

Culture and Downward Influence Tactics: A Meta-analysis of Correlates

Mahfooz A. Ansari

Faculty of Management, University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, T1K 3M4, Canada

Tel: 403-329-2069; Fax: 403-329-2038; E-Mail: mahfooz.ansari@uleth.ca

Zhanna Lyubykh

Faculty of Management, University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, T1K 3M4, Canada

Tel: 587-998-3323; E-Mail: zhanna.lyubykh@uleth.ca

Both authors contributed equally to this research. This poster was presented at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology, Anaheim, CA, April 14-16, 2016.

Correspondence concerning this proposal should be addressed to Mahfooz A. Ansari, Faculty of Management, The University of Lethbridge, 4401 University Drive W, Lethbridge, Alberta T1K 3M4, Canada; E-mail: mahfooz.ansari@uleth.ca; Web: <http://mahfoozaansari.blogspot.com/>

ABSTRACT

We examined the role of culture in moderating the relationship between downward influence tactics and their correlates. Our meta-analysis results suggest that although members are universally sensitive to how their leaders treat them, their responses in vertical collectivist cultures may also be influenced by collective interests and role-based obligations.

PRESS PARAGRAPH

We examined the role of culture in moderating the relationship between downward influence tactics and their correlates. Using 17 independent studies from 10 countries, we estimated the population correlations between influence tactics and their correlates in two contrasting cultural contexts: vertical collectivism and horizontal individualism. Our meta-analysis results suggest that although members are universally sensitive to how their leaders treat them, their responses in vertical collectivist cultures may also be influenced by collective interests and role-based obligations. Implications for practice include the awareness of culture and employees cultural orientations in getting one's way with subordinates.

Keywords: Downward influence tactics, culture, meta-analysis

Culture and Downward Influence Tactics: A Meta-analysis of Correlates

A review of the current literature (e.g., Bass & Bass, 2008; Barling, Christie, & Hopton, 2011) indicates that extensive research on leadership has rapidly accumulated during the past 70 years, as evident in the development of many different theories and models. Of these, one often-cited model is the power act model (Kipnis, 1976; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980). Drawing on French and Raven's (1959) bases of power taxonomy, the power act model of social influence and leadership emerged in the 1980's. Kipnis and colleagues (Kipnis, 1976; Kipnis et al., 1980) presented the power act model as the study of influence process from the standpoint of the influencing agent (Kipnis et al., 1980). They identified some specific behaviors individuals have at their disposal for influencing others. These specific behaviors henceforth were called "influence tactics" (Kipnis et al., 1980). Subsequently, the influence tactics model was revised and expanded (Ansari, 1990; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Since then, a large number of studies have examined the correlates (antecedents and outcomes) of influence tactics. To date, two meta-analytic studies are available on these published study findings. The first included 21 studies and examined the relationship between influence tactics and two work outcomes, job performance and extrinsic success (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). The second study (Barbuto & Moss, 2006) meta-analyzed the dispositional antecedents of intra-organizational influence tactics and covered all directions of influence. We are aware of no meta-analytic study that has specifically examined the correlates of downward influence tactics in the cultural context. Thus our work complements but does not replicate that of previous meta-analyses (Barbuto & Moss, 2006; Higgins et al., 2003).

In this meta-analysis, we focus on the relationship between downward influence tactics and their correlates in two contrasting cultural contexts, vertical collectivism (VC) and horizontal individualism (HI). We contribute to the existing leadership and influence tactics

literature in four distinctive ways. First, previous meta-analyses did not distinguish between upward, downward, and lateral influence tactics; they analyzed tactics in an aggregate form. Past research (e.g., Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Kipnis et al., 1980) has clearly demonstrated that direction of influence has significant effect on work outcomes. For instance, harsh tactics might be more effective in downward than in upward direction. Thus, we examine specifically downward influence tactics in our meta-analysis. Second, Kennedy, Fu, and Yukl (2003) noted that there is no "theory linking national and cultural variables to the use and effectiveness of managerial influence tactics" (p. 145). Our findings would help develop such a needed theory. Third, a meta-analysis of influence tactics-correlates link in the cultural context would generate insights for academics and practitioners alike. Fourth, the majority of influence tactics studies have been based on Western contexts of individualism and low power distance (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Triandis, 2004). We believe, however, that influence tactics used in HI parts of the world may operate differently in VC cultures. Hence introducing a cultural lens would provide a complete understanding of the use of influence tactics.

Theory and Hypotheses

Whereas social power is defined as the ability to influence or "influence potential" (Fiol, O'Connor, & Aguinis, 2001; French & Raven, 1959), influence is defined as a transaction in which one person acts in such a way as to change the behavior of another individual in some intended fashions (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Given the overlap between social power and influence constructs, a parallel development of ideas on power and influence began by David Kipnis (1976). Kipnis presented a power act model as the study of influence processes from the standpoint of the influencing agent. Table 1 presents an expanded list of influence tactics and their definitions.

The role of "culture" in leadership effectiveness has been of interest to organizational researchers since the seminal work by Hofstede (1980) up until more recently the massive data provided by

the GLOBE studies (House et al., 2004). Hofstede (1980), while advocating the importance of cultural values to have a significant impact on leadership and organizational behavior, identified four dimensions that distinguished national cultures: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism *vs.* collectivism, and masculinity *vs.* femininity. Subsequently, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) added two more dimensions--long-term orientation and indulgence *vs.* restraint.

We chose in our meta-analysis a recent conceptualization of individualism and collectivism (Triandis, 1995; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Laccu, 1988). Triandis and colleagues (Triandis et al., 1988; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) have differentiated cultural level classification of individualism-collectivism and expanded the concept of individualism-collectivism by adding another dimension--vertical-horizontal dimension. Crossing the two dimensions, they came up with four cultural configurations: vertical collectivism (VC), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), and horizontal individualism (HI). Our primary concern in this research, however, is only two cultural configurations: (a) *VC*: People emphasize the integrity of the in-group, are willing to sacrifice their personal goals for the sake of in-group goals, and support competitions of their in-groups with out-groups. (b) *HI*: People want to be unique and distinct from groups but they are not especially interested in becoming distinguished or in having high status. We have three reasons for choosing VC and HI. First, in most studies, power distance (PD) and individualism-collectivism appear to be correlated. Second, of the six cultural dimensions, power distance and individualism-collectivism are the two most widely used dimensions in the cross-cultural leadership literature. Third, countries which are higher on power distance are likely to be higher on collectivism dimensions and *vice versa*. As mentioned above, VC culture (such as India, China, Turkey) consists of high power distance and collectivism, whereas HI culture (such as Germany and the USA) is predominantly lower on power distance and collectivism. Given this

argument, the two cultural configurations of VC and HI have also been used in a recent meta-analytic study on leader-member exchange (LMX, Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, & Shore, 2012).

Past studies have shown that culture makes a difference in the use of influence tactics (Ralston, Hallinger, Egri, & Naohinsuhk, 2005; Ralston, Vollmer, Srinivasan, Nicholson, Tang, & Wan, 2001; Xin & Tsui, 1996) and their effectiveness (Leong, Bond, & Fu, 2006; Fu & Yukl, 2000). Managers from VC countries have reported greater preference for the use of harsh influence tactics (in particular, assertiveness) than managers from HI cultures (Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991), because subordinates from HI cultures may express more resistance, and even if the outcome is successful, the cost might be too high. Ingratiation as a downward influence tactic is universally accepted across HI and VC cultures (Ansari, 190; Fu & Yukl, 2000; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schermerhorn & Bond, 1991). Rational tactics too are equally effective across cultures and in all directions of influence (Kennedy et al., 2003). Given these findings, we expect that the effectiveness of influence tactics will be contingent on the cultural context, though some influence tactics will be universally accepted across cultures. In particular, rational tactics are used effectively in both VC and HI cultures, and soft and rational tactics are universally accepted and are effective across cultures.

In summary, a handful of research has focused on examining the effects of culture on upward influence tactics acceptance in two or more countries and differences in the likelihood to use a particular tactic (Ralston et al., 2005; Ralston et al., 2001) with less focus on exploring the antecedents and outcomes of the use of downward influence tactics and how they differ across cultures. Hence, the current study fills this void by examining the correlates of downward influence tactics in the cultural context. Given the findings of previous researchers, we hypothesized,

H1a: Harsh downward influence tactics are more effective in VC cultures than in HI cultures.

H1b: Rational influence tactics are universally accepted as effective across cultures.

H1c: Soft downward tactics are universally accepted as effective across cultures.

Although a range of influence tactics might be universal across cultures, perceptions of the exercise of power vary from culture to culture (Oyserman, 2006). Supervisors from both cultures report engaging in all meta-categories of influence tactics (Kennedy et al., 2003). However, the consequences of these behaviors might vary with cultures. Individuals from high power distance society generally accept an unequal distribution of power, whereas individuals from low power distance societies may see it as unfair (Hofstede, 2001). Thus we anticipate that the relationship between influence tactics and power bases will be contingent on culture. We hypothesize,

H2a: The relationship between harsh influence tactics and negative position power will be weaker in VC than in HI cultures.

H2b: The relationship of rational and soft influence tactics with positive position power and personal power, respectively, will be stronger in VC than in HI cultures.

Method

We adopted three search strategies to identify all possible studies examining the correlates of downward influence tactics. First, using broad keywords as “influence tactics” and “influence strategies,” we searched empirical studies from several sources such as ABI/Inform, PsycINFO, ProQuest Dissertation, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases. Second, we did manual search of articles from previous meta-analyses and systematic reviews (e.g., Barbuto & Moss, 2006; Higgins et al., 2003; Smith et al., 2013). Third, we included in-press and unpublished (conference) papers. Our search ended up with an initial pool of 200 + studies conducted between 1980 and 2015 from around 20 countries.

To narrow the focus of our meta-analysis, we set the following inclusion and exclusion criteria of studies: First, the study had to employ employees as participants. Therefore, studies involving unemployed individuals and laboratory participants were not included in the analysis. Second, the study had to include at least one correlate (antecedent or consequence) of influence tactics. Third, we excluded studies that did not report adequate effect size measures and studies that reported only intercorrelations among influence tactics. Fourth, we did not include studies that had built-in effectiveness (e.g., Ansari, 1990; Kipnis et al., 1980). Fifth, we excluded studies that did not report sample size and country. These selection criteria resulted in 22 codable studies, consisting of 25 independent samples from 10 countries and reported 529 correlations between individual influence tactic and its correlate (antecedent or outcome). However, some correlates appeared only in one study and thus were excluded from the analysis. The final sample consisted of 17 studies. We set the intercoder percentage of agreement across the study variables at 90%. Two raters (authors) independently coded each study in terms of sample size, effect size, variances, and reliabilities of influence tactics and their correlates and country of study. Of the 17 identified studies, 11 were from HI culture and six were from VC cultures. These studies reported a total of 17 distinct samples and 256 correlates between influence tactics and various correlates. Three studies utilized self-rated influence tactics, while 15 studies used subordinates ratings of influence tactics.

Given the dearth of cross-cultural studies, we classified studies into VC and HI cultural configurations based on the country in which studies were conducted. Following Rockstuhl et al., (2012), we used median split of Hofstede’s country-level scores of power distance and individualism-collectivism to determine which configuration best applied to each society. In the meta-analysis, we included tactics from two validated scales—Kipnis et al.’s (1980) questionnaire and Yukl’s Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ). Downward influence tactics that do not appear in those scales (e.g., showing dependency and personalized help)

were not included in the analysis. We categorized influence tactics into three meta-categories: (a) harsh (coalition, upward appeal, assertiveness, negative sanctions, pressure, legitimating, and threats), (b) soft (ingratiation and personal appeal), and (c) rational (exchange, rational persuasion, consultation, inspirational appeal, and positive sanctions). We adopted a quantitative approach to reviewing empirical findings (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009; Hunter & Schmidt, 2004; Lipsey & Wilson, 2001), and conducted separate meta-analyses for VC and HI cultures to estimate the population correlations between influence tactics and their correlates. To test our moderation hypotheses, we followed the procedures advocated by Aguinis, Sturman, and Pierce (2008) that compared estimated true correlations between studies in VC and HI cultural configurations.

Results

We conducted separate analysis for each meta-category of influence tactics. Table 2 presents the results of rational influence tactics and their correlates. Contrary to our hypothesis, results demonstrate that the relationship between rational influence tactics and compliance is stronger in HI than in VC cultures. In other words, employees from HI cultures are more likely to comply with rational tactics than employees from VC cultures. The relationship between rational influence tactics and organizational commitment is not significantly different between HI and VC cultures.

Regarding bases of power, results show that relationships of rational influence tactics with positive position power (e.g., reward power) and negative position power (e.g., legitimate and coercive power) are stronger in VC than in HI cultures. However, the relationship between personal power (e.g., referent and expert) and rational influence tactics is not different in two cultures.

Table 3 shows the results between harsh downward influence tactics and their correlates in two cultures. As expected, the relationship between compliance and harsh influence tactics is much stronger in VC than in HI cultures. As

regards the relationship between bases of power and harsh influence tactics, only personal power has a significant difference between HI and VC cultures. The relationship between personal power and harsh influence tactics is negative in HI culture but positive in VC cultures, resulting in a significant difference between two cultures.

In general, VC cultures demonstrate stronger relationships between bases of power and soft influence tactics. However, meta-analysis shows no significant differences in the relationships between soft tactics and bases of power (see Table 4).

Although, we have identified 61 correlates of influence tactics, only five correlates have been studied in both VC and HI cultures (see Tables 2 through 4), while other correlates have been studied either in several studies but within one culture, predominantly from HI countries, or appeared only in one study (e.g., extraversion, locus of control, emotional distress). Thus we conducted a post hoc analysis for rational and harsh influence tactics regardless of cultural configurations (see Table 5). The analysis reveals differences in correlates for rational and harsh meta-categories of influence tactics. Significant differences between two downward influence tactics were found for some behavioral correlates, such as compliance, resistance, and task commitment. In addition, rational downward tactics demonstrate significantly stronger correlations with personal power, positive position power, and leader-member exchange than harsh influence tactics.

Discussion

We examined the moderating impact of national culture on the relationship between downward influence tactics and their correlates. Our meta-analysis findings show that culture does make a difference in how members respond to leaders' influence attempts. First, culture moderates the relationship between influence tactics and behavioral outcomes. Leaders who use rational tactics are more likely to gain compliance in HI cultures, whereas rational tactics are not associated with compliance in VC cultures. In VC cultures, harsh influence tactics have

significant positive correlations with compliance. However, in HI cultures, harsh tactics do not appear to be effective. One possible explanation is that subordinates from HI cultures express more resistance and may even “sabotage” an influence attempt, which explains a negative correlation between harsh influence tactics and compliance in HI cultures. The findings suggest that employees in both cultures demonstrate organizational commitment in response to leaders’ rational influence tactics.

Second, culture moderates the relationship between influence tactics and some bases of power. The relationship between rational influence tactics and positive position power is significantly stronger in VC than in HI cultures. Personal power is negatively associated with harsh influence tactics in HI cultures, whereas it has a weak positive correlation in VC cultures. We also observed a counterintuitive finding that rational influence tactics are positively associated with negative power. These findings suggest that perceptions of the exercise of power vary with cultures.

Third, we found that the relationship between soft influence tactics and power bases were not different in VC and HI cultures. However, we should note that sample size for soft influence tactics was too small to detect any significant differences. Thus, there is a need to better investigate how culture affects the relationship between soft tactics and different correlates.

Finally, the results of our additional analysis show that how leaders try to influence their subordinates makes a difference. In general, rational influence tactics demonstrate their effectiveness. Subordinates are more likely to comply with rationality than with harsh influence tactics. In addition, harsh influence tactics result in greater resistance, lower task commitment, and poorer LMX.

The study has several important implications for theory and practice. Our results demonstrate that national culture moderates the relationship between influence tactics and their correlates. Future studies might include employees’ individual cultural orientation in the design to

assess whether the moderating role of culture is similar to that at the individual level.

The current study clearly distinguishes the direction of influence. Higgins et al. (2003) noted that the direction of influence attempt is a potential moderator between influence tactics and their correlates, and the effectiveness of certain influence tactics varies depending on the direction of influence. However, there is still little research that investigates downward or lateral influence attempts. Therefore, future research might focus on the moderating effect of the direction of influence tactics.

Our findings have valuable implications for leaders working in a global environment. For instance, we found that using harsh influence tactics with subordinates could lead to compliance in VC cultures, while it results in resistance in HI cultures. Therefore, our findings underline the importance for leaders to adjust their influence attempts with subordinates from various cultures.

One limitation of our study is a relatively small sample. Some correlates were studied either in one culture (such as Machiavellianism, instrumental motivation, task commitment, and need for power) or only in one study (leader mental boundaries, role clarity, role ambiguity, or safety climate). These variables require more research before any valid conclusions regarding the moderating role of culture could be made. Another limitation is that the current study includes only cross-sectional research. Thus future studies might consider including laboratory and/or field experiments in cross-cultural meta-analyses of influence tactics.

References

Asterisk-marked () references indicate studies included in the meta-analysis*

- Aguinis, H., Sturman, M. C., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Comparison of three meta-analytic procedures for estimating moderating effects of categorical variables. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 9–34. doi: 10.1177/1094428106292896
- *Ansari, M. A. (1990). *Managing people at work: Leadership styles and influence strategies*. New Dehli, India: Sage.
- *Ansari, M. A., Aafaqi, R., & Lo, M. C. (2015, May). *Influence tactics and attributed bases of leader power: The role of leader-member exchange*. Paper presented at the Workshop on Research Advances in Organizational Behavior and Human Resources Management, University of Paris-Dauphine, Paris, France.
- Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40*, 39-49. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(87)90004-5
- *Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2002). A field examination of two measures of work motivation as predictors of leaders' influence tactics. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(5), 601-616.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Moss, J. A. (2006). Dispositional effects in intra-organizational influence tactics: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*(3), 30-52.
- Barling, J., Christie, A., & Hopton, C. (2011). Leadership. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 183-240), Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- *Chong, M. P. M. (2012). Influence behaviors and organizational commitment: A comparative study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 35*(1), 54-78. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-03-2012-0035
- *Emans, B. J. M., Munduate, L., Klaver, E., & Van de Vliert, E. (2003). Constructive consequences of leaders' forcing influence styles. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 52*(1), 36-54.
- Fiol, C. M., O'Connor, E. J., & Aguinis, H. (2001). All for one and one for all? The development and transfer of power across organizational levels. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 224-242. doi: 10.2307/259120
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 118-149). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. A. (2000). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the United States and China. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(2), 251–266.
- *Furst, S. A., & Cable, D. M. (2008). Employee resistance to organizational change: Managerial influence tactics and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 453-462. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.453
- Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 89-106. doi: 10.1002/job.181
- *Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1990). Relationships between subordinate perceptions of supervisor influence tactics and attributed bases of supervisory power. *Human Relations, 43*(3), 221-237. doi: 10.1177/001872679004300302
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors,*

- institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the Mind* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Palo Alto, CA: Sage.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Jun, L. (2005). *On the relationship between CEO value transmission strategies and follower attitudes: Do leader identity and follower power orientations matter?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kennedy, J. C., Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2003). Influence tactics across twelve cultures. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 3, 127-147.
- Kipnis, D. (1976). *The powerholders*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(4), 440-452.
- Leong, J. L. T., Bond, M. H., & Fu, P. P. (2006). Perceived effectiveness of influence strategies in the United States and three Chinese societies. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 6(1), 101-120.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Michela, J. L. (2007). Understanding employees' reactions to supervisors' influence behavior: A community sample predicting employee commitment, turnover, and stress. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 15(4), 322-340. doi: org/10.1108/19348830710900133
- *Moss, J. A., & Barbuto, JR., J. E. (2004). Machiavellianism's association with sources of motivation and downward influence tactics. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 933-934.
- *Mulder, M., de Jong, R. D., Koppelaar, L., & Verhage, J. (1986). Power, situation, and leaders' effectiveness: An organizational field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 566-570. doi: org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.566
- Oyserman, D. (2006). High power, low power, and equality: Culture beyond individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16, 352-356.
- Ralston, D. A., Hallinger, P., Egri, C. P., & Naothinsuhk, S. (2005). The effects of culture and life stage on workplace strategies of upward influence: A comparison of Thailand and the United States. *Journal of World Business*, 40(3), 321.
- Ralston, D. A., Vollmer, G. R., Srinivasan, N., Nicholson, J. D., Tang, M., & Wan, P. (2001). Strategies of upward influence: A study of six cultures from Europe, Asia, and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 6, 728-735.
- *Rajan, S., & Krishnan, V. R. (2002). Impact of gender on influence, power and authoritarianism. *Women in Management Review*, 17, 197-206. doi: org/10.1108/09649420210433157
- Rockstuhl, T., Dulebohn, J. H., Ang, S., & Shore, L. M. (2012). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and culture: A meta-analysis of correlates of LMX across 23 countries. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1097-1130. doi: 10.1037/a0029978
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr., & Bond, M. H. (1991). Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: A comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 8(2), 147-158.

- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(3), 246-257. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.75.3.246
- Smith, A. N., Watkins, M. B., Burke, M. J., Christian, M. S., Smith, C. E., Hall, & Simms, S. (2013). Gendered influence: A gender role perspective on the use and effectiveness of influence tactics. *Journal of Management, 39*(5), 1156-1183. doi: 10.1177/0149206313478183
- *Sparrowe, R. T., Soetjijto, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Do leaders' influence tactics relate to members' helping behavior? It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management, 49*(6), 1194-1208. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2006.23478645
- *Tepper, B. J., Eisenbach, R. J., Kirby, S. L., & Potter, P. W. (1998). Test of justice-based model of subordinates' resistance to downward influence attempts. *Group & Organization Management, 23*(2), 144-160. doi: 10.1177/1059601198232004
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2004). The many dimensions of culture. *Academy of Management Executive, 18*, 88-93. doi:10.5465/AME.2004.12689599
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 118-128. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Luccu, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(2), 323-338.
- *Tripathi, S., & Tripathi, N. (2009). Influence strategies & organizational success: Moderating effect of organizational culture. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 45*(2), 213-228.
- *Vecchio, R. P., & Sussmann, M. (1991). Choice of influence tactics: Individual and organizational determinants. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 73-80. doi: 10.1002/job.4030120107
- Xin, K. R., & Tsui, A. S. (1996). Different strokes for different folks? Influence tactics by Asian-American and Caucasian-American managers. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(1), 109-132.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(2), 132-140.
- *Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(4), 525-535. doi: org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.4.525

Table 1

List of Influence Tactics: Definitions and Directional Use

<i>Influence Tactic</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Apprising ^a	Explain how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target
Assertiveness/Pressure ^{a,b,c,e}	Use of force, demands, etc.
Coalition Tactic ^{a,b,c,e}	Use of pressure by obtaining the support of co-workers Create a solution that is favorable for both parties
Collaboration ^a	Ask for suggestions
Consultation ^a	
Exchange ^{a,b,c,e}	Offer an exchange and/or personal favors or sacrifices
Image Management ^d	Present oneself in a positive manner
Ingratiation ^{a,b,c,d,e}	Show a need, ask politely, act friendly or humbly
Inspirational Appeal ^a	Appeal to the target's values and ideals or seek to arouse the target person's emotions
Legitimizing Tactic ^a	Seek to establish the legitimacy of a request
Manipulation ^c	Withhold, distort the information or overwhelm the target with too much information
Personal Appeal ^a	Frame request as a personal favor
Personalized help ^c	Provide help in personal matters or do personal favors
Rational Persuasion/ Rationality ^{a,b,c,d,e}	Use of logical arguments with facts and data
Sanctions ^{b,c}	Use rewards (positive) or punishment (negative)
Upward Appeal ^{b,c,e}	Seek help from a higher authority

Note. ^a Yukl (2006); ^b Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson (1980); ^c Ansari, (1990); ^d Ralston, Giacalone, & Terpstra (1994); ^e Schriesheim & Hinkin (1990).

Table 2

Moderator Analysis of National Culture on Relationships between Rational Influence Tactics and Correlates

<i>Rational Tactics Correlate</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>k_c</i>	<i>r</i>	ρ	95% CI	<i>t</i>
Negative position power							
Horizontal individualism	603	3	2	-.03	-.05	[-.27, .25]	2.70*
Vertical collectivism	2,254	6	2	.10	.14	[.05, .21]	
Personal power							
Horizontal individualism	603	3	2	.30	.29	[-.18, .70]	0.17
Vertical collectivism	2,254	6	2	.28	.36	[.18, .51]	
Positive position power							
Horizontal individualism	502	2	1	.09	.02	[-.10, .14]	3.20**
Vertical collectivism	3,134	8	2	.19	.22	[-.16, .54]	
Compliance							
Horizontal individualism	1,160	8	1	.31	.44	[.29, .56]	3.70**
Vertical collectivism	451	1	1	.07	.07	[-.02, .16]	
Organizational commitment							
Horizontal individualism	180	1	1	.30	.30	[.16, .43]	0.34
Vertical collectivism	545	4	2	.26	.25	[.14, .35]	

Note. *N* = combined sample size; *k* = number of correlations; *k_c* = number of countries; *r* = mean

uncorrected correlation; ρ = estimated true score correlation corrected for measurement error; CI =

confidence interval; *t* = Student's *t*-test statistic for differences in true correlations between countries with configurations of horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism.

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 3

Moderator Analysis of National Culture on Relationships between Harsh Influence Tactics and Correlates

<i>Harsh Tactic Correlate</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>k_c</i>	<i>r</i>	ρ	95% CI	<i>t</i>
Negative position power							
Horizontal individualism	753	3	1	.05	.06	[-.20, .31]	1.60
Vertical collectivism	5,221	15	2	.16	.16	[.11, .22]	
Personal power							
Horizontal individualism	753	3	1	-.18	-.18	[-.42, .09]	2.70**
Vertical collectivism	5,221	15	2	.17	.12	[.06, .18]	
Positive position power							
Horizontal individualism	753	3	1	-.05	-.05	[-.12, .03]	0.79
Vertical collectivism	7,421	20	2	-.04	.01	[-.05, .06]	
Compliance							
Horizontal individualism	870	6	1	-.12	-.12	[-.2, -.04]	5.90**
Vertical collectivism	451	1	1	.25	.25	[.16, .33]	

Note. *N* = combined sample size; *k* = number of correlations; *k_c* = number of countries; *r* = mean

uncorrected correlation; ρ = estimated true score correlation corrected for measurement error; CI =

confidence interval; *t* = Student's *t*-test statistic for differences in true correlations between countries with configurations of horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism.

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 4

Moderator Analysis of National Culture on Relationships between Soft Downward Influence Tactics and Correlates

<i>Soft Tactic Correlate</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>k_c</i>	<i>r</i>	ρ	95% CI	<i>t</i>
Negative position power							
Horizontal individualism	251	1	1	-.07	-.07	[-.19, .05]	1.27
Vertical collectivism	494	2	2	.17	.15	[.06, .23]	
Personal power							
Horizontal individualism	251	1	1	.02	.02	[-.1, .14]	0.72
Vertical collectivism	494	2	2	.26	.28	[-.18, .63]	
Positive position power							
Horizontal individualism	251	1	1	-.01	-.01	[-.13, .11]	0.69
Vertical collectivism	385	2	2	.25	.26	[-.26, .67]	

Note. *N* = combined sample size; *k* = number of correlations; *k_c* = number of countries; *r* = mean

uncorrected correlation; ρ = estimated true score correlation corrected for measurement error; CI =

confidence interval; *t* = Student's *t*-test statistic for differences in true correlations between countries with

configurations of horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism.

Table 5

Results of Analysis of Rational and Harsh Downward Influence Tactics and Their Correlates

<i>Correlate</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>k_c</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>ρ</i>	95% CI	<i>t</i>
Authoritarian leadership style							
Rational	989	3	1	.14	.16	[.09, .22]	0.47
Harsh	2,636	9	1	.12	.11	[.03, .18]	
Compliance							
Rational	1,611	9	1	.28	.28	[.18, .37]	
Harsh	1,321	7	1	-.07	-.06	[-.22, .09]	2.57*
Goal internalization motivation							
Rational	1,892	8	1	.07	.08	[.01, .14]	0.67
Harsh	1,927	8	1	.03	.02	[-.04, .09]	
Instrumental motivation							
Rational	1,892	8	1	.02	.01	[-.05, .05]	0.13
Harsh	1,927	8	1	.00	.00	[-.03, .06]	
Intrinsic process motivation							
Rational	1,892	8	1	.12	.12	[.05, .19]	0.43
Harsh	1,927	8	1	.08	.08	[.01, .13]	
Job satisfaction							
Rational	811	4	2	-.08	-.07	[-.32, .18]	1.13
Harsh	691	3	2	-.26	-.26	[-.46, -.02]	
LMX							
Rational	632	4	1	.36	.36	[.06, .63]	2.68*
Harsh	556	4	1	-.01	-.02	[-.17, .14]	
Machiavellianism							
Rational	1206	9	1	-.02	-.03	[-.08, .03]	0.48
Harsh	1650	6	1	.01	.01	[-.04, .06]	
Negative position power							
Rational	2857	9	4	.08	.06	[.00, .14]	1.20
Harsh	5589	18	3	.15	.15	[.08, .21]	
Organizational commitment							
Rational	725	5	3	.28	.28	[.19, .36]	1.65
Harsh	425	3	2	.05	.09	[-.20, .36]	
Personal power							
Rational	2857	9	4	.26	.28	[.19, .37]	2.56*
Harsh	5974	18	3	.11	.06	[-.02, .14]	
Positive position power							
Rational	3636	10	3	.18	.18	[.08, .28]	2.30*
Harsh	8174	23	3	.01	.00	[-.05, .05]	
Resistance							
Rational	315	2	1	-.18	-.18	[-.18, -.29]	2.37*
Harsh	406	3	1	.23	.23	[.14, .32]	
Self-concept external motivation							
Rational	1892	8	1	.07	.07	[.00, .14]	0.59
Harsh	1927	8	1	.02	.02	[-.03, .06]	
Self-concept internal motivation							
Rational	1892	8	1	-.01	-.02	[-.08, .05]	0.12
Harsh	1927	8	1	-.03	-.03	[-.07, .02]	
Task commitment							

Rational	512	4	1	.39	.39	[.29, .49]	2.70*
Harsh	384	3	1	-.09	-.09	[-.23, .05]	

Note. N = combined sample size; k = number of correlations; k_c = number of countries; r = mean

uncorrected correlation; ρ = estimated true score correlation corrected for measurement error; CI = confidence interval; t = Student's t -test statistic for differences in true correlations between rational and harsh influence tactics.

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

Appendix A

Summary of Studies Included in the Current Meta-Analysis and Coding for Moderators

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	ALS	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	ALS	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	ALS	.29	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	ALS	.14	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	.29	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.22	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.28	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	NP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.07	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	.30	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	NP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	NP	.27	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	NP	.27	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	NP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	NP	.05	Self

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	NP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	NP	.06	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.08	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.17	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	-.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	-.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	-.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	-.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	-.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.08	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	-.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	-.17	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PP	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PP	.21	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PP	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PP	.25	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.20	Self

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PP	.22	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PP	.14	Self
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	PP	.47	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	PP	.25	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	PP	.48	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	PPP	.49	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	PPP	.49	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	NP	.13	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	NP	.35	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	NP	.11	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	IPM	.16	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	IPM	.22	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	IPM	.18	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	IPM	.33	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	IPM	.11	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	IPM	.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	IPM	.18	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	INSM	.10	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	INSM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	INSM	.12	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	INSM	.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	INSM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	INSM	.01	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	INSM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCEM	.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCEM	.17	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCEM	.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCEM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCEM	.03	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCIM	-.16	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCIM	-.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCIM	-.03	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCIM	-.12	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCIM	-.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCIM	-.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCIM	.01	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	GIM	.07	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	GIM	.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	GIM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	GIM	-.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	GIM	.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	GIM	.08	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	GIM	.2	Subordinates
Chong (2012)	185	Hong Kong	VC	HARSH	HARSH	COMM	-.18	Subordinates
Chong (2012)	185	Hong Kong	VC	RATION	RATION	COMM	.35	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	PRE	HARSH	COMP	-.26	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	LEG	HARSH	COMP	-.08	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	COA	HARSH	COMP	-.03	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	RAT PER	RATION	COMP	.48	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	EXC	RATION	COMP	.20	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	INS	RATION	COMP	.29	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	CON	RATION	COMP	.44	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	PRE	HARSH	COMP	-.23	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	LEG	HARSH	COMP	-.05	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	COA	HARSH	COMP	-.08	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	RAT PER	RATION	COMP	.32	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	EXC	RATION	COMP	.20	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	INS	RATION	COMP	.24	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	CON	RATION	COMP	.28	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	RES	.18	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	RES	.21	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	RES	-.26	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	LMX	.07	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	LMX	-.20	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	LMX	.42	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	PP	.27	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	PP	-.31	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	PP	-.31	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	PP	.02	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	PP	.08	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	PP	.09	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	PPP	.16	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	-.03	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	PPP	-.01	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	PPP	.02	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	PPP	.01	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	NP	-.10	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	NP	.31	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	NP	-.03	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	NP	-.07	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	NP	-.13	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	NP	-.12	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	INS	RATION	JS	.17	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	AUT	HARSH	JS	-.07	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	INS	RATION	COMP	.07	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	AUT	HARSH	COMP	.25	Subordinates
Michela (2007)	180	Canada	HI	RAT	RATION	COMM	.30	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Michela (2007)	180	Canada	HI	RAT	RATION	COMM	.89	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	IPM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	IPM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	IPM	.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	IPM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	IPM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	IPM	.06	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	IPM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	IPM	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	IPM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	INSM	-.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	INSM	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	INSM	-.09	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	INSM	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	INSM	.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	INSM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	INSM	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	INSM	-.10	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	INSM	-.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCEM	-.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCEM	-.10	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCEM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCEM	.17	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCEM	.16	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	SCEM	-.05	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	SCEM	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCIM	-.07	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCIM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCIM	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCIM	.11	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCIM	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCIM	.10	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	SCIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	SCIM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	GIM	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	GIM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	GIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	GIM	.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	GIM	.15	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	GIM	.07	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	GIM	.23	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	GIM	-.12	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	GIM	-.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	MAC	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	MAC	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	MAC	-.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	MAC	-.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	MAC	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	MAC	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	MAC	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	MAC	.00	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	MAC	.02	Subordinates
Mulder et al. (1986)	101	Holland	HI	CON	RATION	NP	.14	Subordinates
Mulder et al. (1986)	101	Holland	HI	CON	RATION	PP	.55	Subordinates
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	ALS	.29	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	ALS	-.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	ALS	.02	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	ALS	.11	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	ALS	-.05	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	-.01	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.03	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	PP	-.27	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	PP	.32	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	PP	-.33	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.06	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	PPP	-.11	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	PPP	.14	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	-.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.31	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	NP	.13	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	NP	.02	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	NP	.13	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	PP	.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	PPP	-.01	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	NP	.21	Self
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	LMX	.48	Subordinates

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	LMX	.55	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	LMX	-.06	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	LMX	.15	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	LMX	-.11	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	TC	.38	Subordinates
Tepper et al. (1998)	214	U.S.	HI	HARSH	HARSH	RES	.27	Subordinates
Tepper et al. (1998)	214	U.S.	HI	RATION	RATION	RES	-.14	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS EX	RATION	JS	-.31	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	RAT REW	RATION	JS	.10	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	NS	HARSH	JS	-.42	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	EXC	RATION	JS	-.26	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	JS	-.29	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS EX	RATION	COMM	.09	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	RAT REW	RATION	COMM	.25	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	NS	HARSH	COMM	.24	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	EXC	RATION	COMM	.35	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	COMM	.22	Subordinates
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	MAC	.11	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	MAC	-.01	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	MAC	.15	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	MAC	-.01	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	MAC	.04	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	MAC	-.01	Self

<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	TC	.51	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	TC	.42	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	TC	.26	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	TC	.00	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	TC	-.05	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	TC	-.23	Subordinates
<i>Study</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>HI/VC</i>	<i>Influence tactic</i>	<i>Meta-category</i>	<i>Correlate</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	ALS	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	ALS	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	ALS	.29	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	ALS	.14	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	ALS	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	.29	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.22	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.28	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	NP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.07	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	.30	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	NP	.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	NP	.27	Self

Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	NP	.27	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	NP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	NP	.05	Self
				Influence				
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	NP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	NP	.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	NP	.06	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	.11	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.08	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.17	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	-.13	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	-.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PPP	-.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	-.02	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	-.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PPP	.08	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PPP	-.09	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PPP	-.17	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PP	.18	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	.19	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PP	.21	Self

Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PP	.10	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	EXC	RATION	PP	.25	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.20	Self
				Influence				
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	UP AP	HARSH	PP	.22	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	PS	RATION	PP	.20	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	NS	HARSH	PP	.16	Self
Ansari (1990)	440	India	VC	THR	HARSH	PP	.14	Self
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	PP	.47	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	PP	.25	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	PP	.48	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	PPP	.49	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	PPP	.49	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	SOFT	SOFT	NP	.13	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	HARSH	HARSH	NP	.35	Subordinates
Ansari et al. (2015)	385	Malaysia	VC	RATION	RATION	NP	.11	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	IPM	.16	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	IPM	.22	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	IPM	.18	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	IPM	.33	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	IPM	.11	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	IPM	.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	IPM	.18	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	INSM	.10	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	INSM	.02	Subordinates

Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	INSM	.12	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	INSM	.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	INSM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	INSM	.01	Subordinates
				Influence				
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	INSM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCEM	.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCEM	.17	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCEM	.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCEM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCEM	.03	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCIM	-.16	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCIM	-.13	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCIM	-.03	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCIM	-.12	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCIM	-.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCIM	-.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCIM	.01	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	GIM	.07	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	GIM	.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	GIM	.04	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	GIM	-.05	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	GIM	.06	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	GIM	.08	Subordinates
Barbuto et al. (2002)	219	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	GIM	.2	Subordinates
Chong (2012)	185	Hong Kong	VC	HARSH	HARSH	COMM	-.18	Subordinates

Chong (2012)	185	Hong Kong	VC	RATION	RATION	COMM	.35	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	PRE	HARSH	COMP	-.26	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	LEG	HARSH	COMP	-.08	Subordinates
				Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	COA	HARSH	COMP	-.03	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	RAT PER	RATION	COMP	.48	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	EXC	RATION	COMP	.20	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	INS	RATION	COMP	.29	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	CON	RATION	COMP	.44	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	PRE	HARSH	COMP	-.23	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	LEG	HARSH	COMP	-.05	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	COA	HARSH	COMP	-.08	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	RAT PER	RATION	COMP	.32	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	EXC	RATION	COMP	.20	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	INS	RATION	COMP	.24	Subordinates
Emans et al. (2003)	145	Spain	HI	CON	RATION	COMP	.28	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	RES	.18	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	RES	.21	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	RES	-.26	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	LMX	.07	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	LMX	-.20	Subordinates
Furst & Cable (2008)	101	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	LMX	.42	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	PP	.27	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	PP	-.31	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	PP	-.31	Subordinates

Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	PP	.02	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	PP	.08	Subordinates
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	PP	.09	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	PPP	.16	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	PPP	-.03	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	PPP	-.01	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	PPP	.02	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	PPP	.01	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	NP	-.10	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	NP	.31	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	NP	-.03	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	ING	SOFT	NP	-.07	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	NP	-.13	Subordinates
Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990)	251	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	NP	-.12	Subordinates

Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	INS	RATION	JS	.17	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	AUT	HARSH	JS	-.07	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	INS	RATION	COMP	.07	Subordinates
Jun (2005)	451	China	VC	AUT	HARSH	COMP	.25	Subordinates
Michela (2007)	180	Canada	HI	RAT	RATION	COMM	.30	Subordinates
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Michela (2007)	180	Canada	HI	RAT	RATION	COMM	.89	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	IPM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	IPM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	IPM	.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	IPM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	IPM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	IPM	.06	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	IPM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	IPM	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	IPM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	INSM	-.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	INSM	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	INSM	-.09	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	INSM	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	INSM	.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	INSM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	INSM	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	INSM	-.10	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	INSM	-.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCEM	-.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCEM	-.10	Subordinates

Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCEM	.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCEM	.17	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCEM	.16	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCEM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	SCEM	-.05	Subordinates
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	SCEM	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	SCIM	-.07	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	SCIM	.05	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	SCIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	SCIM	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	SCIM	.11	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	SCIM	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	SCIM	.10	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	SCIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	SCIM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	GIM	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	GIM	.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	GIM	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	GIM	.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	GIM	.15	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	GIM	.07	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	GIM	.23	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	GIM	-.12	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	GIM	-.03	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	MAC	.00	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	MAC	.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	MAC	-.05	Subordinates

Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	MAC	-.08	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	MAC	-.04	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	MAC	-.01	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	MAC	-.02	Subordinates
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	MAC	.00	Subordinates
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Moss & Barbuto (2004)	254	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	MAC	.02	Subordinates
Mulder et al. (1986)	101	Holland	HI	CON	RATION	NP	.14	Subordinates
Mulder et al. (1986)	101	Holland	HI	CON	RATION	PP	.55	Subordinates
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	ALS	.29	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	ALS	-.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	ALS	.02	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	ALS	.11	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	ALS	-.05	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PP	-.01	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PP	.03	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	PP	-.27	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	PP	.32	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	PP	-.33	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	PPP	.05	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	PPP	.06	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	PPP	-.11	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	PPP	.14	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	PPP	-.12	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	NP	-.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	COA	HARSH	NP	.31	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	HI AU	HARSH	NP	.13	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	REA	RATION	NP	.02	Self

Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	SAN	HARSH	NP	.13	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	PP	.04	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	PPP	-.01	Self
Rajan & Krishnan (2002)	109	India	VC	FRI	SOFT	NP	.21	Self
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	LMX	.48	Subordinates
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	LMX	.55	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	LMX	-.06	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	LMX	.15	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	LMX	-.11	Subordinates
Sparrowe et al. (2006)	177	U.S.	HI	RAT PER	RATION	TC	.38	Subordinates
Tepper et al. (1998)	214	U.S.	HI	HARSH	HARSH	RES	.27	Subordinates
Tepper et al. (1998)	214	U.S.	HI	RATION	RATION	RES	-.14	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS EX	RATION	JS	-.31	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	RAT REW	RATION	JS	.10	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	NS	HARSH	JS	-.42	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	EXC	RATION	JS	-.26	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	JS	-.29	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS EX	RATION	COMM	.09	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	RAT REW	RATION	COMM	.25	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	NS	HARSH	COMM	.24	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	EXC	RATION	COMM	.35	Subordinates
Tripathi & Tripathi (2009)	120	India	VC	ASS	HARSH	COMM	.22	Subordinates
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	ASS	HARSH	MAC	.11	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	RAT	RATION	MAC	-.01	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	SAN	HARSH	MAC	.15	Self

Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	MAC	-.01	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	UP AP	HARSH	MAC	.04	Self
Vecchio & Sussmann (1991)	95	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	MAC	-.01	Self
Study	N	Country	HI/VC	Influence tactic	Meta-category	Correlate	<i>r</i>	Reported by
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	INS	RATION	TC	.51	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	CON	RATION	TC	.42	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	EXC	RATION	TC	.26	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	COA	HARSH	TC	.00	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	LEG	HARSH	TC	-.05	Subordinates
Yukl & Tracey (1992)	128	U.S.	HI	PRE	HARSH	TC	-.23	Subordinates

Note. ALS = authoritarian leadership style; ASS = assertiveness; ASS EX = asserting expertise; AUT = authoritarian; COA = coalition; COMM = commitment; COMP = compliance; CON = consultation; EXC = exchange; FRI = friendliness; GIM = goal internalization motivation; HARSH = harsh; HI = horizontal individualism; HI AU = higher authority; ING = ingratiation; INS = inspirational appeal; INSM = instrumental motivation; IPM = intrinsic process motivation; JS = job satisfaction; LEG = legitimating; LMX = leader-member exchange; MAC = Machiavellianism; NP = negative position power; NS = negative sanctions; PP = personal power; PPP = positive position power; PRE = pressure; PS = positive sanctions; RAT = rationality; RAT PER = rational persuasion; RAT REW = rational rewards; RATION = rational; REA = reason; RES = resistance; SAN = sanctions; SCEM = self-concept external motivation; SCIM = self-concept internal motivation; SOFT = soft; TC = task commitment; THR = threats; UP AP = upward appeal; VC = vertical collectivism.