



## Influence Strategies/Tactics in the Workplace

Mahfooz Ansari, Jocelyn Wiltshire

LAST MODIFIED: 24 MARCH 2021

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199846740-0202

---

### Introduction

This article is a selective guide through the literature on influence tactics, which is grounded in the power-influence approach to leadership, most popularly known as bases of social influence/power. A major premise of the theory is that the exercise of influence is the essence of leadership. The theory deals with reciprocal influence processes in leadership—that is, leader power over subordinates and that of subordinates over the leader. In reality, the direction of influence/power may be downward (supervisor to subordinate), upward (subordinate to supervisor), lateral (coworkers to coworkers), or outward (customer). Though the two terms—“power” and “influence”—are used interchangeably, they are conceptually different. Power is defined as the ability to influence, whereas influence is power in action or the demonstrated use of power, and it is viewed as the process of producing behavioral or psychological effects in a target person. One may have power, but he or she may not feel like using it. That is, the use of power is influence. Though influence and power are conceptually distinct, they are often used interchangeably. Power is also confused with authority. Whereas power is the capacity to influence, authority is the power associated with position or chair. This bibliography begins with a description of the foundation of knowledge and general overviews and textbooks. Next, it discusses the emergence and types of influence tactics. Finally, it summarizes the empirical evidence concerning the antecedents and outcomes of influence tactics, as well as the cultural context of influence.

---

### General Overviews

Power is known as the capacity that one individual has to influence the behaviors of another. In other words, when an individual engages in an influence tactic, it is an exercise of their power. As such, understanding the nature of power and its acquisition in organizational settings is central to the literature and research on influence tactics. Elias 2008 provided a thorough overview of French and Raven’s taxonomy of bases of power (see Ansari 1990 and French and Raven 1959 under The Foundation of Knowledge) and its developments in the decades since. From power to actual influence behavior, Bolino, et al. 2016 offered an excellent overview of key research on impression management tactics, whereas Cialdini and Goldstein 2004 reviews the existing literature on the strategies of compliance and conformity. Mowday 1978 was perhaps the earliest to conduct groundbreaking empirical research on upward influence. Later researchers built their upward influence studies on these theoretical frameworks and empirical findings. Smith, et al. 2013 reported a meta-analytic study on the gendered nature of lateral and upward influence attempts. The results provided limited support to gender role theory such that men were more likely to engage in agentic influence tactics and women were more likely to receive personal advancement outcomes when they used communal influence tactics. Ferris, et al. 2019 reported a critical review on the already existing three categories of organizational politics—the perception of organizational politics, political behavior, and political skill, and suggested a new classification of organizational politics research. Their new classification scheme consisted of political characteristics, political actions, and political outcomes.

**Bolino, M., D. Long, and W. Turnley. “Impression Management in Organizations: Critical Questions, Answers, and Areas for Future Research.” *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 3 (2016): 377–406.**

This is an excellent review of key questions and research related to impression management including antecedents, outcomes, cross-cultural implications, as well as the role of gender, political skill, self-monitoring, and hierarchical position in tactic effectiveness; clarifies the distinctions between general influence tactics, impression management, and self-presentation; discussion of honest versus deceptive impression management attempts; highlights key areas for future research.

**Cialdini, R. B., and N. J. Goldstein. "Social Influence: Compliance and Conformity." *Annual Review of Psychology* 55 (2004): 591–621.**

This is a commonly cited literature review of social influence research, with a predominant focus on compliance and conformity.

**Elias, S. "Fifty Years of Influence in the Workplace." *Journal of Management History* 14 (2008): 267–283.**

This is a historical overview of the prominent French and Raven taxonomy of social power bases; focuses on the empirical and theoretical developments of the taxonomy over the past several decades.

**Ferris, R., B. P. Ellen III, C. P. McAllister, and L. P. Maher. "Recognizing Organizational Politics Research: A Review of the Literature and Identification of Future Research Directions." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 6 (2019): 299–323.**

Making a critical review on the previous three categories of organizational politics—the perception of organizational politics, political behavior, and political skill—Ferris and colleagues suggest a new framework with higher-level categories with which to classify organizational politics research. The new framework comprises political characteristics, political actions, and political outcomes.

**Mowday, R. T. "The Exercise of Upward Influence in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23 (1978): 137–156.**

This is the earliest, groundbreaking empirical paper on upward influence tactics. Later researchers built their investigations, following the footpath of this theoretical framework.

**Smith, A. N., M. B. Watkins, M. J. Burke, et al. "Gender Influence: A Gender Role Perspective on the Use and Effectiveness of Influence Tactics." *Journal of Management* 39 (2013): 1156–1183.**

This meta-analytic study examines the gendered nature of lateral and upward influence attempts. The results provide limited support to gender role theory such that men are more likely to use agentic influence tactics and women are more likely to receive personal advancement outcomes when they use communal influence tactics.

---

## The Foundation of Knowledge

Power has been characterized as "the fundamental concept in social science . . . in the same sense energy is a fundamental concept in physics" (Russell 1938, p. 18). Power and influence have been conceptualized in many different ways, but the one which is probably the most influential view is that of French and Raven 1959. According to the authors, power is often seen as a function of sources or bases of power. They viewed power as a "potential influence" that an influencing agent (A) could exert on a target person (B). Aguinis, et al. 2008 precisely defined power bases as follows: (1) *Reward power* is based on B's perception that A can provide desired tangible or intangible outcomes. (2) *Coercive power* is based on B's perception that A can issue punishments. (3) *Legitimate power* is based on B's perception that A has the legitimate right to give orders and there is an obligation to comply with those orders. (4) *Referent power* is based on an identification with or B's desire to be associated with A. (5) *Expert power* is based on B's belief that A possesses superior or special knowledge. Subsequently, Raven 1965 added a sixth base, (6) *Information power*, which is based on B's perception that A can control the availability and accuracy of information. Other researchers (Ansari 1990; Hersey, et al. 1979) added a seventh base of power, (7) *Connection power*, which is based on B's perception that A is well connected with other powerful individuals. In a meta-analytic study, Carson, et al. 1993 reported the usefulness of the power bases scheme. In another influential paper, Kelman 1958 introduced the three processes of attitude change: compliance, identification, and internalization, which were later reduced to a two-process model by Sutton and Harrison 1993, thus combining the last two factors into one process, commitment. The bases of power models kept later researchers quite busy with conceptualizing and identifying influence tactics and developing their measuring instruments. However, a description of the

existing classification of power bases may not describe fully the use of various influence tactics in organizations. Power bases alone are insufficient unless one uses them. It is important, therefore, to develop a better understanding of how a given base of power is translated into effective influence in organizational decision-making. Stated differently, how do individuals exercise the power they have to influence others.

**Aguinis, H., M. A. Ansari, S. Jayasingam, and R. Aafaqi. "Perceived Entrepreneurial Success and Social Power." *Management Research* 6 (2008): 121–137.**

Precisely defining the seven bases of power (reward, coercion, legitimate, referent, expert, information, and association or connection), this article provides empirical evidence to show the link between bases of power and perceived entrepreneurial success.

**Ansari, M. A. *Managing People at Work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1990.**

This book provides an excellent historical overview of social power and influence. Introducing the seventh base of power, connection power, the book offers a large data-set on power and influence tactics.

**Carson, P. P., K. D. Carson, and W. Roe. "Social Power Bases: A Meta-analytic Examination of Interrelationships and Outcomes." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 23 (1993): 1150–1169.**

This meta-analytic study tests the usefulness of French and Raven 1959, the original power bases scheme, and that of the revised scheme (Raven, et al. 1998, cited under the Emergence of Influence Tactics) in terms of three important employee outcomes: satisfaction with supervisor, job satisfaction, and performance. Carson and colleagues structural equations analysis provides empirical evidence in favor of the revised power typology in terms of the goodness of fit indices and the predictive power.

**French, J. R. P., and B. Raven. "The Bases of Social Power." In *Studies in Social Power*. Edited by D. Cartwright, 118–149. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1959.**

This early book chapter introduces a unique bases of power theory that proposes five bases of power: reward, coercion, legitimate, expert, and referent.

**Hersey, P., K. H. Blanchard, and W. E. Natemeyer. "Situational Leadership, Perception, and the Impact of Power." *Group and Organization Studies* 4 (1979): 418–428.**

This article shows the link between situational leadership and the bases of power. It also introduces the seventh base of power, association (or connection power).

**Katz, D., and R. L. Kahn. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1978.**

This seminal book consists of several theories on social psychological constructs useful for understanding modern organizational dynamics, including power, influence, and control.

**Kelman, H. C. "Compliance, Identification, Internalization: Three Processes of Attitude Change." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2 (1958): 51–60.**

In this widely cited paper, Kelman introduces three processes of attitude change: compliance (i.e., accepting influence in the hope of achieving a favorable reaction from another person), identification (i.e., accepting influence because of the desire to establish or maintain a satisfying, self-defining relationship to another person), and internalization (i.e., accepting influence because the induced ideas are intrinsically rewarding).

**Raven, B. H. "Social Influence and Power." In *Current Studies in Social Psychology*. Edited by I. D. Steiner and M. Fishbein, 371–382. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1965.**

This chapter adds the sixth base of power to the bases of power scheme, information power.

**Russell, B. *Power: A New Social Analysis*. New York: Norton, 1938.**

This bestseller is largely philosophical, which is based on the premise that the use of power and acquisition of power is cyclical. It offers several guidelines for using influence in day-to-day life.

**Sutton, C. D., and A. W. Harrison. "Validity Assessment of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization as Dimensions of Organizational Commitment." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 53 (1993): 217–223.**

In a factor-analytic study, the authors reduce Kelman's three processes of influence to a two-process model (Factor 1 = compliance, Factor 2 = identification + internalization).

---

## Textbooks

Given that the exercise of power and influence is ubiquitous in organizations, this topic is included as a subtopic within almost all organizational behavior textbooks. Yet, multiple textbooks are available on this topic. The authors listed are all noted in the area of social power and influence. As such those books are suitable for teachers and practitioners, as well as for those people starting to research the area. Dale Carnegie's 1936 book (Carnegie 1936) is one of the most groundbreaking and timeless bestsellers of all time. It teaches people how to be liked, ways to win people to your way of thinking, and ways to change people without arousing resentment. In the author's presidential address to the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Cartwright 1959 forcefully asserted that any social psychological theory was incomplete without the construct of social power and influence. The question of "how to get things done in a timely and effective way" was asked by Pfeffer 1993. Pfeffer was of the view that problems of implementation are issues of how to influence behavior, change the course of events, overcome resistance, and get people to do things they would not otherwise do. Guinot and Vescio 2000 addressed the issue of influence and power as a central concern in social life. They examined how having or lacking power influences the way individuals and groups think, feel, and act. In an influential volume, Cialdini 2009 provides experimental evidence on the strategies the author studied while working with salespersons, fundraisers, advertisers, and in other positions inside organizations that commonly used effective influence tactics to get us to say "yes." He outlined six psychological principles of influence that direct human behavior: reciprocity, consistency, social proof, liking, authority, and scarcity. Kipnis 2012 dealt with the issue of how the added power provided by technology changes the behavior of people who control it. These changes are described among managers at work, psychologists, physicians, and colonists. Kipnis believes that an evidence-based perspective is needed for viewing the many social problems generated by technology.

**Carnegie, D. *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1936.**

The earliest bestseller on influence presents some good advice on how to motivate people like you, ways to win people to your way of thinking, and ways to change people without arousing resentment.

**Cartwright, D. *Studies in Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1959.**

The earliest edited volume on social problems that provides the ground for empirical research on power and influence.

**Cialdini, R. *Influence: Science and Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2009.**

This bestseller examines the psychology of compliance. It uncovers the factors that cause a target person to say “yes” to an influencing agent’s request.

**Guinot, A., and T. K. Vescio. *The Social Psychology of Power*. New York: Guilford, 2000.**

This book is a comprehensive review of classic and contemporary research on power and influence.

**Kipnis, D. *Technology and Power*. New York: Springer, 2012.**

This book deals with the issue of how the added power provided by technology changes the behavior of people who control it.

**Pfeffer, J. *Managing with Power: Politics and Influence in Organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1993.**

The book convincingly shows that the effective use of power is an essential component of strong leadership.

---

## The Emergence of Influence Tactics

Drawing on the most comprehensive bases of power taxonomy, formal research on influence tactics began in the early 1980s. Extending and commenting on the bases of power taxonomy, Kipnis, et al. 1980 argued that individuals do not exercise influence tactics in ways predicted by the power bases scheme; many of the influence tactics do not fit into the expected power categories. Hence, they developed an influence scale that consisted of eight effective tactics of influence. In a subsequent validation study, Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990 reduced the number of influence tactics from eight to six. Building on Kipnis and colleagues, Yukl and Falbe 1990 came up with nine influence tactics. These influence tactics were all suitable for use in all directions—downward, upward, and lateral. Ansari 1990 (cited under The Foundation of Knowledge) added two new culture-specific tactics of influence: personalized help and showing dependency. Leong, et al. 2007 reported sixteen scenario-based influence tactics and categorized them into a two-dimensional model of influence strategies. Based on the previous works, Raven, et al. 1998 revised the authors’ original thinking and proposed a new taxonomy called the Interpersonal Power Inventory Model (IPIM) that includes eleven influence categories. Overall, several tactics have been empirically identified in the literature. The often-cited tactics are (1) Apprising, (2) Assertiveness or pressure, (3) Coalitions, (4) Collaboration, (5) Consultation, (6) Exchange of benefits, (7) Image management, (8) Impersonal coercion, (9) Impersonal reward, (10) Ingratiation, (11) Inspirational appeal, (12) Legitimacy of dependence, (13) Legitimacy of equity, (14) Legitimacy of position, (15) Legitimacy of reciprocity, (16) Legitimizing, (17) Personal coercion, (18) Personal reward, (19) Manipulation, (20) Personal appeal, (21) Personalized help, (22) Rational persuasion/rationality/information, (23) Reference, (24) Showing dependency, (25) Showing expertise, and (26) Upward appeal.

**Kipnis, D., S. M. Schmidt, and I. Wilkinson. “Intraorganizational Influence Tactics: Explorations in Getting One’s Way.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 65 (1980): 440–452.**

This seminal article introduces an influence tactics taxonomy and provides an empirically sound measure to assess effective influence tactics with supervisors, co-workers, and subordinates. The scale, popularly known as the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS), consisted of eight influence tactics: assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanction, exchange, upward appeals, blocking, and coalitions.

**Leong, J. L. T., M. H. Bond, and P. P. Fu. “Perceived Effectiveness of Influence Strategies among Hong Kong Managers.” *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 24 (2007): 75–96.**

Authors report sixteen scenario-based influence tactics and categorized them into a two-dimensional model of influence strategies. The two dimensions were (a) the more nurturing Gentle Persuasion (GP) and (b) the more agentic Contingent Control (CC) across downward, upward, and lateral direction of influence.

**Raven, B. H., J. Schwarzland, and M. Koslowski. "Conceptualizing and Measuring a Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 28 (1998): 307–332.**

Accounting for the works by Ansari 1990 (cited under the Foundation of Knowledge), Kipnis, et al. 1980, and Yukl and Falbe 1990, this article is the refined statement on bases of power. The new taxonomy is called the Interpersonal Power Inventory Model (IPIM) that consisted of eleven influence tactics: personal reward, impersonal reward, personal coercion, impersonal coercion, legitimacy of equity, legitimacy of reciprocity, legitimacy of dependence, legitimacy of position, expertise, information, and reference.

**Schriesheim, C. A., and T. R. Hinkin. "Influence Tactics Used by Subordinates: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis and Refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson Subscales." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (1990): 246–257.**

The authors report a theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, et al. 1980 influence tactics scale. Based on a four-study psychometric investigation including a large data-set, they reduced the number of influence tactics from eight to six by removing two tactics—sanctions and blocking.

**Yukl, G., and C. M. Falbe. "Influence Tactics in Upward, Downward, and Lateral Influence Attempts." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (1990): 132–140.**

This article refines the already existing influence tactics measures. It attempts to refine and strengthen the taxonomy and scale dimensions. The scale consists of eight influence tactics: pressure tactics, upward appeals, exchange tactics, coalition tactics, ingratiating tactics, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, and consultation tactics.

---

## Types of Influence Tactics

Individual influence tactics have been conceptualized across a variety of frameworks and models. These conceptualizations have provided foundations for subsequent research that aims to improve our understanding of interpersonal influence in the workplace. These frameworks and models are characterized by differences in terms of the nature of the tactic, the motivation behind the tactic, objectives of the influence attempt, context, or the target of the influence attempt. Yukl, et al. 2008 summarizes eleven common proactive influence tactics that are used in organizational settings. Focusing on the intended target of the influence behavior, Wayne and Ferris 1990 reviews and classifies tactics as being supervisor-focused, self-focused, or job-focused tactics. Jones and Pittman 1982 and Tedeschi and Melburg 1984 are both seminal works in the conceptualization and classification of impression management tactics, which are a specific form of influence behavior whereby the actor attempts to manage the impression that another has of them. Jones and Pittman 1982 proposes five impression management tactics that are focused around the intended projected image (e.g., likable, competent, intimidating, etc.), whereas Tedeschi and Melburg 1984 classifies the tactics using a tactical-assertive taxonomy. In summary, a comprehensive list of influence tactics is fairly long (see under The Emergence of Influence Tactics). Given that the list is long, researchers have tried to come up with meta-categories. Kipnis, et al. 1980 (cited under The Emergence of Influence Tactics) categorized all influence tactics into three meta-categories: strong (such as assertiveness and upward appeal), soft (such as ingratiation), and rational (such as rationality and exchange). Falbo and Peplau 1980 presented a two-dimensional model of influence tactics in intimate relationships: direct (ranging from direct to indirect) and interactive (ranging from bilateral to unilateral). Whereas indirect tactics consist of such influence tactics as hinting and withdrawing, direct tactics include such influence tactics as rational persuasion and exchange. Bilateral tactics comprise such tactics as exchange and rationality, unilateral includes such tactics as withdrawing and laissez-faire. Farrell and Petersen 1982 suggested three key dimensions of political influence behavior: internal (e.g., exchange)-external (e.g., whistleblowing), vertical (e.g., apple-polishing)-lateral (e.g., exchange), and legitimate (e.g., exchange)-illegitimate (coalitions). Finally, the eleven influence tactics of the IPIM (cited under The Emergence of Influence Tactics) have been found to fit in two major categories, harsh and soft. Whereas the soft category includes such influence tactics as showing expertise and reference, the harsh category contains such tactics as personal and impersonal coercion.

**Falbo, T., and L. A. Peplau. "Power Strategies in Intimate Relationships." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 38 (1980): 618–628.**

The authors present a two-dimensional model of influence tactics in intimate relationships: direct (ranging from direct to indirect) and interactive (ranging from bilateral to unilateral).

**Farrell, D., and J. C. Petersen. "Patterns of Political Behavior in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 7 (1982): 403–412.**

The authors suggest three key dimensions of political behavior: internal (e.g., exchange)-external (e.g., whistleblowing), vertical (e.g., apple-polishing)-lateral (e.g., exchange), and legitimate (e.g., exchange)-illegitimate (coalitions).

**Jones, E. E., and T. S. Pittman. "Toward a General Theory of Strategic Self-Presentation." In *Psychological Perspectives on the Self*. Edited by J. Suls, 231–261. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1982.**

This study provides a framework of impression management focused on five tactics: ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification, intimidation, and supplication. This paper serves as the foundation for many of the later empirical works on impression management in the workplace.

**Tedeschi, J. T., and V. Melburg. "Impression Management and Influence in the Organization." In *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. Vol. 3. Edited by S. B. Bacharach and E. J. Lawler, 31–58. Greenwich, CT: JAI, 1984.**

In this conceptual paper, the authors classify impression management tactics using a 2 X 2 taxonomy: tactical (short-term) versus strategic (long-term) and assertive (initiated by the actor) versus defensive (used by the actor in response to an undesirable image).

**Wayne, S. J., and G. R. Ferris. "Influence Tactics, Affect, and Exchange Quality in Supervisor-Subordinate Interactions: A Laboratory Experiment and Field Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 75 (1990): 487–499.**

In this article, the authors' approach to influence is focused on the target of the influence behavior: supervisor-focused, self-focused, and job-focused tactics.

**Yukl, G., C. F. Seifert, and C. Chavez. "Validation of the Extended Influence Behavior Questionnaire." *The Leadership Quarterly* 19 (2008): 609–621.**

In this multi-study scale development and validation article, eleven common influence tactics are outlined and discussed; the distinction is made between proactive and political tactics; contribution for advancing research on interpersonal influence in organizations.

---

## Antecedents of Influence Tactics

From a political perspective, Ferris and Judge 1991 conceptualizes the antecedents of interpersonal influence behavior in terms of (a) actor characteristics, (b) situational characteristics, and (c) target characteristics. Actor-related antecedents have been of particular interest to researchers, including gender (Eagly 1983) and personality (Bourdage, et al. 2015). Within the organizational influence literature, the context of the employment interview has been gaining research attention—particularly concerning deceptive influence tactics, or faking to make a desired impression on the interviewer. Levashina and Campion 2006 proposes a framework of faking likelihood in the interview, which offers a very thorough model of antecedents that are suggested to predict the occurrence of faking. Barbuto and Moss 2006, in a meta-analytic study, examined the dispositional antecedents of intra-organizational influence tactics. The authors included, in their analysis, the self-reported dispositional measures (impression management, Machiavellianism, self-monitoring, locus of control, social identity, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation) and six influence tactics identified by Schriesheim and Hinkin 1990 (cited under The Emergence of Influence Tactics). Each tactic of influence demonstrated significant dispositional effects. In one of the earliest experimental studies on upward influence tactics, Ansari and Kapoor 1987 tested a general hypothesis that the use of upward influence is a function of the supervisor's leadership behavior and the objectives of influence attempt.

**Ansari, M. A., and A. Kapoor. "Organizational Context and Upward Influence Tactics." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 40 (1987): 39–49.**

This is one of the earliest empirical studies on upward influence. Using experimental vignette methodology, the authors demonstrate that the influence tactics that the managers use are a function of the objectives of the influence attempt and the leadership styles of their immediate supervisor.

**Barbuto, J. E., and J. A. Moss. "Dispositional Effects in Intra-organizational Influence Tactics: A Meta-analytic Review." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 12 (2006): 30–52.**

The authors, in an excellent meta-analysis study, examine dispositional antecedents of intra-organizational influence tactics.

**Bourdage, J. S., J. Wiltshire, and K. Lee. "Personality and Workplace Impression Management: Correlates and Implications." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100 (2015): 537–546.**

In this study, the authors examine personality as an actor antecedent of impression management behavior, using the HEXACO model of personality.

**Eagly, A. H. "Gender and Social Influence: A Social Psychological Analysis." *American Psychologist* 38 (1983): 971–981.**

This classic article focuses on the impact of gender on interpersonal influence, with a discussion of differences in status and society's gender roles.

**Ferris, G. R., and T. A. Judge. "Personnel/Human Resources Management: A Political Influence Perspective." *Journal of Management* 17 (1991): 447–488.**

This article provides a useful framework for conceptualizing the various antecedents of influence in the workplace; provides an organized guide facilitating future research.

**Levashina, J., and M. A. Campion. "A Model of Faking Likelihood in the Employment Interview." *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 14 (2006): 299–316.**

The authors propose a model of the likelihood of deceptive influence attempts in the employment interview context, which is focused around three primary antecedents: individual capacity, willingness, and opportunity. Lays the groundwork for future research and practice.

---

## Outcomes of Influence Tactics

To examine the actual effectiveness of influence tactics in organizational settings, researchers have measured the relationships between various influence tactics and key outcomes associated with success in the workplace, including supervisor-rated performance, likability, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Bolino, et al. 2006), as well as salaries and promotions (Higgins, et al. 2003). For an excellent review of existing research on this topic, Lee, et al. 2017 conducted a meta-analysis on the relationship between influence tactics and task- and relations-oriented outcomes. Harris, et al. 2007 built upon these findings by examining the moderating role of actor political skill in the relationship between influence behavior and work outcomes. Narrowing in on the specific context of the employment interview, Barrick, et al. 2009 examines how impression management tactics, appearance, verbal and non-verbal behavior relate to interview success and job performance.



**Barrick, M. R., J. A. Shaffer, and S. W. DeGrassi. "What You See May Not Be What You Get: Relationships among Self-Presentation Tactics and Ratings of Interview and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (2009): 1394–1411.**

This is a classic study on the relationships between self-presentation tactics in the interview (impression management, appearance, verbal and non-verbal behavior) and ratings of interview success and job performance; discusses relevant theories, including social influence theory and interdependence theory.

**Bolino, M., J. A. Varela, B. Bande, and W. H. Turnley. "The Impact of Impression-Management Tactics on Supervisor Ratings of Organizational Citizenship Behavior." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27 (2006): 281–297.**

This study examines impression management as a predictor of supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB); also investigates the mediating role of OCB in the relationship between impression management and the outcomes of performance and likeability; uses the Wayne and Ferris 1990 (cited under Types of Influence Tactics) framework of target-focused impression management behaviors.

**Harris, K. J., K. M. Kacmar, S. Zivnuska, and J. D. Shaw. "The Impact of Political Skill on Impression Management Effectiveness." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92 (2007): 278–285.**

Building upon previous work looking at the relationship between impression management tactics and supervisor-rated performance, this study investigates the moderating role of actor political skill.

**Higgins, C. A., T. A. Judge, and G. R. Ferris. "Influence Tactics and Work Outcomes: A Meta-analysis." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24 (2003): 89–106.**

This is a well-cited meta-analytic review of the correlations between various influence tactics (ingratiation, self-promotion, rationality, assertiveness, exchange, and upward appeal) and work outcomes including performance assessments and extrinsic success (e.g., salaries and promotions).

**Lee, S., S. Han, M. Cheong, S. L. Kim, and S. Yun. "How Do I Get My Way? A Meta-analytic Review of Research on Influence Tactics." *Leadership Quarterly* 28 (2017): 210–228.**

This is a meta-analytic review of the relationship between influence tactics and task- and relations-oriented outcomes. The results of the study show positive relationships between outcomes and influence tactics of rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, apprising, collaboration, ingratiation, consultation, and a negative relationship between pressure influence tactics and outcomes. The tactic of rational persuasion appears to hold a stable positive relationship with both categories of outcomes, regardless of moderating factors.

---

## Peer Identification of Influence Tactics

When it comes to the use of impression management (IM) tactics in the workplace (e.g., trying to appear likable or competent), are others able to detect these attempts? In general, it appears as though individuals have difficulty accurately identifying coworkers' use of IM, including self-promotion, ingratiation, exemplification, supplication, and intimidation (Bourdage, et al. 2015, cited under Antecedents of Influence Tactics). One organizational context where the detection of IM is particularly relevant is the employment interview, where applicants may be especially eager to make a desirable impression on interviewers. Early research on IM in the interview (Stevens and Kristof 1995) found that job applicants were most likely to rely on self-promotion tactics, as well as assertive (versus defensive) tactics. Interestingly, there was low to moderate convergence between applicants' self-report of IM use and that rated by interviewers and observers across different methods. These findings suggest that accurate IM detection may be difficult for interviewers, just as it was for coworkers in the Bourdage, et al. 2015 (cited under Antecedents of Influence Tactics) study. More recently, Roulin, et al. 2015 delineated the difference between honest versus deceptive IM tactics used by job applicants in the interview. For example, honest tactics could include

highlighting one's actual past accomplishments and successes, whereas deceptive tactics could involve embellishing or even inventing past accomplishments to appear more ideal to the interviewer. Consistent with previous research, their experimental results generally suggested that it is very difficult to detect impression management during the interview—especially, dishonest tactics. Similarly, Roulin, et al. 2014 found that while interviewers were able to identify applicants' use of self-promotion, they were less accurate in detecting the use of more dishonest tactics. Interestingly, while the type of interview question may influence IM detection, it appears as though interviewer experience does not (Roulin, et al. 2015). There is still limited empirical research on this topic, however, it has been gaining attention in the influence literature with important implications for both research and practice, including the impacts of IM on interview validity.

**Roulin, N., A. Bangerter, and J. Levashina. "Interviewers' Perceptions of Impression Management in Employment Interviews." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 29 (2014): 141–163.**

This study focuses on the employment interview context; collects self- (applicant) and interviewer-reports of IM in the interview.

**Roulin, N., A. Bangerter, and J. Levashina. "Honest and Deceptive Impression Management in the Employment Interview: Can It Be Detected and How Does It Impact Evaluations?" *Personnel Psychology* 68 (2015): 395–444.**

This set of five experimental studies investigates applicants' use of honest and deceptive IM tactics in the interview, as well as interviewers' ability to detect these tactics. The impact of interview question type and interviewer experience on IM detection are also examined.

**Stevens, C. K., and A. L. Kristof. "Making the Right Impression: A Field Study of Applicant Impression Management during Job Interviews." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80 (1995): 587–606.**

Early research on IM in the interview context examining the types of IM most frequently used by applicants, as well as the convergence between self-reports of IM and interviewer- and observer-reports across a variety of methods.

---

## The Cultural Context of Influence

As with other organizational constructs, the use of influence tactics is culturally determined. Though not many studies are available, a handful of studies are pointing toward the significant role of culture in the use of influence tactics. In a meta-analytic study of thirty-one studies, Higgins, et al. 2003 (cited under Outcomes of Influence Tactics) identified only two studies that were conducted from outside the United States. Leong, et al. 2006 investigated the perceived effectiveness of influence tactics among three Chinese societies and the United States. Their obtained data from 488 managers on sixteen scenario-based influence tactics across three directions of influence—upward, downward, and lateral—fell into two broad influence dimensions. The dimensions were named (a) the more nurturing Gentle Persuasion (GP) and (b) the more agentic Contingent Control (CC). No cultural differences were found for the rated effectiveness of CC tactics, regardless of the directions of influence. On the other hand, significant cultural differences were observed for the GP group of tactics, regardless of influence directions. American managers rated GP as the most effective, Mainland Chinese the least. In a two-culture study, Qadan, et al. 2012 compared Jewish and Arab employees in terms of the evaluation of the effectiveness of several influence tactics. Some cross-cultural differences were revealed. Jewish employees evaluated rational persuasion influence tactics as more effective than did Arab employees. On the other hand, Arab employees evaluated ingratiation, pressure, and coalition influence tactics more effective than did Jewish employees. Drawing on the transactional-relational contracts model, Chong, et al. 2013 empirically examined the effects of influence tactics on two types of commitment: immediate task and organizational commitment. They had a large data-set of 1,150 respondents from six societies: China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Germany, Brazil, and the United States. Their analysis indicated universally-endorsed as well as culturally-contingent influence tactics in predicting task and organizational commitment. In a forty-one-society study, with a large sample of 9,990 managers and professionals, Ralston, et al. 2009 investigated the ethical preferences for influencing superiors. They found both macro-level and micro-level predictors contributing to the model definition. They also found a global agreement for a subordinate influence ethics hierarchy. In yet another large study (i.e., including 4,325 managers and professionals in a diverse set of eleven Asian societies), Karam, et al. 2013 suggested that both sociocultural values and in-group favoritism contributed to our understanding of influence behavior in Asia.

**Chong, M. P. M., M. Muethel, M. Richards, et al. "Influence Behaviors and Employee Reactions: An Empirical Test among Six Societies Based on Transactional-Relational Contracts Model." *Journal of World Business* 48 (2013): 373–384.**

In this cross-national study, the authors obtained data from six societies: China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Germany, Brazil, and the United States. Their study revealed both universally-endorsed and culturally-contingent influence tactics in predicting task and organizational commitment.

**Karam, C. M., D. A. Ralston, C. Egri, et al. "Perceptions of the Ethicality of Favors at Work in Asia: An 11-Society Assessment." *Journal of Business Ethics* 30 (2013): 373–408.**

In this eleven-society assessment study, the authors explore macro-level factors that shape perceptions of the ethicality of favors in Asian workplaces using the upward influence ethics measure.

**Leong, J. L. T., M. H. Bond, and P. P. Fu. "Perceived Effectiveness of Influence Strategies in the United States and Three Chinese Societies." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 6 (2006): 101–120.**

In this article, the authors examined the perceived effectiveness across three directions—upward, downward, and lateral—of influence tactics among three Chinese societies and the United States. Cross-cultural similarities and differences were noted.

**Qadan, E., A. Tziner, and R. Waismel-Manor. "Differences in the Perceived Effectiveness of Influence Tactics among Jews and Arabs: The Mediating Role of Cultural Values." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 42 (2012): 874–889.**

In this article, the authors report a comparison between Jewish and Arab employees on the evaluation of the effectiveness of influence tactics. Some similarities and differences are apparent in the use of influence tactics.

**Ralston, D., C. Egri, M. T. G. Carranza, et al. "Ethical Preferences for Influencing Superiors: A 41-Society Study." *Journal of International Business Studies* 40 (2009): 1022–1045.**

Based on a forty-one-society sample (990 managers and professionals), the authors investigate the impact of both macro-level and micro-level predictors of subordinate influence ethics. According to them, developing a global model of subordinate influence ethics is possible.

[back to top](#)

Copyright © 2021. All rights reserved.