

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Introduction

This section presents an overview of the theory pertaining to organisational influence and its linkages, and considers previous research pertinent to this entire area of study. In more detail, this research reviews downward influence tactics, and their interactions with the antecedents and outcome variables as shown in Figure 1.1. The chapter begins by discussing the key constructs or variables and the related theoretical perspectives. This is followed by the literature review covering the more specific development of earlier related research works that link downward influence tactics with leadership, organisational contexts, subordinates' competence, and role ambiguity. Additionally, the outcomes of various theoretical views are considered.

The first part of the chapter brings into focus the main theories that guide this study, these being: social exchange theory, leadership theory, influence theory, and role theory. Next, a review of the definition and concept of leadership styles, organisational contexts, influence tactics, subordinates' competence, role ambiguity, organisational citizenship behaviour, and satisfaction with supervision are presented. Special emphasis is given in explaining the concept of downward influence tactics as it represents the key aspects of this study. The basis for selecting the leadership styles and organisational contextual variables used as predictors in this study is also discussed and the implications of these styles and variables for downward influence tactics and the resulting relationship

with employees are analysed. The mediating variables such as downward influence tactics, subordinates' competence and role ambiguity are incorporated in this study to demonstrate causal effects, and hence promote a more comprehensive and meaningful study.

The second part of the chapter presents a review of previous studies reported in the literature on either the bivariate or multivariate links between the relevant constructs and variables studied. The findings of the existing research on the various interactions between leadership styles, downward influence tactics, organisational contexts, subordinates' competence, role ambiguity and the outcomes relationship are discussed. The sequence of the previous works is arranged according to the emphasis of the variables investigated by the researchers concerned as conditioned by their specific focus, disciplines, and methodologies. The literature review also summarises the results of the research findings in terms of their agreements, complementarities and contradictions. It is important in providing the basis of and guidance for the overarching approach to the current study, as well as in the framing of the research problems and methodologies.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

It is important to consider some related theories to explain how the conceptual framework from which the model is developed has emerged, and in this respect, the theories of social exchange, leadership, influence, and organisational roles are discussed.

### 2.2.1 Social Exchange Theory

The notion of social exchange theory is derived from the economics, psychology and sociology disciplines, and was developed by Homans (1958) who defined the theory, saying:

“Social behaviour is an exchange of goods, material goods and also non-material ones, such as symbols of approval or prestige. Persons that give much to others try to get much from them, and persons that get much from others are under pressure to give much to them. This process of influence tends to work out at equilibrium to a balance in the exchanges. For a person in an exchange, what he gives may be a cost to him, just as what he gets may be a reward, and this behaviour changes less as the difference of the two, profit, tends to a maximum” (p. 606).

Accordingly, Homans (1961) and Gergen (1969) later conclude that the relationship between the employer and employee involves the capacity to influence one another's behaviour, a practice that usually results in achieving valued outcomes. In short, the relationship comprises of social transactions in which both parties are mutually reciprocate rewards and punishments. Other researchers had similar ideas. Thibaut and Kelly (1959), for example, interpreted social exchange theory as an economic model of human relationships in which the interaction between parties involved was seen as a vehicle for striving for more reward in a relationship, while Blau (1964) stressed that the desire to maximise rewards and minimise losses would result in gaining trust and attraction. It is suggested that both parties should continue to exchange rewards with each other in order to sustain mutual attraction that will lead to prolong relationship.

Despite the fact that these researchers came to the theory from different perspectives, they all tended to agree that the reward incorporated in the social exchange could be in the form of monetary rewards and or non-monetary rewards (Yukl, 2000).

The non-monetary rewards such as support, status and approval, and monetary rewards provided to subordinates by superiors are all signs of exchange. This exchange relationship requires subordinates in return to devote their productive time and expertise to achieve organisational objectives and goals. At certain times, the superior may benefit in part or whole, as for example when the subordinates contribute more than what is stipulated in the employment contract. For instance, subordinates may be more than willing to allocate extra personal time and effort to their jobs and show greater trust and loyalty to their superior, in return for their superior's support or additional resources (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Subordinates' willingness to perform tasks outside their formal role in order to assist their superior in finishing a task on time or to help their co-workers to complete an assignment, are examples of OCB (Williams & Anderson, 1991). And for as long as the benefits arising from the relationship exceed those available elsewhere (Emerson, 1972a, 1972b; Molm & Cook, 1995), the superior will continue to maintain this exchange relationship with subordinates.

In exchange theory, a leader's expectations and perceptions are being transformed into a variety of requests, demands or assignments (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987) and leaders must possess sufficient organisational power to effectively ensure that these requests, demands or assignments are achieved by their subordinates (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Bass (1990a) views the exercise of power as an influence attempt. Hence, it can be postulated that leaders convey their expectations to members via their efforts to influence them. This type of exchange constitutes a basic concept of leadership, that being that leaders use their power and influence to persuade subordinates to do what they want (Bass, 1990a).

Previous researchers have also recognised the importance of exchange relations between leaders and members, acknowledging that resource exchanges between them are limited and various (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). Indeed, in any organisation, it is commonly observed that the superior provides some subordinates with more resources than others and such differences may impact on members' responses in terms of their OCB and satisfaction with supervision.

However, most of the social exchange research focuses on examining factors that affect the outcomes of the exchange relations such as loyalty, contributions, liking and respect (e.g. Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). Due to that trend, there is an omission in the articulation of the social exchange process concerning the interpersonal influence among leaders and members. For instance, leaders influence their members so that their members will return the favours they have received in the future, while members who seek favours from their leaders may feel a debt of gratitude that leads to the development of personal obligation towards the leader. Such feeling of obligation may eventually result in members returning the leaders' favours (Blau, 1964). Therefore, social exchange theory can be used to bridge the segmented influence literatures and focus attention on more important, yet previously unanswered specific issues on leadership and influence tactics used and the effects of these influence tactics on subordinates.

In this study, social exchange approaches to interpersonal relationship are used to better understand some organisational processes such as leadership, influence, satisfaction with supervision, and OCB. Hopefully, the application of the social

exchange framework to study these constructs can help to unify different streams of literature concerning these links.

### **2.2.2. Leadership Theories**

According to Bass (1981, p. 5) “the study of leadership is an ancient art”. Jaffe (2006) emphasises that leadership is one of the most observed but least understood phenomena in this world. Indeed, in this new millennium, managers require leadership skills to perform their organisational roles effectively, it being recognised that managing and leading are two separate activities, the former involving planning, organising, staffing, directing and controlling while the latter is concerned with creating vision, and instilling motivation, trust and loyalty in employees.

The evolution of leadership research can be observed to have occurred over a century with a comprehensive approach from many scholars, and the result that there are various theories (Bass, 1981; Hollander, 1985). The earliest attempt to understand leadership began with the Great Man Theories and was followed by Trait Theories, Behavioural Theories, Contingency Theories, Influence Theories and Relational Theories. All these leadership approaches are still applicable and relevant to the current empirical study of leadership.

In the era of the Great Man Theories, studies focused on determining the distinctive characteristics of the behaviour of a great leader’s behaviour, and researchers at that time generally agreed that an effective leader was born rather than made. A born Great Man was perceived to possess certain heroic leadership and natural abilities to

influence followers, being said to inherit the strength of inborn traits, qualities and abilities.

The distinctive physical or psychological behaviour of a great leader was later explored from the viewpoint of Trait Theory, the argument being made that great leaders could be found if the required traits are identified. Unfortunately, all these previous studies failed to produce a comprehensive list of traits to describe an effective leader, and consequently, leadership researchers continually challenge this approach, with the result that other leadership theories have emerged. In other words, the failure to generate a universal set of leadership traits led researchers to begin to examine what leaders do rather than their traits (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998).

Subsequently, studies were extended to investigate the behavioural aspect of leadership effectiveness, that is to say, how the leader approaches tasks and employees. Essentially, the focus was on whether the leader had a task or relationship style. Later, substantial research efforts were directed to considering the contextual or situational variables that influence the leadership effectiveness, and from these efforts Contingency Theory evolved, according to which leaders analyse their situation or environment and modify their behaviour to improve leadership effectiveness. The main situational variables are the characteristics of followers, the task, and work environment.

Following that, influence theories were introduced to explore the influence process between leaders and followers. Theoretically, these view leadership influence according to the quality and charismatic personality of the leader and not on his or her power position, or formal line of authority. In the late 1970s, leadership studies focused on the relational aspect of how leaders and followers interact and influence each other,

producing the Relational Theories in which the concentration is on the engagement of all parties in the matter of contributing towards the achievement of organisational goals. In this perspective, interpersonal relationships are seen as the most important element of leadership (Komives et al., 1998; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2003).

It is worth noting here that there are numerous popular dichotomous theories of leadership that have been introduced in the past. These begin with the use of ‘initiating structure’ and ‘subordinate consideration’ leadership dimensions proposed by the studies conducted at the Ohio State University and University of Michigan (Fleishman, 1973; Haplin & Winer, 1957; Likert, 1979; Stogdill, 1974). Another similar study by Fiedler (1967) in his development of contingency model claims leadership behaviours as having either a ‘task orientation’ or ‘relationship orientation’, while Hersey and Blanchard (1977) prefer to call these dimensions ‘concern for people’ and ‘concern for task’ behaviour. Initially, leadership theorists viewed these orientations as styles that are acquired through a learning process and that could, therefore, be modified when required. Fiedler (1967), however, suggests that these orientations are nurtured from deep-seated temperaments or traits and are not easily adjusted when desired.

From the discussion it can be seen that an understanding of the characteristics and behaviours that determine leadership effectiveness is essential to researchers, and is especially pertinent to theory development and attempts to understand organisations. It is also important to practitioners who are concerned with assessing and developing leadership potential in organisations. Accordingly, theoretical and empirical work in the leadership domain is now viewed on the continuum of transactional-transformational



leadership behaviours, and researchers have focused on the subordinates' perspectives on these facets of leadership (Bass, 1985a, 1985c; Burns, 1978).

### **2.2.3 Influence Theory**

Theory and research on social influence have developed and advanced through the contributions of scholars such as Jones and colleagues (Jones, 1964; Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas, & Skelton, 1981; Jones & Schaubroeck, 2004), Tedeschi (1981), and Leary and Kowalski (1990). Their bodies of work have articulated the nature of interpersonal influence tactics, its antecedents, boundary conditions and consequences, and the concept of 'social influence' which refers to the power individuals have to exert change in others' attitudes and behaviour has been transferred into the organisational setting. When an individual convinces others to change their attitudes or forces others to conform and comply with expectations regardless of their attitudes, that individual is exerting social influence. The terms 'source' and 'target' are usually coined in the discussion of the social influence process (Tedeschi & Bonoma, 1972), the source being the agent who engages in influence tactics, and the target being the person who is the focus of the influence tactics. In general, the social influence process can be summarised as: (i) the influencer attempts to change the target's perceptions by getting the target to see the benefit of the intended behaviour, and (ii) the influencer tries to gain compliance with behaviours not in the target's interest through other means (Frazier & Summers, 1984, 1986).

The interest in applying interpersonal influence theory to organisational settings started to emerge with the work of Goffman (1955), who introduced the idea of interpersonal influence in the workplace where people manage their self-image to impress others. According to Goffman, in any organisation, people play out roles in efforts to establish a favourable identity that they wish to convey to others with the intention of building a closer relationship. It is interesting to consider that people alter their image according to the situation they are in and the outcomes they wish to accomplish. Since Goffman's early work, this dramaturgical perspective has strongly influenced the evolution of theory and research in interpersonal behaviour.

Additionally, the realisation of the importance of interpersonal influence among superior-subordinate relationship can be seen in the work of Bass (1990a), Kipnis et al. (1980), and Yukl (1998). These scholars all recognised both how pervasive interpersonal influence is in organisational life, and the fact that managers must often work through others to achieve organisational objectives. Thus, the capability to influence others is essential for managers. However, past researchers seem to agree that the influence process is often complex and difficult to predict due to the fact that the effectiveness of an influence attempt is based on the perceptions held by various individuals and the interaction of multiple variables.

Interpersonal influence, in its many forms, is ubiquitous in organisational life. As researchers have continued to pursue an understanding on how organisations function, the topic of influence has received an ever-increasing amount of attention (Cohen & Bradford, 1990; Pfeffer, 1992; Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008). In light of the recognition that organisational leaders must often work through others to accomplish their tasks,

researchers have been trying to fill in many of the gaps in our current knowledge regarding how, when, and why influence is used in organisations. Specifically, the objective has been to establish in what ways individuals at work influence their peers, subordinates and superiors to achieve desired outcomes or obtain important resources (Kipnis, 1976; Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Bonoma, 1973).

The importance of interpersonal influence has been recognised over time and is attested to by a preponderance of studies drawn from numerous literature streams applied to interpersonal influence in various disciplines including management, sociology and psychology (Bass, 1990a; Ferris & Judge, 1991; Frink & Ferris, 1998; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Judge & Bretz, 1994; Yukl, 1994). Fortunately, researchers in these various disciplines have acknowledged the importance of this area of enquiry and sought to address this issue, and subsequently, streams of research work have been related to self-presentation (Jones & Pittman, 1982), persuasion (Eagly & Chaiken, 1984; Petty, Ostrom, & Brock, 1981), impression management (Gardner & Martinko, 1988; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981; Wayne & Ferris, 1990), communication (Cody, MacLaughlin, & Jordan, 1985; Scheneck-Hamlin, Wiseman, & Georgarakos, 1982), bargaining and negotiation (Bazerman & Lewicki, 1983; Pruitt, 1981), influence tactics used for different purpose and objectives (Yukl & Chavez, 2002; Yukl et al., 1995), and organisational politics used to influence policy decisions or the allocation of scarce resources (Clark, 1983; Kacmar & Baron, 1999; Pfeffer, 1992).

The unique disciplinary perspectives have revealed different aspects of influence. For instance, the aspects of dyadic influence have been studied on individual and group levels in organisations. This suggests that research in various disciplines varies with

respect to perceptual perspective between superior and subordinate, and the level of analysis. The management and leadership literature has long recognised the ability to influence employees as an essential quality of successful management since successful influence attempts have an impact upon the outcome of a request. Hence, managerial advancement and success are very dependent on a manager's effective use of influence tactics (Pfeffer, 1981; Yukl, 1998).

Another reason for the attention to influence tactics is that many firms are making concerted efforts to flatten their hierarchies, empower their workers and reconfigure the work to adapt to outside change. As organisations adapt to the forces of change, so too must employees, and as the workforce adapts to the changing needs of organisations, leaders must also know how to manage the new genre of employees. The focus on leaders whose power stems primarily from their position in the organisation is shifting towards a focus on the ability to create highly motivated and committed employees (i.e. to influence others). An inherent dilemma is how to make the transition from a manager who is autocratic, to a leader who uses influence tactics to motivate diverse workgroups with assorted expectations and needs, while fostering self-management and creativity.

Clearly, influence is the essence of leadership as leaders rely on responsive followers in a process of maintaining collective effort and manoeuvring the followers towards the accomplishment of organisational goals. Additionally, businesses tend to measure managerial effectiveness by the manager's ability to influence and motivate employees so that they are committed to completing and achieving the organisational tasks and goals (Bass, 1990a; Yukl, 1998). Thus, today's organisations must recognise the need for new approaches to interpersonal interaction between management and

employees. All in all, leaders must influence people over whom they have little or no authority, or who expect more than orders based on authority. Therefore, knowledge about how the influence tactics work alone and in combination is a key component of success in today's organisations.

#### **2.2.4 Organisational Role Theory**

Organisational Role Theory was originally introduced by Kahn et al. (1964), who suggested that a superior has an expectation of a specific role that a subordinate should play in the organisation. Using the influence approach, the superior can require the subordinate to accept the expectation (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). In this situation, the subordinate's role is developed and defined with reference to a supervisor's expectation. Similarly, a role is defined by Banton (1965) as a set of expectations applicable to an individual holding a specific position in an organisation. These expectations are determined by the role senders and role incumbents in an organisation, and extend to senders outside the organisation. Additionally, other researchers such as Katz and Kahn (1978) have illustrated the role as a fundamental development of a social system, and such a social system can be observed in an organisation. In general, roles in organisations can be expressed as a pattern of behaviours or expectations perceived by the employees (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980). Employees' identity and ability to perform can be seen in the roles that they play within organisations. Therefore, a clear defined role should be described to employees.

Organisation role theory addressed the basic issue that "organisational members accomplish their works through roles" (Graen, 1976, p. 1201) and that these roles must

be clearly defined (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). More specifically, work roles encompass the expectations pertaining to the perceived responsibilities or requirements associated with enacting specific jobs. This association with the job makes it easy for leaders to convey role expectations to their followers and to provide tangible and intangible rewards to those who fulfill these expectations. Likewise, followers hold role expectations of their leaders with respect to how they are to be treated and rewarded if the expectations placed upon them as employees are met. It is said that followers are not passive role recipients, being able to reject, accept or renegotiate roles determined by their leaders. In this situation, there is a dyadic exchange between the leaders and followers in which each party brings to the relationship different kinds of resources for exchange.

This element of exchange creates an interest in applying role theory as a means of understanding a wide range of psychological and behavioural outcomes such as job satisfaction and performance. In particular, researchers have found role variables to include role ambiguity and role conflict, and research on these two concepts has been conducted with their endogenous variables such as job satisfaction (Jackson & Schuler, 1985), and job performance (Abramis, 1994; Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

### **2.2.5 Integrating the Perspectives**

The diversity of empirical research in which influence has been studied, and the inconsistencies in results, have constrained the integration of literature in a meaningful way (Barry & Watson, 1996). The lack of an overarching framework has resulted in an artificially narrow body of work and unnecessary conceptual disagreement concerning types of influence tactics and the effects of influence tactics on others. As a result, study

in the area of leadership has been switched to focus on identifying how managers influence subordinates and the frequency with which managers use influence tactics rather than how influence tactics might be used more broadly (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). And to date, the development of integrated conceptual models that explain how subordinates react to their superiors' influence tactics has received less attention from researchers. In an effort to bring relevant ideas together, this study has the intention to integrate leader influence attempts with leadership theories so that a better understanding of both these theories can be gained.

The integration of influence theory and leadership theory is clearly necessary in order to show how leaders deliver their requests, demands, or assignments using certain leadership styles and influence tactics that can affect subordinates' outcomes in terms of OCB and satisfaction with supervision. Indeed, the integration of perspectives always leads to a more comprehensive or better specified model linking a host of variables as is the case in this study. This integration also highlights several possible mediations of: (i) downward influence tactics on the relation between leadership styles and its outcomes; (ii) subordinates' competence on the link between leadership styles and downward influence tactics or the outcomes; (iii) role ambiguity on the relation between leadership styles and downward influence tactics or the outcomes, and (iv) role ambiguity on the connection between structure and downward influence tactics or the outcomes.

In addition, the OCB comes into this framework by providing a conceptual description of subordinates' performance. Moreover, the basic theoretical perspective for most OCB research lies in the social exchange theory (van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994; Eisenberger, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Shore & Wayne, 1993). This theory

postulated that in any organisations, social interaction exists between employees is based on mutual attraction and understanding, result in unspecified obligations (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). Eventually, employees engage in these unspecified obligations with the organisation or its representatives (their supervisors) will be depicted as OCB behaviours that are arbitrary and can lead to the organisation's success (Organ, 1988). In the long run, a trend of reciprocity evolves, entailing in a perceived balance in the exchange relationship (Blau, 1964; Rousseau, 1989). This theory further suggests that subordinates' OCB may provide a feedback for subsequent leaders' leadership styles and influence tactics. Therefore, accommodating influence and OCB, and integrating them with leadership provides a theoretical basis to describe subordinates' performance. Implicitly, this seems to imply a contingency theory of leadership (Daft, 2008).

## **2.3 The Concept and Definition of Constructs**

The following section describes the concept and definition of relevant constructs proposed in this study. Inevitably these definitions are based on the literatures available to date relating to the subjects.

### **2.3.1 Leadership Styles**

Leadership is defined as the ability to influence others to get things done. It reflects influence relationship behaviour between leaders and followers in a particular situation with the common intention to accomplish the organisation's end results (Bass, 1981; Stogdill, 1948).



In order to have a better understanding of leadership, it is important to look at leadership as a main function that leaders carry out for organisations. Generally, leadership researchers agree that effective leaders should be able to articulate visions, instill trust, belief and loyalty as well as lead the employees' talents directly towards achieving the organisational goals (Bennis, 2002; DePree, 2002; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Levin, 1999; Strange & Mumford, 2002).

There are several well established dichotomy approaches to the classification of leadership styles (Stogdill, 1974; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). This study, however, focuses on the transactional and transformational dichotomy leadership style, since previous investigations have suggested this may be applicable in the exploration of phenomenological-based leadership styles (Misumi, 1985; Misumi & Peterson, 1985), in addition to the affording insights into leader-subordinate communication patterns (Penley & Hawkins, 1985) that shape both parties' influence behaviours. **Phenomenological-based leadership describes the subjective experience of individuals in leadership.** The following sub-sections discuss transactional and transformational leadership styles in some detail.

### **2.3.1.1 Transactional Leadership**

The exchange relationship is the key element reflected in transactional leadership. Transactional leaders demand that their subordinates agree with, accept or comply with their request if they (the subordinates) wish to receive rewards and resources or to avoid punitive action (Burns, 1978; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982). This dyadic exchange type of leadership style has been linked with contingent reward and punishment behaviour and termed as transactional leader behaviour by Bryman (1992).

Originally, the majority of researchers considered the transaction element of leadership as the core characteristic of a successful organisational leadership style, but this changed when transformational leadership was introduced (Bass, 1985a; Burns, 1978; House, 1977). Transactional leadership embodies two types of behaviour. The first is called transactional contingent reward leadership and this clarifies expectations and offers recognition upon the achievement of goals, thus resulting in expected performance (Bass, 1985a). In the past, empirical research has indicated transactional contingent reward leadership to be positively associated with subordinates' commitment, satisfaction and performance (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001; Hunt & Schuler, 1976; Podsakoff, Todor, Grover, & Huber, 1984). The second type is called transactional punishment behaviour that uses punishment if subordinates fail to achieve the goals set by the superior.

The typical manager who adopts a transactional leadership approach tends to identify employees' lower level needs by determining and defining the goals that subordinates need to achieve, stipulating how these are to be achieved, and communicating how successful execution of those tasks will lead to the receipt of desirable job rewards (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991; Bass, 1985b, 1990a; Zaleznik, 1983). In fact, however, this process only helps employees to meet their basic work requirements, and simply maintains the organisational status quo. Moreover, the transactional leader also limits the employees' effort and effectiveness in respect of the realisation of goals, and restricts their job satisfaction (Bass, 1985a). Bass (1986) suggests that transactional leadership is

acceptable as far as it goes, but fundamentally is a prescription for organisational mediocrity.

Additionally, Bass, Avolio, and Goodheim (1987) have labelled transactional leadership as either active or passive. Active management-by-exception involves an interaction between leader and follower that emphasises a more proactive positive exchange. The leader specifies the rules for compliance as well as what constitutes ineffective performance and may punish followers for non-compliance with those rules. This style of leadership implies closely monitoring for deviances, mistakes and errors and then taking corrective action as quickly as possible when these transgressions occur. Such leadership includes identifying the current needs of subordinates, and helping them to address the task and role requirements that result in desired outcomes. By linking individual needs to the leader's expectations and reward, followers may enhance their motivational level.

In contrast, passive management-by-exception allows the status quo to exist as long as the old ways are working. If things go wrong, however, a leader practising passive management-by-exception will take actions that often have a negative connotation. It is this contingency of the punishment that makes the leader exhibit transactional behaviour. Clearly, not all forms of transactional leadership are ineffective. Transactional leaders who engage in contingent reward behaviours are more effective than those who do not (Atwater, Camobreco, Dionne, Avolio, & Lau, 1997). According to MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Rich (2001), transactional leadership studies in general have not provided a convincing account for the criterion variables as initially expected.

### **2.3.1.2 Transformational Leadership**

In response to this shortcoming, numerous scholars have added to the body of research in the effects that exceptional leaders can have on their followers and organisations (Bass, 1985c; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanunga, 1987; House, 1977; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). House and associates (House 1977; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) call it as ‘charismatic leaders’, while Bass and associates (Bass, 1985a, 1990a; Bass & Avolio, 1989) prefer to name them ‘transformational leaders’. In this study, the researcher considers the term transformational leadership to be a broad concept, with charisma as a component of it.

The term transformational leadership was originally coined by Burns (1978) in his exploration of great leader. Since then, transformational leader behaviour has been operationalised and received extensive attention in business industries, health service organisations, and the military (Bass, 1985a, 1990a, 1997, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bycio et al., 1995; Hater & Bass, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Steward, 1994). Transformational leadership refers to leadership that involves individuals, group and or organisations, with the aim of creating substantive change in the attitude of employees, encouraging high workforce morale, and sound organisational direction. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) highlighted that transformational leadership “is made possible when a leader’s end values (internal standards) are adopted by followers thereby producing changes in the attitudes, beliefs and goals of followers” (p. 653). Likewise, Bryman (1992) has stated that “transforming leadership entails both leaders and followers raising each other’s motivation and sense of purpose. This higher purpose is one in which the aims and aspirations of leaders and followers congeal into one. Both leaders and

followers are changed in pursuit of goals which express aspirations in which they can identify themselves” (p. 95).

As stated by Bass (1985b), transformational leader possesses four characteristics namely idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration. The idealised influence characteristic energises subordinates with an inspiring vision. The inspirational motivation behaviours of transformational leader plays the role as an advisor to subordinates to build their self-confidence level to achieve the organisational goal (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Shamir et al., 1993). To be more specific, transformational leaders “build team spirit through their enthusiasm, high moral standards, integrity and optimism and provide meaning and challenge to their followers’ work, enhancing followers’ level of self-efficacy, confidence, meaning and self-determination” (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004, p. 953). Transformational leadership engage in intellectual stimulation to challenge subordinates’ mindset, beliefs and values by having them to re-look into the way they perform tasks and stimulate them to try new or creative approaches to their work (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Lastly, transformational leadership provides subordinates with individualised consideration by giving personal attention to their higher level needs and motivating them to take on more challenging role such that they are able to develop their full potential (Kark & Shamir, 2002).

Although transformational leadership components (Bass, 1985a; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; House, 1977) somehow complement one another, each specifies a dissimilar leader behaviour. Podsakoff et al. (1990) identified six key dimensions of transformational leadership behaviours, these being: articulating a compelling vision of

the organisation, providing an appropriate model consistent with the vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals, having high performance expectations, providing individualised support and intellectual stimulation. A detailed explanation of transformational leadership behaviour is shown in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Characteristics of Transformational Leadership**

Articulating a Vision	Behaviour on the part of a manager that is aimed at the identification and expression of a clear vision of the future.
Providing an Appropriate Model	Behaviour on the part of the manager that sets an example for subordinates to follow that is consistent with both the values the manager espouses and the goals of the organisation.
Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals	Behaviour on the part of the manager aimed at promoting co-operation among subordinates and getting them to work together toward a common goal, even at the expense of their personal goals and aspirations. In other words, leaders exhibiting this behaviour emphasise collective identities and encourage self-sacrifice for the sake of the group.
High Performance Expectation	Behaviour that demonstrates high expectations for excellence, quality and or high performance on the part of the employees.
Providing Individualised Support	Behaviour on the part of a manager that indicates that he or she respects subordinates and oversees their individual development with concern about their personal feelings and needs.
Intellectual Stimulation	Behaviour on the part of a manager that encourages employees to re-examine assumptions about their work and to find creative ways of improving their performance.

Source: Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990)

Transformational leadership is of great interest to this study due to its popularity and attractiveness, and the fact that it has been found to be consistently associated with superior performance (Barling et al., 1996; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), increased morale-related outcomes such as self-efficacy (Kirkpartick & Locke, 1996), affective commitment (Barling et al., 1996), intrinsic motivation (Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001), and trust in the leader (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Positive relationships have also been consistently reported between individual, group and organisational performance, and the ratings followers give their leaders on these transformational leadership behaviours. Typically, these findings have been explained as showing that leader behaviours cause basic values, beliefs and attitudes of followers to align with organisational collective interests (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Transformational leadership has received more empirical research in organisational behaviour studies than have all other leadership theories (Bass, 1998; Judge & Bono, 2000; Lowe & Gardner, 2000). Transformational leadership can be viewed as building on earlier theories of leadership in a constructive and integrative manner to explain more fully the range of behaviours and outcomes precipitated by various styles of leadership. The concept of transformational leadership posits that most leaders engage in transactional forms of leader behaviour by providing feedback contingent on performance, but exceptional leaders go beyond this and also engage in transformational forms of leader behaviour. Although it is said that transactional leadership can produce positive effects on employees, transformational leadership can engender even greater results. Indeed, Waldman, Bass, and Einstein (1985) have

confirmed that transformational leader behaviours amplify the impact of leader effectiveness over and above what could be achieved through transactional leadership alone, because the transformational leader recognises and exploits employees' higher-level needs. This suggests that transformational leadership is more than transactional leadership, having a stronger positive effect on employees' attitudes towards their work and motivating them to perform beyond their initial performance, goals and objectives (Bass, 1985a; Burns, 1978; Tirchy & Devanna, 1986). According to Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, and Chen (2005), transformational leadership theories are still at early stages of specifying the developmental mediating processes between leader behaviour and outcomes (Dvir et al., 2002).

### **2.3.1.3 Comparing Transformational and Transactional Leadership**

The differences between transformational and transactional leadership behaviour as highlighted by several researchers are described here. Initially, Burns (1978) distinguished the main feature of transformational and transactional leadership by looking at the processes by which leaders motivate and appeal to their followers' values and emotions. The transactional leader is said to be able to motivate followers by appealing to their self-interest and this type of relationship is entailed in the exchange relationship, whereby follower compliance is exchanged for expected rewards. There is no common pursuit of higher order purpose and this may lead to minimum production of organisational outcomes. The transformational leader, however, is able to raise the level of motivation of their followers beyond exchange values and thus achieve a higher level



of performance. Burns (1978) concluded that transformational and transactional leadership lie at the opposite ends of the leadership continuum.

Coming from Burns' (1978) work, Bass and colleagues (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990) view transactional and transformational leadership as a 'Two Factor Theory' of leadership. According to Bass and colleagues, transformational and transactional leadership consist of two conceptually independent but related dimensions of leadership. Transformational leaders differ from transactional leaders in that they do not merely recognise the needs of followers, but also attempt to elevate those needs from lower to higher levels of individual development. Transformational leadership motivates followers to do more than they originally expected or to even exceed their original expectations.

In other words, transformational leadership augments transactional leadership by focusing on the development of followers as well as addressing the goals of the leader, follower, group, and organisation (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transactional leadership is generally sufficient for maintaining the status quo, but transformational leadership is development-oriented for the purpose of change (Bass, 1985a; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Hater & Bass, 1988). As highlighted by Bass and colleagues, the success of a transformational leader is demonstrated both by increased performance outcomes and the degree to which followers develop their own leadership potential and skills (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Empirical works in the past have suggested that transformational leadership has positive impact on work satisfaction, and subordinates' perceptions of

transformational leadership effectiveness are beyond the levels which transactional leadership can achieve (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Podsakoff et al. (1990), however, view transformational leadership differently from transactional leadership behaviour from three perspectives. First, the authors seem to agree that transformational leadership behaviour should be more committed to changing the basic values, goals and aspirations of followers so that they can perform their tasks consistent with the leader's vision as opposed to the expectation that they will be rewarded according to their efforts. Secondly, the behaviours through which transformational leaders influence their followers are different. Indeed, Podsakoff et al. (1990) have documented that transformational leaders get their followers to perform above and beyond expectations by articulating a vision, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, providing individualised support and intellectual stimulation and expressing high performance expectations. These forms of behaviour are quite different from contingent reward and punishment behaviour, which is typically associated with transactional leadership. Thus, the forms of transformational leadership behaviour are distinct from the forms of transactional leadership behaviour and the processes through which they work are different too. Finally, transformational behaviour tends to be more proactive in terms of influencing subordinates than transactional behaviour that tends to be more reactive (MacKenzie et al., 2001). In contrast to transactional leadership, transformational leadership influences followers through a process of internalisation and or identification rather than instrument compliance (Kelman, 1958).

#### **2.3.1.4 Augmenting Effects of Transformational Leadership**

In response, theories of leadership development are constantly exploring the augmenting effects of leadership. This started with the pioneering work done by Bass and Avolio (1993) who conceptualise the leadership model as one involving augmentation effect. Augmenting means that transactional leadership is not a substitute for transformational leadership but rather a complement to it (Bass, 1985a). Bass and Avolio (1993) propose that “a key concept of this model of leadership involves the augmentation effect. The augmentation effect predicts that by measuring transformational leadership behaviours, one can achieve a higher level of precision in predicting extra levels of effort than if one simply rely on previous models of transactional leadership” (p. 53).

Of a similar mind, Waldman et al. (1990) suggested that “although conceptually distinct, contingent reward and transformational or charismatic leadership both may be displayed by the same individual leader. Thus, contingent reward behaviour can be viewed as the basis of effective leadership and transformational or charismatic leadership can be viewed as adding to that base for greater leader effectiveness” (p. 384). In fact, there are several empirical studies supporting the augmenting effects of transformational leadership behaviour, and such studies have been conducted in a wide variety of both business and non-business environments (Avolio et al., 1988; Bass, 1990a; Hater & Bass, 1988; Shamir et al., 1993; Waldman et al., 1990; Yammarino & Bass, 1990a, 1990b).

### 2.3.2 Influence

Influence refers to any behaviour that causes a change in another's behaviour, attitudes or cognitions (Atuahene-Gima & Li, 2000; Raven, 1992; Raven & Rubin, 1983; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2002; Zimbardo & Leippe, 1992). Rost (1993) terms influence as “an interactive process in which people attempt to convince other people to believe and or act in certain ways” (p. 157). Willer, Lovaglia and Markovsky (1997) view influence as “socially induced modification of a belief, attitude or expectation effected without recourse to sanctions’ (p. 573). The American Heritage Dictionary (1992) defines influence as “power affecting a person, thing or course of events, especially one that operates without any direction or apparent effect” or “power to sway or affect based on prestige, wealth, ability or position” (p. 926).

Lacayo (1996) proposes that “to have influence is to gain assent, not just obedience; to attract a following, not just an entourage; to have imitators, not just subordinates” (p. 83). The author further suggests that “influence is generally more popular than power. When influence is in the right hands, its effects can be seem agreeable in a subtle sense of the word, as something we assent to” (p. 83).

Scholars such as Kipnis et al. (1980) and Yukl and Tracey (1992) have developed a simplified definition of influence. According to them, influence occurs when an influence agent is able to alter the target's perceptions by getting the target to see the advantages of the intended behaviour. Changes of behaviour can be in the form of beliefs, attitudes and values. It can also be interpreted as a process by which a person's behaviour is attuned to convince the other person to accept the recommendations, advice, beliefs and values (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Hughes, Gannett, & Curphy, 2002).

Influence can be applied at organisational level (top management, middle management, and lower down), and the direction of influence can be observed as upward, lateral and downward. For example, a superior will make sure his or her subordinates submit their tasks on time; colleagues influence each other when they ask for favours, and subordinates sometimes engage in upward influence to obtain resources needed to perform the required tasks.

In any organisations, influence is an important process because organisational members attempt to influence each other in various work situations to achieve organisational goals. Pfeffer (1992), in exploring the interpersonal influence, reported that organisations are social settings in which people are influenced by each other. Pfeffer reiterates that understanding the basic interpersonal influence process enables an influencer to consider some strategy in exercising his or her influence.

The influence process comprises three major components: (i) the influence tactics applied; (ii) the agent's influence skill, and (iii) members' perception of influence tactics used. However, the responses of the target persons are based on their evaluation of the situation and the consequences likely to be associated with their behaviour. Understanding the influence process and the influence tactics can be a powerful tool for managers wishing to succeed in managing people in the organisations. As highlighted by Fable and Yukl (1992), "it is an advantage for a manager to know which influence tactics have the highest likelihood of success" (p. 651). Similarly, Mintzberg (1983) contends that the ability to influence others is at the very heart of organisational life. Hence, the more the managers understand their managerial skill of using influence, the more they need to know the range of influence tactics available so that they can choose the most

effective approach (Pfeffer, 1992). Moreover, Yukl et al. (1995) mention that the manager would gain the advantage of understanding how each influence tactic can be used effectively.

### **2.3.2.1 Influence Tactics**

Influence tactics describe a specific kind of influence behaviour an individual employs to influence superiors, co-workers or subordinates in organisations. The influence agent (superior) uses a different type of influence tactics to communicate his or her requests to the influence target (subordinates). For instance, the influence agent could assign a task to the influence target, demand performance improvement from the influence target, request the influence target's advice or help, ask for resources (including information) and/or solicit support from the influence target for a proposal initiated by the influence agent (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Influence tactics are the medium through which the influence agent converts power into behaviours (Yukl, 2002) or which serve as a means of facilitating individual co-operation.

Influence tactics as a phenomenon has been identified in organisational behaviour and psychology literature. For example, Spiro and Perreault (1979) examine influence strategy, Boyle and Dwyer (1995) study influence tactics scales, Kipnis et al., (1980) explore power and influence to understand managerial effectiveness and suggest researchers look into particular forms of influence tactics used by leader to exercise influence over followers (Yukl, 2002), rather than focusing exclusively on power as a source of potential influence.

The most common form of influence behaviour in organisations is a ‘simple request’ based on a legitimate tactic, that is to say, a request to subordinate to comply with a simple request relevant to work and to do so effectively. However, if the request is irrelevant and difficult to deliver, the subordinates’ reaction is likely to be resistance. Other influence tactics found in literature are: silent authority, assertiveness, exchange, coalition formation, upward appeals, ingratiation or impression management, persuasion and information control. The description is summarised in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2: Types of Influence Tactics in Organisations**

Influence Tactics	Description
Silent Authority	The silent authority happens when a person has the legitimate power to make the target person comply with his or her request to complete a task. The application of this influence strategy is without negotiation, threats, persuasion, if the task is within the job scope of the target person. It is most commonly used in high context society where the power distance is high. Employees’ compliance with their supervisor’s requests is due to the superior’s higher authority and power.
Assertiveness	Assertiveness involves actively applying legitimate and coercive power through pressure or threats to influence others. Forms of assertiveness include constant reminders, checking and using threats of sanctions to gain the target’s compliance.
Exchange	Promising benefits or resources in exchange for the target person’s compliance of requester’s request. Reciprocity is the

	key theme in exchange tactics - that is, the target person should return favour to those who have assisted him or her before (Gouldner, 1960).
Coalition Formation	Forming a group that attempts to influence others by pooling the resources and power of its members in order to have more influence. If the membership of informal group is formed from various levels in the organisation then the proposed coalition can be accepted by other members (Terry, Hogg, & White, 1999).
Upward Appeals	Gaining support from one or more people with higher authority or expertise. Upward appeals can be formed from a formal alliance with informal support from higher authority.
Ingratiation or Impression Management	Ingratiation or impression management is the soft skill of influence tactics. Ingratiation refers to an attempt to increase liking by or perceived similarity to, some targeted person.
Persuasion	Using logical arguments, factual evidence and emotional appeals to convince people of the value of a request.
Information Control	Explicitly manipulating someone else's access to information for the purpose of changing his or her attitudes and or behaviour.

Source: McShane and Von Glinow (2005). Organisational Behaviour, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.

Research into influence tactics has been extensive. For many types of influence attempts, influence behaviour called 'proactive influence tactics' has been regularly studied by researchers in the management and leadership literature (Erez, Rim, & Keider, 1986; Jones & Pittman, 1982; Kipnis et al., 1980; Porter, Allen, & Angle, 1981; Schilit & Locke, 1982; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). The study of



proactive influence tactics has been predominantly guided by Kipnis et al. (1980), who began by exploring the tactics used by people in organisations to influence their superiors, peers and subordinates. Earlier work had focused on determining the precise tactics used to convert power into influence styles by people in organisational settings (Kipnis & Consentino, 1969; Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971; Mechanic, 1962; Mowday, 1978; Wortman & Linsenmeier, 1977). The sample used in the study by Kipnis et al. (1980) comprised 165 part-time working students who described how they influenced their boss (n = 62), co-workers (n = 49) or subordinates (n = 54). In the initial study, from the qualitative data collected, the authors were able to identify 370 influence tactics and subsequently classified into 14 categories. Then, in their second study, Kipnis and colleagues (1980) developed a 58-item questionnaire after rewriting the 370 influence tactics. Finally, eight dimensions of influence were identified using factor analysis. There are assertiveness, ingratiation or friendliness, rationality, sanctions, exchange or bargaining, upward appeals, blocking and coalitions. Definitions of these tactics are shown in Table 2.3.

**Table 2.3: Typology of Influence Tactics – Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980)**

Assertiveness	An attempt to influence the subordinate by using a forceful manner to get what one wants.
Ingratiation	Using behaviours designed to increase the target's liking of oneself to make oneself appear friendly in order to get what one wants.
Rationality	An attempt to use data and information to make a logical argument supporting one's request.
Sanctions	Use of power inherent in the organisation to back up the influence attempt.

Exchange	An attempt to influence subordinates by means of negotiation and exchange of benefits or favours.
Upward Appeals	A tactic that relies on the chain of command or people higher up in the organisation who have power over the subordinate.
Blocking	An attempt to stop the target from carrying out some action by impeding his or her progress.
Coalitions	Mobilising other people in the organisation to assist supervisors in influence their subordinates.

Source: Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980)

Subsequently, Kipnis and associates (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988, Kipnis et al., 1984; Kipnis et al., 1980) extended their earlier study to group the managers' influence styles into three types, these being: (i) shotgun managers – those who use all types of influence tactics, (ii) tacticians – those who apply more reasoning or rational, and (iii) bystanders – those who prefer not to use any influence tactics. **As reported, there is a less favourable rating on individuals who engaged in shotgun styles than those using tactician styles. This is because the shotgun influencers utilise all types of influence tactics excessively with heavy emphasis on assertiveness. Unlike, tactician influencers who display moderate amounts of influence tactics, but focus on reasoning or rational tactics.**

The influence typology produced by Kipnis et al. (1980) has represented a wide segment of the influence tactic literature and received widespread acceptance, it being the most cited typology in the development of organisational influence studies. Later research on this typology has, however, eliminated two tactics (sanctions and blocking) from the original list of eight because of conceptual problems and infrequent use (Kipnis

& Schmidt, 1983, 1988; McFarland, 2000; Yukl & Fable, 1990). These results were later verified by Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Lepsinger, & Lucia, 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). That said, the development by Kipnis et al. (1980) of the agent instrument called Profile Organisation Influence Strategy (POIS) has been used in many studies (Deluga, 1988b, 1991; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Thacker & Wayne, 1995; Wayne, Liden, Graef, & Ferris, 1997).

Besides the influence tactics put forth by Kipnis et al. (1980), there are also contributions from several other researchers who have explored the influence behaviour of managers. Jones and Pittman (1982) identify influence tactics in terms of self-presentation tactics which consist of five facets: ingratiation, self promotion, intimidation, exemplification and supplication. Ingratiation is to display oneself in a manner as to be liked by others, self promotion describes an attempt to create an appearance of competence or capability of completing a task, intimidation is making oneself appear to be dangerous or capable of doing harm, exemplification is making oneself seem to have moral value, and supplication means presenting oneself in such a way that can garner sympathy. Although the categorisation by Jones and Pittman included a total of five self-presentation tactics, only self-promotion has received substantial attention in the literature. Researchers have continued to use self-promotion in discussing the type of influence behaviour that can present a person in a positive way (Ferris & Judge, 1991; Judge & Bretz, 1994).

In a later study by Dosier, Case, and Keys (1988), a structured interview process was used to examine seventeen (17) categories of influence tactics in a study of downward influence attempts by asking 257 undergraduates to describe managers'

influence tactics in terms of success or failure. One way chi-square analysis was used to test the categorised responses. Their findings generally supported the prediction of potential influence success at the beginning of new task assignments, while influence failure was linked with an attempt to eliminate subordinates' retaliation against rules. The authors concluded that influence attempts in relation to threatening tactics are more related to influence failure than success. Unsuccessful influence attempts tend to negatively affect the interpersonal relationships.

Subsequently, Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) replicated the study conducted by Kipnis et al. (1980) and developed new items to measure the same sub-scales. Initially, Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) objected to the popular Kipnis et al. (1980) typology on the grounds that it was theoretically inappropriate. They claimed that influence tactics vary as a function of the relationship between the target and the agent and that combining three referents (bosses, co-workers and subordinates) in the same study makes it difficult to interpret the results. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) later conducted four different studies in order to refine the measurement instrument development by Kipnis et al. (1980) for upward influence attempts only. They used exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis and their efforts resulted in identifying six factors: assertiveness, ingratiation, reason, bargaining, higher authority, and coalition.

Extending from earlier findings, Yukl and colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Falbe, & Youn, 1993; Yukl et al., 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) have conducted several studies to develop a more comprehensive set of influence dimensions using approaches such as survey questionnaires and influence incidents from both the agent and target perspectives. They found nine influence tactics that are relevant for managers to use to

influence others in organisations, and particularly in the study by Yukl and Tracey (1992) who examine managers' influence tactics and task commitment by using their Influence Behaviour Questionnaire (IBQ). Results showed that consultation, inspirational appeals, and rational persuasion are generally more effective in generating task commitment than tactics such as pressure, coalition and legitimating. The study supported the direction that some influence tactics are more successful than others and that managers who understand this difference may be more effective.

Subsequently, Yukl et al. (1993) explored the nine influence tactics in terms of their effectiveness as standalone tactics or in combination with other tactics. Their study was driven by the idea that it would be necessary to use several tactics, rather than just one in order to reduce resistance as little was known about the influence behaviour at that time. The study demonstrates that direction differences were significant for all nine influence tactics and that sequencing of the use of tactics is often significant. Important findings are: pressure tactics were used more often as a follow-up to earlier influence attempts and coalition tactics were the least preferred tactics a manager would use.

Yukl et al. (1995) sought to re-affirm the influence direction and objective by using the nine influence tactics identified by Yukl and Falbe (1990). They found that all nine tactics were applicable to any objective required but not all managers were able to best employ influence tactics in a singular form or in combination. Yukl et al. (1996) add to this area of research by demonstrating that tactics, agent's position power, and content factors such as interesting assignment or objective were perceived to act independently to affect the outcomes. An important conclusion of their study was that power and influence are separate and independent factors.

Later, Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Seifert, 2002; Yukl, Chavez, & Seifert, 2005) identified two more new influence tactics - collaboration and apprising - that made up a total of eleven proactive influence tactics. They used field studies, incident studies, and laboratory methods to test the validity of the additional two influence tactics. They found collaboration and apprising to be independent of, and different from, the other nine influence tactics across all three research methods, concluding that all items on the list of eleven influence tactics are relevant for influencing subordinates, peers and superiors in large organisations. The definitions of the proactive influence tactics are given in Table 2.4.

**Table 2.4: The Proactive Influence Tactics of Yukl (2002)**

Rational Persuasion	The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show a proposal or request is feasible and relevant for attaining important task objectives.
Apprising	The agent explains how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or help advance the target person's career.
Inspirational Appeals	The agent makes an appeal to values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person's emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal.
Consultation Tactics	The agent encourages the target to suggest improvements in a proposal or to help plan an activity or change for which the target person's support and assistance are desired.
Exchange Tactics	The agent offers an incentive, suggests an exchange of favours or indicates willingness to reciprocate at a later time if the target

	will do what the agent requests.
Collaboration	The agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.
Personal Appeals	The agent asks the target to carry out a request or support a proposal out of friendship or asks for a personal favour before saying what it is.
Ingratiation Tactics	The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an influence attempt or expresses confidence in the target's ability to carry out a difficult request.
Legitimizing Tactics	The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify authority referring to rules, formal policies or official documents.
Pressure Tactics	The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking or persistent reminders to influence the target person.
Coalition	The agent seeks the aid of others to persuade the target to do something or uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree.

Source: Yukl (2002). Leadership in Organisations, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition.

To sum up the major findings of the research work undertaken by Yukl and his associates, consultation tactics, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals and ingratiation tactics are the most frequently used influence tactics, while exchange tactics is used least frequently in any direction of influence attempts and objectives. In addition, the authors present a dyadic influence model that reflects a manager's use of influence tactics based on his or her perception of the situation. For example, a manager's selection of influence

tactics reflects the dyadic relationship between the manager and individual member, which is predicated on situational and member's characteristics.

There are other researchers suggest considering certain meta-categories of influence tactics that may reflect the influence strategies used by individuals instead of focusing on a tactic-by-tactic examination of influence use (Berger, 1985; Deluga, 1991; Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988, 1985, 1983; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1987). Following this suggestion, several survey studies using a wide meta-category of influence tactics rather than the specific tactics have been conducted. These meta-categories of influence tactics have been characterised as reflecting hard strategies, soft strategies and rational strategies (e.g., Deluga, 1991; Farmer, Maslyn, Fedor, & Goodman, 1997; Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985, 1988).

Due to that, it has been proposed that groupings of influence tactics in this typology may reflect several overarching, higher-order strategies (Barry & Shapiro, 1992; Deluga, 1991; Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985). Hard influence tactics include pressure, coalitions, upward appeals, assertive, invoking legitimate authority, and the use of exchange tactics in a manipulative manner (Deluga, 1991; Farmer et al., 1997; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985). Soft influence tactics include the use of ingratiation, consultation and inspirational appeals (Deluga, 1991; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985), while rational strategies on the other hand, focus on managers' use of persuasive arguments, logical explanations and supporting information (Deluga, 1991; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985; Farmer et al., 1997).

The hard influence approach represents the least used tactics (Falbe & Yukl, 1992), and is generally associated with formal authority, but in downward attempts, the



superior might choose hard tactics when the probability of obtaining the goal is low (Deluga, 1991), or to signal a poor working relationship with a subordinate (Farmer et al., 1997). Also, subordinates will view their superior's use of hard tactics favourably when the intention is to achieve organisational outcomes (Church & Waclawski, 1999). Notably, little empirical research has examined these competing higher order factor structures, with the exception of one study by Farmer et al. (1997). Unfortunately, there has been no direct empirical evidence concerning this categorisation, although Barry and Shapiro (1992) and Deluga (1991) have reviewed it in the beginning.

Another typology of influence tactics identified in the literature in a variety of disciplines is that of Wayne and Ferris (1990) which refers to influence tactics used in impression management, and which they call 'supervisor-focused' and 'job-focused'. Supervisor-focused is termed as ingratiation tactics or other enhancement communication that is used by individuals to control the impressions that others form on them with the intention of being liked (Kipnis et al., 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Wayne & Liden, 1995). These tactics are effective in gaining positive outcomes from the target. Job-focused tactics refer to self-promotion or self-presentation behaviours (Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994), and involve manipulating information related to job performance through enhancements, entitlements, excuses and self-serving distortions in efforts to appear competent. Tedeschi and Melburg (1984) add that individuals use self-promotion tactics to achieve some immediate objective such as higher performance ratings. Other taxonomies of influence tactics appear in Table 2.5.

**Table 2.5: Taxonomies of Influence Tactics**

Schilit and Locke (1982)	Erez and Rim (1982)	Erez, Kim, and Keider (1986)	Ansari and Kapoor (1987)	Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990)	Noris, Sager, and Kumar (1996)
Ingratiation	-	Ingratiation	Ingratiation	Ingratiation	Ingratiation
Assertiveness	-	Assertiveness	-	Assertiveness	Assertiveness
-	-	Blocking	Blocking	-	-
Sanctions	Sanctions	Sanctions	-	-	-
Rationality	Rationality	Rational Persuasion	Rationality	Rationality	Rationality
Exchange	Exchange	Exchange	-	Exchange	Exchange
Upward Appeals	Upward Appeals	Upward Appeals	Upward Appeals	Upward Appeals	Upward Appeals
Coalition	-	Coalition	-	Coalition	Coalition
Adhere to Rules	-	-	-	-	-
-	Clandestine	-	-	-	-

**2.3.2.2 Effectiveness of Influence Tactics**

The effectiveness of different influence tactics has been considered in a number of studies but few of the findings have been significant and the results have not been consistent across the studies (e.g., Case et al., 1988; Dosier et al., 1988; Keys, Case, Miller, Curran, & Jones, 1987; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1978; Schilit & Locke, 1982). For example, Mowday (1978) investigated the overall effectiveness of influence behaviours among elementary school principals, comparing self-rated reports of

the principal's use of five influence tactics with their immediate supervisor's reporting of ratings on how effectively the principals exercised influence. Only one tactic - information distortions - is significantly related to ratings of the effectiveness of the principals. Falbe and Yukl (1992) however, found that inspirational appeals and consultation tactics are the most effective tactics, the least effective ones being pressure, legitimating, and coalition tactics. Rational persuasion, ingratiation, personal appeals, and exchange tactics are rated as intermediate in effectiveness. The use of influence tactics can be more complex when they are used in combinations. However, Yukl and Tracey (1992) found that inspirational appeals and consultation tactics could be most effective when used alone. Rational persuasion was much more effective if combined with consultation, inspirational appeals, or ingratiation tactics. Case et al., (1988) reported similar findings - that rational persuasion, when used together with strong support and persistence, was an effective influence method in upward influence efforts.

Schilit and Locke (1982) used critical incidents to study successful or unsuccessful use of upward influence attempts and collected the incidents from the viewpoint of the agent (subordinate) and the target (boss), identifying eighteen distinct tactics by subjective grouping. The author compared the frequency of use for each of the tactic with successful and unsuccessful influence attempts but the results were not consistent across the two perspectives. The inconsistency of the results was justified by the authors by referral to several comments on the early studies of influence tactics. The first concerns earlier research that did not consider the determinants of the outcome's success such as why the same influence tactic worked in one situation and not in another. Secondly, most of the studies only examined the use of influence in one direction. There

are many reasons why a particular tactic may work in one direction but not another. Thirdly, criticism made by Yukl and Tracey (1992) about the lack of appropriate criteria to determine tactic effectiveness, and that an immediate outcome measure such as target commitment is more likely to be affected by the agent's influence behaviour than is a distant measure of overall performance, such as performance ratings. The same authors also noted that while critical incident studies used an immediate outcome measure, this measure was dichotomised as successful versus unsuccessful, thereby reducing the probability of finding any effect of influence tactics on outcomes. Finally, there is no consensus on the number of relevant influence tactics. For example, Kipnis et al. (1980) identified eight tactics, Yukl and Tracey (1992) identified nine tactics, Yukl (2002) identified eleven different tactics, Schilit and Locke (1982) identified eighteen tactics, Keys et al. (1987) found eleven influence tactics, Dosier et al. (1988) identified seventeen tactics and Case et al. (1988) investigated twenty-one tactics in the researchers' areas of interest.

### **2.3.2.3 Direction of Influence Tactics**

Studies on influence tactics have found three directions of influence tactics that may be applicable in any organisation (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993; Yukl et al., 1992). The directional of influence tactics (upward, lateral and downward) demonstrates that certain tactics are mainly used in a specific direction (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). For instance, Kipnis et al. (1980) found that rationality, friendliness, assertiveness, bargaining, higher authority and coalition are mainly used in upward direction whereas, blocking and sanctions are

commonly applied in downward or lateral directions. Yukl and Tracey (1992) posit that exchange, pressure, ingratiation and legitimating tactics are used more in a downward and lateral direction than in an upward fashion. A number of studies (e.g. Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993) conducted using survey methods or descriptions of influence incidents have supported the prediction of Yukl and Tracey (1992).

Kipnis et al. (1980) and Yukl and associates (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1996; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) found that rational persuasion is the most preferred tactic regardless of direction. Both research teams tend to agree with the fact that the use of particular tactics in any direction is affected by the leader's own power base and resources as well as the organisation's culture and norms.

Other studies that have examined directional differences in the use of various influence tactics have found moderately consistent results with just a few discrepancies that may reflect differences in how the tactics were operationally defined and measured (Erez et al., 1986; Gravenhorst & Boonstra, 1998; Kipnis et al., 1980; Savard & Rogers, 1992; Xin & Tsui, 1996). A summary of findings of Yukl and Tracey on the directional of influence tactics appears in Table 2.6.

**Table 2.6: Direction of Influence Tactics**

Influence Tactics	Directional use of Tactics	Sequencing Results	Used Alone or in Combination	Likely Effectiveness
Rational Persuasion	Widely used in all directions	Used more for initial request	Used frequently both ways	High
Inspirational Appeals	More down than up or lateral	No difference	Used most with other tactics	High
Consultation	More down and lateral than up	No difference	Used most with other tactics	High
Collaboration	More down and lateral than up	Not studied	Not studied	High
Apprising	More down and lateral than up	Not studied	Not studied	Moderate
Ingratiation	More down and lateral than up	Used more for initial request	Used most with other tactics	Moderate
Exchange	More down and lateral than up	Used most for immediate follow-up	Used both ways	Moderate
Personal Appeals	More lateral than down or up	Used more for initial request	Used both ways	Moderate

Coalition	More lateral and up than down	Used most for delayed follow-up	Used both ways	Low
Legitimizing	More down and lateral than up	Used most for immediate follow-up	Used most with other tactics	Low
Pressure	More down and lateral than up	Used most for delayed follow-up	Used both ways	Low

Source: Yukl (2006). Leadership in Organisations, 6th Edition.

#### **2.3.2.4 Downward Influence Tactics**

Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl, 1998; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) have examined a variety of downward influence tactics available to leaders including inspirational appeals, consultation, exchange, and pressure tactics. The ability to exert influence on the decisions made by a superior is an important objective, because the way in which superiors persuasively frame their downward influence tactics has been shown to impact performance ratings (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971), organisational influence (Floyd & Wooldridge, 1997), promotability (Thacker & Wayne, 1995), job effectiveness (Yukl & Tracey, 1992) and supervisors' liking of the employee (Wayne & Ferris, 1990).

Downward influence tactics has received less conceptual and empirical attention across the various behavioural literatures than has upward influence in management and leadership disciplines (Deluga, 1991; Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Porter et al., 1981). Part

of the reason for this increased interest in studying downward influence tactics mirrors the shifts in power distributions in many organisations. As organisations have downsized and flattened to meet the demands of competitive environments, employees in some firms have been 'empowered', with more decision-making authority vested in lower level employees (Cotton, 1993).

Coupled with increased competitive pressure requiring employees' involvement and empowerment to meet the need for more innovation and more productivity (Gustavsen, 1986), it seems likely that managers will have to acquire effective influence skills to convince their subordinates to perform beyond job duty. Moreover, people today are better-educated and more articulate. They can no longer be commanded in the same way as before, and there needs to be much more employee involvement and participation at work (Stewart, 1994). Thus, a better understanding of downward influence tactics will ultimately benefit many organisations.

The focus on the downward influence tactics used by superiors in respect of their subordinates is essential for effective management. In other words, to be effective, a manager must influence others to carry out requests, support proposals and implement decisions. The success of an attempt by the superior to influence the subordinates depends to a great extent on the downward influence tactics used by the superior. The proactive downward influence is used to convince subordinates to carry out an immediate request, especially, in situations where the superior has little authority over subordinates.

The researcher has chosen the downward influence tactics proposed by Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl 2002; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; 1992; Yukl & Seifert, 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) as the variable of this study, since this particular typology of downward



influence tactics is among the most popular used in research. To-date, the influence tactics typology offered by Yukl and his colleagues has received the most attention and has been the only typology that has prompted more research in the field of organisational influence (Aguinis, Nesler, Hosoda, & Tedeschi, 1994; Barbuto, Fritz, & Marx, 2002; Ceasar & Gardner, 2004; Charbonneau, 2004; Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Sparrowe et al., 2006; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993; Yukl et al., 1995; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). More specifically, the work of Yukl and his colleagues led them to identify the following tactics which are the primary tactics used by leaders in the downward direction.

#### **2.3.2.5 Typologies of Downward Influence Tactics**

The typologies of downward influence tactics that is used in this study deserve further elaboration. Clear distinction between them can be understood.

##### **(i) Inspirational Appeals**

A superior makes an emotional request or proposal to subordinates by appealing to their values and ideals, or by affirming belief in their ability to complete a task, thereby increasing their confidence. Inspirational appeals use the subordinate's values, ideals, aspirations and emotions as a basis for gaining commitment to a request or proposal (Yukl, 1990, 2000; Yukl & Steifert, 2002). Inspirational appeals appear feasible for downward influence attempts for gaining the commitment of someone to work on a new task or project (Erez et al., 1986; Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). For instance, such appeals seem to be most appropriate for influencing someone to (i) support an

innovative proposal or change in strategy; (ii) accept a difficult task or assignment; or (iii) increase efforts on a task for which success is in doubt (Kipnis et al., 1980). Thus, managers have more opportunity to use inspirational appeals with subordinates than with peers or superiors in an attempt to influence them.

## **(ii) Consultation Tactics**

A superior seeks subordinates' participation in decision-making or in implementing a proposed policy, strategy or change for which subordinates' support and assistance are desired, or the superior is willing to modify a proposal to deal with subordinates' concerns and suggestions (Yukl, 2002; Yukl et al., 1996; Yukl & Seifert, 2000, Yukl & Tracey, 1992). In a study conducted by Yukl and Falbe (1990), it was found that superiors apply greater use of consultation tactics in a downward direction. When people gain a sense of ownership of a project, strategy or change after participating in planning how to implement it, they are likely to be more committed to making that project, strategy or change successful (Yukl, 1989). This influence tactic appears especially appropriate in the situation in which a superior has the authority to plan a task or project but relies on the subordinates to help implement plans. Because authority to assign work and make changes in work procedures is mostly downward, a manager probably has more opportunity to use consultation tactics to influence subordinates than to influence peers or superiors (Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Consultation tactics appear to be most relevant when a manager has authority to make a decision that must be implemented or supported by the target person (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Because of the nature of

authority relationships in hierarchical organisations, this situation is most likely to occur for a manager in relation to subordinates and least likely to occur in relation to superiors.

### **(iii) Ingratiation Tactics**

Ingratiation is defined as influence behaviour designed to enhance an individual's interpersonal skills. Jones (1964) categorised ingratiation activities as: other enhancement, opinion conformity, and self-presentation. Other enhancement of flattery involves favourable evaluation of the subordinates. Opinion conformity includes values, beliefs and opinions similar to those of the subordinates. Byrne, Nelson, and Reeves (1966) suggested that opinion conformity can cause interpersonal attraction due to the fact that agreement enhances the target's confidence and beliefs. Additionally, Johnson and Johnson (1972) argue that individual expectations of agreement will facilitate the achievement of organisational goals which is an important matter to an organisational supervisor. Lastly, self-presentation is an image creation that is perceived appropriate by the subordinates (e.g. reporting to work on time and in an appropriate manner is deemed desirable in the subordinates).

Therefore, the exercise of ingratiation by a superior is indeed to engage subordinates in a good mood before an influence attempt is made upon them. Superiors often provide favours with the intention of being liked by subordinates (Kipnis et al., 1980; Krone, 1992; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Wayne & Liden, 1995). From the superior's perspective, the intention of adopting ingratiating behaviour is to be liked and to enhance managers' liking of the subordinates. Some studies have indicated that ingratiation tactics can be reciprocated (Miller & Kenny, 1986; Sims & Manz, 1984;

Terborg, 1981). As liking is inclined to be reciprocated (Gardner & Martinko, 1988), an individual might present himself or herself as interpersonally attractive in order to become liked, which is a desirable state. Reciprocal liking can lead to more favourable relationships as reported by Tsui and Barry (1986).

Previous research exploring ingratiation has demonstrated that this tactic is effective in making the superior attractive and gaining positive outcomes from the subordinate. The basis for influence in ingratiation is an increase in the subordinates' feeling of positive affect toward the superior (Jones, 1964; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Flattery, praise, expression of acceptance, and expression of agreement are used to increase the superior's liking by the subordinate (Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). A subordinate is more likely to co-operate with a superior for whom he or she has feelings of positive affect. Compliments and flattery are more credible when the superior has discretionary power and position in the organisation (Jones, Gergen, Gumpert, & Thibaut, 1965; Wortman & Linsenmeier, 1977). Finally, ingratiation was found to be used mostly in downward influence attempts (Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992).

#### **(iv) Exchange Tactics**

Exchange tactics are the most commonly form of influence and are said to occur when there is an offer of rewards or favours given by the superior to subordinates who subsequently comply with the superior's requests. Exchange includes reminding others of past favours or willingness to reciprocate when attempting to influence them. Kipnis et al. (1980) originally coined this tactic, which was later similarly defined by

Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) and Yukl and Falbe (1990) using the term ‘conceptualised exchange’ to denote something of value to be transacted. For example, managers usually have more control over resources desired by subordinate. Moreover, it is uncommon for subordinates to initiate an exchange with a superior, because resources under subordinate control are usually things they are expected to provide without additional rewards.

This seems to imply that the use of exchange tactics appears to be related to the person-centered variable. A superior makes an explicit or implicit promise that subordinates will receive a reward or tangible benefit for complying with the superior’s request or for supporting a proposal. As an alternative, the superior may remind subordinates of the need to reciprocate a prior favour. There are at least three major studies (Erez et al., 1986; Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990) that have found the exchange tactics to be used more in downward influence attempts than in upward or lateral approaches.

#### **(v) Pressure Tactics**

A superior demands, threatens or intimidates subordinates to convince them to influence each other to do something. This tactics features proactive actions designed to make intentions and desires clear, with the aim of getting other to succumb to influence attempts. Kipnis et al. (1980) originally labelled this influence behaviour as sanctions while Yukl and Falbe (1990) called it pressure tactics, and Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) used the term assertiveness. The use of pressure influence tactics appears to be preceded by person-centered variables. Studies found more use of pressure in a

downward direction than in a lateral or upward direction (Erez et al., 1986; Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Pressure tactics are based on coercive power, and there is growing evidence that coercive power is used more frequently with subordinates than with peers or superiors (Yukl et al., 1996).

#### **(vi) Legitimizing Tactics**

Legitimizing tactics derive from authority power such that the leader seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request by claiming authority or by verifying that it is consistent with organisational policies, rules, practices or traditions. Legitimizing tactics involve attempts to establish one's legitimate authority or right to make a particular type of request. Compliance is more likely when a request is viewed as legitimate and proper. However, legitimacy is more likely to be questioned when a request is made that is unusual, when the request clearly exceeds the authority of the individual making it, or when the target person does not know who the requester is, or what authority he or she has. There are several different types of legitimizing tactics, most of which are mutually compatible. Examples include providing evidence of prior precedent, showing consistency with organisational policies and rules, showing consistency with professional role expectations and showing that the request was approved by someone with proper authority.

Legitimizing tactics derive their authority from extrinsic factors, such as a leader's legitimate power in an organisational hierarchy or the normative character of organisational policies. In one sense, a member's response to any downward influence attempt depends on his or her perceptions that the leader's request is legitimate (Yukl &

Falbe, 1991). However, when a leader makes his or her authority explicit, or justifies his or her request through appeal to organisational policy, the implication is that legitimacy is not being taken for granted by the member.

### **2.3.3 Organisational Contextual Variable**

Organisational context is an important determinant of attitudes and behaviour. Rousseau (1978) noted that “recognition is growing that both individual differences and characteristics of organisational settings are germane to all phases of organisation research” (p. 522). Rousseau further defined organisational context as “characteristics of the organisational setting, the individual, individual role in the organisation and other environment factors that may shape the responses” (p. 522). In the past, researchers have used many different contextual variables including tasks characteristics such as task identity, task significant, autonomy (Rousseau, 1978), structure and technology (Sutton & Rousseau, 1979), structure and size (Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998). In this study, the researcher has specifically explored organisational structure and span of control as organisational context in the proposed model in Figure 1.1.

#### **2.3.3.1 Organisational Structure**

The structure of an organisation is typically defined as “the total sum of the ways in which it divides its labour into distinct tasks and then achieves coordination among them” (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 2). Structure is also termed as ‘anatomy of the organisation’ within which it lays the foundation and framework for the organisation to function. The structure of an organisation can vary and affect both the behaviour and attitudes of the

organisational members as highlighted by Hall (1977) in his statement that “organisational structure served to minimise or at least regulate the influence of individual variations in the organisation. Structure is imposed to ensure that individuals conform to the requirements of the organisation and not vice versa” (p. 109). James and Jones (1976) summarise much of the literature on structure and conclude that structure is defined “as the enduring characteristics of an organisation reflected by the distribution of units and positions within an organisation and their systematic relationships to each other” (p. 76). Central to this definition is the division of labour, which creates task positions and the inter-relationships or interdependencies among positions. Hence, job differentiation, the formulation of rules, and formal relationships among employees of the organisation are the essence of organisational structure.

Research on organisational structure has been strongly influenced by Weber’s (1947) work on bureaucracy. Research on Weber’s work on structure can be located in various sources (Blau & Schoenherr, 1971; Child, 1972; Hage & Aiken, 1967; Hall, 1962; Meyer, 1972; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968). Weber (1947) suggests that bureaucratic organisation depicts a clear and precise task structure that emphasises rules, procedures and authority based on hierarchy, and that it is “technically superior to all other forms of organisation” (p. 196). This type of bureaucratic structure is referred to as “organisational formalisation” by Aldrich (1976). Organisations with the Weberian bureaucratic structure are viewed as having “work distributed among specialist roles within a clearly defined hierarchy” (Burns & Stalker, 1961, p. 6) and structure serves as the framework for the analysis of the interactive patterns of organisational members,



enabling a view to be gained of individual performance or satisfaction (Burns & Stalker, 1961, Durkheim, 1997; Meadow, 1980; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004).

In this study, structure is conceptualised on a mechanistic-organic continuum based on the theory of Burns and Stalker (1961) of mechanistic and organic structure which has proven its reliability in terms of measuring organisational properties. Although this mechanistic-organic view of organisational structure differs from the traditional view that emphasises such variables as centralisation and formalisation, it is consistent with the Burns and Stalker (1961) suggestion that some successful organisations tend to favour vertical specialisation (control) or horizontal specialisation (co-ordination). When an organisation clearly spells out rules, policies, regulations and procedures, rigidity and inflexibility result, and when organisations centralise their decision-making and develop elaborate control systems backed by a centralised staff, the term ‘mechanistic’ or ‘bureaucratic’ is used to describe them (Burns & Stalker, 1966). This type of organisation tends to have a vertical emphasis as the staff units will always be placed at the top of the system. In mechanistic organisations, departmentalisation serves as a specialised functional and hierarchical division of labour. The mechanistic structure can be seen in the stable and predictable environments where organisations tend to be strictly controlled and highly formalised, standardised and mechanised.

Intuitively, the opposite of mechanistic structure is labelled ‘organic’ (Burns & Stalker, 1961). This structure tends to emphasise horizontal specialisation and co-ordination and there are comparatively few rules enforced in the organisation. Although there may be numerous policies and procedures and an extensive information system in place, staff units are usually placed toward the middle of a whole in this type of

organisation. Typical forms of departmentalisation are the divisional and the matrix. This type of structure is most likely to be seen when the organisation is in its early stages of existence and in late maturity facing uncertain and turbulent environments (Burns & Stalker, 1966). Such organisations are more loosely structured, more flexible and innovative and less specialised. They have open, lateral communication, decentralised decision-making processes, less formalisation and standardisation, fewer hierarchical distinctions and a less strict division of labour.

Particularly in terms of communication, these two different systems differ in their network structure (i.e. direction and flow of messages) and message patterns. In mechanistic systems, managers tend to use the command style (one-way top-down approach) to communicate with their subordinates. Managers use instruction to dictate subordinates' work rather than giving or encouraging feedback, or indeed encouraging participation (Weick, 1987). Schriesheim, House, and Kerr (1976) who have tried to reconcile different definitions of initiating structure have concluded that the leader in an organisation that practises mechanistic philosophy tends to: (i) initiate - managers originate, facilitate, or reject new ideas, (ii) define - managers define, structure and organise work, (iii) structure - managers promote a harmony workplace, (iv) dominate - managers control employees' behaviour, and (v) inform - managers seek or provide information. All these sub-dimensions of initiating structure imply a top-down influence approach.

In contrast to the mechanistic approach, the organic system involves communication that is based on problem-solving by skilled experts (Blau & Alba, 1982). The top management is actually an ad-hoc unit structure representing a specialised

knowledge team (Weick, 1987). This reflects a modern organic system of self-management team which embraces participatory management (Manz & Angle, 1986; Manz & Sims, 1984, 1987; Poza & Markus, 1980), making a departure from hierarchic control of the mechanistic structure. The self-managed team adopts consultative communication (Manz & Sims, 1980; Meadows, 1980; Mills, 1983), and evidence of this can be seen in the empirical study of Manz and Sims (1984, 1987) conducted in manufacturing companies. These researchers found a notable absence of direct instructions from the team leader, observing instead, the leader using more questioning, discussion and negotiation styles to facilitate team self-management. These approaches articulate a key component of consultative style.

Both of these structures provide coherent patterns of organising that can be altered to fit pressures from contextual variables. Obviously, in its pure form, each of the two 'ideal' patterns exhibits its own strengths and weaknesses. The mechanistic pattern appears more suited when organisations are most interested in efficiency (Litterer, 1973). Conversely, where there is high variability and an organisation is less certain of how to transform inputs to outputs, the organic form may be preferred (Reimann & Negandhi, 1975). However, both may yield high effectiveness if one adjusts the amount of structural diversity appropriately.

The mechanistic organisation derives strength from its intense emphasis on consistency and problem-solving routine to gain higher efficiency (Litterer, 1973). However, some flexibility is lost due to the top management's emphasis on the centralisation of control. Some of the flexibility may be regained by developing a more vertically diverse pattern of specialisation and control.

The advantage of the organic structure lies in its flexibility and adaptability to solve a problem (Burn & Stalker, 1961; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). This structure encourages employees to co-operate and the ability to respond quickly to the unexpected will promote a more informal and less divisive work environment. Webb and Dawson (1991) in their study, indicate that successful change through human endeavour was seen to be achieved by combining the use of the organic form with a centralised authority structure and the construction of a highly programmed routine.

Much the same as the mechanistic whole uses diversity to gain flexibility, the organic whole often uses it to reassert some degree of control over operations (Child, 1974). In reality, few organically-structured organisations decentralise every decision (Drucker, 1974). For example, one can expect organic organisations to maintain a tight, centralised rein on part of one critical aspect of the domain. Those at the institutional level are apt to be very concerned with the degree of horizontal diversity. They often take an active role in deciding where additional units will be augmented (Drucker, 1974).

In summary, the mechanistic-organic structure continuum has evolved from other classical schools of thought and the human relations movement (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Zanzi, 1987). Characteristics of mechanistic structures (highly departmentalised and specialised with formal lines of authority and chain of command) or bureaucratic structure represented classical school, while organic structure (highly involve participation, flexibility, informal network of authority and communication) depicted the human relations movement.

### **2.3.3.2 Span of Control**

Span of control refers to the number of subordinates reporting to a superior, in which respect the question can be asked as to how many subordinates a manager can direct effectively and efficiently. To a certain extent, the span of control, depicts the organisational level and employees at each level. If the span is narrow, the manager will have few underlings. A narrow span will provide closer supervision and tighter 'boss-oriented' controls, thus resulting in tall, hierarchical structure (Likert & Likert 1976; Tannenbaum 1968). The disadvantage of narrow or small spans of control can be seen from the tall structure. In other words, additional levels can be translated into higher cost. Additionally, the hierarchical structure can cause delay in decision-making. Moreover, top-down communication will make for more difficulties in the organisation and close supervision may impede employee work autonomy.

On the other hand, wider spans of control will generally entail more responsibility being given to subordinates, thereby making the job more fulfilling. More and more organisations prefer wider spans of control since they are more efficient due to their strengths in reducing cost, reducing the number of levels and managers in the organisation, faster decision-making, and empowering employees. However, when the span of control becomes too wide or too large, the effectiveness is damaged as the manager has less time to properly supervise the employees. Thus, the span of control can be an important variable in the superior-subordinate exchange relation (Altaffer, 1998).

### **2.3.4 Subordinates' Competence**

White (1963) defines competence as the

“subjective feelings an individual has about his abilities and reflects his confidence resulting from his cumulative interactions with his environment over his life. These feelings are important individual psychological rewards which provide continued incentives to behave competently. The importance of a sense of competence becomes even clearer by recognising that an individual's self esteem and the esteem given him or her by others are contingent on the ability to master the environment and therefore on a sense of competence itself” (pp. 125-150).

Boyatzis (1982) interprets competency as an underlying characteristic of an individual which is causally related to effective or superior performance. A related perspective here is the notion that competencies are related to the willingness and ability of the employee to use his or her capacities in specific situations (Spencer, 1983). Competencies are factors contributing to high levels of individual performance and therefore, organisational effectiveness (Armstrong & Baron, 1995). McClelland (1973) saw competencies as components of performance associated with important life outcomes and as an alternative to the traditional trait and intelligence approaches to predicting human performance.

Perceived competence refers to the experience of feelings one is effective in dealing with the environment (Skinner & Wellborn, 1997). Competencies used in this way refer to broad psychological or behavioural attributes that are related to successful

outcomes, be it on the job or in life in general. Competencies are operationalised in the current studies as those behavioural characteristics that significantly differentiate capable subordinates from others. It is also important to point out that competence refers not to how competent employees actually are but rather to their internal feelings about how competent they seem to themselves from engaging in a work task and solving problems associated with it.

### **2.3.5 Role Ambiguity**

Kahn and his co-authors (Kahn et al., 1964) defined the term ‘role ambiguity’ in a broad sense by noting that: “role ambiguity is a direct function of the discrepancy between the information available to the person and that which is required for adequate performance of his role. Subjectively, it is the difference between his actual state of knowledge and that which provides adequate satisfaction of his personal needs and values” (p. 73).

In short, the elaboration of role ambiguity offered by Kahn et al. (1964) suggests that the concept is quite diverse. Perceived role ambiguity occurs when a focal person feels he or she is uncertain about the salient information necessary to enact his or her role. Kahn et al. (1964) have described role ambiguity as the degree to which salient information is lacking regarding the scope and limits of one’s responsibilities, the expectations associated with a role, and the methods and behaviours for fulfilling one’s job responsibilities, which role member expectation must be met, and the standards on which one’s performance is appraised. Consequently, there are many salient dimensions of role ambiguity.

Kahn et al. (1964) also link role ambiguity with another concept, observing that certain organisational positions or jobs will be characterised by greater role ambiguity and conflict – those in which the incumbents have to: (i) cross boundaries, (ii) produce innovative solutions to non-routine problems, and (iii) be responsible for the work of others. The relationship between experienced role ambiguity and affective outcomes is expected to be influenced by an individual's 'need for clarity'. That is, individuals experiencing role ambiguity who have a low need of clarity will not feel the aversive outcomes as powerfully as will those who have a greater need for clarity.

In support of the work by Kahn et al. (1964), Rizzo et al. (1970) further expand the definition of role ambiguity, defining this as the situation where an individual does not have clear direction about the expectations of his or her role in the job or organisation. The lack of understanding of the behavioural expectations that are held for the role and predictability of the outcomes of role behaviour (House & Rizzo, 1972) is likely to lead to an individual experiencing role ambiguity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

In addition to the 'unpredictability' of behavioural outcomes, Rizzo et al. (1970) added a second component to their definition: "a lack of the existence or clarity of behavioural requirements, often in terms of inputs from the environment which would serve to guide behaviour and provide knowledge that the behaviour is appropriate" (pp. 155-156). This alteration is important because the scale they developed measures the role ambiguity operationalisation in most empirical research. The two components comprise the scale 'unpredictability' and 'information deficiency'.

Pearce (1981) and Cooper, Dewe, and O'Driscoll (2001) suggest that role ambiguity arises due to lack of information required to perform the role. Therefore,



“certain information is required for adequate role performance in order for a person to conform to the role expectations held by members of this role set” (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 22). However, it has been proposed that role ambiguity is generated by one of several conditions. For example, a lack of required information, a lack of communication of existing information, or the receipt of contradictory messages from different role senders (Kahn et al., 1964). In the past, there have been many correlational studies to examine role ambiguity in the context of a series of antecedents (such as propensity to leave, organisational commitment, job involvement, tension or anxiety, job satisfaction, performance, boundary spanning, participation in decision-making, formalisation and individual characteristics), and consequences (such as job satisfaction, performance, tension, employee turnover).

According to role theory, role ambiguity results in employees adopting coping behaviour in an attempt to solve the problems and thus avoid stress, or to use defence mechanisms for changing the real situation. Therefore, ambiguity will cause an employee to be dissatisfied with his or her role in the organisation (Rizzo et al., 1970). It can be seen that the consequences of role ambiguity thus have potential cost implications to organisations. The costs of turnover and poor performance are obvious, but the true cost of attitudinal variables is also now understood (Cascio, 1982; Mirvis & Lawler, 1977).

This view has been reinforced by empirical findings where research has been centred on examining the effects of role ambiguity, and findings have started to reveal the consequences of role ambiguity. Kahn et al. (1964) and other theorists (Miles, 1976, 1980; Rizzo et al., 1970) have proposed that high levels of role ambiguity result in

several unfavourable psychological effects. Such effects are likely to adversely influence the effectiveness of any organisation as role ambiguity occurs when employees are not certain of how to perform given roles or tasks. Among these effects are tension, stress, hostility, dissatisfaction, low productivity, performance and turnover (Cohen 1959; Kahn et al., 1964; Katz & Kahn 1978; Merton 1957; Rizzo et al., 1970; Seeman, 1953).

Following that, a substantial body of empirical research on role stress has shown that high levels of role ambiguity result in unfavourable outcomes for both the individual and the organisation (House & Rizzo, 1972; Kahn et al., 1964; Miles, 1975, 1976a, Miles & Perreault, 1976; Morris, Steers, & Koch, 1979; Rizzo et al., 1970; Schuler, 1977; Tosi, 1971). Bedian and Armenakis (1981) have found a causal relationship between role ambiguity and increased tension, frustration, anxiety and propensity to leave. Role ambiguity has further been found to be correlated with decreased motivation, quality of work life, organisational commitment, individual and group productivity, and an increase in withdrawal behaviour (Blau, 1981; Dougherty & Pritchard, 1985; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Miles, 1975; Rizzo et al., 1970; van Sell et al., 1981).

The study of role ambiguity is still critical for organisations, especially in light of issues such as diversity, globalisation and competitive pressure. Ultimately, managers and employees need role clarity to ensure that they are working on the things that will make the firm successful. Role incumbents who are experiencing role ambiguity may be working on the wrong things (based on the organisation's mission and objectives) and are probably unaware that they are doing so (van Sell et al., 1981). Singh and Bhandarker (1983) once stated that "managerial role clarity is viewed as one of the basic requirements for organisational effectiveness" (p. 50). They further stated that

“managers suffering from role ambiguity are invariably observed to be pre-occupied with trivial organisational chores” (p. 35). Thus, based on the concepts underlying role theory, high levels of ambiguity will be unlikely to reduce the role incumbent satisfaction levels. In an even worse scenario, it increases work anxiety, distorts reality and produces less effective work outcomes (Rizzo et al., 1970).

The researcher’s study is specifically exploring role ambiguity rather than role conflict to establish the causal relationship between the variable and its antecedents and consequences. There are several reasons that dictate the choice of role ambiguity over role conflict in this instance, these being: (i) role ambiguity is an important concept in role theory as well as in path-goal theory of leadership; (ii) of all role concepts, role ambiguity has received the most study; (iii) in comparison with role conflict, role ambiguity is more amenable to managerial intervention and thus the implementation of programmes aimed at diminishing role ambiguity is relatively less difficult, and (iv) studies involving role ambiguity have yielded inconsistent results, prompting greater research incentive.

### **2.3.6 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour**

Organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) represents human conduct of voluntary action and mutual aid without request for pay or formal rewards in return, and it has emerged as a relatively new concept in performance analysis. According to George and Brief (1992), OCB is an important element of employees’ productivity as organisations cannot foresee the entire job scope required for the achievement of their goals and can only state within the contracts they offer, the minimum requirements for the job.

The concept was introduced by Organ (1988), who then defined OCB as “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (p. 4). Organ (1988) has widened the definition of OCB to include it as “contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of the social and psychological context that supports task performance” (Organ, 1997, p. 91), and hence, removed the requirements that OCB be discretionary and unrewarded (Motowidlo, 2000).

Van Dyne, Cumming, and Huismans (1995) suggested another construct depicting OCB as ‘extra-role behaviour’, which he defines as behaviour which benefits the organisation and is intended to benefit the organisation, which is discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations. In this context, extra-role behaviour can be directed at individual, groups or an organisation.

However, Organ (1997) comments that the van Dyne et al. (1995) definition lacks clarity by stating that an individual ‘job role’ is dependent upon the expectations of the role sender. In fact, the role theory definition places extra-role behaviour as a phenomenon in nature that is subjective and unobservable. Organ (1997) further suggests that Borman and Motowidlo’s (1993) construct of ‘contextual behaviours’ states a more tenable definition of OCB as the contextual behaviours “do not support the technical core itself so much as they support the broader organisational, social and psychological environment in which the technical core must function” (p. 73). This definition is not clouded by any notions of discretion, rewards or intent of the actor.

In the past, researchers have been interested in behaviours that generally fit the definition of OCB which is an organisational manifestation of “going beyond the call of

duty” and they did not always label them. These behaviours include ‘prosocial organisational behaviours’ (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), ‘contextual performance’ (Motowidlo, 2000), ‘organisational spontaneity’ (George & Brief, 1992), ‘extra-role behaviour’ (van Dyne et al., 1994), ‘counter-role behaviour’ (Staw & Boettger, 1990).

The term OCB has been referred to as ‘the good soldier syndrome’ by Organ and colleagues (Organ, 1988; Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). Organ’s (1988) framework of OCB has attracted the greatest empirical research (LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002). There are five dimensions of OCB: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (Graham, 1988; Organ, 1988). Altruism describes helping behaviour towards a colleague who is overloaded, whereas conscientiousness refers to work activity exceeding the basic requirements of the job. Sportsmanship includes not complaining about the aggravations that occur in the organisational setting. Courtesy describes behaviour of seeking others’ opinion prior to action, and civic virtue involves subordinates in the political process of the organisation.

Several other conceptualisations have been proposed and operationalised (Morrison, 1994; van Dyne et al., 1994). Van Dyne et al. (1994) suggest five dimensions that underlie OCB: obedience, loyalty, social participation, advocacy participation, and functional participation, while Deckop, Mangel, and Cirka (1999) stated OCB consists of the three facets: (i) helping behaviour, (ii) sportsmanship, and (iii) conscientiousness.

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Pain, and Bachrach (2000) review the literature on citizenship-like behaviours and identify almost 30 potential different constructs in this respect. Nevertheless, they were able to organise them into seven dimensions resembling much of the classification provided by Organ and colleagues (e.g. Organ, 1988; Smith et

al., 1983). LePine et al. (2002) in their review of OCB dimensions, note that “the literature on OCB and related concepts is fairly diverse with respect to both the nature of the behavioural dimensions studied and perhaps more so the jargon used by scholars to label the dimensions” (p. 54). One reason for the ambiguity concerning the definition and operationalisation of OCB is that the research has mostly focused on linking predictors to an overall measure of OCB or to a specific OCB dimension, rather than carefully defining the nature of citizenship behaviour itself and developing a theory that can guide OCB measurement and analysis (LePine et al., 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000).

Subsequently, the OCB literature documented that empirical work in this field has proposed two simple categories of OCB: OCB-I and OCB-O (Williams & Anderson, 1991). OCB-I describes behaviours that immediately benefit the particular individual because such helping behaviour towards others who have heavy workloads can indirectly contribute to the overall organisation performance. On the other hand, OCB-O is citizenship behaviour directed towards the benefit of the organisation as a whole. This behaviour includes volunteering for unpaid tasks or making innovative suggestions to improve the organisational performance. The distinction between the two is important because it has been suggested that these two forms of OCB may have different antecedents (e.g. McNeely & Meglino; 1994; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Determining why individuals engage in OCB has occupied a substantial amount of research attention in both organisational behaviour and social psychology (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; McNeely & Meglino, 1994). Most research on OCB has focused on the effects of OCB on individuals, leadership behaviour and organisational performance

(Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000). A number of predictors of OCBs have been identified including job attitudes (Organ, 1988; Shore & Wayne, 1993), interpersonal trust or loyalty to the leader (Podsakoff et al., 1990), transformational leadership behaviour (Eisenberger, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Greenberg, 1988), task characteristics (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990), organisational justice (Moorman, 1991), cultural influences (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997), civic citizenship and covenantal relationship (van Dyne et al., 1994; Graham, 1991), dispositional influences (van Dyne et al., 1994; Moorman & Blakely, 1995) and contextual influences (Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrian, 1997). The outcomes of OCB studied are satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983), commitment (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), perceptions of fairness (Folger, 1993; Martin & Bies, 1991; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993; Tepper & Taylor, 2003) and perceptions of pay equity (Organ, 1988).

Studies found that OCB produces various tangible benefits for employees, co-workers, supervisors and organisations in a variety of industries (Ackfeldt & Leonard, 2005; Barksdale & Werner, 2001; Bolino et al., 2002; Koys, 2001; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Nelson & Quick, 1999; Podsakoff et al., 2000). It is behaviour that the organisation would want to promote and encourage. Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) argue that in general, OCB enhances organisational performance by “lubricating the social machinery of the organisation, reducing friction, and or increasing efficiency” (p. 135). OCB may also contribute to organisational success by enhancing co-worker and managerial productivity, promoting better use of scarce resources, improving co-ordination, strengthening the organisation’s ability to attract and retain better employees, and reducing variability of performance.

For this study, the researcher has chosen the OCB construct developed by Smith et al. (1983). The authors have identified two dimensions of OCB: altruism and compliance. Altruism refers to behaviours aimed at helping another person such as assisting the supervisor with his or her work, orienting new people and helping others who have been absent, accepting extra duties and responsibilities at work, and working overtime when needed (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000). Smith et al. (1983) contrasted altruism with generalised compliance, which they identified as behaviours that were not directed at specific individuals but rather at the system itself. Compliance refers to impersonal behaviours such as not taking undeserved breaks or time off, being punctual and giving advance notice if unable to come to work. In fact, compliance behaviours are typified by an impersonal conscientiousness on the part of employee whereby he or she seeks to do what is 'right and proper' for the benefit of the organisation rather than specific individuals. Not only have these two categories of OCB been identified as the primary examples of OCB-I and OCB-O respectively (Organ, 1997), but they are also two of the most commonly studied dimensions of OCB, dating back to the early findings of Smith et al. (1983) on altruism and compliance.

Therefore, the choice of OCB dimensions in this study is consistent with the past literature. It seems that an employee who engages in OCB would be contributing to the department's efficiency and effectiveness and thus helping the supervisor. Moreover, empirical and conceptual work in OCB suggests these to be indicative of an employee's performance in the work place and significantly related to supervisory performance ratings (MacKenzie et al., 1991; Werner, 1994). Thus, OCB may be used as a way of reciprocating support from the supervisor.



Moreover, successful organisations need employees who will do more than their usual job duties and perform beyond expectations. Organisations that have OCB employees outperform those that do not (Bolino & Turnley, 2003; Podsakoff et al., 2000). In today's dynamic workplace, where tasks are increasingly done in teams and where flexibility is critical, organisations need employees who will engage in 'good citizenship' behaviour such as helping others on their team, volunteering for extra work, avoiding unnecessary conflicts, respecting the superior and rules and regulations, tolerating work-related impositions and nuisances.

There is a strong body of literature evidence in the literature supporting the influence of OCBs on workgroup and organisational effectiveness. OCBs are useful for managing the interdependencies among members of a work unit, thereby increasing the collective outcomes achieved (Netemeyer et al., 1997). Good organisational citizens enable an organisation to allocate scarce resources for productivity (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Organ, 1988). They improve the ability of co-workers and managers to perform their jobs through more efficient planning, scheduling and problem solving (MacKenzie et al., 1991; Organ, 1988) and they contribute to service quality (Hui, Lam, & Schaubroeck, 2001). Organisations that foster good citizenship behaviours become an attractive workplace and are able to hire and retain the best people (George & Bettenhausen, 1990). Given these important contributions to organisational success, it is critical for organisations to understand how and why employees engage in OCBs.

### 2.3.7 Satisfaction with Supervision

Job satisfaction is defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job” (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). It is a collection of feelings or affective reactions of the organisational members which are associated with the job situation within the organisation by making a comparison of actual outcomes with those desired. Locke (1976) argued that job satisfaction was a psychological phenomenon and a function of an individual’s expectation to obtain and actually gain from work. The definition shows that satisfaction is a positive affection-oriented attitude generated by individuals to a specific subject in the organisation. The specific subject can be an individual or job itself. In addition, satisfaction also reflects the extent of an individual’s feeling. The extent of the feeling originates from an individual’s comparison between expectations of the other person. If in the actual situation, for example, expectation is not met by the individual, dissatisfaction ensues, and the greater the gap, the greater the dissatisfaction. Churchill, Ford, and Walker (1974) delineated the conceptual domain of the job satisfaction construct as “all characteristics of the job itself and the work environment in which individuals find rewarding, fulfilling and satisfying or frustrating and unsatisfying” (p. 255).

The aspect of supervising style is simply the amount of supervision and direction given to the subordinates. These being: how closely their job activities are structured, monitored, and directed. Many studies recorded that supervision to the extent that the superior is “breathing down one’s neck” is found to have a negative impact on the worker’s satisfaction (Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Kahn, et al., 1964; Likert, 1967). The other aspect of supervising style is the quality and frequency of communication between

the superiors and their subordinates. This includes the superior's ability to communicate effectively his or her demands and expectations, company's policies and procedures especially those concerning evaluation and compensation, informing of the subordinate's performance as well as verbal and non-verbal rewards.

Satisfaction with satisfaction has received quite extensive attention in organisational research. Justification for the need to investigate satisfaction is exemplified in the seemingly observed relationship between the levels of job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, grievance expression, tardiness, low morale and high turnover. Dissatisfaction with supervision is an antecedent of intention to leave the workplace. Unsatisfied workers will leave their jobs more than their satisfied colleagues (Gangadhraiah, Nardev, & Reddy, 1990; Martin, 1990; Padilla-Vellez, 1993). Retention and turnover of staff, particularly highly skilled personnel are important issues for managers in any organisation (McBride, 2002).

In contrast, employees who experience satisfaction with supervision are more likely to be productive and stay on the job (McNeese-Smith 1997). Furthermore, more satisfied employees have more innovative ideas to help organisations improve further by active participation in decision-making (Kivimaki & Kalimo, 1994). Therefore, employees' satisfaction is an important workplace construct and one that is of concern for effective management. Clearly, from human relations perspectives, supervisory satisfaction is one aspect of satisfaction and is related to the personality traits of the superior such as his or her temperament, openness, industriousness, pleasantness and etc. The positive side of all of these traits can enhance subordinates' satisfaction with the leader's supervision.

## **2.4 Literature Review**

This section reviews the literature that is related to the study of downward influence tactics and its relationship to leadership styles, organisational contextual variables, subordinates' competence, role ambiguity, and the linkage to outcome variables such as OCB and satisfaction with supervision. To understand the development of related studies, it is important to examine the literature on the conceptual and empirical links between leadership, influence, structure, span of control, competence, role ambiguity, OCB and satisfaction in order to provide a conceptual foundation of the model developed as depicted in Figure 1.1.

From the widely scattered literature, this section systematically organises the review based on popular linkages of the variables studied by researchers. Although some of these studies can be clearly grouped as bivariate analyses, some studies include multivariate analyses. Since this study is more concerned about the causal linkages of antecedents and the consequences of downward influence tactics, the review of literature is organised according to theoretically anchored configurations of variables while reflecting key theoretical and analytical differences taken by the body of researchers. It is easier to make sense from the analysis and comparison of research findings based on the relationships among variables and the context within which the studies were conducted rather than from the detailed descriptions of wide ranging collections of independent studies in an arbitrary manner.

### **2.4.1 Leadership Styles, Subordinate' Competence and Influence Tactics**

There are numerous studies of leadership styles and influence tactics available in the organisational behaviour literature. However, these two constructs seem to be examined separately. Nonetheless, Yukl (1999) has highlighted the importance of integrating the leadership and influence tactics. In his study, the author criticised previous leadership models for not seriously considering the importance of influence behaviour. His comment has triggered other leadership scholars to explore and understand the use of influence as a concept which is inextricably linked with leadership (Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1990; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989). An understanding of these influencing processes has been claimed as important, and hence, further systematic investigation is required to examine the concepts and tools necessary for effective leadership (Bandura, 1977; Bass 1985a; Kipnis et al., 1980; Tichy & Devanna, 1986; Yates, 1985). The discussion that follows will focus on this important relationship, highlighting the theoretical orientation, the empirical conclusion as well as the strengths and shortcomings of the research approaches employed in a large number of studies that include this linkage.

Tepper (1993) used a longitudinal study approach to identify the patterns of downward influence tactics and follower conformity in transactional and transformational leadership. The data were primarily obtained through questionnaires in two separate leadership development workshops over a period of three weeks. Ninety-five (95) lower-line managers of a large financial company participated in these two workshops. The author's analysis reveals that the best predictors for distinguishing transactional and transformational leadership are the supervisor's use of influence tactics. His findings

concluded that transactional leaders frequently employed more exchange tactics and pressure tactics than transformational leaders. This finding is consistent with the suggestion by Kipnis et al. (1984) that individuals will use more controlling and forceful influence tactics (demand and threat) as well as the exchange of favours to obtain organisational objectives. The results also suggest that transformational leaders rely on their legitimating tactics to achieve routine sorts of tasks. Additionally, in pursuit of routine objectives, transactional and transformational leaders employed consultation and rationality with the same frequency, and followers of transformational leadership are more likely to conform to the leaders' downward influence tactics because of their association with, and acceptance of, the leaders' influence objective.

Charbonneau (2004) in his study, focused on the relationship between influence tactics and perceptions of transformational leadership in generating targets' commitment in a sample of military personnel enrolled in a distance learning programme. Eighty (80) military personnel were rated by 181 peers on the four factors of transformational leadership: idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration as well as the four factors of influence tactics: rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, consultation, and collaboration. The results provide support for rational persuasion which contributed significantly on all four factors of transformational leadership, while inspirational appeals significantly related to the idealised influence and inspirational motivation of transformational leadership. However, consultation and collaboration tactics did not contribute in any of the four factors of transformational leadership. The author concluded that the influence tactic of rational persuasion emerged as the most significant predictor of transformational

leadership. Indeed, rational persuasion is the influence tactic widely used in all directions (Yukl, 2002) and is known to be effective (Yukl et al., 1996; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). However, the author highlighted that the current results should be interpreted with caution as different findings may emerge in vertical relationships that examine the superior-subordinate relationship. Moreover, the frequency of influence opportunities may be higher in vertical relationships than in lateral relationships.

Another study on the effects of leader-member exchange (LMX) and supervisor's downward influence attempts was conducted by Warren (1998) with 105 students in a large state university. The result suggests that a high quality of LMX relationship causes supervisors think that their subordinates support them. This belief may prompt supervisors to show more concern to their subordinates by using influence tactics of inspirational appeals, consultation tactics and ingratiation tactics. In addition, in-group subordinates responded to the effect that they were aware their supervisors employed inspirational appeals, consultation tactics and ingratiation tactics to influence them. All these tactics were perceived as effective methods of influencing from the perspective of the subordinates. Subordinates perceived their supervisor's use of inspirational appeals, when the supervisor was in touch with their values, ideals and aspirations. The use of consultation tactics demonstrates to the subordinates that the supervisor is aware of and appreciates their concerns and suggestions. The use of ingratiation tactics with in-group subordinates may be due to the idea that appreciation, acceptance and flattery are commonly communicated subconsciously to in-group subordinates.

The author also found that in low quality LMX relationships, there was no significant differences between the LMX relationships concerning exchange, pressure or

legitimizing tactics. These tactics showed low usage for the LMX groups. With exchange tactics, both parties are receiving something of interest. Due to their authority, supervisors may not feel it is necessary to make exchanges with subordinates in return for the completion of tasks. Likewise, pressure tactics are perceived as impersonal and harsh, and subordinates may refrain from reporting the use of such tactics in their relationships. Lack of significant differences found in the use of legitimizing tactics may be explained by the fact that in-group subordinates steadily show greater loyalty to company policies and procedures in order to maintain that special relationships with their supervisors. Therefore, the need for supervisors to resort to legitimizing tactics is low.

Tepper et al. (1998), in their analysis to test the model of the relationships between managers' downward influence tactics on subordinates' resistance with interactional justice as mediator, used data from 220 employed MBA students from two public universities. They classified the influence tactics into three types: rational, soft and hard. Candidates were asked to recall a current incident in which their superior was trying to convince them to perform a task that they would not do had their superiors not used influence tactics on them. Their research reveals that the managers' exercise of hard influence tactics was considered unfair and caused greater resistance from subordinates. However, the combination of hard tactics (pressure, coalitions, upward appeals, legitimate and exchange tactics) with soft influence tactics (ingratiation, consultation and inspirational appeals) was associated with lower resistance from subordinates, the effect being mediated by interactional justice. The conclusion was that when managers combine soft influence tactics with hard tactics, the outcome is not as threatening to subordinates (Tyler, 1994) as when the influence attempts only involve the use of hard



influence tactics. Even though the managerial practice of rational influence tactics is not related to subordinates' resistance, the effect is seen to be greater with interactional justice. A limitation reported in this study is: using a self-report method to gather data that may then be subject to common method variance.

Clarke and Ward (2006) in their research examine the effect of leader influence tactics on employees' commitment to safety participation in a manufacturing company. Using the structural equation modeling technique, their results showed that the leader's use of rational persuasion and consultation influence tactics had a significant relationship with safety participation and that this relationship is partially mediated by the safety climate. The leader's influence tactic of inspirational appeals was fully mediated by safety climate. Moreover, the study findings suggest that the leader's use of rational persuasion and coalition are aligned with the transactional leadership style, and effective in exerting this influence over safety participation, and similarly, the leader's inspirational appeals and consultation tactics are aligned with transformational leadership.

Lamude and Scudder (1995) studied the relationship between managerial work roles and the manager's use of influence tactics with subordinates with 116 samples consisting of 66 male and 50 female volunteer managers who participated in a one-day Business and Management education program. The findings conclude that a manager's vision-setting role was positively related to the use of consultation tactics. This is consistent with the argument of Bennis and Nanus (1985) that the visions that managers glorify are based on communicating shared values. This relationship is also consonant with that offered by O'Hair and Friedrich (1992) who suggested that acting on visions

often requires the manager to remain flexible and to strive to modify and improve his or her original vision. They also conclude that the manager's motivator role was positively related to the use of ingratiation tactics and inspirational appeals, but negatively related to the use of exchange tactics and coalition tactics to obtain more commitment and effort from subordinates. The results seem to agree with the argument of Falbe and Yukl (1992) to the effect that exchange and coalition tactics are viewed as impersonal and manipulative, and seldom gain subordinates' commitment. However, the results related to the manager's analyser role were positively related to the use of pressure tactics and rationality tactics, but negatively related to the use of the coalition tactics. The findings resembled those reported in Littlepage, Nixon, and Gibson (1992) and Hart and Quinn (1993), both of which studies observed that analyser managers tend to focus on communication to seek information to shape decisions regarding competing viewpoints and to maintain control, and typically ignore behaviours that enhance relationships and participation. Finally the manager's task master role was positively related to the use of the exchange tactics and inspirational appeals. The most defensible conclusion is that inspirational appeals are more effective when used in combination with exchange tactics (Falbe & Yukl, 1992).

Deluga (1988b) in his study comparing superior-subordinate influencing approaches in relation to transformational and transactional leadership theory, used multiple regression analysis with 117 data obtained from a manufacturing company. The results indicate that both transformational and transactional leadership are inversely related to employee-influencing behaviour. As compared to transformational leadership, the beta coefficients show that transactional leadership is more strongly inversely related

to employee-influencing behaviour. For instance, a second attempt at an influencing strategy reported that friendliness, assertiveness, bargaining and higher authority were strongly related to transactional leadership. Relative to the transactional manager-employee relationship, transformational manager-employee influencing approaches would exhibit a more stable influencing activity. Moreover, the findings reported that employees are more satisfied with transformational leadership and will work together to accomplish the organisational goals.

Lo and Osman (2008) studied power congruence and downward influence in Malaysian manufacturing companies with 385 data collected from managers and executives who have participated in the study. **The regression results show that when superiors' perception of their subordinates' holding low to moderate personal power, while subordinates self evaluated themselves as possessing low to moderate personal power, then supervisors would not apply hard tactics. When superiors self-rated their position power as having low and moderate power, which is incongruence with subordinates' perception on them as having low to moderate power, then there is a less tendency to use the soft tactics. On the other hand, superiors would use more soft tactics on subordinates who perceived them as having high position power. This shows that superiors who perceived themselves to have high position power would use more soft influence tactics. The findings also demonstrate that superiors who are in high position power would prefer to use soft influence tactics more than those who have low to moderate position power.**

Chacko (1990) who conducted a survey on university administrators found that reasoning or rational and coalition tactics are used when the supervisor's leadership style was high in initiation of structure. The study also reported that a supervisor whose actions did not comply to this style was most often the target of influence tactics where agents directed efforts to higher authority than the target, and agents more often exhibited assertiveness-type influence tactics.

Another related study on influence tactics is that of Cable and Judge (2003) who investigated the effect of personality on the leader's choice of influence attempts. Their analysis of 189 managers at 149 organisations found that managers scoring high on extroversion are most likely to use inspirational appeals and ingratiation. In terms of gender, women are more likely to use rational persuasion and older people are more inclined to employ legitimising and exchange tactics.

Barbuto et al. (2002) examined the motivation for the influence tactics chosen by leaders. Their study is based on the leader-member dyad relation with data collected from 42 organisations, comprised of 56 leaders and 219 followers. The results show that motivation was more predictive of a leader's influence behaviour. Ansari and Kapoor (1987) explored superiors' leadership styles and the goals of influence attempts on subordinates' power strategies. They concluded that the power strategies used by subordinates differ in accordance with the leader's style and goals. Deluga and Perry (1991) tested upward influence behaviours to determine their effect on the perceived quality of leader-member exchange (LMX). They found an inverse relationship between assertiveness, coalition and higher authority and LMX relationship.

Other studies such as that of Thacker and Wayne (1995), discovered a strong relationship between rational persuasion and promotion ability, but Rao, Schmidt and Murray (1995) and Wayne et al. (1997) did not find support for such relationships. Ringer and Boss (2000) concluded that trust between supervisor and subordinate does not promote the use of assertiveness and upward appeal. Rao et al. (1995) studied three types of situation characteristics identified as routinisation (demanding preexisting plans and little personal discretion), formal organisation (emphasising documentation and standard operating procedures) and innovation (where more personal creativity is allowed). Their study did not find any significant relationships between situations and influence tactics.

There are a few publications known to the researcher that have empirically examined leadership and subordinates' competence. The first is by Lowin and Craig (1968) who reported the effect of subordinates' competence on leader behaviour. Their results show that the supervisor reacts more warmly to, and is more friendly and informal with, competent subordinates. Their findings generalised that leaders react differently to different subordinates' competence.

Kavanagh (1972), used a role projection technique in an experiment with 164 undergraduate students to determine the effects of subordinate competence and task complexity on perceptions of leader behaviour (consideration and initiating structure). He found subordinate competence to have stronger effects than task complexity in this respect. For example, the inexperienced employee would expect his supervisor to structure his job much more than would the experienced subordinate.

Greene (1975) in a longitudinal study, concluded that managers initiated more structure and showed less consideration for less competent performers, while Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975) showed that superiors allow more 'role-negotiating' latitude by some subordinates than others. There are also several other studies (Greene, 1976; Sims, 1977; Sims & Szilagi, 1978; Szilagyi, 1980) that have argued that leader behaviour does appear to influence subordinate performance by linking low subordinate performance with high leader punitive behaviour.

Locke and his associates (Locke, Feren, McCaleb, Shaw, & Denny, 1980; Locke & Schweiger, 1979) seem to agree that subordinate competence plays the role of moderating the relationship between participative decision-making (PDM) and performance. They considered that PDM granted by the superior to competent subordinates may enhance the effectiveness of the work performance. On the other hand, extending PDM privileges to less competent employees may have less effect on performance. They put forward their view of the competence influence PDM-performance relationship by arguing that supervisors may allow their more competent employees to become involved in making decision on matters that affect them.

Steel and Mento (1987) conducted a study to re-evaluate the work of Locke and colleagues (Locke et al., 1980; Locke & Schweiger, 1979) on the plausibility of the effect of employee competence on PDM-performance relationships. Using data from a cross-sectional field study involving six military companies, they presented their moderated regression analysis showing that subordinates' competence failed to act as moderator between PDM-Performance relationship; rather the partial correlation analysis found subordinate competence to be a potentially confounding variable between PDM-

performance. Although the causal mechanisms remain obscure, the result is consistent with a causal interpretation in which supervisors grant their more competent subordinates greater PDM discretion as a reward for effective performance.

Kim and Organ (1982) undertook a laboratory study of 152 part-time MBA students who were asked to play the role of a hypothetical supervisor. They argued that subordinates' competence is relevant in that supervisors stand to gain from establishing a high quality relationship with competent subordinates because those subordinates are able to complete tasks in a way that exceeds the minimum requirement as stipulated in the employment contract. On the other hand, supervisors are likely to gain little (other than social interaction satisfaction) from the development of high-quality linkages with relatively incompetent subordinates. The results generally confirmed their argument that the leader's basic orientation (task versus relationships) actually accounted for less than 3% of the variance in leader-initiated social exchange. A much greater effect (17% of the variance) was due to subordinate competence. Leaders whether possessing a basic task or relationship orientation, were inclined toward a much higher degree of social exchange with those competent subordinates who could offer beyond the minimal contractual obligations to contribute to task success.

However, the methodology employed by Kim and Organ (1982) was criticised for its artificiality. For instance, the competence of a mythical subordinate was manipulated by showing subjects a copy of the subordinate's performance appraisal that included a completed rating scale. In the low competence condition, ratings on the scale were near the bottom for all eight performance categories and a written summary depicted the subordinate as capable of average work but not always reliable. For the subordinate in

the high competence condition, ratings were at the opposite end of the scale and the subordinate was described in an accompanying memo as 'promising' and 'capable of taking on more demanding assignments'. The lack of actual interpersonal dynamics between supervisors and subordinates may lead to respondents to merely act and behave in a manner consistent with the hypotheses.

Because of the artificiality in the methodology employed by Kim and Organ (1982), Snyder and Bruning (1985) attempted to replicate that study by testing a large and heterogeneous sample (815 employees in a social service organisation). They were able to confirm that superiors initiate high quality exchanges with more competent subordinates. These results were obtained by a method in which subordinate competence was assessed from the subordinate's own competence perspective rather than manipulated directly as in the laboratory study. Although the assessment of competence is open to all of the criticisms common to self-report measures, it should be noted that previous research (Morse, 1976; Wagner & Morse, 1975) has provided empirical documentation of strong associations between self-reports competence scales and objectives, and quantitative measures of work performance.

Past studies that addressed the link between subordinates' competence and influence tactics are limited. Some of the literatures identified are described here. A laboratory study conducted by Dockery and Steiner (1990) on 188 undergraduate students explored the ability, liking and influence tactics of ingratiation, assertiveness, and rationality on the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX), finding that subordinates' ability and liking were significantly related to quality of LMX ( $R^2 = 0.79$ ) from the leader's



perspective. Subordinates who have higher ability would be seen as having the capability for high productivity and subordinates who are liked by leaders will be seen as easy to work with as their capability is being fully utilised. This implies that subordinates' ability and likeableness seem to consistently promote organisational effectiveness (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). However, explaining the results from the subordinates' perspective, they prefer their superiors to employ ingratiating behaviour and refrain from using assertiveness and rationality at the initial interaction of LMX. The subordinates' self-report ability has little influence when they are assessing their relationship with the superior.

Another study conducted by Tepper et al. (1998) suggests that a leader's use of rational persuasion and soft tactics involves inspirational appeals that signal respect for subordinates' ability to understand managerial objectives, recognition of their knowledge, and communicates a desire to strengthen leader-member relations. Their study further highlights that subordinates' competence gives rise to the superior's belief of their potentially useful contribution and that belief prompts the leader to manage his or her influence style through more persuasive means.

Knippenberg, Eijbergen, and Wilkes (1999) considered the effect of relative competence and confidence in one's own ability to complete a task, on one's susceptibility to particular types of influence tactics, concluding that competent individuals were less susceptible to the strength of the available influence tactics than low competence individuals. Likewise, high competence group members used hard tactics as often as soft tactics, whereas low competence group members used hard tactics less often than soft ones. However, this effect only showed when the task gave rise to high

confidence in one's own task solution. When low competence group members had relatively low confidence, the frequency with which they used soft tactics declined substantially. All in all, the results suggest that people who aim for a positive group outcome employ influence tactics cautiously. The use of any influence tactic is affected by the applicant's assessment of his or her own competence level which suggests that competence is quite likely to be a mediating variable.

Other studies exploring subordinates' competence as moderator or mediator are discussed here as well. A study conducted by Synder and Morris (1978) with 80 female undergraduate students who were split into two sub-groups, tested the relationship of subordinates' competence as a moderator of the similarity or attraction relationship. The results obtained a significant moderating effect on judgmental ability of competence component ( $Z = 2.26$ ,  $p = 0.024$ ), but not for the interpersonal efficacy dimension of competence. Abdel-Halim (1981) has examined employee ability as a moderator between role perceptions (role conflict and role ambiguity) and satisfaction on 89 middle-lower managers in a large machinery company. Moderated multiple regression was applied to the data and results disclosed that the perceived ability-job fit component of ability is consistent with the ability-adaptability as suggested by Schuler (1977) - that is employees' job matching their ability are more satisfied under high role conflict and role ambiguity than those employees who have low ability-job fit.

## **2.4.2 Leadership Styles, Influence Tactics and Outcomes**

The investigation of the relationship between leadership styles and organisational outcomes such as OCB and satisfaction has gained increasing prominence in organisational studies in recent years. Researchers have identified factors that influence organisational citizenship and satisfaction, and leadership style is one of the main such factors. The initial empirical work incorporating the link between leadership and OCB was undertaken by Smith et al. (1983) who identified the connection between leader supportiveness with altruism and generalised compliance of OCB. Their findings explain the tendency of subordinates to give something back to their leader in return for the leader's support, and in such situations tend to engage in prosocial behaviour. According to social psychological theory, prosocial behaviour can be influenced by leadership behaviour (Berkowitz, 1970; Krebs, 1970) because this behaviour would eventually benefit the leader and thus help him or her to achieve organisational goals.

Bass (1985a) reported that transformational leaders are able to “stimulate followers to perform beyond the level of expectations” (p. 32) and that employees choose to perform tasks out of identification with the transformational leader in the organisation. This relationship results in the employees' basic agreement with the norms to which they are required to conform. Bass's suggestion is that transformational leadership can create identification with, and internalisation of, desirable values as opposed to the limited goal of transactional leadership that is to create only a compliant workforce. Additionally, subordinates are encouraged to perform beyond their self-interests. Therefore, it seems

likely that transformational leader can stimulate followers to perform OCB (Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Subsequently, the study of leadership and OCB can be detected in the work of Graham (1988) who has suggested that the most important effects of transformational leadership behaviour should be on extra-role behaviours that exceed the requirements of in-role expectations. These extra-role behaviours are best articulated by the OCB construct (Deluga, 1995a, 1995b; Organ, 1988; Organ & Konovsky, 1989; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Graham's results show transformational leadership behaviour to have a positive relationship with extra-role behavior which is consistent with the findings of Podsakoff et al. (1990) and Whittington (1997) on transformational leadership and OCB.

Podsakoff et al. (1990), in their study on petro-chemical companies in the United States, conclude that transformational leadership has a positive relationship with subordinates' OCB, but most studies share the common perspective that transformational leadership behaviour can influence and change the basic values, beliefs and attitudes of followers such that they volunteer to exceed the basic job description. Indeed Podsakoff et al. (1990) have concluded that transformational leaders who motivate followers beyond expectations should have greater effects on extra-role than in-role behaviours.

Subsequently, Koh, Steers, and Terborg (1995) in their attempt to establish an empirical link between OCB and two-factor leadership (transformational and transactional leadership) in academic settings, found that transformational leadership has a significant augmentation effect upon transactional leadership in explaining OCB. They show that the group of transformational leadership behaviours has a much greater influence upon teachers' OCB than the group of transactional leadership behaviours.

This positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB is further proven by Zellars, Tepper, and Duffy (2002) and Leithwood, Tomlinson, and Genge (1996). Zellars and colleagues (2002) have identified a strong negative connection between abusive supervision (i.e. the opposite of transformational leadership) and OCB, and Leithwood et al. (1996) discovered a positive relationship between transformational leadership and altruism and compliance of OCB.

The study by MacKenzie et al. (2001) on leadership and sales performance proposed that the core transformational leadership behaviour, individualised support and high performance expectations, are positively related to salespersons' extra-role performance, and intellectual stimulation is negatively related to that variable. However, the hypotheses received weak to modest support from the data. The only significant positive relationships reported are: individual support and civic virtue ( $\beta = 0.25, p < 0.01$ ) and high performance expectations and sportsmanship ( $\beta = 0.14, p < 0.01$ ) and intellectual stimulation is negatively correlated with civic virtue ( $\beta = -0.22, p < 0.01$ ). They concluded that transformational leadership is able to convince sales agents to perform 'above and beyond the call of duty' better than transactional leader behaviour. Their results were supported by Farh et al. (1990) and Yukl (1989).

Wang et al. (2005) examine 162 leader-follower dyads in organisations located in China in their exploration of leader-member exchange (LMX) to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and OCB. Their empirical data suggest that transformational leadership is positively correlated with OCB and task performance ( $r = 0.18, p < 0.05$ ;  $r = 0.20, p < 0.05$ ) and their argument is that a transformational leader encourages employees to work exceed their performance goals

and self-interests. Transformational leaders elevate followers' acceptance to extra-role behaviour through personalisation and identification. The effect of transformational leadership on subordinates' performance and OCB depends upon the subordinates' experiences of social interaction with a transformational leader and how they translate these experiences into performance and OCB (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002). Their findings also suggest that LMX mediates the relationship between transformational and performance (OCB and task). The authors claimed that their results can be generalised in the West due to increasing evidence of remarkably consistent results across cultures (cf. Chen & Farh, 1999; Hackett, Farh, Song, & Lapierre, 2003; Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999). The limitation reported is the common method variance caused by subordinates rating both their superior's leadership style and LMX, and superiors evaluating both their subordinates' OCB and task performance. However, the way to overcome common method bias is by averaging the subordinates' rating of transformational leadership. Moreover, Wang et al. (2005) also stressed that their findings were based on perceptual rather than behavioural measures, for instance, respondents' rating of leadership and OCB was according to their subjective perception and no further measurement such as recording of real leadership behaviour was taken to support these perceptions.

Schlechter and Engelbrecht (2006) conducted an empirical study on transformational leadership, meaning, and OCB, using non-probability sampling to select 76 media companies including electronic media, printed media, printing presses, publishers and retail bookstores located in South Africa. An email was sent to media companies' employees requesting them to participate in the online web-based questionnaire. A second email was then sent using the convenience sampling method to

select a database of people who were members of a management institute. The respondents selected represented diverse types of organisation. There were 496 usable responses and structural equation modelling was used to analyse the data. The modification indices show a strong direct relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. This relationship is also supported by some previous studies (Bycio et al., 1995; Chen & Farh, 1999; Ferres, Travaglione, & Connell, 2002; Gerstner & Day, 1997; Koh et al., 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996b; Podsakoff et al., 1990; MacKenzie et al., 2001).

Boerner, Eisenbeiss, and Griesser (2007) conducted a cross-sectional study that hypothesised transformational leadership to impact upon follower performance by stimulating OCB, and that transformational leadership improves follower innovation by provoking controversial discussion called debate. The authors did not expect such mediating effects to occur between transactional leadership and follower performance and innovation respectively. Data gathered from 91 leaders concluded their findings were in line with what they predicted.

There are three separate meta-analyses that have demonstrated transformational leadership to exhibit a strong and consistent relationship with task performance and OCB across organisations in various industries (Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). In general, the direct relationship between transformational leadership and OCB has received considerable scholarly attention in the literature (e.g. Boerner et al., 2007; Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004; Schlecter & Engelbrecht, 2006; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000; Wang et al.,

2005). This is important because virtually all theories of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; House, 1977; House & Shamir, 1993) argue the key attribute of transformational leaders as being that they cause followers to perform beyond expectations. Although this may take the form of higher than expected levels of in-role performance, it is more likely to take the form of extra-role behaviour.

On the other hand, research on transactional leadership has been somewhat less rewarding, in that these leader behaviours have not accounted for as much of the variance in performance and other criterion variables as initially expected (Bryman, 1992). Although the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB has been empirically investigated to a much lesser extent, Graham (1988) suggests that the instrumental compliance to obtain rewards required by transactional leadership may suggest a reduction in extra role behaviours when working for a transactional leader.

MacKenzie et al. (2001) who tried to ascertain whether transactional leadership could trigger higher levels of extra-role performance, found that if the transactional leader gives positive feedback contingent upon certain citizenship behaviour, a positive relationship will result. In fact, Podsakoff et al. (1990) applied this logic to explain their postulation of a direct linkage between contingent reward behaviour (i.e. feedback) and extra-role behaviour. Indeed, they reasoned that if rewards are provided on a contingent basis, then the employees will perceive that they are being treated fairly and this will cause higher engagement in extra-role behaviour (Farh et al., 1990). The same explanation can be applied to punishment contingent upon low levels of extra-role behaviours and this should be perceived as fair treatment. However, Podsakoff et al.



(1990) failed to find any support for the hypothesis that transactional leadership can lead to higher levels of OCB.

Nevertheless, Goodwin et al. (2001) did report a positive relationship between transactional contingent reward leadership and OCB, distinguishing transactional leadership that was more recognition-based from that based on setting basic expectations and goals. They showed that recognition-based transactional leadership, which they labelled 'implicit contracting', was more positively related to followers displaying OCB than was a transactional leadership based on explicit contracts or a quid pro quo exchange between the leader and follower.

Another study by Vigoda-Gadot (2007) examined the mediating effect of organisational politics on the relationship between leadership style and employees performance (in-role performance and OCB), hypothesising that transformational and transactional leadership are positively related with in-role performance and OCB. However, the results showed a direct relationship between leadership and performance, that is a positive relationship emerged between transformational leadership and in-role performance ( $r = 0.20$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and transformational leadership and OCB ( $r = 0.22$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), and a negative relationship was found between transactional leadership and in-role performance and OCB ( $r = -0.24$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ;  $r = -0.23$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) respectively.

Liang, Ling, and Hsieh (2007) conducted a study of 215 military leaders and 430 subordinates from 21 military units in Taiwan, finding that benevolent leadership and moral leadership have a positive effect on OCBs, whereas authoritarian leadership has a negative effect upon it. The results show that the relationship between leaders'

benevolent and authoritarian leadership and OCBs is mediated by leader-member exchange quality.

Organisational success in obtaining goals and objectives depends on managers and their leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. By using appropriate leadership styles, managers can affect not only employees' job satisfaction but also their commitment and productivity (Bass, 1985a, 1985c). There is substantial empirical research on leadership style focused on subordinates' satisfaction (Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Mosadeghrad & Yarmohammadian, 2006; Bartram & Casimir, 2007; Emery & Barker, 2007; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Podsakoff, et al., 1996b). Bryman (1992) cites a variety of organisational studies demonstrating that transformational leader behaviours are positively related to employees' satisfaction and job performance. And similar results have been reported in several field studies that cover a variety samples in different organisational settings (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987; Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Deluga, 1988b; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; House, Woycke, & Fodor, 1988; Roberts, 1985; Trice & Beyer, 1986).

The study by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996a) on transformational leadership behaviours and the substitutes for leadership produced by Kerr and Jermier (1978) as predictors of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organisational citizenship behaviours on 1,539 employees from various industries, found that leader behaviours have significant impacts on employees' satisfaction. Their findings conclude that individualised support ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), providing an appropriate model ( $\beta =$

0.10,  $p < 0.01$ ), vision articulation ( $\beta = 0.09$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), fostering group goals ( $\beta = 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) have a positive relationship with satisfaction; however, high performance expectation is negatively related with satisfaction ( $\beta = - 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and intellectual stimulation is not related to transformational leader behaviour. In summary, the findings were that transformational leaders who are supportive, provide an appropriate model, clarify vision, foster common goals and do not make overly high demands, have more satisfied employees.

Podsakoff et al. (1982) explored the relationship between leader reward and punishment behaviours on subordinates' performance and satisfaction using 72 supervisors and administrators working with a non-profit organisation. Due to high inter-correlations among leader's behaviour, the authors decided to employ partial correlation analysis to study the effect of leader behaviour upon subordinate performance and satisfaction. This analytical procedure was recommended by House and Dessler (1974). The study documented a positive relationship between leader contingent reward behaviour with employees' satisfaction in terms of their work, supervision and career advancement. The result is consistent with that of Hunt and Schuler (1976) who found that leader contingent reward behaviour has a stronger association with subordinates' performance and satisfaction than leader contingent punishment behaviour. However, there is no relationship reported between leader contingent punishment on either subordinates' performance and satisfaction. This concludes that leader contingent punishment behaviour has no impact on subordinates' performance or satisfaction. The study highlighted the limitation associated with making inferences from the findings due to the fact that the relationships reported are correlational.

Deluga (1988b) studied the relationships of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies using 117 employees of a manufacturing company, and found that employees exhibited significantly greater satisfaction with transformational leadership than with the transactional leadership style. This may be due to satisfied employees working toward achieving the organisational mission articulated by the transformational leader.

In addition, in a laboratory study designed to examine the relative impact of directive leader behaviour versus charismatic leadership behaviour, Howell and Frost (1989) found that charismatic leader behaviour (which is also considered by many to be a form of transformational leader behaviour) produced higher performance, greater satisfaction and greater role clarity than directive leader behaviour.

Much more recently, Nguni et al. (2006) undertook a study on transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organisational commitment and OCB, using a set of data collected from a sample of Tanzanian primary school teachers. Multiple regression analyses show transformational leadership dimensions to have strong effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organisational commitment and OCB. Transformational leadership had significant add-on effects to transactional leadership in the prediction of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and OCB. Job satisfaction appears to be a mediator of the effects of transformational leadership on teachers' organisational commitment and OCB. .

Mosadeghrad and Yarmohammadian (2006) have studied the connection between leadership style and job satisfaction using descriptive correlation design and cross-sectional method in Iranian hospital settings. The 814 data, collected via a stratified

random sampling method, represents first line, middle and senior level managers. The correlation coefficient revealed a strong positive relationship between people's concern for leadership style and satisfaction with supervision, and a strong statistically significant negative relationship between fringe benefits as a job satisfier factor and task-oriented leadership style. The limitation in the ability to generalise the results is due to the fact that the majority of participants in the survey were from the university hospital, and therefore, caution should be taken when interpreting the results.

Similarly, Bartram and Casimer (2007) found that the only significant direct effect in their study was that of transformational leadership on subordinates' satisfaction with the leader. A plausible explanation of why transformational leadership has a unique effect on followers' satisfaction is given by reference to its charismatic attributes, and their findings are consistent with those reported by Jung and Avolio (2000).

In their empirical work, Emery and Barker (2007) examined the connection between leadership style and organisational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel in two service industry settings (i.e. banking and food chain). In all, 77 branch managers from three regional banking institutions and 47 store managers from one local food store company participated in the survey. Correlational analysis was used to test the research propositions. The findings provide evidence to support the hypothesis that employees managed under a transformational style of leadership will have higher levels of job satisfaction. More specifically, transformational leadership factors such as charisma and intellectual stimulation are positively correlated with the job satisfaction of food store employees ( $r = 0.212, p < 0.05$ ;  $r = 0.322, p < 0.01$ ) respectively. Conversely, the transactional leadership style of management-by-exception has a negative correlation

with job satisfaction ( $r = -0.244$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and an insignificant correlation with contingency reward. Similarly, the results in the banking sample only supported the positive correlation between job satisfaction and intellectual stimulation of transformational leadership ( $r = 0.130$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and not with other factors such as charisma and individual consideration. Contingent reward and the management-by-exception transactional leadership style were found to have no relationship with job satisfaction. In order to determine the predictive effect of transformational and transactional leadership styles on job satisfaction, they adopted the stepwise and hierarchical regression analysis method suggested by Cohen and Cohen (1983). As predicted, intellectual stimulation was found to have predictive power in terms of job satisfaction ( $R^2 = 0.017$ ,  $p < 0.026$  in the banking company and  $R^2 = 0.145$ ,  $p < 0.01$  in the food company). Overall, the data seemed to support Bass's (1985a) contention that transformational leadership is more likely to predict individual and group performance and satisfaction, and management-by-exception may not be an effective leadership style.

In another study undertaken by Hunt and Schuler (1976), support was found for the proposition that leader contingent reward behaviour has more positive relationships with employee performance and satisfaction than does leader contingent punishment behaviour. There exists a substantial amount of evidence that rewards made contingent upon performance then cause subsequent increases in performance and subordinates' expression of satisfaction with their work supervision (Baird & Hammer, 1979; Cherrington, Reitz, & Scott, 1971; Greene, 1973, 1976; Greene & Podsakoff, 1978; Lawler, 1971). The effects of punishment, on the other hand, are not quite as straightforward (Podsakoff et al., 1982; Sims, 1980), but the evidence does suggest that

the administration of aversive events contingent upon weak performance does show low, positive relationship with the satisfaction expressed by higher level supervisors and administrators. Arbitrary punishment behaviour not surprisingly has been related negatively to job satisfaction (Kohli, 1985; Schul, Remington, & Berl, 1990).

There is limited research studying influence tactics and OCB. Thus, studies using variables that offer similar implications are also discussed here.

Barbuto (2000) reviewed the literature and found that leaders use soft tactics when seeking performance beyond expectations (Barbuto et al., 2002; Barry & Shapira, 1992; Bass, 1985a; Podsakoff et al., 1990). The leader is said to use more interpersonal or inspirational influence strategies when encouraging colleagues to complete tasks that they really do not like (Barbuto, 2000; Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Sparrowe et al. (2006) conducted a study on the relationship between leaders' downward influence and members' helping behaviour with leader-member exchange (LMX) as moderator, and using 177 leader-member dyads in a distribution company in the United States. The downward influence tactics examined ranged from 'soft' to 'hard'. Soft tactics include inspirational and consultative approaches, whilst hard tactics involve legitimating and pressure (Yukl & Seifert, 2002), exchange tactics lying in between the two as indicated by previous research (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). In the study, the authors explain the results from the leader-member perception of high-low LMX on helping behaviour. In the event that the member perceives a high-LMX relationship, the exchange tactics of the leader are positively related to their helping behaviour, because exchange tactics reinforce the social exchange relationship and a

high-LMX member views exchange tactics as a soft tactic. Moreover, these findings suggest that the member's perception of LMX may serve as an anchor point from which to interpret a leader's influence tactics. On the other hand, for members who perceived LMX relationship as low, leaders' use of inspirational appeals (i.e. appeal to members' values, goals and aspirations) or leaders' diffuse exchanges offers are viewed as empty and as making the low-quality LMX relationship salient, thus leading to a negative association with members' helping behaviour. Likewise, leaders' consultation tactics are positively related to members' helping behaviour due to the participatory nature of consultation tactics recognise members' input to the decision-making. This may also occur because members with low-LMX may find consultation tactics to be especially salient and this perception in turn may lead them to re-evaluate their relative standing with their leaders. As for the hard tactics, the results failed to find support for the use of pressure and legitimate tactics on members' helping behaviours in high-LMX relationship. The analysis suggests that these two tactics may not serve as signals that the leader expects the member to resist or not to be motivated to comply with a request.

Dulebohn et al. (2005) conducted longitudinal research to examine employee use of influence tactics and OCB on leader reward behaviour and performance rating. They used structural equation modelling with data from 165 employee-superior dyads to test whether influence tactics (ingratiation and self-promotion behaviours) and OCB (altruism and compliance) have any differential effect on superior-subordinate dyad relationship and performance rating outcomes. The analysis indicated that leader-reward behaviour demonstrated an important mediating effect between influence tactics and performance ratings. The use of altruism and compliance of OCB directly and positively impacted



upon performance ratings over time, a finding which is consistent with earlier studies that state OCB measures to be significantly related with supervisor performance evaluation ratings (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991).

Other researchers have also found support for associations between employee influence tactics with quality relationship and supervisory performance ratings (Ferris et al., 1994; Niehoff, 2000; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne & Liden, 1995). In addition to facilitating job performance, fostering helping behaviour is arguably one of the primary reasons why leaders employ influence tactics. It can also be argued that because influence attempts are a common form of interaction between the supervisor and the subordinate, the type of influence tactics used by the supervisor with a subordinate will also affect the task commitment from the subordinates (Yukl, 1989). Task commitment includes special effort beyond what is normally expected. Moreover, task commitment from employee is likely to lead to higher performance which may reflect positively on the supervisor. Thus, this provides an initial notion that influence tactics may be associated with OCB.

Work satisfaction is one of the most important attitudinal issues in the workplace and one that is of concern for effective management. Knowing its importance, some research studies have attempted to explore how influence tactics can be related to various aspects of employee satisfaction (Liden et al., 1997).

A study by Warren (1998) for example, found that the influence tactics of inspirational appeals, consultation, ingratiation and rational persuasion are highly correlated with satisfaction with supervision. Supervisors perceived to use these four

influence tactics may be viewed positively. Additionally, these tactics have been found to be most effective in downward application (Yukl & Tracey, 1992) and show minimal amounts of resistance by targets (Falbe & Yukl, 1992).

Omar (2001), examining four measures of downward influence tactics, leader-member exchange (LMX) and organisational outcomes such as intention to quit and job satisfaction, concluded that ingratiation, personalised help and exchange tactics of influence have positive impact on job satisfaction, while manipulation, upward appeal and assertiveness have negative impact on job satisfaction. Surprisingly, the author also reported that the use of rational persuasion and showing expertise also had a negative impact on satisfaction.

There are few previous studies that have examined downward influence tactics as mediator. This section describes some of the related work with regard to the exploration of downward influence tactics as an intervening or moderating variable.

Empirical work was performed by Soetjipto (2002) on the mediating effects of downward influence tactics between the LMX perceived quality of the leader-follower relationship and its outcomes such as commitment, resistance, compliance, in-role and extra-role behaviour. The sample was 202 leader-member dyads in a distribution company, in which the territory managers and their respective service center managers interacted on a daily basis. It was found that the downward influence tactics of inspirational appeals, consultation and pressure tactics partially mediate the connection between leaders' and members' perceptions of the quality of their relationships. This mediation is partially supported because the author only examines four downward

influence tactics: inspirational appeals, consultation, pressure and exchange tactics. Simultaneously, the author suggests that there may be other downward influence tactics that may also mediate such relationships. Additionally, the findings provide evidence that exchange tactics do not mediate the said relationship. The failure to demonstrate the mediation connection involving this tactic can be explained by the earlier findings of Kipnis et al. (1980) and Yukl and his associates (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) that the exchange tactics were used not only downwardly but also laterally, suggesting that the use of such a tactic in a downward direction is overshadowed by its use in lateral direction. Moreover, the study by Sparrowe et al. (2006) on the five tactics of downward influence: inspirational appeals, consultation, exchange, legitimation and pressure, that is ranging from hard to soft approaches, reported that exchange tactics lies somewhere between soft and hard tactics as previously identified by researchers such as Falbe and Yukl (1992) and Yukl and Tracey (1992).

However, the study by Warren (1998) on the effects of LMX on a supervisor's downward influence attempts, hypothesised that the influence tactics used in this respect can mediate the LMX and the influence outcome. Data were collected from 105 Masters degree students who participated in the survey. The procedure developed by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used to test the mediation effect. Unfortunately, the findings concluded that the type of influence tactics used by the supervisor does not mediate the relationship between the leader-member exchange relationship type and the influence outcome. As explained by Warren (1998), this could be due to the fact that a single item influence outcome scale was used to describe each of the nine influence tactics developed by Yukl et al. (1992). This may affect the content validity and reliability of the scale and

the author suggested that further research should consider refining the influence outcome scale, thereby improving its content validity and reliability.

Regardless of that recommendation, only a few researchers have studied the reciprocal link between managerial styles, influence tactics and outcome, due to methodological reasons. This lack of agreement and replication in the operationalisation of constructs among studies has prevented a more fine-grained conclusion about the cause-effect relationship in these cases. Moreover, the methodological limitation relating to longitudinal case studies with a small sample would hinder meaningful comparison and generalisation across populations.

Despite the limited amount of converging research evidence on the nature of relationships between leadership, influence tactics and outcomes (OCB and satisfaction with supervision), it would appear that the potential value of this perspective can be exploited only when one specifies more comprehensive links between the leadership, influence, and outcomes, as in the case of this work. Such specification can provide a better insight into the leadership and influence processes that contribute to the variations in outcomes (Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

### **2.4.3 Supervisory Leadership, Role Ambiguity and Outcomes**

Studies focusing on the importance of matching the leadership style with the situation increased in the 1960s and 1970s (Fiedler, 1967; House & Dessler, 1974; Weed, Mitchell, & Moffitt, 1976). From these, it was agreed that an effective leadership style in one situation may be viewed as ineffective in another set of circumstances. Role ambiguity seems to appear in most of the studies of situational factors (Kerr,

Schriesheim, Murphy, & Stogdill, 1974). Previous research findings pertinent to role ambiguity seem to warrant conclusions that this construct has appeared as an important factor in employee morale. Its effects have emerged to be generally consistent and closely associated with individual stress, tension, anxiety and dissatisfaction.

Reviewing the literature on supervisory leadership behaviour and role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict), the studies of House and colleagues (House & Rizzo, 1972; Rizzo et al., 1970) performed with non-selling executives, found that leadership styles in the form of initiation structure (task-oriented leadership) and consideration (relationship-oriented leadership) are negatively related to subordinates' perceptions of role stress (role ambiguity and role conflict). Their works indicated that management practice and leader behaviour were generally stronger determinants of role ambiguity than role conflict. Summarising their findings they stated that role ambiguity may be easier to control or reduce through leadership behaviour.

In another empirical work by Walker, Churchill, and Ford (1975), only the closeness of supervision (similar to task-oriented leadership) was found to be negatively related to the salesperson's perception of role ambiguity and no significant relationship with role conflict was observed. The authors explained their findings which contradicted the research results of House and associates (House & Rizzo, 1972; Rizzo et al., 1970) by stating that the samples used in the work of House and associates, were non-selling personnel who may not be likely to be confronted with conflicting expectations from their organisations and their customers. Finally, they concluded that "the supervisory styles of the sales managers have relatively little impact on the total amount of role conflict experienced by the salesman" (p. 38).

Teas (1983) in his study, replicated and extended the work of House and colleagues (House & Rizzo, 1972; Rizzo et al., 1970) and Walker et al. (1975) by using structural equation modelling to test hypotheses among sales supervisors' behaviour, role stress and job satisfaction. The results show that leader consideration is found to be statistically significantly related to the salesperson's perception of role conflict ( $\beta = -0.379$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and role ambiguity ( $\beta = -0.288$ ,  $p < 0.005$ ), and that no statistically significant relationship between initiation of structure and role ambiguity existed.

MacKenzie et al. (2001) predict that the core transformational leader behaviours, individualised support and high performance expectations of transformational leadership, would be negatively related to role ambiguity. As reported, only the core transformational leader behaviours were negatively related to role ambiguity ( $\beta = -0.59$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). However, there is no relationship between high performance expectations and individualised support on role ambiguity. Likewise, the prediction that contingent reward and punishment (transactional behaviour) would have a negative association with role ambiguity, was partially confirmed. The only negative relationship existing was that between contingent punishment and role ambiguity ( $\beta = -0.20$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

Researchers have now shown more concern in applying role theory to describe and explain the outcomes such as performance (Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Lysonski, 1985). Specifically, role variables have been found to be salient predictors of work performance (Fried, Ben-David, Tiegs, Avital, & Yeverehyahu, 1998) and satisfaction (Bagozzi, 1980; Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Brown & Peterson, 1993). Although research has often emphasised role conflict over role ambiguity (Pearce, 1981), numerous studies

suggest role ambiguity to be a more consistent factor in explaining various job outcomes (Fisher & Gitelson, 1988; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; van Sell et al., 1981). This is due to that fact that high levels of perceived role ambiguity are dysfunctional in respect of work outcomes. This section provides the review of the existing literature concerning this relationship.

Conceptually, it has been proposed that exposure to role ambiguity tends to reduce individuals' capacity to control their work environment which, in return is expected to adversely affect the individual's ability to function effectively (Lazarus, 1966). It has been further proposed that prolonged exposure to a particular contextual stressor such as role conflict and role ambiguity, increases demand on individual attention to cope with or minimise the adverse effects of the threatening stressor (e.g., Cohen, 1980; Lazarus, 1966). Individuals will devote more attention to finding a solution to avoid stress, or they will use defence mechanisms to cope with the focal stressor. As a result, they have fewer resources available for monitoring and enacting behaviours necessary for performing assigned job duties and responsibilities effectively and consistently (Cohen, 1980). Therefore, role ambiguity will cause employees to be dissatisfied with their role in the organisation and thus reducing their performance (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Some empirical support does exist in the literature for the expected adverse effects of individual role stressors (role conflict and role ambiguity) and job performance. However, although some studies have demonstrated a negative relationship between role ambiguity and performance (Bagozzi, 1978; Behrman, Bigoness, & Perreault, 1981; Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Lysonski, 1985; Walker et al., 1975), other studies indicate

weak or no relationships (Brief & Aldag, 1976; Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Moreover, role ambiguity has been found to negatively influence in-role performance in a number of studies (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Jaworski & Kohli, 1991, MacKenzie et al., 2001). In fact, Churchill, Ford, Hartley, and Walker (1985) reported that role perceptions were more strongly associated with salesperson performance. The reasoning is simply that salespeople can better focus on appropriate objectives and thus achieve higher performance when they are clear about what they are expected to accomplish. Higher performance can be attributed to signalling the performance of extra-role behaviour.

There is also a considerable amount of empirical research dealing with the connection between role stress (role conflict and role ambiguity) and a host of hypothesised consequences such as job satisfaction, job involvement, tension, and propensity to leave the job (Abramis, 1994; Tubre & Collins, 2000). All these correlational research efforts concluded that one of the strongest predictors of satisfaction is low role ambiguity (Abdel-Halim, 1981a; Bagozzi, 1980b; Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Brief & Aldag, 1976; Brief, Aldag, van Sell, & Melone, 1979; Haynes, 1979; Kahn et al., 1964; Tadepalli, 1991). This implies that the less confusion about responsibility that employees experience in completing work tasks, the more satisfied they are with their jobs.

Rizzo et al. (1970) documented forty years ago that role ambiguity was more strongly and negatively related to a variety of satisfaction variables than was conflict, though they had expected role conflict to be more dysfunctional based on the laboratory study conducted by Manning, Ismail, and Sherwood in 1981 that found role conflict to cause a host of dysfunctional affective and behavioural outcomes. This put forward the



notion that subordinates who experience less role ambiguity in their job responsibilities will be more satisfied with their jobs.

Keller's (1975) study of 51 professional employees concluded that role ambiguity is highly statistically significant and negatively correlated with work satisfaction. These findings confirm those of House and Rizzo (1972) and Greene and Organ (1973) who also obtained similar results. Subsequently, Babin and Boles (1996) suggested that increased role conflict and role ambiguity diminish job satisfaction among customer service employees. Conley and Woolsey (2000), in a study of elementary and secondary teachers, found that role conflict and role ambiguity affect both individual and organisational outcomes including job satisfaction.

Babakus, Cravens, Johnston, and Moncrief (1996) examined a sample of 186 salespersons in a national sales organisations found that role ambiguity had a significant negative effect upon job satisfaction ( $r = -0.60$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The results, in fact, concluded that role ambiguity is an important antecedent to job satisfaction that can affect the attitudes and behaviours of an individual (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

Koustelios, Theodorakis, and Goulimaris (2004) examine the extent of role conflict and role ambiguity in predicting job satisfaction of 61 physical education teachers. The results concluded that role ambiguity and role conflict were significant predictors of only two aspects of job satisfaction: the job itself and supervision. In particular, for supervision, role conflict was the only significant predictor, contributing 15% of the total variance. Similarly, negative beta weights indicated that the greater the role conflict the lower is the satisfaction with supervision of the teachers.

Karadal, Ay, and Cuhadar (2008) recently conducted a study that dealt with the effects of role conflict and role ambiguity on job satisfaction and organisational commitment, using regression analysis to test for the relationships in these respects. The results conclude that both role conflict and role ambiguity show a negative relationship with job satisfaction with F value of 22.21 at significant level of  $p < 0.001$ . These results are in harmony with the findings of previous empirical work (Acker, 2004; Ceyla & Uluturk, 2006; DeConinck & Stillwell, 2004; Mohr & Puck, 2006).

A meta-analytic study on the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity by Fisher and Gitelson (1983) in which 43 studies were reviewed in an effort to draw valid conclusions from the apparently inconsistent research results, found evidence supporting the expected negative relationship between role ambiguity and various indices of job satisfaction. For example, the reported frequency weighted mean correlation between role ambiguity and satisfaction with pay was -0.12, satisfaction with co-workers was -0.22, satisfaction with supervisor was -0.37, satisfaction with promotion was -0.24, satisfaction with work itself was -0.35. The conclusions are based on empirical analyses of results across many studies and should be considered more accurate than the results of any one study or the results of purely narrative reviews of many studies.

Another meta-analysis of the job satisfaction literature conducted by Brown and Peterson (1993) states that role perceptions have higher average correlations with job satisfaction than organisational variables, supervisory behaviours, job or task variables or individual differences. These authors further conducted a quantitative investigation of relationships involving role ambiguity and salesperson job satisfaction and sales performance. The results of meta-analysis generally supported the arguments that role

ambiguity produces negative effects on both job satisfaction and sales performance. It is true that not all the evidence is supportive (Tosi, 1971), but the prevailing evidence strongly suggests that role ambiguity and satisfaction are negatively related.

Teas (1983) in his cross-sectional study using data from 116 samples consisting of 49 and 67 salespersons from two companies, found role ambiguity not to be statistically significantly related to job satisfaction. This contradictory result viz-a-viz previous findings was caused by a high correlation between role conflict and role ambiguity as indicated in the partial regression coefficients of  $r_{\text{role conflict, role ambiguity}} = 0.515$ . The author suggests that the insignificance of role ambiguity may be due to measurement issues as shared variance between role conflict and role ambiguity signal a multicollinearity problem, and hence, the result should be interpreted carefully.

Previous leadership studies have conceptualised leadership styles as having a strong direct and indirect effect on outcomes such as OCB, performance and job satisfaction (MacKenzie et al., 2001; Valenzi & Dessler, 1978; Wang et al., 2005). The indirect effects may be caused by a potential mediator or moderator variable. The mediators explored between leadership styles and OCB or performance by previous researchers are: meaning (Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006), leader-member exchange (Wang et al., 2005), role ambiguity and trust (MacKenzie et al., 2001), potency and cohesion (Bass et al., 2003), procedural justice climate (Ehrhart, 2004), and core job characteristics (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Additionally, Valenzi and Dessler (1978) have examined role ambiguity as mediator or moderator in the relationship between leader behaviour and job satisfaction, while (Teas, 1983) has explored role stress in the said relationship. This

section addresses the mediating role played by role ambiguity, which is an important variable in its own right as predictor. However, it is of special interest to the researcher because of its potential to help us to better understand the mechanism through which leadership styles affect subordinates' OCB.

A study by MacKenzie et al. (2001) of 477 sales people in a large insurance company, examined the effect of transformational and transactional leader behaviours on sales performance and OCB, using the mediating variable of role ambiguity and trust. The results reported that only core transformational leader behaviour has an indirect effect on in-role sales performance mediated by role ambiguity. They indicate that transformational leadership may possibly be related to extra effort because it provides followers with a clearer perspective on their work, thus reducing role ambiguity. The contingent punishment behaviour of transactional leadership has an indirect impact on in-role sales performance and this relationship is mediated by role ambiguity as well. They reasoned that transactional leader behaviour could increase subordinates' understanding of their role in the organisation and that this would lead to a decrease in role ambiguity.

Kohli (1985) studied the effects of supervisory reward and punishment behaviours stating that “punishment may have a negative impact on role ambiguity primarily when a leader is indiscriminately punitive” (p. 429). His findings are in line with those of MacKenzie et al. (2001) who found that contingent punishment (e.g. punishment that is administered in response to poor or ineffective sales behaviour) negatively related to role ambiguity ( $\beta = -0.20$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). However, the MacKenzie et al. (2001) study revealed contingent punishment behaviour to have a positive effect on in-role sales performance, mediated by role ambiguity. The indirect effect of contingent punishment behaviour on

in-role performance suggests that managers who make a point of disciplining sales representatives who are not performing to the expectations, will increase in-role sales performance by diminishing role ambiguity. Indeed, it appears that in the long run, leaders who continually reduce role ambiguity may increase the subordinates' extra-role performance.

House (1971), in his path goal theory, postulated that subordinates' response to leader's 'initiating structure' behaviour differs due to role ambiguity which acts as a mediator. The author argues that for subordinates with clear tasks, leader structuring behaviour is considered redundant and thus caused less job satisfaction than in the situation of subordinates who experienced unclear tasks (role ambiguity), in which case leader structuring behaviour would be appreciated, thereby leading to greater satisfaction. In contrast, Schriesheim and Murphy (1976) who replicate the study, found no significant mediating effects.

Valenzi and Dessler (1978) investigated the interaction effects of leader behaviour in respect of consideration and initiating structure, and role ambiguity, on subordinates' job satisfaction, with 284 employees in two electronics companies, revealed that role ambiguity moderates the relationship between leader consideration and the subordinate satisfaction relationship, but not between the leader initiating structuring and subordinate satisfaction relationship. They conclude that subordinates perceived their job to be less ambiguous under the supervision of a more considerate and supportive leader because this leader behaviour is associated with their satisfaction with supervision. Valenzi and Dessler (1978) disagree with the path goal hypothesis that generally supports the idea that the role of initiating structure is positively related to subordinate satisfaction. Their

justifications are that the leader consideration and satisfaction relationship has received more empirical support (Schriesheim, House, & Kerr, 1976). Moreover, the path goal theory concerning the initiating structure and satisfaction relationship is inconsistent (Schriesheim & Von Glinow, 1977). The finding then, at best, only provides mixed support for the path goal hypothesis although role ambiguity is consistently found to moderate leader consideration and subordinates' satisfaction relationships. However, there are several previous studies supporting the Valenzi and Dessler (1978) that role ambiguity may moderate the relationship between leader behaviour and subordinates' satisfaction (House, 1971; Weed et al., 1976). It makes sense that leader consideration is associated with higher employees' satisfaction (Schriesheim et al., 1976). Respectively, leader consideration may reduce role ambiguity, thus increasing subordinates' satisfaction in ambiguous situations.

Smith and Brannick (1990) who re-examine Schuler's (1980) model of employee participation in decision-making (PDM) and job satisfaction (Lee & Schuler, 1982; Schuler, 1980) using a path analysis method, identified the direct and indirect effects of PDM on satisfaction. They found a strong direct path from PDM to satisfaction and this direct path was supported by Schuler's (1980) samples. The results also strongly confirm Schuler's (1980) model and the contention of Lee and Schuler (1982) that role ambiguity and role conflict and performance-reward expectancy all act to mediate the relationship between PDM and satisfaction. This shows that participation does seem to improve job satisfaction by decreasing role conflict and role ambiguity and by increasing performance-reward expectancies. The author has highlighted the unique and powerful tool of path analysis that allows some inferential assumptions and comparisons across

data samples as most previous studies depended heavily on bivariate and partial correlation analysis of a single data set.

In conclusion, many researchers have sought mediators that would increase the strength of the demonstrated association between role ambiguity and a host of antecedents and outcomes. A variety of variables have been tried, using the inductive approach and the results have been mixed, so few solid conclusions can be drawn from early research attempts.

#### **2.4.4 Organisational Contexts, Role Ambiguity, Influence Tactics, and Outcomes**

This section reviews the previous research with relate to organisational contexts and influence tactics. The discussion covers works that are related to various permutations of variables involving organisational context, role ambiguity, influence tactics, and outcomes. While it is desirable to discuss these according to specific bivariate or multivariate relationships, the arbitrary nature of the body of works will not permit topical discussion in such a disciplined way.

In a study conducted by Sullivan, Albrecht, and Taylor (1990) on superior compliance-gaining strategies, subordinate resistance and superior follow-up strategies of 176 superior and subordinate dyads. They found that reasoning was the most frequently used tactic and highly associated with formalisation in organisations ( $r = -0.37$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The findings suggest that the higher the presence of rules and procedures, the more the superior would engage in employing reasoning tactics to gain subordinates' compliance. Unfortunately, despite the potential value of this association, there is a general lack of articles exploring this relationship.

In the past, there have been several correlational studies performed on the relationships between formalisation, boundary spanning, organisational commitment, and perceived role ambiguity and role conflict (Chonko, 1982; Michaels, Cron, Dubinsky, & Joachimsthaler, 1988; Nicholson & Goh, 1983). Generally, most of these studies have been cross-sectional in nature. Nicholson and Goh (1983) studied organisational structure and interpersonal attitudes in relation to role conflict and role ambiguity in the production department of a manufacturing company, and in the research development department of a large public utility. In total, 42 supervisory executives participated in the survey. The results of correlation coefficients analysis show that only in the production sample were significant correlations found between role ambiguity and formalisation ( $r = -0.61, p < 0.01$ ) and between role ambiguity and participation ( $r = -0.60, p < 0.01$ ). The plausible explanation of the relationship between role ambiguity and structure is due to the uncertainty experienced by an individual resulting from lack of information concerning his or her role within the organisation. Limitations highlighted in their study are the small sample size that may cause statistical estimation errors of the variables and the fact that the analysis is based on correlational and not causality.

In a study conducted by Michaels et al. (1988), in which the inter-relationships were explored between organisational formalisation and work alienation influence by role ambiguity, role conflict and organisation commitment, the data from 215 salespersons and 330 industrial buyers were collected for analysis. Path analysis procedure was used to test the model for each sample. The results reveal that in more formally structured organisations, the degree of role ambiguity and role conflict among salespersons and industrial buyers is less. Close supervision of employee behaviour seems not to affect



employees' work or commitment. Furthermore, the test confirmed that role ambiguity and role conflict influence formalised structure and organisational commitment. The finding is in line with that found in the study by Churchill, Ford, and Walker (1976) who reported dissatisfaction among salespersons with their supervisors due to lack of guidance. Pearce (1981) added that role ambiguity was confounded with both job dissatisfaction and formalisation. However, the authors pointed out that the generalisation of these results should be dealt with cautiously as the respondents were mainly from a single company operating in a stable environment.

Rogers and Molnar (1976) in their study, attempted to identify factors affecting role conflict and role ambiguity among high level of administrative staff in public agencies. Structured personal interviews were used to obtain qualitative data from 102 administrators. The researchers found a significant negative correlation between role ambiguity and formalisation and goal clarity ( $r = -0.29, p < 0.01$ ;  $-0.26, p < 0.01$ ) respectively. This indicates that when there is a greater clarity with regard to procedures for meeting goals, administrators reported less role ambiguity in their job, a finding consistent with that reported by Rizzo et al. (1970).

Other works have supported a negative association between mechanistic organisational structures and role ambiguity, these being: Rizzo et al. (1970) who found a strong association between role ambiguity and 'formalisation' and 'goal consensus and clarity', Morris et al. (1978) who concluded moderate correlations between role ambiguity and formalisation and participation, but none for supervisory span, work group size and functional independence. Generally, it is expected that the presence of explicit rules, policies and procedures can clarify role expectations and this eventually leads to a

decrease in role ambiguity. It seems that bureaucratic structure, referred to as 'organisational formalisation' can reduce work ambiguity, enable individual focus, learning, and decision-making, and can increase efficiency (Perrow, 1986). All these findings reveal the consistent outcome that formalisation is negatively associated with role ambiguity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

There is less effort in research work towards structural aspects of span of control in predicting role ambiguity (Morris et al., 1979). The span of control relates to the number of subordinates a manager can supervise effectively (Child, 1977; Woodward, 1965). Chonko (1982) explored the relationship between span of control and role conflict and role ambiguity using 122 sales representatives who worked in an international firm selling energy-based products. The author developed a new instrument by conducting personal interviews, the basis of which were questions founded on scales developed by Rizzo et al. (1970) and Ford, Walker, and Churchill (1975). The instrument was pilot-tested using 30 salespeople and the sample was considered sufficient to identify any flaws in sentence structure (Sudman, 1976). The respondents were instructed to make suggestions for further improvement of the questions. The findings supported the proposed hypothesis that as the span of control grew wider, the sales representatives would experience an increase in role ambiguity. The average respondents' scores were computed and matched to a rank ordering of management span in which a Spearman rank order correlation of 0.87 was obtained. This could be due to the fact that a manager who has a wider span of control is less able to micro-manage and monitor subordinates' actions (Spreitzer, 1996) thereby creating to ambiguity in the subordinates' jobs, since insufficient supervision may result in a lack of communication and hence insufficient

information being provided to subordinates for them to perform their jobs. In order to reduce role ambiguity, the author suggests a close, participative supervisory style.

Exploration of issues regarding structure and OCB is also important. Most research on OCB up to the early 1990s focused on individual phenomena (Folger, 1993; Moorman et al., 1993). Investigation of individual characteristics such as attitudes, psychological states and dispositions may foster OCB, but seems not to fully capture the OCB construct. Individuals performing OCB do not do so in vacuum and organisational context may serve to encourage or discourage individuals to engage in OCB (George & Jones, 1997). According to Eisenberg and Fabes (1988), organisational pattern may be one of the contextual factors that can influence individual OCB. George and Bettenhausen (1990) and Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1995) have concluded that organisational structure which is less formalised can create a working environment that encourage employees to engage in OCB. Conversely, a study by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2004) who examine the OCB from the perspective of organisational contexts with 450 participants, revealed an interesting insight that formalisation (mechanistic structure) can affect the organisational members' OCB. Their logical explanation is that if the organisation's rules and regulations are relatively formal in nature and employees perceive their behaviours to be over-prescribed by the organisation, they may feel not able to perform beyond their well defined roles and responsibility, and hence are discouraged from engaging in OCB. Leaders should be aware of the effects of organisational structure on employees' willingness to perform OCB and reduce formalised rules and procedures (Senge, 1993). Such a reduction would then facilitate employee willingness to invest in OCB for the benefit of the organisation as a whole.

On the other hand, the exploration of relationship between organisational structure and employee satisfaction can be found in several previous research works. Kerr et al. (1974) observed that rule oriented structure adversely affects employee satisfaction, but improves productivity. In general, it has been observed that high autonomy and broad job scope are directly related to employees' intrinsic job satisfaction (Fleishman, 1973; House, 1971), however, Zeist (1983) reported a greater degree of job satisfaction in a more highly structured role which contradicts the previous findings. Moreover, organizational size is also a factor in determining employee satisfaction. Porter and Lawler (1964) observed that although satisfaction is greater in a relatively flat organisation with 5,000 or fewer employees, satisfaction was also found to be greater in a large organisation with more than 5,000 employees and many hierarchical levels.

Meadows (1980) explored employees' satisfaction level in a different organisational structure settings, for example, work team in an organistic structure versus work team in a mechanistic structure. The objective of the study is to find out how the work team's satisfaction varies in organics-mechanistic dimensions. Sample was gathered from the research and development department in two companies. Data comprised of 93 persons in 24 groups was obtained regarding organicity, satisfaction, personality traits and innovativeness of task. The results show that work teams in an organic structure demonstrated a positive relationship with satisfaction, while work teams in a mechanistic structure showed a negative relationship with satisfaction.

Mawdudur and Zanzi (1995) studied the organisational structure influenced the job stress and task characteristics on an organisationally desirable outcome such as job satisfaction in Audit and Management Advisory Services (MAS) that represented two

large accounting firms. They mentioned that the majority of the studies on this subject have been limited to examining these phenomena separately (Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; House & Rizzo, 1972; Kerr et al., 1974; Zanzi, 1987; Zeist, 1983) with little or no attention to the aggregate impact of structure on stress and job satisfaction. They reported that MAS employees reported more organic structure, less stress, and greater job satisfaction than audit. Job satisfaction in audit tends to decrease with increases in organic structure and job-related stress. Increase in stress in MAS tends to decrease job satisfaction, which does not show any significant relationship with structural orientations. The comparison between Audit and MAS indicate that less organic orientation relates to lower stress in both firms.

Ogaard, Marnburg, and Larsen (2008) discuss the organisational structure in respect to job commitment, job satisfaction and performance in the hospitality industry. The organic and mechanistic organisational structure was investigated in 54 hotels with 734 employees. Employees reported their working experience in both the organic environment and the mechanistic environment is positively related to performance, commitment and job satisfaction. In particular, job satisfaction is positively related to organic ( $r = 0.51$ ,  $p \leq 0.000$ ) and mechanistic ( $r = 0.35$ ,  $p \leq 0.000$ ) dimensions of environment. Such results are supported by past study (Cameron & Freeman, 1991; Ogaard, Larsen, & Manburg, 2005; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1991). As the results show both organic (few rules) and mechanistic (more rules) positively related to job satisfaction, that seems to be contradicting, however, the explanation offered is that in hospitality and tourism services, employees appreciate rules and regulations that shape their role expectation and make their job less ambiguous. Conversely, employees tend to prefer

organic structures that allow flexibility in their job. Thus, it shows that employees simultaneously need a set of rules and standards associated with mechanistic organisational structure to understand their job expectation and at the same time require operational flexibility associated with organic organisational structure in order to perform effectively and feel good about their jobs.