

# ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AS A MODERATOR OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND INFLUENCE STRATEGIES

Mahfooz A Ansari\* and Kanika Tandon

*The study used questionnaire survey data from a sample of 440 Indian managers in various hierarchical positions representing seven different organizations. It examined the moderating effects of the organizational climate on the relationships between leadership styles and influence strategies. The hypothesis that organizational climate acts as a moderator received support from the data. The implications of the findings for those in leadership roles are discussed.*

Although leadership literature is voluminous, there still remains a great deal to be known about the subject. For example, relative to other approaches (trait, behaviour, or situational contingency), the "power-influence" approach has received little attention from social or organizational psychologists. This approach believes that the fundamental issue in leadership is power (French and Raven, 1959). That is, effective leadership is a function of the bases of power available to the leader and the manner in which he (the leader) exercises influence over his subordinates (Yukl, 1981). However, the power to attain personal and organizational goals should not be restricted to downward influence in organizations (Gamson, 1968). An organization is composed of superiors and subordinates, each of whom can influence the other. The efficient functioning of the organization requires that there should exist a kind of harmony and a sound relationship between the two (Ansari and Kapoor, 1987). According to Yukl (1981), a leader's downward power (i.e., power over subordinates) is dependent, to a considerable extent, on his upward power (i.e., his power over his superiors). In essence, the leader's capacity to influence superiors may be

an essential ingredient of organizational effectiveness (e.g., Gabarro, 1979; Kanter, 1977; Pelz, 1952; Weinstein, 1979). The present study is an attempt to address the leader's downward and upward power in significantly different organizational settings.

## The Background

A power base is a source of influence in organizations. It is something that an agent possesses which provides him or her with power over the target(s) of influence. On the other hand, an influence strategy is the actual (behavioural) mechanism through which the agent exerts influence over the target(s) of influence. Thus, for a proper understanding of influence, what is more important is to investigate the manner in which a leader exerts influence over subordinates and superiors instead of focusing all attention on the bases of power (Yukl, 1981). Stated differently, together with research on the bases of power there is a need to examine the actual influence exercised by the leader. For the effective functioning of an organization, it is important that the leader gets the job done amicably and efficiently. However, what influence strategies the leader uses can by no means be taken as universally fixed. It may all depend upon his own style and the context in which the influence takes place.

Unfortunately, there is not much substantial research on how leadership styles and influence strategies are related. What research

\* Mahfooz A Ansari is Assistant Professor of Psychology in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur; Kanika Tandon is Assistant Professor at the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie.

there has been will now engage our attention. Mulder and his associates (Mulder, de Jong, Koppelaar, and Verhage, 1977) investigated the relationship between power and leadership in a banking concern comprising nine large offices in West Holland. They found that, in crisis circumstances, leaders exert more formal power, that is referent power, expert power, and upward influence, and use less open con-

---

According to Yukl (1981), a leader's downward power (i.e., power over subordinates) is dependent, to a considerable extent, on his upward power (i.e., his power over his superiors).

---

sultation than in non-crisis situations. An interesting finding was that the relationship between the type of leadership and the leader's effectiveness was significantly moderated by the situation. That is, leaders evaluated favourably by their superiors were ascribed more formal power in crisis situations, but in non-crisis situations their subordinates expected more open consultation. However, for leaders evaluated less favourably, no significant difference appeared between various situations. The role of the situation as a moderator was also found to be significant in a subsequent study (Mulder, Binkhorst and Van Oers, 1983).

In view of the above findings, the present study investigates the moderating effect exerted by the organizational climate on the relationship between leadership styles and influence strategies. The reason for the study of climate as a moderator is that it has been found to be related to various other factors, such as job satisfaction, leader behaviours, and the quality of work group interactions (Schnake, 1983). As evidenced in organizational literature, most leadership theories, today, include one or more moderators. Yet, most of the research on moderators has been unsystematic (Miner, 1980) because it fails to "focus on the mechanisms by which moderators operate" (Howell, Dorfman and Kerr, 1986, p.88, italics in original). In view of this complexity, managers report difficulties in attempting to apply situationally-determined contingency models of leadership. Recently, Howell, et al (1986) have proposed leadership neutralizers or enhancers as moderators. According to them, enhancers and neutralizers

are two varieties of the same basic type of moderator. The only difference between the two is that "enhancers represent a positive moderating influence... while neutralizers represent a negative moderating influence" (p.90). In the present study, the style-strategy relationship was expected to vary as a function of organizational climate. In one climate, this relationship might be stronger (enhancer), whereas in an-

---

In the present study, the style-strategy relationship was expected to vary as a function of organizational climate. In one climate, this relationship might be stronger (enhancer), whereas in another, the same relationship might be substantially weaker (neutralizer).

---

other, the same relationship might be substantially weaker (neutralizer).

#### Method

*Research Site and Sample*: The study was conducted in seven heterogeneous organizations located in northern India. Some organizations represented the public sector, while others were privately managed; some were manufacturing concerns, others service organizations; some were large, others small; some were running at a profit, others at a loss; and some were known to be efficient, others inefficient. Taking such a diverse group of organizations represented a deliberate attempt to generalize the survey findings in significantly different settings.

Altogether 440 managers representing the seven organizations voluntarily participated in the study. About 90% of them were male. A majority of them represented low (43%) levels of management and about 14% constituted the top level. Their average age was 37.89 years, with a range between 25 and 60. The majority (77%) of the managers had a bachelor's or higher degree. They had held positions in the same organization for an average of 10 years, and had been in their present assignments approximately for 4 years. Finally, most (60%) of the managers supervised 1 to 9 full-time subordinates.

#### Measures

Each of the measures employed in the

study was based on a varimax rotated factor analysis (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975). A detailed discussion of the development of measures can be found in Ansari (1990). A brief description is presented below.

**Leadership Style Measures :** Based on the work of Ansari (1986), Hassan (1986), and Sinha (1980), 18 single-statement items were employed to tap the respondents' three self-reported leadership styles. Respondents rated each item on a 5-point scale (1= quite false; 5=quite true), to show the extent to which the item truly applied to them. The sample items, descriptive statistics, and coefficients alpha can be found in Table 1.

they engaged in the behaviours described by the scale items to influence their immediate subordinates. They were instructed to respond in terms of what they generally did, not what they would like to do; so that the response was closer to the actual strategy used, not the ideal conjectured strategy. The sample items along with descriptive statistics and coefficients alpha are presented in Table 2.

**Upward Influence Strategy Measures :** The upward influence strategy measures employed 29 items to measure five strategies. The items were drawn from the work of Falbo (1977), Falbo and Peplau (1980), and Kipnis, et al (1980). They were presented exactly the way downward in-

Table 1 : Factors with sample items, descriptive statistics, and reliabilities (leadership styles)

Factors	Sample Items	Mean	SD	Alpha
P (4)	I grant full freedom and autonomy to the subordinates so that they can work best  I go by the joint decisions of my group	15.0	2.4	0.69
T (8)	I expect my subordinates to increase their knowledge on the job  I see that subordinates work to their capacity	33.4	3.5	0.76
B (6)	I believe in strict division of labor even in a work group  I always follow standard rules and regulations	22.3	3.5	0.68

Note : Figures in parentheses are number of items; P= Participative; T= Task-oriented; B= Bureaucratic.

**Downward Influence Strategy Measures :** Twenty-nine items were drawn from the available literature (Falbo, 1977; Falbo and Peplau, 1980; Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson, 1980) to tap the seven downward influence strategies. Respondents were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale (1= never; 5= very often) the frequency with which during the past six months

fluence strategy measures were presented, except that the target of influence was identified as the immediate superior. Table 3 reports sample items and descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients of the subscales.

**Organizational Climate Measures :** A modified version (Schname, 1983) of Litwin and

**Table 2 : Factors with sample items, descriptive statistics, and reliabilities (downward influence strategies)**

Factors	Sample Items	Mean	SD	Alpha
DS1 (5)	I helped them get further advancement if they helped me now I challenged their ability (e.g., "I bet you can't do that")	9.2	3.7	0.76
DS2 (6)	I influenced them because of my competence I told them the reasons why my plan was the best	20.5	3.9	0.71
DS3 (3)	I helped them even in personal matters I went out of my way to help them at the time of their need	9.6	2.6	0.70
DS4 (4)	I obtained the support of co-workers to back my request I usually got my way by making them feel that it was their idea	9.8	3.3	0.65
DS5 (4)	I made an impression that I can't really work without their help I showed that I sought their help	11.4	3.1	0.69
DS6 (4)	I obtained the informal support of higher-ups I got the support of someone higher-up to back my request	9.4	3.3	0.65
DS7 (3)	I repeatedly reminded them about what I wanted I pointed out that the rules required that they comply	8.8	2.4	0.48

**Note :** Figures in parentheses are number of items; DS1 = Exchange and Challenge; DS2 = Expertise and Reasons; DS3 = Personalized Help; DS4 = Coalition and Manipulation; DS5 = Showing Dependency; DS6 = Upward Appeal; DS7 = Assertion.

**Table 3 : Factors with sample items, descriptive statistics, and reliabilities (upward influence strategies)**

Factors	Sample Items	Mean	SD	Alpha
US1 (9)	I engaged in work slow down until he/she did what I wanted I acted unfriendly or did not cooperate with him/her	13.9	5.4	0.83
US2 (11)	At times I showed my knowledge of the specific issue I got my way by convincing him/her that my way was the best way	37.1	6.7	0.84
US3 (4)	I acted very humbly to him/her while requesting my point I offered to work harder in the future	11.5	3.3	0.67
US4 (3)	I obtained the support of co-workers to back my request I got everyone else (my colleagues) to agree with me before I made the request	6.4	2.7	0.73
US5 (2)	I made a show that I had respect for him/her I pretended that I cared for him/her	5.1	2.2	0.70

Note : Figures in parentheses are number of items; US1 = Blocking and Defiance; US2 = Expertise and Reasons; US3 = Ingratiation and Exchange; US4 = Coalition; US5 = Diplomacy.

Stringer's (1968) organizational climate questionnaire was used to assess the respondents' perceptions of organizational climate. It consisted of 13 items to tap the three dimensions of climate. Each item was rated on a 5-point scale (1= to almost no extent; 5= to a very great extent) to gauge the extent to which the item was true for the respondents' organizations. Table 4 presents the sample items and relevant psychometric properties of the subscales.

It was of interest to see if the seven organizations had significantly different climates. The mean scores and F-ratios are contained in Table 5. The differences are highly significant in all the climate factors. The analysis indicated that organizations 1 and 6 had the most unfavourable climate, whereas the remaining five organizations had a favourable climate. On the whole, these mean scores were consistent with information drawn from other sources (for in-

**Table 4 : Factors with sample items, descriptive statistics, and reliability (organizational climate)**

Factors	Sample Items	Mean	SD	Alpha
RP (5)	In this organization, I am given a chance to participate in setting the performance standards for my job in this organization, people are rewarded in proportion to the excellence of their job performance	12.9	4.3	0.80
ST (5)	The assignments in this organization are clearly understood The policies and goals of this organization are clearly understood	17.1	3.9	0.78
WS (3)	People in this organization don't really trust each other very much (R) People in this organization tend to be cool and aloof toward each other (R)	9.7	2.5	0.64

Note : Figures in parentheses are number of items; (R) = Scoring Reversed; RP = Reward and Participation; ST = Structure; WS = Warmth and Support.

**Table 5 : Mean scores on climate factors and significance of their differences**

Climate	Organization							F (6, 433)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
RP	12.16 (6)	12.43 (5)	14.11 (2)	13.56 (3)	13.01 (4)	11.61 (7)	14.46 (1)	4.04
ST	16.45 (6)	18.48 (2)	19.18 (1)	18.35 (3)	17.77 (4)	14.71 (7)	17.17 (5)	11.82
WS	9.18 (6)	9.83 (4)	11.71 (1)	9.36 (5)	10.38 (2)	9.13 (7)	9.86 (3)	5.65

Note : All F-ratios are significant at  $p < .001$ ; Figures in parentheses indicate ranks. The higher the rank, the less favourable the climate. RP = Reward and participation; ST = Structure; WS = Warmth and Support.

stance, the investigators' observations). It should be noted that organizations 1 and 6 were indeed considered to be inefficient by various objective norms of efficiency. On the other hand, the remaining organizations were considered to be efficient and found to have better working conditions. Thus, in the final analysis, organizations 1 and 6 were classified as having an unfavourable climate. To check if there existed a significant difference between the two types of organizations, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the climate scores. Once again, scores on all the climate dimensions reflected a highly significant difference ( $p < 0.001$ ) between the two categories of organizations. In summary, then, organizational environment scores were based on collective judgements of the climates in the particular organization, of which the individual manager was a part. That is, climate was conceptualized as an organizational phenomenon. Such analysis helps a researcher

to rank various organizations in terms of their climate scores (Ansari, Baumgartel and Sullivan, 1982; Glick, 1985).

**Summary**

It is important to note that the scales employed in the present study exhibited reliability coefficients well over 0.50, suggested by Nunnally (1978) as a minimum level for an acceptable level of reliability. There was, however, one exception. The Assertion scale (a measure of downward influence strategy) had a reliability coefficient just below the required level, perhaps because it was composed of just three items (see Table 2).

The information contained in Table 6 also suggests that, in general, there is a great deal of independence between the subscales within a scale. That is, they do not appear to limit the subsequent analyses owing to the problem of multicollinearity.

Table 6 : Intercorrelations of study variables

Factor	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
01. P	X																	
02. T	35	X																
03. B	10	49	X															
04. DS1	08	02	13	X														
05. DS2	11	24	09	14	X													
06. DS3	27	19	07	19	39	X												
07. DS4	17	07	13	29	29	26	X											
08. DS5	17	04	-05	26	27	35	33	X										
09. DS6	09	00	14	40	15	14	56	22	X									
10. DS7	-01	14	27	32	22	20	19	10	25	X								
11. US1	-08	-32	-05	39	-12	00	19	10	28	17	X							
12. US2	07	21	09	11	56	27	27	22	07	12	00	X						
13. US3	16	13	32	39	22	25	28	22	25	25	15	24	X					
14. US4	10	-09	05	27	00	04	43	21	35	13	44	09	31	X				
15. US5	07	-03	16	29	10	19	25	15	20	21	31	19	38	33	X			
16. RP	03	01	-03	13	-05	05	32	15	20	11	19	00	08	25	11	X		
17. ST	01	26	02	06	11	07	10	04	05	07	-11	04	07	02	-08	47	X	
18. WS	-05	09	-06	-12	-08	-04	-16	01	-12	-08	-26	-12	-09	-17	-19	11	28	X

Note : Decimal points are omitted;  $r(438) = .09$  at  $p < .05$ ;  $r(438) = .12$  at  $p < .01$ .  
For abbreviations, see Tables 1 through 4.

### Procedure

Two female Research Assistants conducted the interviews with managers; both of them held master's degrees in psychology and were experienced in interviewing. Managers were assured complete anonymity in their individual responses, and the importance of frank and sincere replies was emphasized. The managers were interviewed individually and in private.

### Statistical Analyses

Researchers in leadership studies have used different analytical strategies for identifying moderators. According to Howell, et al (1986), different strategies (such as ANOVA, median-split sample with correlation coefficients, and hierarchical multiple regression) yield different information and the techniques may have been used inappropriately. For example, the median-split sample approach employing zero-order correlations gives information regarding the degree and direction of a relationship between the two variables, whereas the hierarchical regression approach provides the form or pattern of a relationship between the two variables. Considering the problems of various moderating techniques, both Arnold (1982) and Stone and Hollenbeck (1984) have strongly favoured the use of a hierarchical regression approach as the appropriate strategy to identify moderators.

Since the position taken in the present research is slightly different from the one recommended above, a note is in order. In a hierarchical regression analysis, a moderator is identified through interaction. For each interaction pair, scores on predictor and moderator are first converted to *z* scores and then a product term is formed. If the moderator hypothesis is to be confirmed, the beta weight of the product term (interaction) should be significant. It should also be noted that the use of such a regression approach generally requires that the data in each pair are obtained on interval scales. In the present analysis, instead of using hierarchical regression, a stepwise multiple regression strategy was adopted to identify the role of organizational climate as moderator. The reason is that the moderator was split into two

kinds, based on the mean climate scores. Each of the seven organizations was located in a "high" or "low" category on each of the three climate dimensions based on an inspection of the organization's mean score on the dimension (see Table 5). It should be emphasized that this was an "organizational level" analysis; the objective was to study how differences in organizational environments moderate the relationship between managerial styles and influence strategies, not, how individual perceptions of the environment affect the relationship. In view of this methodology, five organizations were classified as having an unfavourable climate (i.e., they had lower scores in all the three climate dimensions). Thus, two sets of step-wise regression analyses were performed: one in a highly favourable and another in a less favourable (unfavourable) climate, to examine the patterns of relationship between managerial styles and the use of downward and upward influence tactics.

### Results

*Bivariate Analysis*: The data were first analyzed using zero-order correlations for the entire sample. An inspection of Table 6 suggests at least three conclusions, which are given below.

- i) Of the 21 correlations between leadership styles and downward influence strategies, 13 are statistically significant. The participative style is positively tied with all influence strategies except exchange and challenge, and assertion. The task-oriented style is linked to only three strategies: expertise and reasons, personalized help, and assertion. The bureaucratic style is related to all except the strategies of personalized help and showing dependency.
- ii) Of the 15 correlations between leadership styles and upward influence strategies, 9 are statistically significant. The participative style is related to only two influence strategies: ingratiation, and exchange and coalition. The task-oriented style is tied with all strategies except diplomacy. The bureaucratic style is linked to all but the strategies of blocking and defiance, and coalition.
- iii) The data meet the assumption underlying subgroup analysis in that all the three climate factors (moderators) are unrelated



(or weakly related) either to predictors or criterion measures (the highest  $r^2 = 0.10$ ).

**Multiple Regression Analysis :** Next, in order to test for the effects that organizational climate might have on the leadership styles-influence strategies (downward and upward) relationships, two separate sets of stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed.

The median-split sample approach employing zero-order correlations gives information regarding the degree and direction of a relationship between the two variables, whereas the hierarchical regression approach provides the form or pattern of a relationship between the two variables.

#### Downward Influence Strategies

Table 7 shows the findings in terms of the particular combination of influence strategies that best predicted each leadership style. In addition, Table 7 reports the regression coefficients and zero-order correlations of these influence strategies with each leadership style.

Even a cursory look at Table 7 would suggest that climate does moderate the relationships between leadership styles and downward influence strategies. The significant relationships are summarized below.

- i) Participative managers, in an unfavourable climate, report a more frequent use of coalition and manipulation tactics to in-

The objective was to study how differences in organizational environments moderate the relationship between managerial styles and influence strategies, *not* how individual perceptions of the environment affect the relationship.

fluence the subordinates. In contrast, they rely more often on personalized help to influence the subordinates in a favourable climate; however, they report a less frequent use of assertiveness.

- ii) Whereas none of the influence tactics is significantly associated with the task-oriented style in an unfavourable climate,

Table 7 : Regression coefficients between leadership styles and downward influence strategies— subgroup analysis

Leadership Styles	Unfavourable Climate (a)			Favourable Climate (b)		
	Strategies	r	beta	Strategies	r	beta
Participative	Coalition and Manipulation	.32	.35	Personalized Help	.28	.21
				Assertion	-.04	-.13
			R = .33	R = .31		
Task-oriented				Expertise and Reasons	.27	.19
				R = .31		
Bureaucratic	Assertion	.39	.37	Assertion	.20	.19
				Exchange and Challenge	.18	.21
				Showing Dependency	-.07	-.15
				R = .39		

Note : All regression coefficients are significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence. Strategies are listed in order of their entry into the stepwise multiple regression equation; \*N = 159; \*N = 261.

tactics like expertise and reasons are associated positively with this style in a favourable climate.

- iii) Bureaucratic managers report a more frequent use of assertiveness in an unfavourable climate, whereas in addition to this technique (assertion), they make frequent use of such tactics as exchange and challenge in a favourable climate. Additionally,

The participative style is positively tied with all influence strategies except exchange and challenge, and assertion. The task-oriented style is linked to only three strategies: expertise and reasons, personalized help, and assertion. The bureaucratic style is related to all except the strategies of personalized help and showing dependency.

showing dependency is negatively associated with the bureaucratic style of leadership in a favourable climate.

#### Upward Influence Strategies

Two separate sets of stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed in order to test for the effects that climate might have on the relationships between leadership styles and upward influence strategies. Table 8 shows the zero-order correlations and the findings relating to the particular combination of influence tac-

Participative managers, in an unfavourable climate, report a more frequent use of coalition and manipulation tactics to influence the subordinates. In contrast, they rely more often on personalized help to influence the subordinates in a favourable climate; however, they report a less frequent use of assertiveness.

tics that best predicted each leadership style. As can be seen in Table 8, there is a meaningful pattern of relationships as a function of ob-

Table 8 : Regression coefficients between leadership styles and upward influence strategies— subgroup analysis

Leadership Styles	Unfavourable Climate (a)			Favourable Climate (b)		
	Strategies	r	beta	Strategies	r	beta
Participative	Ingratiation and Exchange	.27	.22	Ingratiation and Exchange	.10	.04*
	Blocking and Defiance	-.10	-.20	Blocking and Defiance	-.07	-.16
			R = .30			R = .13
Task-oriented	Blocking and Defiance	-.41	-.48	Expertise and Reasons	.27	.22
				Blocking and Defiance	-.27	-.30
			R = .41			R = .41
Bureaucratic	Ingratiation and Exchange	.29	.23	Ingratiation and Exchange	.34	.33
	Blocking and Defiance	-.18	-.29			
	Diplomacy	.24	.21			
			R = .44			R = .34

Note : All regression coefficients are significant at or beyond the .05 level of confidence except the star marked. Strategies are listed in order of their entry into the stepwise multiple regression equation.

\*N = 159; †N = 281.

jective organizational climate, an evidence of a moderating effect. The significant relationships are summarized below.

- i) Participative managers report a less frequent use of such upward influence tactics as blocking and defiance, regardless of the nature of the climate, favourable or unfavourable. Yet they report a more frequent use of ingratiation and exchange tactics when dealing with the boss in a favourable climate.
- ii) Task-oriented managers report less frequent use of blocking and defiance tactics in both the climates. But, they report a more frequent use of such tactics as expertise and reasons in a favourable climate.
- iii) Bureaucratic managers make a more frequent use of ingratiation and exchange tactics in both the climates. But, they also report a frequent use of diplomacy and a less frequent use of blocking and defiance in an unfavourable climate.

#### Discussion and Implications

Several interesting conclusions follow from the findings. To begin with, organizational climate does appear to represent an important moderator of the relationships between leadership styles and influence strategies, for this sample of Indian managers. The present data suggest that essentially the same leadership style which enhances the efficiency of an influence strategy in one climate also neutralizes it in another. It should be pointed out, however, that while the magnitude of the relationship is not overly large (Maximum  $R^2 = 0.19$ ), much criterion variation is still explained. Attention should, therefore, be directed at investigating the moderating role of other factors (such as the personal characteristics of the subordinates and those of the managers, the tasks, and the goals of the influence attempt) in determining the relationships between leader behaviour and influence strategies. Furthermore, corroborative evidence from the subordinates' perceptions, attitudes, and behaviour on the job can be studied for the use of leadership styles mediated by climate conditions. The individual perceptions of climate by the subordinates can also reveal important insights into the process of leadership at the level of the leader-member

dyads. Thus, a thorough mapping of moderator variables is necessary before such knowledge can be used meaningfully in organizations with any serious probability of success.

On the positive side, treating organizational climate as a moderator has several important implications for both individual managers and organizations. One obvious implication is that managers should diagnose their own styles and then develop skills in order to change the climate in the desired direction. That is, they should use effective tactics of influence which fit in with their style and the climate of their organization. The present data show that climate helps determine the kinds of influence tactics actually used by managers in order to get their way with immediate superior and subordinates. The implication is that climates can and do influence the motivational behaviour of the members of an organization. Therefore, changes in certain climate properties should have immediate and profound effects on the use of influence strategies. Evidence (Rosenberg & Pearlman, 1962) exists that organizational norms governing decision-making processes may constrain managers in the choice of influence tactics.

If organizational climate has such an important impact on the relationship between leadership styles and influence strategies, then organizations should be changed in such a way that they provide a favourable environment for the use of effective and rational influence tactics. It should be noted at this point that the present survey concerns itself with only those influence strategies which are effectively used by managers in getting their way with bosses and subordinates. The data show that, in order to be effective, even participative managers sometimes use nonrational tactics. This is not to say that to the extent an influence tactic is successful, we would expect a manager to use it and that this would most likely lead to successful organizational performance. What needs to be highlighted is that the effective use of an influence tactic should also have a positive bearing on the mind of the target person(s), and should have a long-lasting effect. For example, a manager may successfully use coalition and manipulation to get his or her way with the subordinates, but the use of such tactics may also produce negative effects (such as dislike of the boss) on the part of the subordinates. In

view of this, a manager must be supportive and task-oriented; he or she must be aware of the popular rational influence tactics and their consequences; and the climate of the organiza-

---

Participative managers report a less frequent use of such upward influence tactics as blocking and defiance, regardless of the nature of the climate, favourable or unfavourable.

---

tion expressed in terms of reward and participation, structure, and warmth and support, must be favourable. Only then can we expect a modern organization to move towards success. The following guidelines may help in the attainment of these goals.

The chief executive officer or the top management must deliberately change the policy choices. Past research has shown that it is the top management that sets the climate (Likert, 1967) or culture (Wilkins, 1983) of the organization. The most important and dramatic determinant of organizational climate appears to be the leadership style of the top managers themselves. Top management can stress policies and lay out perspectives in two ways: (i) through their personal behaviour and (ii) through the formal systems they create (Wilkins, 1983). Another option is an organizational development programme—a planned programme for changing the character of an organization involving the use of behavioural science consultants and social science methodologies of planned change (Baumgartel, 1981).

Which influence strategy is the most appropriate? It all depends on the circumstances

---

Managers should diagnose their own styles and then develop skills in order to change the climate in the desired direction.

That is, they should use effective tactics of influence which fit in with their style and the climate of their organization.

---

in which a particular strategy is being used. However, the choice of the most appropriate strategy can be made by self-examination and management development programmes (Kipnis

& Schmidt, 1984). In such training programmes, managers need to be made aware of a variety of influence tactics and their possible effects rather than relying on traditional methods of influence like reward, coercion, or legitimate.

To summarize, the present research has provided a frame-work which, if understood by managers, may provide a much needed perspective for the effective managing of people (boss and subordinates) at work. The research suggests that managers must have influence over their people, but this influence cannot be only aimed at style. If managers are to become effective in using various styles and strategies, they must understand certain facts; they must learn about the climate of the organization, of which they are a part. Our data provide enough evidence to suggest that Indian managers are flexible at using effective influence tactics. They must be trained to choose and use the most appropriate strategies in a given organizational

---

If organizational climate has such an important impact on the relationship between leadership styles and influence strategies, then organizations should be changed in such a way that they provide a favourable environment for the use of effective and rational influence tactics.

---

context. Therefore, action to enhance leadership effectiveness should focus on both influence strategies and organizational climate.

Note: This paper reports one of a number of analyses of data collected. Support for the original research investigation was provided by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi. Appreciation is expressed to the funding institution, to the many public and private sector organizations, and to the various individual managers who cooperated in this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Reeta Kool for her assistance in collecting the data and to Rashmi Shukla for her assistance in collecting, tabulating and analyzing the data.

A portion of this paper was presented by the senior author at the 24th Convention of the International Congress of Psychology, Sydney, Australia, August, 1988.

#### References

1. Ansari, M. A. (1986): Need for Nurturant-Task Leaders in India: Some empirical evidence. *Management and Labour Studies*, Vol 11, No.1, 28-36.

2. Ansari, M. A. (1990) : Managing People at Work. New Delhi: Sage.
3. Ansari, M. A., Baumgartel, H., and Sullivan, G. (1982) : The personal orientation-organizational climate fit and managerial success. *Human Relations*, 35, 1159-1178.
4. Ansari, M. A., and Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 29-39.
5. Arnold, H. J. (1982) : Moderator variables: A classification of conceptual, analytic, and psychometric issues. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 29, 143-174.
6. Baumgartel, H. (1981) : Human factors in the transfer of technology in national development. *Human Futures*, 4, 1-9.
7. Falbo, T. (1977) : Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 537-548.
8. Falbo, T., and Peplau, L. A. (1980) : Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 618-628.
9. French, J. R. P. and Raven, B. H. (1959) : The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 118-149). Ann Arbor, MI; Institute for Social Research.
10. Gabarro, J. J. (1979) : Socialization at the top : How CEO's and subordinates evolve interpersonal contracts. *Organizational Dynamics*, 7, 3-23.
11. Gamson, W. A. (1968) : Power and Discontent. Homewood, IL; Dorsey.
12. Glick, W. H. (1985) : Conceptualizing and measuring organizational and psychological climate : Pitfalls in multilevel research. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 601-616.
13. Hassan, A. (1986) : Subordinate and task characteristics as moderators of leadership effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Patna, India: Patna University.
14. Howell, J. P., Dorfman, P. W., and Kerr, S. (1986) : Moderator variables in leadership research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 88-102.
15. Kanter, R. M. (1977) : Men and Women of Corporation. New York, Basic.
16. Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., and Wilkinson, I. (1980) : Intraorganizational influence tactics : Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-452.
17. Likert, R. (1967) : The Human Organization. New York, McGraw-Hill.
18. Litwin, G. H. and Stringer, R. A. (1968) : Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston, MA; Harvard University Press.
19. Miner, J. B. (1980) : Theories of Organizational Behaviour. Hinsdale, Dryden.
20. Mulder, M., Binkhorst, D., and Van Oers, T. (1983) : Systematic appraisal of leadership effectiveness of consultants. *Human Relations*, 36, 1045-1064.
21. Mulder, M., de Jong, R. D., Koppelaar, L., and Verhage, J. (1977) : Power, situation, and leaders' effectiveness—An organizational field study by means of the influence analysis questionnaire. Department of Psychology, Free University, Amsterdam.
22. Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. (1975) : SPSS : Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York : McGraw-Hill.
23. Nunnally, J. C. (1978) : Psychometric Theory. New York : McGraw-Hill.
24. Peiz, D. C. (1952). Influence : A key to effective leadership in the first-line supervisor. *Personnel*, 29, 3-11.
25. Rosenberg, M., and Pearlin, L. (1962) : Power-orientations in the mental hospital. *Human Relations*, 15, 335-349.
26. Schnake, M.E. (1983) : An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 791-807.
27. Sinha, J. B. P. (1980) : The Nurturant-Task Leader. New Delhi, Concept.
28. Stone, E. F., and Hollenbeck, J. R. (1984) : Some issues associated with the use of moderated regression. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 195-213.
29. Weinstein, D. (1979) : Bureaucratic Opposition : Challenging Abuses of the Workplace. New York, Pergamon.
30. Wilkins, A. L. (1983) : The culture audit : A tool for understanding organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11, 24-38.
31. Yukl, G. A. (1981) : Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.