccione un número del 1 al 7 que este más de acuerdo con su percepción. Por favor tenga en cuenta el 1 indica el mayor grado de desacuerdo, el 4 indica que usted no esta ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, y el 7 indica estar totalmente de acuerdo.

1 : 2 : 3 :	4 : 5 :	6 : 7
Totalmente En desacuerdo	Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo	Totalmente De acuerdo

Upward Influence Tactics

Por favor indique su grado de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones teniendo en cuenta lo que usted estaría dispuesto a hacer al solicitarle a su jefe que lo ayudara en algo que usted necesita.

29. Actuar en forma humilde mientras le hace la solicitud a su jefe.

30. Actuar de manera amigable antes de hacerle la solicitud a su jefe.

31. Haría que mi jefe se sintiera a gusto conmigo y mi trabajo, antes de hacerle la solicitud.

32. Le recordaría a mi jefe algunos favores que le he hecho antes de hacer mi solicitud.

33. Le ofrecería devolver el favor después (si usted hace esto por mi, yo mañana puedo hacer algo por usted), antes de pedirle el favor que necesito.

34. Le ofrecería a mi jefe compensar en tiempo o en trabajo (por ejemplo: trabajar hasta mas tarde otros días, asumir mas responsabilidades en el trabajo, trabajar en el horario que mas le convenga a la empresa) si él o ella responde positivamente a su solicitud.

35. Utilizaría una explicación lógica para convencer a mi jefe de que me ayude con mi solicitud.

36. Le explicaría a mi jefe las razones por las cuales estoy haciendo mi solicitud.

37. Le presentaría la información y los documentos a mi jefe que acreditan la necesidad para mi solicitud.

38. Confrontaría a mi jefe cara a cara para que me ayude con mi solicitud.

39. Expresaría con rabia las razones por las cuales mi jefe de responder afirmativamente a mi solicitud.

40. Utilizaría amenazas al solicitarle a mi jefe que responda positivamente a mi solicitud.

41. Obtendría el apoyo informal de otros miembros importantes de la organización para convencer a mi jefe que apoye mi solicitud.

42. Obtendría apoyo formal de otras personas importantes en la organización para poder comprometer la respuesta afirmativa de mi jefe para mi solicitud.

43. Obtendría el apoyo de mis compañeros de trabajo para respaldar la solicitud ante mi jefe.

44. Obtendría el apoyo de mis empleados para respaldar la solicitud ante mi jefe.

45. Le pediría ayuda a otras personas en la organización para convencer a mi jefe que me ayude en mi solicitud.

Concern for getting your way

46. Cuando le pido un favor a mi jefe, es importante obtener lo que quiero.

47. Yo tengo unos objetivos específicos en mi trabajo que deseo alcanzar.

48. Obtener mis objetivos de trabajo es muy importante para mí.

49. Mis objetivos de trabajo son importantes para obtener lo que deseo en esta empresa.

50. Para mi es importante obtener mis objetivos personales.

51. Yo haría cualquier cosa para obtener mis objetivos en esta empresa.

52. Para mi es importante obtener lo que necesito cuando le pido favores a mi jefe.

Concern for Maintaining the Relationship

53. Mi relación con mi jefe es importante para mí.

54. Yo tengo una buena relación que debo mantener con mi jefe.

55. Cuando le pido un favor a mi jefe, para mi es importante mantener una buena relación interpersonal con él o ella.

56. Para mi es primordial el tipo de relación que tengo con mi jefe, en especial cuando le pido un favor.

57. Yo haría cualquier cosa necesaria para mantener una buena relación con mi jefe.

Relationship Scale

58. A menudo yo actúo de manera amigable con mi jefe.

59. Yo respondo positivamente a todas las sugerencias hechas por mi jefe.

60. Yo me comunico a menudo con mi jefe para discutir asuntos de trabajo.

61. A mi me preocupa el bienestar personal de mi jefe.

62. A menudo le comunico a mi jefe mis pensamientos y sentimientos acerca de mi trabajo.

63. Yo intento tener una buena relación con mi jefe.

Task Scale

64. Yo establezco las reglas en mi grupo de trabajo.

65. A menudo, yo tengo un plan de acción para obtener mis objetivos de trabajo.

66. Yo tengo un plan claro de trabajo claro para alcanzar mis objetivos.

67. Yo siempre tengo un plan de acción para obtener lo que yo quiero.

68. Yo intento hacer lo mejor posible en todo lo que hago.

Power Distance

69. Las personas con posiciones más importantes en la organización deben tomar las decisiones importantes por los empleados por debajo de su posición.

70. Las personas en posiciones más importantes en la organización deben cuidar a los trabajadores de niveles más bajos dentro de la organización.

71. Las personas en los niveles más bajos de un grupo o una organización deben llevar a cabo lo necesario para realizar las decisiones de las personas en niveles más altos.

72. La jerarquía de los grupos en la sociedad debe permanecer constante a través del tiempo.

73. Los empleados con posiciones más importantes en una organización deben tener más privilegios que esos en niveles más bajos en la organización.

74. Las personas con posiciones de menos nivel en una organización no deben esperar tener mucho poder dentro de la organización.

75. Las organizaciones trabajan mejor cuando hay jerarquías claras y formales.

76. Es mejor no expresar desacuerdo con las decisiones administrativas dentro de mi organización.

77. Cuando mi jefe toma una decisión con la cual no estoy de acuerdo yo prefiero aceptar esa decisión antes de cuestionarla.

78. Yo pienso que no es correcto estar en desacuerdo con mi jefe.

PARTE IV. Percepciones personales en el trabajo.

A continuación encontrará una serie de afirmaciones, seleccione un número del 1 al 7 que este más de acuerdo con su percepción. Por favor tenga en cuenta el 1 indica el mayor grado de desacuerdo, el 4 indica que usted no esta ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, y el 7 indica estar totalmente de acuerdo.

1	:	2	:	3	:	4	:	5	:	6	:	7
Totalmente						Ni de acuerdo						Totalmente
En desacuerdo						ni en desacuerdo						De acuerdo

Por favor indique su grado de acuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones.

Pay Satisfaction

73

79. Yo creo que mi salario es adecuado para el tipo de trabajo que hago.

80. En mi trabajo los aumentos salariales son muy pocos y demorados.

81. Estoy satisfecho/a con las oportunidades de aumento salarial en la organización en que trabajo.

Promotion Satisfaction

82. En mi trabajo hay pocas oportunidades para ascensos laborales.

83. Las personas que hacen su trabajo bien en esta empresa tienen muchas posibilidades de ser ascendidas a cargos más importantes.

84. En la empresa en que yo trabajo, las personas obtienen ascensos laborales tan rápido como lo hubieran obtenido en otras empresas.

85. Estoy satisfecho con mis oportunidades de ascenso en esta organización.

Other Items

86. Mis posibilidades de ascensos laborales dependen de la relación que yo tengo con mi jefe.

87. La opinión de mi jefe es muy importante para mis posibilidades de ascenso laboral.

88. Mi relación con mi jefe no afecta mis oportunidades de ascenso laboral en la organización en la que trabajo.

Reward Satisfaction

89. Cuando yo realizo un buen trabajo recibo el reconocimiento que me merezco.

90. Yo no creo que el trabajo que hago en esta empresa es apreciado.

91. En esta empresa hay poco reconocimiento para las personas que trabajan duro.

92. Yo no creo que mis esfuerzos en esta empresa son reconocidos como deberían.

Operating Procedures

93. Muchas de las reglas y procedimientos de esta empresa hacen mi trabajo más difícil.

94. Mis esfuerzos por hacer cosas buenas para esta empresa no son bloqueados por otros en esta empresa.

95. Generalmente tengo mucho trabajo que hacer en mi empresa.

96. En mi trabajo hay mucho papeleo.

Coworker Satisfaction

97. Me caen bien las personas con las que trabajo.

98. En varias ocasiones me toca trabajar más de lo necesario por la incompetencia de otras personas con las que trabajo.

99. Yo disfruto trabajar con mis compañeros de trabajo.

100. Hay muchos conflictos entre mis compañeros de trabajo.

Work Satisfaction

101. Yo creo que mi trabajo no tiene sentido.

102. Yo disfruto lo que hago en mi trabajo.

103. Yo me siento orgulloso(a) de lo que hago en mi trabajo.

104. Mi trabajo es agradable.

Communication Satisfaction

105. La comunicación entre los empleados de esta empresa es buena.

106. Para mi los objetivos que tiene esta empresa no son claros.

107. A menudo siento que no estoy enterado de lo que esta sucediendo en esta empresa.

108. Las asignaciones de trabajo en esta empresa no son muy claras.

Voice Behavior

109. Generalmente yo le hago recomendaciones a mi jefe acerca de asuntos que afecten mi trabajo.

110. Estimulo a mis compañeros de trabajo para que expresen sus ideas de mejoramiento y cambio a nuestro jefe.

111. Comunico mis opiniones y recomendaciones sobre aspectos de trabajo a mis compañeros de trabajo aún cuando ellos tienen opiniones diferentes a la mía

112. Me mantengo bien informado sobre los asuntos de trabajo en donde mi opinión puede ser valiosa.

113. Participo en todos los asuntos que mejoren la calidad de vida de mi grupo de trabajo.

114. Comparto con mi jefe ideas que puedan ser útiles para cambiar algunos procedimientos en mi empresa de trabajo.

Parte V. Información Personal y de su organización

Por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas sobre usted.

115.Sexo: Mujer Hombre

116.Cuál es su edad en años? _____

117.Por favor indique su nivel de educación (Cuál fue el último grado que obtuvo?)

- Primaria
- Bachillerato
- Tecnología
- Algunos semestres de universidad

- Grado universitario
- Especialización
- Maestría
- Doctorado

118.Cuanto tiempo (en años) ha trabajado usted en esta empresa? _____

119.Cuantos años ha trabajado en el puesto que ocupa actualmente? _____

120.Elija la opción que mejor describe el trabajo que usted desempeña:

☐ Administrador
☐ Profesional
☐ Técnico
☐ Profesional en las ciencias de ingeniería o computación

☐ Profesional en salud
☐ Servicios administrativos
☐ Ventas
☐ Artesano
☐ Otro _____

121.Usted Pertenece al sindicato?   Sí   NO

122.Cuantos jefes ha tenido usted? _____

123.Cuantos jefes inmediatos tiene usted? _____

124.Ha sido usted supervisor en el pasado? _____

125.En su trabajo actual es usted un supervisor? _____

         a. Por cuanto tiempo ha sido supervisor? _____

         b. Cuantos empleados supervisa? _____

126.Cuantos años ha trabajado con su jefe actual? _____

Por favor responda las siguientes preguntas a cerca de su *jefe inmediato*.

127.Cuál es el sexo de su jefe? Mujer Hombre

128.Por favor indique cual es el nivel de educación de su jefe (Cuál fue el último grado que obtuvo?)

☐   Primaria
☐   Bachillerato
☐   Tecnología
☐   Algunos semestres de universidad

☐   Grado universitario
☐   Especialización
☐   Maestría
☐   Doctorado

129.Cuantas personas tiene su jefe a cargo? _____

Por favor responda las siguientes preguntas a cerca de la *empresa para la que usted trabaja.*

130. Por favor indique el sector que mejor describe a su empresa:
   - ☐ Público
   - ☐ Privado
   - ☐ Sin ánimo de lucro.

131. Entre las siguientes opciones escoja la que mejor describe el tipo de actividad que realiza su organización:
   - o Administración Pública
   - o Educación
   - o Industria
   - o Bancos y Empresas Aseguradoras
   - o Servicio público (transporte, acueducto, energía, Alcantarillado)
   - o Construcción
   - o Agricultura
   - o Comunicación
   - o Otro: _____

132. Aproximadamente cuantas personas trabajan en su empresa:
   - o 0-50
   - o 50-100
   - o 100-300
   - o 300-600
   - o 600-1000
   - o 1000-2000
   - o 2000 o mas

Table 1

Definitions and Examples of Politeness Strategies

Name of Strategy	Definition	Example
Bald –on record	Presenting the message in the most clear, concise, direct and unambiguous way possible.	Go get the mail. Bring the mail
Positive Politeness	Message that states the request by indicating solidarity with the listener.	Why don't you bring the mail? You'll go get the mail, won't you?
Negative Politeness	Message that states the request by indicating that you respect the targets freedom of action	I would like you to bring the mail. Would you bring the mail? Could you bring the mail? Would you mind bringing the mail?
Off-record	Presenting the message in an ambiguous way by providing hints, metaphors, irony or understatements.	Don't you think the mail has come by now? The mail should be here by now.
No Communication	No message is presented to the listener.	

Table 2

Politeness Coding Frequencies

	Code	High Imposition Condition	Low Imposition Condition
Address	0	31.60 %	33.90 %
	1	36.15 %	38.25 %
	2	32.25 %	30.85 %
Request	1	9.90 %	24.60 %
	2	46.90 %	51.45 %
	3	39.35 %	22.55 %
	4	3.85 %	1.40 %
	5	0 %	0 %
Adjunct	0	37.75 %	66. 15 %
	1	37.25 %	20.45 %
	2	25.25 %	13.4 %

Table 3

Zero Order Correlations Combined Sample

	Mean	SD	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Politeness High Imposition	4.11	1.31	258												
2. Politeness Low Imposition	3.39	1.33	248	.56**											
3. Country	1.46	0.5	270	-.02	-.02										
4. LMX Quality	5.33	1.18	270	.12	-.04	.20**	(.93)								
5. Power Distance	2.69	1.4	251	-.13*	.06	.07	-.05	(.75)							
6. Job Satisfaction	5.9	1.3	248	.13	.11	-.22**	.31**	-.20**	(.86)						
7. Voice Behavior	5.46	1.19	248	.11	.04	-.04	.41**	-.34**	.46**	(.87)					
8. Union membership	0.19	0.39	248	.05	.00	-.01	.06	-.07	.18**	.09					
9. sex	0.68	0.47	249	.18**	.10	.04	.04	.08	.05	-.03	-.04				
10. age	35.4	10.8	248	-.05	-.11	-.42**	-.01	-.14*	.26**	.16**	.31**	-.06			
11. Concern for getting your way	5.93	0.83	260	.15*	.11	-.26**	.10	-.17**	.35**	.26**	.01	.05	.12	(.77)	
12.Concern for maintaining the relationship	5.2	1.19	260	.13*	.03	.07	.54**	.12	.22**	.18**	-.01	.16*	-.13*	.34**	(.80)

Note: *p<.05 , **p<.01

Alpha coefficients are presented in the diagonal.

Country was coded 0 for the United States, 1 for Colombia; Union membership 0 = no, and 1 = yes; Sex: 0 = male, 1= Female

80

Table 4

Zero Order Correlations Colombian Sample

	Mean	SD	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Politeness High Imposition	4.14	1.37	145											
2. Politeness Low Imposition	3.42	1.42	135	.61**										
3. LMX Quality	5.12	1.13	147	.07	-.09	(.93)								
4. Power Distance	2.60	1.46	139	-.20*	-.04	-.09	(.68)							
5. Job Satisfaction	6.15	1.14	139	.08	.09	.31**	-.18*	(.80)						
6. Voice Behavior	5.51	1.21	139	.06	.02	.39**	-.26**	.41**	(.85)					
7. Union membership	0.19	0.39	139	-.04	-.06	.03	-.09	.10	.07					
8. sex	0.66	0.47	139	.19*	.11	.01	.04	.01	-.08	-.13				
9. age	39.43	9.97	138	-.07	-.06	.01	.01	.12	.08	.40**	-.03			
10. Concern for getting your way	6.13	0.80	142	.06	.05	.11	-.13	.26**	.11	.07	-.01	-.06	(.76)	
11. Concern for maintaining the relationship	5.12	1.20	142	.13	-.02	.53**	.01	.27**	.17*	-.02	.12	-.15	.40**	(.79)

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01

Alpha coefficients are presented in the diagonal.

Union membership 0 = no, and 1 = yes; Sex: 0 = male, 1= Female

81

Table 5

Zero Order Correlations United States Sample

	Mean	SD	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Politeness High Imposition	4.08	1.24	113											
2. Politeness Low Imposition	3.36	1.23	113	.46**										
3. LMX Quality	5.59	1.18	123	.21*	.03	(.95)								
4. Power Distance	2.80	1.32	112	.01	.24	-.03	(.87)							
5. Job Satisfaction	5.57	1.41	109	.17	.15	.43**	-.21*	(.91)						
6. Voice Behavior	5.40	1.16	109	.19	.06	.49**	-.46**	.52**	(.90)					
7. Union membership	0.18	0.39	109	.19	.09	.10	-.05	.28**	.11					
8. sex	0.70	0.46	110	.18	.09	.07	.12	.12	.05	.16				
9. age	30.29	9.56	110	-.09	-.20*	.15	-.28**	.28**	.27**	.27**	-.07			
10. Concern for getting your way	5.70	0.82	118	.28**	.19	.21*	-.20*	.36**	.44**	-.05	.16	.10	(.75)	
11. Concern for maintaining the relationship	5.30	1.18	118	.15	.11	.55**	.25**	.23*	.21*	.01	.21*	-.09	.34**	(.83)

Note: *$p<.05$ **$p<.01$

Alpha coefficients are presented in the diagonal.

Union membership 0 = no, and 1 = yes; Sex: 0 = male, 1= Female

82

Table 6

Results from Mixed Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (N=229)

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Subjects					
Country	.301	1	.301	.116	.733
LMX Quality	1.317	2	.659	.255	.775
Power Distance	.475	1	.475	.184	.669
Job Satisfaction	5.682	1	5.682	2.19	.140
Sex	14.109	1	14.109	5.46	**.020**
Country x LMX quality	.912	2	.456	.177	.838
Error between groups	560.72	217	2.584		
Within Subjects					
Imposition	9.223	1	9.223	14.309	**.0001**
Imp x Country	3.097	1	3.097	4.805	**.029**
Imp x LMX Quality	4.954	2	2.477	3.843	**.023**
Imp x Power Distance	7.025	1	7.025	10.899	**.001**
Imp x Job Satisfaction	1.433	1	1.433	2.223	.137
Imp x Sex	.632	1	.632	.981	.323
Imp x Country x LMX quality	2.430	2	1.215	1.885	.154
Error within groups	139.871	217	.645		

Table 7

Politeness Means by Different Levels of LMX Quality and Power Distance for the Two Samples Combined

Variable	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
High Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.73	1.34	4.15	1.30	4.41	1.05
Power Distance	4.48	1.23	4.04	1.25	3.91	1.46
Low Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.38	1.19	3.37	1.33	3.48	1.04
Power Distance	3.38	1.08	3.36	1.35	3.68	1.33

Table 8

Politeness Means by different levels of LMX Quality and Power Distance for the

Colombian Sample

Variable	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
High Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.92	1.33	4.17	1.41	4.40	1.46
Power Distance	4.51	1.37	4.13	1.34	3.57	1.53
Low Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.40	1.25	3.38	1.40	3.05	1.21
Power Distance	3.42	1.10	3.44	1.49	3.26	1.58

Table 9

Politeness Means by different levels of LMX Quality and Power Distance for the United

States Sample

Variable	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
High Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.44	1.30	4.11	1.14	4.41	0.77
Power Distance	4.40	0.55	3.94	1.15	4.29	1.32
Low Imposition						
LMX Quality	3.35	1.12	3.35	1.22	3.72	0.95
Power Distance	3.25	1.06	3.28	1.18	4.14	0.80

Table 10

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Maintaining the Relationship for Combined Sample (N=246)

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β
LMX Quality	.55	.062	.55**
Power Distance	.11	.048	.14*
Job Satisfaction	.08	.058	.09
Voice Behavior	-.04	.069	-.04
Country	-.04	.134	-.02

Note: $R^2 = .328$, $R = .573$.

** $p < .001$ * $p < .01$

Table 11

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Getting One's Way for Combined Sample (N=246)

Variable	B	SE B	β
LMX Quality	-.01	.05	-.01
Power Distance	-.03	.03	-.05
Job Satisfaction	.14	.04	.228**
Voice Behavior	.10	.05	.15*
Country	-.32	.10	-.19**

Note: R^2 = .181, R = .425.

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

Table 12

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Maintaining the Relationship for the United States Sample (N=105)

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β
LMX Quality	.527	.08	.55**
Power Distance	.238	.07	.27*
Job Satisfaction	.019	.07	.02
Voice Behavior	.051	.10	.05

Note: $R^2 = .395$, $R = .628$.

$**\ p < .001\ *\ p < .01$

Table 13

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Getting One's Way for the United States Sample (N=108)

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β
LMX Quality	-.027	.07	-.04
Power Distance	.012	.06	.02
Job Satisfaction	.117	.06	.19*
Voice Behavior	.262	.09	.36**

Note: $R^2 = .216$, $R = .465$.

$**\ p < .01\ *\ p = .06$

Table 14

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Maintaining the Relationship for the Colombian Sample (N=137)

Variable	B	SE B	β
LMX Quality	.560	.08	.52**
Power Distance	.053	.06	.06
Job Satisfaction	.160	.08	.15*
Voice Behavior	-.079	.09	-.07

Note: $R^2 = .300$, $R = .547$.

** $p < .001$ * $p = .07$

Table 15

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Overall Concern for Getting One's Way for the United States Sample (N=137)

Variable	B	SE B	β
LMX Quality	-.006	.06	-.008
Power Distance	-.041	.04	-.078
Job Satisfaction	.163	.06	.239*
Voice Behavior	.014	.07	.021

Note: $R^2 = .075$, $R = .273$.

* $p < .05$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 40*(1), 39-49.

Ansari, M. A., Tandon, K., & Lakhtakia, U. (1989). Organizational context and leaders' use of influence strategies. *Psychological Studies, 34*(1), 29-38.

Barry, B., & Shapiro, D. L. (1992). Influence tactics in combination: The interactive effects of soft versus hard tactics and rational exchange. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*(18), 1429-1441.

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* (Vol. 19, pp. 269-317). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Borchgrevink, C. P., & Boster, F. J. (1994). Leader-member exchange: A test of the measurement model. *The Hospitality Research Journal, 17*(3), 75-100.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1988). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J. P., Doran, N. E., & Miller, M. D. (1982). Cultural and situation influences on the process of persuasive strategy selection. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 6*(1), 85 - 100.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J. P., Doran, N. E., & Miller, M. D. (1982). Cultural and situational influences on the process of persuasive strategy selection. *International Journal of Intercultural relations, 6*(1), 85-100.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, C. P., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance.* New York, NY: Lexington Books.

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 & Human Decision Processes, 13*(1), 46-78.

Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group & Organization Management, 23*(2), 189-216.

Deluga, R. J., & Perry, J. T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behaviour, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 64*(3), 239-252.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell. (1988). *Advances in International Comparative Management, 3,* 127.

Ebel, R. L. (1951). Estimation of reliability ratings. *Psychometrika, 16,* 407-424.

Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 638-652.

Farmer, S. M., Maslyn, J. M., Fedor, D. B., & Goodman, J. S. (1997). Putting upward influence strategies in context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(1), 17-42.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827-844.

Graen, G. B. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 143-165). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Kent, OH: Kent State Press.

Graen, G. B., & Ginsburgh, S. (1977). Job resignation as a function of role orientation and leader acceptance: A longitudinal investigation of organizational assimilation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 19*(1), 1-17.

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

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (lmx) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly Special Issue: Leadership: The multiple-level approaches (Part I), 6*(2), 219-247.

Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(2), 89-106.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1990). Relationships between subordinate perceptions of supervisor influence tactics and attributed bases of supervisory power. *Human Relations, 43*(3), 221-237.

Hirokawa, R. Y., & Miyahara, A. (1986). A comparison of influence strategies utilized by managers in american and japanese organizations. *Communication Quarterly, 34*(3), 250-265.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review 65*, 117-127.

Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J.-n. (1990). Politeness as universal: Cross-cultural perceptions of request strategies and inferences based on their use. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 59*(4), 719-729.

Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J.-n. (1992). Interpersonal underpinnings of request strategies: General principles and differences due to culture and gender. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 62*(2), 246-256.

Hunter, J. E., & Gerbing, D. W. (1982). Unidimensional measurement, second order factor analysis and causal models. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 267-320). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Ilgen, D. R. (1994). Jobs and roles: Accepting and coping with the changing structure of organizations. In M. G. Rumsey & C. B. Walker (Eds.), *Personnel selection and classification* (pp. 13-32). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 679-740; Thousand Oaks, CA).

Kipnis, D. (1984). The use of power in organizations and in interpersonal settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 5*, 179-210.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward-influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluations, salary, and stress. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(4), 528-542.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Braxton-Brown, G. (1989). The hidden costs of persistence. In M. J. Cody & M. L. Mclaughlin (Eds.), *The psychology of tactical communication*. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., Swaffin-Smith, C., & Wilkinson, I. (1984). Patterns of managerial influence: Shotgun managers, tacticians, and bystanders. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(3), 58-67.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*(4), 440-452.

Krone, K. J. (1991). Effects of leader member exchange on subordinates' upward influence attempts. *Communication Research Reports, 8,* 9-18.

Krone, K. J. (1992). Achieving communication goals in superior subordinate relationships: Upward influence maintenance tactics. *Communication Quarterly, 40*(1), 1 - 15.

Lee, J., & Jablin, F. M. (1995). Maintenance communication in superior-subordinate work relationships. *Human Communication Research, 22*(2), 220-257.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 853-868.

Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management, 24*(1), 43-72.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 15, pp. 47-119; Stamford, CT, US JAI Press, Inc, 1997 ix, 1383).

Lora, E. A. (2003). *Changing patterns in the supply of labor.* Washington DC: Inter-american Development Bank.

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 & Organization Management, 21*(4), 461-480.

Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 697-708.

Pfeffer, J. (2003). Developing and exercising power and influence. In L. W. Porter, H. l. Angle & R. W. Allen (Eds.), *Organizational influence processes* (2nd ed.). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Porter, L. W., Allen, R. W., & Angle, H. l. (1980). The politics of upward influence in the organization. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 109-149). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Porter, L. W., Angle, H. l., & Allen, R. W. (2003). *Organizational influence processes* (2nd ed.). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Ralston, D. A., Giacalone, R. A., & Terpstra, R. H. (1994). Ethical perceptions of organizational politics: A comparative evaluation of american and hong kong managers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 13*(12), 989-999.

Ralston, D. A., Vollmer, G. R., Srinvasan, N., Nicholson, J. D., Tang, M., & Wan, P. (2001). Strategies of upward influence: A study of six cultures from europe, asia, and america. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(6), 728-735.

Ralston, D. A., Vollmer, G. R., Srivasan, N., Nicholson, J. D., Tang, M., & Wan, P. (2001). Strategies of upward influence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(6), 728-735.

Schermerhorn, J. R., & Bond, M. H. (1991). Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: A comparative study of hong kong chinese and american. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 8*(2), 147-158.

Schmidt, S. M., & Yeh, R.-s. (1992). The structure of leader influence: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*(2), 251-264.

Schmidt, S. M., & Yeh, R.-s. (1992). The structure of leader influence: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*(2), 251-264.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the kipnis, schmidt, and wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(3), 246-257.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*(1), 108-119.

Waldron, V. R. (1991). Achieving communication goals in superior-subordinate relationships: The multi-functionality of upward maintenance tactics. *Communication Monographs, 58*(3), 289-306.

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

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 leader-member dyad. *Communication Studies, 44,* 254-272.

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(5), 487-499.

Xin, K. R., & Tsui, A. S. (1996). Different strokes for different folks? Influence tactics by asian-american and caucasian-american managers. *Leadership Quarterly Leadership and diversity: I.,* 7(1), 109-132.

Xin, K. R., & Tsui, A. S. (1996). Different strokes for different folks? Influence tactics by asian-american and caucasian-american managers. *Leadership Quarterly Special Issue: Leadership and diversity,* 7(1), 109-132.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (Fourth ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75(2), 132-140.

Yukl, G., Guinan, P. J., & Sottolano, D. (1995). Influence tactics used for different objectives with subordinates, peers, and superiors. *Group & Organization Management,* 20(3), 272-296.

Yukl, G., Kim, H., & Falbe, C. M. (1996). Antecedents of influence outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 81(3), 309-317.