

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



# **Personality and Situation Effects on Interpersonal Influence Tactic Selection**

by

**Francis Guglielmo**

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City  
University of New York**

1996

**UMI Number: 9707097**

**Copyright 1996 by  
Guglielmo, Francis**

**All rights reserved.**

---

**UMI Microform 9707097  
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.  
This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1996

**Francis Guglielmo**

**All Rights Reserved**

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

5/17/96  
Date

  
Donald Levine  
Chair of Examining Committee

9-9-96  
Date

  
Kay Dean  
Executive Officer

  
Walter Reichman

  
Edwin Hollander

  
Joseph Moses

  
Michael Grissom

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

**Abstract****Personality and Situation Effects on Interpersonal Influence Tactic Selection**

by

**Francis Guglielmo****Advisor: Professor Donald L. Levine**

Research into the topic of interpersonal influence tactic selection has followed two lines of investigation. In one line of research, taxonomies of interpersonal influence tactics have been created. Work by David Kipnis and his colleagues predominates in this area and takes a mid-level approach to organizing these behaviors. A second line of research has focused on situational antecedents to the selection of particular influence tactics when one wishes to exert power in an interpersonal encounter. This research has uncovered several distinct situational variables which affect influence tactic selection. These include: the affective relationship between the target and exorter of influence attempts, a desire for a continuing relationship between parties, disparities in the degree of relative power, expected resistance to the influence attempt and the specific goals of the individual exerting influence. Personality variables, in particular, consideration of the effect of personality systems on influence tactic selection, have been largely ignored.

The present research examines interpersonal influence tactic selection from the point of view of a particular personality system, i.e., E. Fromm's character typologies. Fromm outlined four distinct character types: Marketing, Hoarding, Exploitive and Receptive, which describe the way an individual characteristically seeks to interact with

others. It is hypothesized that these character types will affect the influence tactic an individual chooses to employ under differing situational constraints.

To examine the effect of these character types subjects completed a Paired Adjectives Checklist which identified their predominant character type. The development of this checklist is described. Subjects participated in three role play situations. These situations were manipulated to create conditions hypothesized to lead to the selection of "strong," "weak" or "mixed" influence tactics. A 3X4 within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA was used to test the hypothesized interactions between situational variables (3 levels) and character type (4 levels) on the frequency of influence tactic selection.

Results demonstrated strong support for the impact of situational cues on influence tactic selection. The MANOVA analysis did not provide support for the mediating effect of Fromm character type. However, subsequent correlational analysis demonstrated the effect of the Exploitive and Marketing character types on influence tactic selection. Specifically, subjects' Hoarding type scores on the *Paired Adjectives Checklist* were significantly related to the use of strong influence tactics under both strong and weak situational cues. Subjects' Marketing character scores were shown to be significantly related to their use of weak influence tactics under both weak and strong situational conditions. No support was found for the effects of the Receptive and Exploitive character types on influence tactic selection. Results of the study indicate that an individual's orientation toward Fromm's Marketing and Hoarding types mediate their interpretation and response to social cues leading to behaviors which may be situationally inappropriate.

## Table of Contents

<b>Section I: Statement of Problem</b>	
Introduction .....	1
 <b>Section II: Power &amp; Influence Theories</b>	
Introduction .....	6
Resource Dependence .....	7
Bases of Power .....	11
Influence Tactics .....	16
Influence Styles .....	22
Levels of Analysis for Influence Activities .....	24
Definitions of Power and Influence .....	25
Effect of Goals on Power and Influence Strategies .....	26
Situational Factors Affecting the Use of Influence Strategies .....	27
Summary .....	30
 <b>Section III: Personality Approaches to Influence Strategies</b>	
Introduction .....	32
Existing Research .....	32
Approaches to Personality Theory .....	34
Summary .....	38
 <b>Section IV: Fromm's Theory of Character Typology</b>	
Fromm's Basis of Personality .....	40
Freedom .....	42
Love .....	43
Personality Development .....	44
Responses to Freedom .....	45
Styles .....	46
Character Orientations .....	48
The Receptive Orientation .....	50
The Exploitive Orientation .....	51
The Hoarding Orientation .....	51
The Marketing Orientation .....	52
Productive and Non-Productive Traits of Character Orientations .....	52
Summary .....	54

<b>Section V: Hypotheses and Study Design</b>	
Introduction .....	56
Hypotheses .....	57
<b>Study Design</b>	
Subjects .....	59
Measures .....	59
Paired Adjectives Checklist .....	59
Situation Variables .....	61
Role plays .....	62
Dependent Measures .....	65
Raters .....	66
Data Analysis .....	68
<b>Section VI: Results</b>	
Paired Adjectives Checklist .....	70
Influence Tactic Measures .....	71
Manipulation Check .....	74
Hypothesis 1 .....	75
Hypotheses 2 to 5 .....	76
<b>Section VII: Discussion</b>	
Discussion .....	84
Limitations of the Study and Areas for Future Research .....	87
<b>Appendix</b>	
A1. Paired Adjectives Checklist Items Statistics .....	91
A2. Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Exploitive Scale .....	93
A3. Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Receptive Scale .....	98
A4. Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Hoarding Scale .....	101
A5. Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Marketing Scale .....	104
A6. Paired Adjectives Checklist .....	107
A7. Manipulation Check Questionnaire .....	109
A8. Rater Coding Form .....	111
<b>References</b> .....	113

## Tables

Table 1.	
<b>Variables Affecting Influence Tactic Selection</b> .....	30
Table 2.	
<b>Productive and Non-Productive Traits of Character Orientations</b> .....	53
Table 3.	
<b>Influence Tactic Clusters</b> .....	56
Table 4.	
<b>Situational Cues for Influence Tactic Selection</b> .....	57
Table 5.	
<b>Hypothesis Summary</b> .....	59
Table 6.	
<b>Paired Adjective Checklist - means, variances, alphas</b> .....	61
Table 7.	
<b>Paired Adjective Checklist Scale Inter-Correlations</b> .....	61
Table 8a.	
<b>Paired Adjectives Checklist: Score distribution</b> .....	70
Table 8b.	
<b>Paired Adjectives Checklist: Score distribution by usable videotape</b> .....	70
Table 9.	
<b>Paired Adjectives Checklist: Means and standard deviations for Fromm character type scores</b> .....	70
Table 10.	
<b>Correlations among Fromm character type scores</b> .....	70
Table 11.	
<b>Fromm character scores by highest scoring character type: Means and standard deviations</b> .....	71

Table 12.	
<b>Summary of rater reliability estimates</b> .....	72
Table 13.	
<b>Comparison of number of observations across situations:</b>	
<b>Results of within-subjects ANOVA</b> .....	72
Table 14.	
<b>Percentage of time spent and number of influence attempts made by situation:</b>	
<b>Means and standard deviations</b> .....	73
Table 15.	
<b>Results of Manipulation check: Mean ratings</b> .....	74
Table 16.	
<b>Use of strong and weak influence tactics in different conditions:</b>	
<b>Within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA</b> .....	75
Table 17.	
<b>Percentage of time spent using strong and weak tactics under different</b>	
<b>conditions Mean comparisons</b> .....	76
Table 18.	
<b>Use of influence tactics by Fromm type under different situations:</b>	
<b>Within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA</b> .....	77
Table 19.	
<b>Percentage of time spent using various influence tactics:</b>	
<b>Means and standard deviations</b> .....	78
Table 20.	
<b>Total percent use of influence tactic: Means and standard deviations</b> .....	79
Table 21.	
<b>Fromm character type scores and strong and weak influence tactic</b>	
<b>usage: Correlation table.</b> .....	81
Table 22.	
<b>Fromm character type and influence tactic usage under different situational</b>	
<b>Conditions: Correlation table</b> .....	83

## - Section I -

Social scientists have long sought an understanding of power and influence and their impact on the human condition. Psychology has, for the most part, pursued its investigation of this topic within the realm of interpersonal power and influence. The present investigation seeks to extend this body of knowledge.

In studying power relationships there are many points of departure. The methods and motives of power acquisition and use exist in many circumstances, and occur for reasons both rational and irrational. Recent evidence has even suggested a biological component to power motivation (McClelland 1985, cited in House & Singh, 1987). Within an organizational context, the acquisition and use of power by individuals is predominantly rationally based (Pfeffer, 1981; Kipnis, 1976; Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith & Wilkinson, 1984). In fact, power relationships are ubiquitous within organizations and are necessary for the continued functioning of organizations (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Pfeffer, 1991; McClelland, 1975; Greiner & Schein, 1988; Kipnis, 1976). Therefore, the present investigation will focus on power usage at the point of the actual exercise of power, within the context of an organization. This investigation follows Kipnis (1976) and examine power after the decision to use power has been made. The study of the motivation to use power is a field unto itself and beyond the scope of this investigation (see for example McClelland, 1975).

Power relationships can be examined in terms of one individual influencing another, one group influencing another group, an individual influencing a group, or a

group influencing an individual. Following Cartwright (1959), the present paper focuses on the power relationship between an individual attempting to influence, called by Kipnis (1976) the "power holder", and the target of the influence attempt, which may be either an individual or a group. Certainly, many of the same processes discussed in the present paper with respect to an individual power holder can be applied to situations in which a group is the "power holder" (Perrow, 1986; Pettigrew, 1973; Crozier, 1964, cited in Pettigrew, 1973). However, in order to limit the influence of group process variables on the present analysis, only the case of the individual as power holder will be considered. In sum, this study investigated power and influence use within an organizational context, where one individual attempted to influence another, and focused on the actual exertion of power and influence.

Although some authors have treated the topics of power and influence as interchangeable, for the most part psychologists and other social scientists have treated these topics as separate but highly interrelated concepts (Dahl, 1957). Power has largely been investigated from two related approaches: bases of power (French & Raven, 1959) and resource dependence approaches (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). Influence has been researched from a variety of perspectives and by numerous authors. The line of research conducted by Kipnis and his associates culminating in the *Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies* (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1982) has been the most systematic effort to identify and organize the behaviors or "influence tactics" people use to get their way with others. This research has led to a comprehensive taxonomy of influence tactics used by individuals in organizations. For the purposes of this investigation, power and influence

will be treated as separate concepts. Definitions of these concepts will be presented in section II.

Previous investigators have also examined situational factors which moderate the power that an individual possesses and impinge on the choice of influence strategy an individual selects. While the literature on situational variables' effects on power and influence has not been as thorough as the research which cataloged the state of their existence, a number of clear findings have emerged. With respect to power, control of resources (including one's own abilities, knowledge) has been shown to engender power. Further, the criticality of the resource to the power holder's target, the ability of the resource to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity for the target and the ability or inability of the target to substitute for this resource have all been identified as factors which moderate power in interpersonal relationships.

A number of situational variables have also been examined with respect to influence tactics. The goal of the individual exerting influence, the relative power of the power holder to the target, the number of times an individual has made an influence attempt, the pre-influence probability of the target performing the desired action and the desire for a continued relationship with the target have all been investigated as determinants of influence strategy use.

Generally speaking, the literature concerning the effect of situational variables on influence strategy use has been flawed in two ways. First, much of the research suffers from single method bias in that surveys of the power holder provide both the independent and dependent variables. Second, in the limited number of studies where actual

behavioral observation occurred, the situations were highly constrained and contrived laboratory settings. The present investigation addresses these methodological flaws.

Beyond situational variables, personality variables have received scant and inconsistent attention from researchers' investigations of influence attempts within organizations. The research which does exist treats personality as a range of discrete variables, such as Machiavellianism, self confidence and need for power . No systematic approach to personality has been applied to the study of influence. This gap in the literature has been addressed as follows.

Hogan (1991) has suggested that personality systems can be divided into two major classifications: individual oriented strategies and observer oriented strategies. Observer oriented strategies include those which seek to systematically describe systems for clustering and predicting behavior. Individual oriented strategies include those which seek to define and describe latent personality systems which drive manifest behavior. This investigation will pursue the latter approach. As there exist numerous individual oriented systems and no general consensus in the field as to the most efficacious of these, it is suggested that Erich Fromm's (1941, 1956) system of character typology be employed. This system was chosen because interpersonal power and individual reaction to external influences form the underpinnings of Frommian personality theory, making it directly relevant to this investigation.

Thus, the present investigation will examine the nature of power relationships in terms of situational and personality impacts on influence tactic selection. The present paper will proceed as follows. Section II will discuss definitions of power & influence

described in the literature. A main feature of this definition of power will be the differentiation of power and influence. Although power and influence are intimately related, they can be distinguished from one another. According to French & Raven (1959), "...influence is kinetic power just as power is potential influence" (p. 152).

Section III will provide an overview of the existing research concerning personality and influence. Then a description of the conceptual differences between individual and observer oriented approaches to personality will be provided. This discussion will describe how individual oriented approaches to personality can be related to the study of power and influence usage and justify the selection of Fromm's system for use in this study. Section IV will describe Fromm's theories as they relate to this investigation. Section V will describe hypotheses derived from the literature review and the research methodology to be employed. Section VI will present the results of the study and section VII will provide a discussion of the results, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

**- Section II -**

Within an organizational framework, power has been studied from a rational perspective, relying on organizational context and the nature of interpersonal or interdepartmental relationships as the key determinants of power acquisition and use. Previous investigations have uncovered two aspects of power which are key to the present investigation. First, as noted by numerous researchers, power is relational (e.g. Kipnis, 1976; Pfeffer, 1981; Dahl, 1957; French and Raven, 1959; Cartwright, 1959). An individual or group has power (or does not have power) in relation to another individual or group. Second, the use of power is intended to result in a modification of the target or the target's behavior in such a way as to achieve the goals of the individual or group wielding power (Cartwright, 1959; Dahl, 1957, Kipnis, 1976; Perreault & Miles, 1979; Mowday, 1978).

Few have difficulty understanding, intuitively, what is meant by power (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977). Yet defining power is very difficult. In the most global sense, definitions of power present in the literature contain two elements: aspects of the power holder which differ from the target and some intended change in the target which results from the activity of the power holder.

Various proposed definitions of power emphasize one or the other of these elements. For example, Perrow (1986) defines power as "...the ability of persons or groups to extract for themselves valued outputs from a system in which other persons either seek the same outputs for themselves or would prefer to expend their effort toward

other outputs" (p.259). This definition stresses the outcome aspect of power. House & Singh (1987) define power in terms of an aspect of the power holder - "...power is seen to accrue to positions that control critical contingencies derived either from the environment or the technology of the organization" (p.672). Conversely, influence involves an activity engaged in by the power holder with respect to the target.

Each of these different emphases has in common two things: intention on the part of the power holder and a relationship between the power holder and the target. With respect to the intentions of the power holder, the specific goals may be manifold, but can generally be broken down into two categories: personal goals and organizational goals (Kipnis, 1976). The goals of power usage will be discussed at a later point. For now, recognizing that they are an implicit component of any definition of power is sufficient.

That power exists in the form of a relationship can be taken, almost, as a tautology. Power can not exist in a vacuum. Cartwright (1959) specifically defines power in terms of relational fields among individuals. Dahl (1957) makes it a requirement of power that the target is aware of the activity of the power holder. Accepting the proposition that power is based on a relationship, we are left with the questions: why do organizations create power relationships among individuals, and what is the basis of these relationships?

### **Resource Dependence**

The answer to the first question is readily apparent. Organizations, being based on a division of labor, create relationships between individuals with both common and

conflicting goals (Katz & Kahn; 1978, Schein, 1977). These relationships exist within a structure of scarce resources (Pfeffer, 1981). The ability to control these resources is seen by some as the underlying basis for power relationships (Hickson, Hinnings, Lee, Schneck & Pennings 1971; Michner & Schertfeger, 1972; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977; Pfeffer, 1981; Pettigrew, 1973; Izraeli, 1975). Pfeffer (1981) adds that the discretion or ability to distribute these scarce resources is equally important. This perspective can be viewed as a resource dependence approach to power.

Mainiero (1986) proposed that dependency relationships within organizations were related to an individual's task and work activities and career aspirations. She interviewed 53 managers within the same organization and questioned them regarding their dependence on others and others dependence on them along these two factors. As predicted, the degree of dependence of others on the manager, minus the dependence of the manager on others was a predictor of the manager's perceived power. Mainiero's (1986) data, however, consisted of perceptions of the subject alone. Therefore, no inferences regarding the validity of the information can be made.

Hickson, *et al* (1971) and Salancik & Pfeffer (1977; Pfeffer, 1981) have proposed strategic contingency models that extend a strict resource dependency notion of power. Hickson, *et al* (1971) suggests that power is based not only on the resource dependency of the target on the power holder but also on: the relative availability of alternatives for the resources controlled by the power holder, the ability of the power holder to reduce uncertainty for the target, and the pervasiveness of the power holder's work flow in the organization. In other words, the determining factors in establishing power are: the

centrality, substitutability, and the ability to reduce uncertainty of the resources controlled by the power holder.

Salancik & Pfeffer (1977) also include the notion of criticality in their strategic contingency model. That is, the resource controlled must be of vital or relatively vital importance to the organization or target individual, in order to be a source of power. In a study of a major Midwestern university, Salancik & Pfeffer (1977) found that the ability of a department to acquire grant and research money was the major determinant of power as measured by representation on important decision making committees. For this particular university, grants and other research funds provided more than 50% of the discretionary capital available to the university, making them a critical resource (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977).

Hinnings, Hickson, Pennings & Schneck (1974) used a reputational measure of power to test the Hickson, *et al* (1971) model. Hinnings, *et al* (1974) used open ended interviews and questionnaires with the department heads and chief executive officers of 5 breweries and 2 container manufacturers. They measured a number of variables including: ability of the managers' departments to cope with uncertainty experienced by the organization, substitutability of the functions of the manager, criticality of the function of each manager's department to the organization, and perceived power of each manager (as perceived by the other managers and the chief executive). Results found that perceived power was correlated with coping with uncertainty, .81; criticality of work, .73 and (non)substitutability, .60. However, when each of these bivariate correlations was partialled to hold constant the variance accounted for by the other two predictors, the

correlations dropped to .65, .28, and .24 for coping with uncertainty, criticality and (non)substitutability, respectively (p.36). This would seem to indicate that those resources which permit the target to cope with ambiguity are more closely associated with perceived power.

The resource dependency model suggests that the crucial difference between a power holder and a target is control by the power holder of some resource which the target needs. The strategic contingency approach (Pfeffer, 1981; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977; Hickson, *et al* 1971; Hinnings, *et al* (1974) extends this model by suggesting a number of specific attributes of the resources, controlled by the power holder, which effect the weight (Dahl, 1957) or forcefulness of the power holder's power. These factors include: the criticality of the resource to the target in particular or the organization as a whole; the ability of the target to substitute other resources for those controlled by the power holder; the ability of the resource to enable the target to cope with or contain uncertainty; and the discretionary ability of the power holder over the resource.

A strategic contingencies approach would appear to add a significant amount of complexity to a resource dependency approach to power. This complexity is compounded manifold once the specific resources a power holder may control begin to be enumerated. Conceptualizing power as a resource dependence relationship with the various types (e.g. money, work output) and aspects (substitutability, criticality, etc.) of resources as moderators appears to be a cumbersome theoretical framework.

### **Bases of Power**

An alternative approach is that of French & Raven (1959). They have suggested that power be defined and examined based on the sources of power, which they called "bases of power." Although predating it, their approach incorporates and extends the resource dependence approach by creating a conceptual grouping of resources controlled by the power holder. This conceptual grouping allows for the various aspects of the resources to be examined in a more parsimonious manner, while allowing for differences in power, resulting from various types of resources, to be examined in more detail than would a general resource dependency approach.

According to French & Raven (1959), "by the bases of power we mean the relationship between O (the power holder) and P (the target) which is the source of that power" (p. 155). French & Raven (1959) identified 5 bases of power: reward, coercive, referent, legitimate, and expert. By reward power, French & Raven (1959) were discussing a concept analogous to Pfeffer's (1981) notion of slack resources, useful but not currently vital resources which quickly become vital to the target. For French & Raven this concept also includes the ability to remove or decrease negative valences. Coercive power refers to the ability to deny needed or desired resources. Reference or referent power refers to the degree of identification between the target and the power holder. "By identification, we mean a feeling of oneness of P (the target) with O (the power holder), or a desire for such identify" (French and Raven, 1959; 161). Legitimate power refers to the feelings within the target that he/she "ought" to conform to requests by the power holder because of his/her formal organizational position. Thus legitimate

power is a function of the organizational and societal norms operating in a given situation and the degree of internalization of these norms by the target (French and Raven, 1959; Mechanic, 1962).

Expert power refers to specialized technical knowledge possessed by the power holder and needed or desired by the target. Work by Crozier (1964, cited in Pettigrew, 1973) and Pettigrew (1973) provided strong support for the notion of expert power. In the case of Crozier (1964) a group of wine press mechanics at a winery wielded wide spread power, far beyond what their formal position would normally allow, because they alone possessed the specialized knowledge required to repair the wine press machinery. This knowledge was not available elsewhere and wine press breakdowns were a key source of uncertainty for the organization, which made this knowledge a vital resource. Pettigrew (1973) found an almost identical situation in studying the power wielded by computer technicians in a manufacturing corporation. In this case, their particular expertise could be replaced, but not easily, and their work output was of central importance to the organization.

Raven (1974) enlarged the typology of French & Raven (1959) by including informational power. This refers to knowledge about the organization, its policies, practices, environment, etc. held by the power holder and needed or desired by the target. French & Raven (1959) explicitly note that their bases of power are a reflection of a dependency between the power holder and the target. For the reward, coercive, informational, and expert bases of power, the strategic contingency models presented above provide a theoretical underpinning for considering dependency as the basis of the

power relationships which rely on these bases. A resource dependency approach does not, however, speak directly to legitimate and referent bases of power. However, Fromm's (1941) notion of symbiotic dyadic relationships would support the notion of considering legitimate and referent power bases as resulting from dependency relationships.

Certainly, French & Raven (1959) have not been unique in postulating a variety of bases of power. Taylor (1986) listed eight sources of power which included expert, legitimate and reward power. In addition Taylor (1986) includes: charisma, a characteristic of the power holder which includes physical attractiveness and persuasive ability; applied pressure, which involves the ability to use the power of another individual to bear on a situation; raw force, at the individual level this implies physical strength, at the organizational level this involves economic might. Further, Taylor (1986) differentiates between implied and actual coercive power. The former being the ability to use coercive power, the latter being the demonstrated willingness to do so.

Charisma, while similar to referent power, is different in that it is an aspect of the power holder, and is brought to the situation by him or her while referent power is an aspect of the target of the power holder and is based in his or her need to identify with the power holder. While both forms of power rely on attributions about the power holder being made by the target they can be differentiated.

Etzioni (1987) recognizes physical strength as a base of power. He also stressed material bases, which can be used as reward or coercion, and symbolic bases which are analogous to French & Raven's (1959) referent power base. Mechanic (1962) subdivides

material bases into control over information, instrumentalities (physical equipment or material) and skilled personnel. Kipnis & Cosentino (1969) cite control over: sanctions (coercive power), communication channels (information power) and the direction of task performance, i.e., what task or how a specific task is to be performed, as bases of power. Perrow (1986) notes that the bounded rationality of a target is a source of power in that it can create a dependence on the power holder. The bounded rationality of the target allows the power holder to either "flood" him or her with information or to pre-process this information. Flooding the target will render him or her unable to act in many instances. Preprocessing of information allows the power holder to act as a gatekeeper, affecting the quality and perspectives of information received by the target.

Kanter (1979) describes power bases as "lines" and suggests three lines: supply, which refers to physical resources including capital; information; and support, which refers to support of the power holder by other, more powerful individuals. Mintzberg (1983) describes five bases of power including rewards, technical skill, information, formal position, and access to those in powerful positions. He also cited the political skill of the power holder as being crucial to his/her use of power.

To summarize, this myriad of power bases can be condensed into the following: reward, coercive, legitimate, reference, expert, formal information, informal information, charisma, physical strength, applied pressure, task performance, formal position, and bounded rationality.

A number of researchers have criticized the bases of power approach. Patchen (1974) suggests that not only the characteristics and resources of the power holder, but also those of the target need to be considered in order to accurately gauge power. Patchen

(1974) used the extent of involvement in critical decisions as a measure of power in 11 different companies in a variety of industries. He found that relative expert, referent, legitimate, and position power among competing managers were those bases that determined power measured in this way.

This is consistent with Raven's (1974) notion that power bases interact and that a given power holder will have access to more than one power base. Cartwright (1959) concurs with the position that a power holder will have available more than one base, however, he suggests that only the most effective will be used and thus only this base should be a measure of power. This is also the position of Dahl (1957) who recommends that power be measured as the difference of: the probability of a target performing a given action in the presence of a specific action by the power holder and the probability of the target performing the same action in the absence of specific action by the power holder.

These recommendations to measure an individual's power by the degree of change in a target he or she is able to cause appear to cloud the distinction between the power an individual possesses and the manner in which he attempts to use this power, that is, the distinction between power on the one hand and influence tactics on the other.

Perhaps the most telling criticism of the use of bases of power to define the power of an individual in an organization is that bases of power do not describe what particular means an individual power holder may attempt in order to effect a change in a target. Bases of power are therefore potential influence, "influence in repose" (Gamson, 1968). Dahl (1957) sums up this criticism,

The base of an actor's power consists of all the resources, opportunities, acts, objects that he can exploit in order to effect the behavior of another....(However) the base is inert, passive. It must be exploited in some fashion if the behavior of others is to be altered. The means or instruments of such exploitation are numerous; often they involve threats or promises to employ the base in some way and they may involve actual use of the base. (p. 203)

### **Influence Tactics**

Earlier it was stated that a definition of power, conceptualized as a relationship, must incorporate aspects of the power holder which differ from the target and some intended change in the target which results from the activity of the power holder. The various bases of power and resource dependency models described above satisfy these requirements for a definition of power. Influence, an activity engaged in by the power holder with respect to the target is the active manifestation of power. Research concerning the tactics used in the exertion of influence is described below.

Influence has been studied by a variety of researchers who have generated a large and varied list of influence tactics. This research has taken two general forms. A number of researchers (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith & Wilkinson, 1984; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Wilkinson & Kipnis, 1978; Allen, Madison, Porter Renwick & Mays, 1979; Falbo, 1977; Izraeli, 1975; Schilit & Lock, 1982; Erez & Rim 1982; Rim & Erez, 1980; Perreault & Miles, 1978) have conducted broad exploratory studies in both the laboratory and the field in order to enumerate and categorize the various means or tactics of influence used by individuals in organizations. Other researchers (Goodstat & Kipnis, 1970; Fodor, 1974; Michner & Schwertfeger,

1972; Lawler & Bacharach, 1976; Mowday, 1979) have conducted experiments to study the situations surrounding the use of particular influence tactics.

Falbo (1977) used a sample of 141 undergraduates to generate a list of influence tactics. Subjects wrote an essay entitled "Getting My Way." A group of raters then content analyzed these essays and derived 16 categories. These were subjected to a factor analysis which resulted in two dimensions: direct-indirect tactics and rational-nonrational tactics. Examples of direct tactics included assertion, persistence, and direct simple statements. Indirect tactics included hinting and "thought manipulation". Rational tactics included use of reason, expertise and compromise. Nonrational approaches included appeals to emotions, evasion, and threats. Falbo's use of the terms rational and irrational in this context may be misleading. The terms rational and emotional would appear to better capture her intent.

Kipnis and his associates (Wilkinson & Kipnis, 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis, *et al.*, 1984) attempted to inductively derive a classification scheme for influence tactics. Kipnis & Schmidt (1983) note that deductive classification schemes are frequently overlapping and use differing dimensions to arrive at a typology. This criticism is readily born out by the previous discussion of bases of power. In an early attempt at deriving a list of influence tactics Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) collected a large number of critical incidents of the use of power between individuals from a sample of part-time graduate business students (n=67).

These critical incidents were content analyzed into two categories: strong tactics and weak tactics. Strong tactics included such tactics as withholding payments, use of

deceit, and threats to punish. Weak tactics included negotiation, requesting compliance, logical arguments, and offering benefits. They found that 63% of the respondents used weak tactics as a first choice. Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) also noted that there was a strong tendency for a power holder to move from a weak to a strong tactic if initial attempts failed. They further noted that when the target organization was perceived as stronger by the power holder weak tactics were more likely to be employed ( $r. = -.44$ ).

While the Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) study used an inductive method to collect examples of influence tactics, the categorization schema was still developed deductively. Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson (1980) addressed this problem. They used the same methodology as that of Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) on a similar sample ( $n=165$ ). This process yielded a total of 370 influence incidents. From this list a questionnaire consisting of 58 different influence tactics was developed. This questionnaire was administered to 754 part time business graduate students at two different universities. One third of the subjects were asked to respond on the use of each of the influence tactics on a 5 point scale with respect to influencing their boss, one third were asked to respond with respect to their peers and one third with respect to their subordinates.

A factor analysis of the results yielded 8 factors: assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanctions, exchange of benefits, upward appeal, blocking, and coalitions. Assertiveness refers to such tactics as demanding, ordering or setting deadlines. Ingratiation refers to "acting humble" and increasing the self-esteem of the target. Rationality includes planning, logical arguments and explanations. Sanctions include threats and withholding salary increases. Exchange of benefits involves an exchange or

offering of an exchange of resources. Upward appeal involves obtaining both formal and informal support from "higher up" in the organization. Blocking includes such tactics as work slowdowns, stoppages and refusal to work with certain individuals. Coalitions involves gaining the support of co-workers or peers.

Exchange of benefits, blocking and upward appeal emerged in the factor analysis only when the target under consideration was the boss. Coalitions were present in the factor analysis only when the target was the power holder's subordinate. Subsequent analysis showed, generally, an independence among the factors. Correlations between scales representing the factors ranged from  $-.03$  to  $.36$ . (p. 448).

Two important criticisms of both the Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) study and the Kipnis, et al (1980) study should be noted. First, respondents were uniformly reported to be at relatively low levels within their respective organizations, making generalizability of these findings to all levels of the organization suspect. Second, the methodology employed, surveys and critical incidents, relies on the subjective impressions of the individual attempting to exert influence. No attempt was made to collect observed behavioral data.

Rim & Erez (1980) report using the same 58 item survey used by Kipnis, et al (1980) on a sample of 125 managers in predominantly government employ in Israel. They report 6 different but overlapping factors depending on whether the target is a subordinate, co-worker or boss of the power holder. Erez & Rim (1982) using the same data report a six factor structure combining all targets: clandestine, personal negative sanctions, administrative sanctions, rational tactics, exchange, and appeal to others. Erez

and Rim (1982) do not define or give sample items of these factors. Rim & Erez (1980) do give example items for their 18 factors, however, as these either overlap or combine those presented in the later article, it is unclear precisely what definitions Erez & Rim (1982) intend. It should be noted that a sample size of  $n=125$  is inappropriately small to conduct a factor analysis of 58 items (Kerlinger, 1986).

In a more comprehensive investigation of the factor structure presented by Kipnis et al (1980), Schriesheim & Hinkin (1990) conducted a series of 4 separate studies which generally supported Kipnis' typology. Each of these studies was limited to those items (behaviors) associated with the upward influence sub-scale of the POIS including the ingratiation, exchange, rationality, assertiveness, upward appeal, and coalition tactics. The first of these studies involved having subjects (34 undergraduates) place the items into the appropriate tactic. Schriesheim & Hinkin (1990) found that all but one of the 27 items on these scales were appropriately categorized, although five of the items were correctly categorized on average only 53.8% of the time.

Schriesheim & Hinkin's (1990) remaining three studies were concerned with the factor structure of the Kipnis et al (1980) original 58 item scale, especially those 27 items associated with upward influence attempts. The results of these analyses (251 undergraduates, 281 MBA students, 181 clerical workers) strongly support Kipnis, et al's (1990) factor structure for upward influence tactics, albeit with a more parsimonious set of items. Schriesheim & Hinkin conclude that Kipnis' influence tactic typology is quite robust but the psychometric properties of parts of the Kipnis et al, (1980) scales can be significantly improved.

Schilit & Locke (1982) used a critical incidents procedure similar to that of Wilkinson and Kipnis (1978) and Kipnis, *et al* (1980) with one important difference. In order to control for the effects of getting only the power holder's precept and using only lower level participants, Schilit & Locke (1982) interviewed two different samples, a group of lower level employees (n = 83) and a sample of managers (n = 70). These two samples were drawn from different populations, however demographic variables show them to be reasonably equivalent. The employees were asked to describe incidents in which they attempted to influence their boss. Managers were asked to describe incidents in which they were influenced by one of their subordinates. Content analysis and subsequent categorization of the critical incidents resulted in a list of 19 different methods. These methods are conceptually similar to the 8 categories derived by Kipnis, *et al* (1980). One influence tactic not found by Kipnis, *et al* (1980) or Erez & Rim (1982) is the use of organizational rules. Another tactic, asking for pity would appear to be similar to the emotional appeal tactic discussed by Falbo (1975).

Allen, *et al* (1979) conducted a series of interviews with managers in the electronics industry (n=87) concerning the types of political tactics used in organizations. Unlike Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) and Kipnis, *et al* (1980), Allen, *et al* (1979) collected data from all organizational levels including chief executive officer (n = 30). The interviews were coded by a number of different researchers working together. No interrater reliability was reported. This content analysis method yielded the following tactics: blaming others, using information, impression management, building support, ingratiation, power coalitions with strong allies, associating with influential people,

creating obligations. This list is similar to the various tactics developed by Kipnis, *et al* (1980). One important difference is the somewhat negative connotation of some of the tactics found by Allen *et al* (1979) such as blaming others. One explanation for this difference is that Allen *et al* (1979) instructed participants to describe any tactic they were aware of, used by anyone they knew. Kipnis, *et al* (1980) had subjects respond based on the tactics they themselves used. It may be that subjects were unwilling to ascribe socially unacceptable tactics such as blaming others to themselves.

### **Influence Styles**

Kipnis & Schmidt (1982) used the factors obtained in the study by Kipnis, *et al* (1980) to develop a survey, the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies, to measure seven of the previously derived factors: reason (previously termed rationality), coalition, ingratiation, bargaining (previously termed exchange of benefits), assertiveness, higher authority (previously termed upward appeal) and sanctions.

This survey was used to survey managers in the U.S., England, and Australia ( $n = 113, 121, 126$ , respectively, Kipnis & Schmidt 1983; p. 307). The rank ordering of preferred tactics was the same across countries and only slightly different between attempts to influence superiors and subordinates. Reason, coalition, ingratiation, and bargaining were the most frequently used tactics in attempting to influence superiors. Reason, assertiveness, ingratiation and coalition were the most frequently used for subordinates.

A cluster analysis of the entire sample revealed three distinct "influence styles" of managers (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis, *et al*, 1984). These are the bystander, the

tactician and the shotgun styles. The bystander makes very few of any type of influence attempt, the tactician manager uses reason as a predominant influence style and the shotgun managers use all of the seven influence tactics indiscriminately. Kipnis and his associates (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis, *et al.*, 1984) related these influence styles to self reported measures of power of the power holder. Power was gauged as the ability to control resources and the management of non-routine, "high-tech" departments as compared to departments which handled routine functions. They found that tactician managers tended to be higher in power while bystander managers had almost no power. Shotgun managers were somewhere between these power extremes. Kipnis also found that shotgun managers had the least amount of organizational tenure relative to either bystander or tactician managers making it difficult to discern whether power level or tenure lead to the shotgun style. Additionally, it was found that as power increased so did the variety of tactics employed and in particular, the number of "strong" tactics used.

In a case study of a radio and television manufacturing and assembly company, Izraeli (1975) found that middle managers exhibited three styles of influence: the bureaucratic mode, the feudal mode and the expansionist mode. The bureaucratic mode consists of strict adherence to policies and organizational rules. This tactic was also found by Schilit & Locke (1982). The feudal mode consists of simply implementing the directions of others and relying on upward appeals to influence a target. The expansionist mode consists of social networking, installing loyal subordinates in key positions and using information to exert influence. Izraeli (1975) notes that the bureaucratic and feudal managers had no power of their own except for their connections

to their boss and the companies' own rules and procedures. She also notes that the expansionist managers had a degree of their own power in the form of specialized knowledge or expertise.

### **Levels of Analysis for Influence Activities**

This group of exploratory research opens up an important question, what level of analysis is appropriate to describe the influence activities of power holders? By attempting to categorize specific actions either through content analysis or factor analytic methods, it would appear that a majority of researchers have moved away from the notion of detailing specific actions of the power holder. There would appear to be good practical reason for this as specific activities can quickly begin to number in the hundreds (Falbo, 1978; Kipnis, *et al*, 1980).

The other extreme is a large reduction of specific activities into broad styles or dimensions. While such large categorizations are appealing because of the wide range of behavior they encompass, their range may be too broad for any fine grained analysis of influence activities.

One solution to this conundrum would be to maintain the discussion of influence attempts at the level of analysis of tactics such as those that resulted from the factor analyses or conceptual categorizations described above. This level of analysis permits the discussion of discrete activities while incorporating a large number of specific behaviors within tactics. An examination of the tactics discussed above results in 13

tactics: assertiveness, ingratiation, reason, sanctions, bargaining, upward appeals, clandestine actions, blaming others, impression management, and placing loyal subordinates in key positions.

McClelland (1975) describes one additional influence tactic not mentioned in the previously discussed research, empowerment. Empowerment entails the lending of part of the power holder's power in order for the target to accomplish a goal of the power holder. This is conceptually similar to the tactic of upward appeal except that, in using an upward appeal, the power holder is the recipient of power from a third party. In using an empowerment tactic, the target is the recipient of power from the power holder.

Among the influence tactics enumerated above, there are several instances of conceptual overlap, such as "coalitions" and "placing key subordinates". In addition some tactics are ill defined by the authors suggesting them, such as "clandestine activities". For these reasons the present investigation will focus on the seven tactics described in detail by Kipnis, *et al* (1982).

### **Definitions of Power and Influence**

At this point it becomes necessary to pull together the three aspects of power: bases of power, tactics of influence and goals of the power holder in order to form a definition of power and influence. Bases of power are resources, located within the power holder, within the target, or within the situation existing between the target and power holder. These bases provide the source of the power holder's power but are "latent" or "potential" until used. Bases of power are dynamic in that they change as a

function of the relationship between power holder and target and also with each influence attempt of the power holder. Therefore, the weight (Dahl, 1957), an estimate of the amount of power, of a particular base will depend on the particular target. Further, this relationship is not stable, it changes as a result of changes in the organization.

Influence tactics are the active manifestation of the bases of power possessed by a power holder. They are significantly influenced by the type of goal the power holder is pursuing. As manifestations of the bases of a power holder's power, influence tactics are useable only to the extent that a power holder has power available to him or her vis-a-vis a particular target. The goals of an influence tactic may be manifold but can be categorized as personal and organizational.

### **Effect of Goals on Power and Influence Tactics**

Why is power used in organizations? In other words, what is the intended change in the target that the power holder hopes to effect by the exertion of power? Etzioni (1965) describes control of behavior as the reason for the use of power in organizations. According to Pfeffer (1981), power is used to make decisions when there is no obvious, rational reason to choose between a number of alternatives. Salancik & Pfeffer (1977) enumerate the following reasons: enhance individual survival, control scarce resources, place allies, set the agenda and define organizational problems. According to Tedeschi (1974), power is used to control resources, or to change the cognitions, attitudes, or behaviors of others. Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) describe two types of problems that power is used to solve: reactive and proactive. Reactive problems are situations which

are initiated by others and require a response by the power holder. Proactive problems involve attempts to get the target to do something he or she was not previously doing. Kipnis, *et al* (1980) list self-interest, initiation of change, improvement in target's performance, and getting others to do one's work as common goals of influence attempts.

Kipnis & Schmidt (1983; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis *et al.*, 1984) divide the various goals of the power holder into personal and organizational. Personal goals include receiving benefits such as better pay, assistance with one's work, and favorable evaluations. Organizational goals include getting new ideas or changes accepted, getting others to do one's work or improving their own work. As the distinction between personal and organizational goals accounts conceptually for the range of goals discussed above, this is the categorization which will be retained.

Kipnis & Schmidt (1984; Kipnis, *et al* 1980) found that the type of influence tactic used was significantly correlated with the type of goal sought by the power holder. Kipnis found that when an individual's goals were personal, "weak" tactics were used while assertiveness was used when organizational goals were being pursued. Reasoning tactics were used when an individual was promoting a new idea. Kipnis & Schmidt (1983; Kipnis *et al.*, 1984) note that the more goals an individual is pursuing the more varied his or her influence tactic will be. Any attempt to study power and influence must take into account the particular goals of the power holder (Schein, 1977).

### **Situational Factors Affecting the Use of Influence Tactics**

Under what circumstances will a power holder use available influence tactics?

There are a number of situational variables that have been shown to effect the use of various influence tactics. Goodstat & Kipnis (1970) found that span of control and target's attitude effected the type of influence tactic used between supervisors and subordinates. This was a laboratory study in which subjects were not allowed to meet with their "subordinates" and were limited to either verbal tactics such as emotional appeals and reason or the use of rewards (exchange).

Fodor (1974), also using a laboratory simulation, found that the use of exchange or sanctions as influence tactics was mediated by the approach of subordinates to the supervisors. Disparaging and ingratiating subordinates were less well rewarded than were compliant subordinates. In another laboratory simulation, Michner & Schwertfeger (1972) found that when the power holder liked the target, tactics such as exchange were used; when the target was disliked, blocking and coalitions were used. Michner & Schwertfeger (1972) note that power holders will attempt to use influence tactics which will not harm the relationship between themselves and the target. Each of the above studies suffers the limitations of occurring within a laboratory.

Kipnis & Cosentino (1969) studied 184 supervisors in a number of lighting plants who were attempting to improve a subordinate's performance, an organizational goal. They found that in situations where the supervisor perceived the employee's poor performance to be due to an attitude problem, reason was the influence tactic of choice. Where ability was the cause of the problem, increased supervision, an assertive tactic was used.

Kipnis & Schmidt (1983) found that the degree of power differential between the power holder and the target, the power holders' expectations of the targets compliance, and the goals of the power holder all effected the choice of influence tactic. When the power differential was strongly in the power holder's favor, when goals were organizational goals and expectations of target compliance were low, assertiveness was the tactic of choice. This is consistent with Kipnis' (1976) "iron law of power" which suggests that stronger, more direct influence tactics will be chosen as a first resort as the power differential between power holder and target increases in the power holder's favor.

Further, Kipnis & Schmidt (1983) found that reason was used when there was no power differential between target and power holder, goals were organizational and expectations of compliance were high. Ingratiation, was used as an influence tactic when the power differential was strongly in the target's favor, goals were personal and expectation of compliance were low.

Kipnis *et al* (1984) indicates that weaker tactics, such as reason, will be used when expectations of compliance are high. Kipnis, *et al* (1980) found that tactics varied somewhat as a function of the target, with different tactic mixes being employed in order to influence peers, subordinates and supervisors. Although they do not speculate on the reasons for this finding it seems reasonable to suggest that power differences account for the use of different influence tactics.

Wilkinson & Kipnis (1978) examined the use of power between firms. They found that strong tactics were used when there was a perception of superior power or a pattern of resistance. They also found that weaker tactics were used where power was equal or the power holder had less power or where a continued relationship was desired.

This study, as does the entire line of research by Kipnis described above, suffers from single method bias. In each study, individuals were surveyed and their perceptions of the variables under consideration was examined, no direct observations were made.

### **Summary**

The history of research into power and influence has been long and varied. While many researchers have blurred the lines between power and influence, the distinction can be readily made. Investigations into power have taken two major tacks, resource dependency models and basis of power models. From the preceding discussion it becomes clear that basis of power approaches are explicated resource dependency models. Research into influence tactics has been extensive, but predominately guided by the work of Kipnis and his associates. This research has served to define the universe of behaviors used in interpersonal influence attempts and to create meaningful aggregations of these behaviors, called influence tactics, which can be reliably observed.

Further, from the above discussion it is clear that there are situational context factors associated with the use of power and choice of influence tactics by power holders. These include the goals of the power holder, real or anticipated resistance on the part of the object, relative perceived power between the power holder and the object, quality of affective relationship between the power holder and the object, and a desire for a continued relationship with the object on the part of the power holder (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Variables Affecting Influence Tactic Selection**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Levels</b>
Goals of the influence attempt are:	personal vs organizational
A continued relationship between the power holder and the target is:	desired vs not desired
Expected resistance from target is:	low vs high
Quality of affective relationship between power holder and target is:	positive vs negative
The more powerful individual is	target vs power holder

None of these factors have been examined through direct behavioral observation with the exception of the laboratory studies detailed above. These laboratory studies suffered from varying degrees of artificiality (for example, no direct contact between power holder and object). There has also been no systematic attempt to relate influence attempts to sources of power available to the power holder. Observed differences in influence tactics across complex situations or in real life settings have similarly received no attention by researchers. In addition to these gaps in the literature, there is also a paucity of research concerning the effects of personality on influence tactic usage.

The following section will consider the limited research that has been conducted with respect to personality variable and the use of power and influence tactic selection. Following this, a theoretical framework for investigating the effect of personality on influence tactic selection will be discussed.

### **-Section III -**

Throughout the history of research into power and influence in industrial/organizational psychology, the investigation of types of influence tactics that a given individual will use has been wide reaching. Authors such as Salancik & Pfeffer (1977) who do not differentiate between power and influence suggest that the type of influence used is based on the resources controlled. Other authors have investigated variables including: goals of influence, ability of the target to resist, number of influence attempts, and whether the target is intra or extra-organizational, among others. These situational variables have been discussed in the previous chapter.

While situational variables have been explored, the personality of the power holder has been all but ignored. Kipnis (1984) has suggested that individuals have characteristic styles or patterns of influencing others. This, however, is far different than suggesting that different personality structures effect the choice of influence tactic used.

#### **Existing Research**

Certainly, there has been some investigation of the effect of personality on influence attempts. The body of research which developed as a result of Adorno's (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) California F-scale is an important example. This research provides evidence that authoritarian personalities will select coercive influence tactics, particularly when they have greater power relative to the target (Hogan, 1991).

McClelland (1975) describes power motivation as need for power which can be subdivided into need for personal power and need for social power. He found that individuals high in need for personal power used much more direct tactics such as assertiveness and sanctions while those high in need for social power used less direct tactics such as coalitions. Falbo (1977) found that individuals scoring high in Machiavellianism used more emotional appeals and clandestine tactics.

Mowday (1979), in a study of high school principals' attempts to influence budgetary and other administrative decisions, found several personality variables associated with choice of influence tactic. Self-confidence was found to be significantly correlated with the use of reason as an influence tactic ( $r = .22$ , Mowday, 1979; p. 719). Need for achievement and need for power were significantly correlated with the use of reason, and clandestine (described by Mowday as manipulation) tactics and assertive tactics (use of organizational regulations) were significantly correlated with need for power. Correlations ranged from .44 between need for achievement and reason to .21 between need for achievement and clandestine tactics (p. 720). Need for power was inversely related to assertive tactics ( $r = -.26$ ; p.720).

Mowday (1979), however, does not distinguish between the need for social and the need for personal power. Given the findings of McClelland (1975), Mowday's (1979) findings with respect to need for power are difficult to interpret. Further, Mowday (1978), reporting results of the same study, found that need for achievement, need for power, valence of the goal and power holder's self perception of power accounted for only 12% of the variance associated with choice of influence tactic.

None of the research described above takes a systematic approach to personality. In fact, the choice of variables investigated has tended toward the motivational variables rather than personality variables. The pattern for these investigations have been to simply relate a wide range of individual variables to influence tactics and power motivations. In no case has a comprehensive personality theory been investigated with respect to interpersonal influence tactics.

Given that this gap in the research literature exists, two questions arise. First, is there a theoretical reason why personality should effect the use of influence tactics? Second, how should personality be construed in investigating the effect of disposition on influence tactic usage?

### **Approaches to Personality Theory**

There is no *a priori* reason to construe personality differently in the investigation of power and influence than in other areas of psychology. Hogan (1991) suggests that personality has been considered from two different, though not always explicit, venues. First, he suggests that personality can refer to the cohesive sets of behavior, exhibited by an individual and observed by others. This is commonly termed a trait approach and was championed by Allport (1961). More recently this approach has gained currency in psychological theory and research as the Big Five personality theory (Hogan, 1991; Digman, 1990; Norman, 1963).

This approach suggests that there are five bipolar dimensions which compromise the universe of observable personality traits. While the exact wording of the poles differs slightly between authors, one accepted set of dimension labels are (Digman, 1990):

I	Extroversion/Introversion	(Surgency)
II	Friendliness/Hostility	(Agreeableness)
III	Conscientious	(Will)
IV	Neuroticism/Emotional Stability	(Emotional Stability)
V	Intellect	(Openness)

It should be noted that factor III, Conscientious, is intended to describe the will to achieve and factor V, Openness, refers to openness to new experiences (Digman, 1990; Hogan 1991; Barrick & Mount, 1991). Hogan (1991) notes that through higher order factor analysis it is possible to combine these five dimensions into three superordinate factors and that these dimensions also easily breakdown into sub factors. He suggests that the Big Five theory serves as a mid-range theory, providing a useful frame work for observers to group behavioral data.

The second approach to personality in the psychological literature as noted by Hogan (1991; 875) "...refer(s) to the structures, dynamic processes, and propensities inside a person that explain why he or she behaves in a characteristic way." These agencies are thought to be the driving force(s) underlying observable behavior but are themselves only able to be inferred.

Rather than view these as competitive approaches Hogan (1991) describes them as complimentary, suggesting that the trait approach is oriented to the observers'

perspective (observer oriented) whereas an internal processes approach is an individual oriented approach. In Hogan's approach, **observer oriented** theories (e.g. trait theories) provide the "what" of personality - systematic descriptions of manifest behavior.

**Individual oriented** theories (e.g. Freud) provide the "why" of personality - systematic explanations of the driving forces of manifest behavior.

In contrast, Allport (1961) and more recently Funder (1991) consider traits as both descriptions of patterns of behavioral consistency and as the causal agents of these behaviors. Allport (1937) suggests that traits effect the way an individual perceives social situations, through a process called functional equivalence, thus effecting the way he or she responds. Similarly, the specific behavior of an individual may vary across social situations. Allport suggests that these behaviors as well are functionally equivalent for the individual. In fact, both Hogan (1991) and Funder (1991) argue that an individual's specific actions must vary across situations in order to remain consistent.

By way of illustration, an introverted individual might, in one situation, chose solitude over a social evening with a small group while, in another situation chose to join a large group over a small group. In the first instance the individual chose to be with the smallest number of people (himself) and in the second chose the largest number of people. Yet, this behavior is functionally equivalent as in each case the individual actively sought to avoid the potential for close interpersonal contact (isolation and anonymity, respectively).

Assuming that the taxonomies of influence tactics presented in the previous chapter represent the universe of behaviors associated with attempting to influence

another, the foregoing discussion suggests that personality will impact the use of influence tactic in the following way. Traits, as observable patterns of behavior, serve to create equivalent classes of both behavior and social perception for the individual. As such, they may serve to place boundaries on the repertoire of behaviors an individual will bring to a particular class of social stimuli. Thus, different situations requiring an individual to exert influence may become functionally equivalent to that individual, eliciting a functionally equivalent set of behavioral responses. Therefore personality traits will serve to limit the universe of influence tactics typically available to an individual.

Thus, when considering various effects on an individual's selection of influence tactics, personality would appear to serve as particularly important. Current thinking in personality theory (Hogan, 1991; Digman, 1990, Barrick & Mount, 1991) suggests that personality can gainfully be measured in terms of five discrete dimensions. These "Big Five" dimensions can be thought of as "observer oriented" (Hogan, 1991) in that they describe cohesive and consistently observable patterns of human behavior. However, while Big Five theory is useful in organizing and even predicting observed behavior, it lacks the ability to explain the cause(s) of behavior (Digman, 1990).

An alternative approach would be to select from among the myriad "individual oriented" theories which provide, theoretically, explanatory power. This is essential if one wishes to make strong hypotheses concerning the specific effects of personality on influence tactic selection in given situations.

In general, there is no rational way to select from among the large number of individual oriented approaches to personality. However, Erich Fromm's theories of personality character typology would seem to be the most appropriate choice for use in this study for two reasons. First, Fromm's (1947) personality system is based on a number of character types. These types represent cohesive patterns of behavior associated with an individual's style of interpersonal relationships. As such they can be considered "meta traits" in that they provide an even greater level of abstraction and accumulation of cohesive behavior than is normally done when specifying traits. This character typology is, therefore, consistent with an observer orientation to personality. Second, Fromm's character typology is derived from an individual oriented, psychodynamic system. This system is based on the individual's reaction to existential freedom and interpersonal power (Fromm, 1941). This makes Fromm's approach uniquely relevant to investigations of interpersonal power and influence.

### **Summary**

Previous research into the effect of personality on power usage and influence tactic selection has been sparse. The little programmatic research that has been conducted in this area has focused predominately on the motivation to use power (cf. McClelland, 1975; Adorno *et al.*, 1950). Other research in this area has suffered from a lack of a systematic approach to personality.

When considering personality theory in both practice and research Hogan (1991) has recommended using both the observer oriented approaches and individual oriented

approaches. Hogan suggests that these are complimentary venues for investigating the effects of personality on human performance. Fromm's theory of character typologies will serve as both of these approaches. This choice is made for two reasons. First, as an individual oriented approach, it describes the genesis of systematic differences in observed behavior. Second, Fromm provides a "character typology" system which allows for an observer oriented description of behavior. In addition, the psychodynamic system which Fromm postulates as the foundation and driving force behind observed behavior is based on individual responses to power and freedom, making this system directly relevant to investigations of power and influence. The following section will provide a description of Fromm's personality theory.

- Section IV -

**Fromm's Basis of Personality**

Fromm views the development of personality as stemming from both the internal world and the socio-economic external world in which man finds himself. From Fromm's (1941) perspective, man's needs can be divided into two categories. First are the set of physiological needs which man must satisfy if he is to survive. These can be summarized as a need for self preservation.

To put this in a simple formula: man must eat, drink, sleep, protect himself from his enemies, and so forth. In order to do all this he must work and produce. "Work", however, is nothing general or abstract. Work is always a specific kind of work in a specific kind of economic system.  
(Fromm, 1941; 32).

Self-preservation therefore requires man to adapt to his own unique socio-economic condition. This adaptation occurs along two dimensions, static and dynamic. Static adaptation refers to those peculiarities of habit, conditioned by societal norms, which are readily changed and are of little consequence to the individual's personality, such as hair style (Fromm, 1947, 1941).

Dynamic adaptation refers to the many strivings and character traits which differ from person to person, such as love, destructiveness, lust for power, enjoyment of sensual pleasure, etc. These aspects of personality are seen by Fromm to be somewhat malleable and adaptable. Individuals are able to adapt these characteristics of personality, particularly in childhood, to the needs of their environment. However, these

characteristics are not particularly flexible in that, once established, they are not easily altered:

Thus the mode of life, as it is determined for the individual by the peculiarity of an economic system, becomes the primary factor in determining his whole character structure, because the imperative need for self-preservation forces him to accept the conditions under which he has to live. (Fromm, 1941; 33)

The second of man's needs according to Fromm is an "imperative part of man's nature...which is not rooted in bodily processes but in the very essence of the human mode and practice of life: the need to be related to the world outside oneself, the need to avoid aloneness" (Fromm, 1941; 34). Fromm notes two causes for the need for belonging and its companion, fear of aloneness. The first reason is the obvious and practical reason of self-preservation. Man needs others, in a cooperative society, in order to survive.

The second reason, which Fromm saw as overwhelmingly more significant, is the uniquely human experience of subjective self-consciousness - "the faculty of thinking by which man is aware of himself as an individual entity, different from nature and other people" (1941; 36). According to Fromm, the very existence of this awareness of ourselves as differentiated from nature, of our aging and eventual death, necessarily leads the individual to feelings of insignificance and smallness compared to the universe and all others who are "not he". That the central feature of human existence is self-awareness, and that this self-awareness leads to feelings of alienation and powerlessness is a key feature of Fromm's writings (1941, 1947, 1956, 1976). Further, this theoretical base leads

Fromm to postulate freedom as the central variable in understanding personality (1941, 1947, 1956).

### **Freedom**

For Fromm, freedom, "...characterizes human existence as such, and furthermore...(freedom's) meaning changes according to the degree of man's awareness and conception of himself as an independent and separate being" (1941; 38). Freedom has two aspects. A negative aspect, "freedom from", and a positive aspect, "freedom to".

As man evolved, he developed a greater and greater awareness of himself as separate and distinct from nature. This original psychological attachment with nature Fromm (1941) called primary bonds. As man's self-awareness grew these bonds became irrevocably severed. This is the beginning of human existence, of freedom. This early freedom is characterized by freedom from; freedom from bonds, ties, and proscriptions imposed externally on how man should/could live his life. The advent of freedom from is experienced by man as frightening. It is a sense of aloneness and lack of belonging. It is man devoid of a sense of rootedness in the universe (1941, 1947).

The second aspect of freedom, positive freedom, is freedom to. That is, freedom to be one's self. Thus, while negative freedom makes an individual isolated and anxious, positive freedom leads an individual to the realization "that there is only one meaning of life: the act of living itself" (1941; 289). "The basic dichotomy that is inherent in freedom - the birth of individuality and the pain of aloneness - is dissolved on a higher plane by man's spontaneous action" (1941; 287).

## **Love**

Reminiscent of Freud's famous dictum, Fromm finds that love and work are the foremost components of spontaneous activity, with love taking preeminence (1956). The work Fromm refers to is "work as creation, in which man becomes one with nature in the act of creation" (1941;287), thereby affirming the individuality of the self. Work, as a creative activity, can provide man with a sense of oneness with his creative product and, perhaps, with nature, but this is not an interpersonal oneness. For Fromm love is the venue through which an individual can experience interpersonal oneness.

Fromm describes love as having four attributes: caring, respect, responsibility and knowledge. Thus love is a caring concern for the life and well being of that which we love. It is also a responsibility for that which is loved, akin to the biblical notion of "my brother's keeper". Coinciding with this notion of responsibility is the notion of respect, respect of the individuality and uniqueness of that which we love. The final aspect of love is knowledge, but this is both an aspect of the act of loving and an outcome of love. Knowledge, in the sense of factual, psychological knowledge, is a prerequisite for loving. The act of loving, however, is a penetration into the essence of the loved one which provides a knowledge, an understanding, of that person which transcends thought and is based on the experience of oneness with the loved one.

Fromm uses the term "love" to describe a positive or healthy mode of interpersonal relating which consists of knowledge, respect, concern for and feelings of responsibility toward, another. Love is "...an attitude, an orientation of character which

determines the relatedness of a person to the world as a whole, not toward one 'object' of love" (1956; 38).

Fromm (1947) describes these attributes as a productive orientation toward others. This productive orientation emerges out of the positive attributes of a number of personality character types and their various blendings. Before discussing specific personality character types, it is important to first look at the development of an individual's orientation.

### **Personality Development**

The capacity for love in the individual is, according to Fromm (1956), derived during childhood and is based on parental love; "motherly" and "fatherly" love, each of which is qualitatively different. Motherly love, of the infant and young child, is unconditional and need not be acquired. The child experiences the notion that I am loved because I am. This has both a positive and negative aspect. Because motherly love is unconditional it does not need to be deserved and it need not be acquired. This also implies that it can not be deserved and can not be acquired. It is something, a "blessing", beyond the child's control; it is passive. Fatherly love, of the young child, is conditional. thus it is active. It is present only when the father determines that it has been deserved. It is within the control of the child; it can be brought about by the activity of the child.

According to Fromm, until approximately the age of ten, the child is predominantly concerned with being loved. At about age ten, the child comes to discover a new aspect of its being, its own activity. It is at this point that the child can attempt to love others. This will occur if the child has received unconditional motherly love and if

the fatherly love received by the child contains the aspect of respect so that the father permits the child to grow in his or her own unique individuality.

Thus there is a shift in the quality of love from childhood to adulthood. "Infantile love follows the principle, 'I love because I am loved'. Mature love follows the principle, 'I am loved because I love'" (1956, 34). The act of loving another creates, in the one loved, a spontaneous response of reciprocal loving.

### **Responses to Freedom**

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that, from a Frommian perspective, there are three forces which shape early interpersonal relations with the family, specifically the experience of motherly and fatherly love; adaptation to the socio-economic milieu in which the individual finds himself; and the individual's reaction to freedom derived from self-awareness. These forces interact such that the first two, parental love and social/economic adaptation, strongly influence the individual's reaction to freedom, which in turn influences his continued adaptation to the world and others.

In his earlier attempts to distinguish among patterns of observed behavior in individuals Fromm described three "styles" which resulted from an individual's response to existential freedom. In his latter writings, Fromm provided a more systematic description of "character orientations" which organized specific behaviors within a consistent framework. Fromm's early styles are described below followed by a discussion of his character orientations.

## **Styles**

An individual will adopt one or more "styles" of reacting to freedom. These styles will then shape the individual's "character orientation", that is, the way in which the individual continues to adapt/respond to the world around him. Two prominent styles which Fromm (1941) felt were intimately related and were the result of a flight from negative freedom were the sadistic and masochistic styles. The masochistic personality is one which wishes to submit completely to some power or authority. This power can be either God, a nation, an organization, or another individual. Because negative freedom has created such an overwhelming feeling of isolation and powerlessness in the masochistic individual, he or she attempts to be "swallowed up" by a powerful other and thus participate in this power in an attempt to overcome isolation and insignificance. This is done at the expense of the individual's integrity.

The sadistic character is one which attempts to "swallow up" another, to use and control another in order to increase the sadistic individual's feelings of self power. Fromm saw this type of individual as being motivated by the same feelings that motivate the masochistic character, overwhelming feelings of insecurity and powerlessness.

Both the masochistic and sadistic styles result in a false and unsatisfying sense of security and lead to a vicious cycle of inadequate attempts to flee feelings of personal insignificance. Fromm (1941) noted that a given individual may be both sadistic and masochistic, that is, overly willing to completely submit to a perceived power and at the same time dominating and using those who are perceived as weak. Weakness in others is

an intolerable condition because it is reflective of the sadistic personality's own feared powerlessness and weakness.

Fromm also noted that a sadistic individual and a masochistic individual may enter into a symbiotic relationship. Such a relationship will satisfy each individual's need to manage anxiety brought about by feelings of powerlessness but, as such a relationship is based on a violation of the integrity of the individual, it does not permit growth. It will not prove sufficient to overcome the individuals' feelings of aloneness nor will it suffice to replace the lost primary bonds.

The third style described by Fromm (1941) is the automaton personality. This individual is characterized as striving for ends which are not his own but are dictated by various non-tangible aspects of society: norms, common sense, advertising, organizational imperatives, etc.. Fromm saw this individual, and believed the individual saw himself, as a cog in a giant machine laboring toward ends that were not his own.

The clearest example of the automaton personality that Fromm (1941) provides is that of the factory worker. This individual works at an automated job which is based on uniformity and routinization. Further, this individual labors not for himself, but for an unseen owner(s) who set the pace and even the product he produces. The individual attempts to reestablish his primary bonds with humanity by "joining". He becomes "one" and the same with those around him; unindividuated from his fellow workers and society. In this way he seeks to escape the isolation and aloneness that freedom from the primary bonds with nature has caused. Argyris (1957) described almost exactly the same set of organizational constraints as eroding the individuals ability for self-actualization and

accelerating the condition of alienation workers frequently experience in modern organizations.

### **Character Orientations**

The infinite diversity of personalities is in itself characteristic of human existence.

...By Personality I understand the totality of inherited and acquired psychic qualities which are characteristic of the one individual and which make the individual unique. The difference between inherited and acquired qualities is on the whole synonymous with the differences between temperament, gifts, and all constitutionally given psychic qualities on the one hand and character on the other.

Temperament refers to the mode of reaction and is constitutional and not changeable; characteristics are essentially formed by a persons experiences, especially those in early life, and changeable, to some extent by insights and new kinds of experiences. (Fromm, 1947;58-60)

The distinction Fromm draws here, is between being physically strong or weak on the one hand, and kind or sadistic on the other. The former is constitutional and the latter is developed through interpersonal experiences. Fromm states (1947, 65) that his theory of character typology follows Freud in "essential" points:

- character traits underlie behavior and must be inferred from it;
- character traits are powerful forces which may be entirely unconscious;
- the main aspect of character is not the character trait but the total character organization from which the traits follow.

Fromm's theory differs from Freud in that "...the fundamental basis of character is not seen in various types of libido organization but in specific kinds of a person's relatedness to the world" (1947, 66).

Fromm (1946) describes five character orientations: Receptive, Exploitive, Hoarding, Marketing, and Productive. The first four orientations are considered to be "nonproductive", that is, non-spontaneous, immature, unhealthy ways of relating to the world. This is, naturally, an oversimplification. "In reality, we always deal with blends, for a character never represents one of the nonproductive orientations or the productive orientation exclusively" (1946, 118).

The results of this blending are four character orientations: Receptive, Exploitive, Hoarding and Marketing; each with the potential to be productive or non productive. This allows for a range of productive to nonproductive traits to be exhibited by a specific character orientation. The degree to which an individual develops the productive aspects of a particular character orientation is related to the individual's response to "freedom to", the ability and freedom to be a unique individual with the capacity to respond to the world in a creative, spontaneous manner.

Fromm described an affinity between the Receptive and Exploitive orientations and the between the Marketing and Hoarding orientations. This affinity is due to the tendency toward closeness with an object for the former pair and a distancing or withdrawal in the later. An individual's movement toward or away from another "object" is related to the individual's response to "freedom from", individual self-awareness and the severing of primary bonds. Affinities also exist between Hoarding and Exploitive and between Receptive and Marketing based on the individual's response to the world being proactive or reactive, respectively. The description of each character orientation which follows will clarify this distinction.

### **The Receptive Orientation**

"In the receptive orientation a person feels 'the source of all good' to be outside, and he believes that the only way to get what he wants - be it something material, be it affection, love, knowledge, pleasure - is to receive it from that outside source" (1946, 70). The receptive orientation character is always in search of a "magic helper", someone to help them, guide them and give them what they need. The receptive orientation character is loyal, finds it difficult to say no, and is an excellent listener.

Individuals with this orientation tend toward optimism and confidence, however they can do little on their own, they feel paralyzed without help. Thus, such actions as decision making and taking responsibility for actions are very difficult for them. "In interpersonal relationships, for instance, they ask advice from the very person with regard to whom they have to make a decision" (Fromm, 1946, 71).

### **The Exploitive Orientation**

The exploitive orientation, like the receptive, has as its basic premise the feeling that the source of all good is outside, that whatever one wants to get must be sought there, and that one cannot produce anything oneself. The difference between the two, however, is that the exploitive type does not expect to receive things from others as gifts, but to take them away from others by force or cunning (1946, 71).

Individuals of this character orientation, while frequently intelligent, will rarely produce any original ideas. Rather, they will adopt the ideas of others as their own. These individuals tend toward manipulation and hostility, seeing others as objects to be

exploited and valuing others only to the degree that they are "useful". "One finds here suspicious and cynicism, envy and jealousy" (Fromm, 1946;73).

### **The Hoarding Orientation**

Individuals having this character orientation have little faith in anything new they might get from the outside world; their security is based upon hoarding and saving, while spending is felt to be a threat. They have surrounded themselves, as it were, by a protective wall, and their main aim is to bring as much as possible into this fortified position and to let as little as possible out of it (Fromm, 1946; 73). The act of "giving" or sharing material, emotional or intellectual possessions with another is extremely difficult for this character.

Individuals with this character orientation tend toward drawing distinct boundaries between "mine" and "yours". The outside world, and particularly intimate relations with others, is thought of as an intrusion and a threat to be mastered, generally through remoteness or possession. Mastery to these individuals often takes the form of obsessive orderliness, and a "holding on" to thoughts, feelings and ways of accomplishing a task. These individuals will be resistant to change and slow to adopt new ways of solving problems. This character orientation is considerably inflexible but will have an excellent memory for events, rules, procedures, etc. "Their highest values are order and security..." and creativity is an action which is not possible for them (Fromm, 1946; 75).

### **The Marketing Orientation**

In the marketing orientation, man encounters his powers as commodities alienated from him. He is not one with them but they are masked from him because what matters is not his self-realization in the process of using them but his success in the process of selling them. Both his powers and what they create become estranged, something different from himself, something for others to judge and to use; thus his feeling of identity becomes as shaky as his self-esteem; it is constituted by the sum total of the roles he can play. (Fromm, 1946; 80)

The marketing personality is a variant of the automaton style which Fromm (1941) sees as stemming from modern capitalism. Such an individual attempts to reduce the anxiety of separateness and powerlessness brought on by freedom by seeing himself as a commodity to be marketed.

The marketing personality attempts to increase his "worth" on the market by becoming or acquiring those skills and traits which society currently desires. Individuals with this character orientation tend towards wanting to please others and to want to be in fashion. They are superficial and indifferent in interpersonal relations because they see others as commodities, just as they do themselves. These individuals will be adept at "reading" others to find out what type of "personality" is desired in a given situation. They are very dependent on the opinions of others, and are drawn to prestige, status and success.

### **Productive and Nonproductive Traits of Character Orientations**

As has been previously stated, the fifth character orientation, the productive orientation, is in actuality blended into each of the other four character orientations to create a qualitative continuum within each of productive vs nonproductive traits.

While a given individual will have a character orientation or type based on one of the foregoing orientations or a blend of these, he will also tend toward either productive (i.e. spontaneous, creative, original, giving and moving toward "freedom to") or nonproductive (i.e., unauthentic, stagnant, automated, possessive and escaping "freedom from"). Table 2 presents traits associated with each character orientation and their range from productive to nonproductive.

**Table 2 : Productive and Non-Productive Traits of Character Orientations**

	<b><u>Productive</u></b>	<b><u>Nonproductive</u></b>
<b>Receptive</b>	accepting responsive devoted modest charming adaptable socially adjusted idealistic sensitive polite optimistic trusting tender	passive, without initiative opinionless, characterless submissive without pride parasitical unprincipled servile, without self confidence unrealistic cowardly spineless wishful thinking gullible sentimental
<b>Exploitive</b>	active able to take initiative able to make claims proud impulsive self-confident captivating	exploitive aggressive  egocentric  conceited rash arrogant seducing

**Table 2 (continued)**

	<b><u>Productive</u></b>	<b><u>Nonproductive</u></b>
<b>Hoarding</b>	practical economical careful reserved patient cautious steadfast, tenacious imperturbable loyal tolerant witty generous	unimaginative stingy suspicious cold lethargic anxious stubborn  indolent possessive indifferent silly wasteful
<b>Marketing</b>	purposeful able to change youthful forward-looking open-minded social experimenting undogmatic efficient curious intelligent adaptable tolerant witty generous	opportunistic inconsistent childish without a future or a past without principles or values unable to be alone aimless relativistic overactive tactless intellectualistic undiscriminating indifferent silly wasteful

(Source: Fromm 1946; 120-121)

### **Summary**

As described in section II, Kipnis provides a framework for categorizing the universe of behaviors associated with interpersonal influence attempts. These behaviors

have been studied under a number of situational cues with the result that some understanding of the range of behaviors that will be used in different situations exists. The major flaw in this line of thinking is the assumption that the full universe of influence behaviors will be in the behavioral repertoire of every individual. According to Fromm individual character orientation provides boundaries on the range of behavior available to different individuals.

Taken together this literature suggests the following: 1) there is an enumerable list of interpersonal influence tactics, 2) certain of these tactics will be most appropriate under different conditions 3) a given individual will tend toward a certain range of behavior across situations. This would argue that an individual attempting to exert influence will select a tactic that is both consistent with his character orientation and appropriate to the existing circumstances. The following section will delineate explicit hypotheses derived from this literature and present a research methodology for investigating these hypotheses.

**- Section V -**

The present investigation examined the effects of personality on influence tactic selection. Given the body of literature documenting situational effects on influence tactic selection, these effects must also be considered in any investigation of this topic. In this context, the person/situation interaction can be conceived to place bounds on the universe of influence tactic selection in a given instance for a particular individual.

Specifically, selection from among six of the seven influence tactics described by Kipnis was studied based on both personality and situational constraints. Coalition building was excluded from the investigation. This is necessary as only discrete interpersonal encounters were studied. Coalition building requires a number of diverse and ongoing encounters to be exercised and is thus beyond the methodological scope of this study.

The six remaining tactics were examined both individually and in the "strong" and "weak" clusters described by Kipnis (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1984; Kipnis Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980) as follows:

**Table 3. Influence Tactic Clusters**

<b>Weak Tactics</b>	<b>Strong Tactics</b>
Friendliness	Assertiveness
Bargaining	Coercion
Reason	Upward Appeal

## **Hypotheses**

There are 5 situational variables, described in section II, which have been demonstrated to impinge on influence tactic selection. These variables are predicted to lead a power holder to select either weak or strong tactics. These variables are summarized below:

**Table 4. Situational Cues for Influence Tactic Selection**

Variables	Level of variable leading to use of weak tactics	Level of variable leading to use of strong tactics
Goals of the power holder:	personal	organizational
Continued relationship with the target:	desired	not desired
Expected resistance from target:	low	high
Quality of affective relationship between power holder and target:	positive	negative
More powerful individual:	target	power holder

“Weak situations” are those in which the pattern of situational variables suggests that weak tactics will be used. “Strong situations” are those in which the pattern of situational variables suggests that strong tactics will be used. This leads to the following hypothesis:

### *Hypothesis 1:*

Under strong situation conditions power holders will be more likely to employ strong influence tactics, under weak situations they will be more likely to employ weak tactics and under mixed conditions they will employ either weak or strong tactics.

The weak tactics each involve the act of "giving" something on the part of the power holder, as such these tactics will be difficult for the Hoarding character to employ.

Therefore:

*Hypothesis 2*

Power holders identified as Hording characters will employ strong influence tactics significantly more often than weak tactics, regardless of the situation.

The strong tactics each involve the active use of power against others, requiring a move "toward" or closer to the target. The Marketing character is defined as one which moves "away" from interpersonal closeness. Further this character is adaptive and outwardly malleable rather than confrontational, all suggesting that strong tactics would not be employed by the Marketing character. Therefore:

*Hypothesis 3*

Power holders identified as Marketing characters will employ weak influence tactics significantly more often than strong tactics, regardless of the situation.

Both the Receptive character and the Exploitive character involve a movement toward people, that is, interpersonal closeness. The Receptive character doing so in an open, absorbing manner while the Exploitive character does so in an aggressive, taking manner. Therefore:

*Hypothesis 4*

Power holders identified as Receptive characters will employ Bargaining and Friendliness tactics in weak situations and Upward Appeal tactics in strong situations.

*Hypothesis 5*

Power holders identified as Exploitive characters will employ Bargaining and Reasoning tactics in weak situations and Assertive and Coercive tactics in strong situations.

The following table summarizes these hypotheses:

**Table 5. Hypothesis Summary**

Situations	Character Types			
	Hoarding	Receptive	Exploitive	Marketing
Weak	Strong	Friendliness & Bargaining	Reason & Bargaining	Weak
Strong	Strong	Upward Appeal	Coercive & Assertive	Weak
Mixed	Strong	Friendliness, Bargaining, Upward Appeal	Reason, Bargaining, Coercive, Assertive	Weak

**Study Design****Subjects**

Subjects were 54 high performing sales representatives (37 men and 17 women) in a Fortune 50 consumer goods company participating in an assessment center for promotion to sales management.

**Measures**

Two independent variables will be considered: Fromm Character Type and Situation. Fromm Character type is the individual's highest scoring character type on the Paired Adjectives Checklist (described below). Situation is the collection of variables summarized in Table 3 which create either strong, weak or mixed influence conditions. Each subject responded under all three conditions. The variable manipulations to create these conditions are described below under *Role plays*.

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist**

There does not exist a measure of Erich Fromm's Character typology, other than clinical assessment. As clinical assessment is impractical in the current investigation, a paper and pencil measure needed to be developed. The adjectives developed by Fromm and presented in Table 2 were used as the starting point for this development.

The adjectives were administered to a group of introductory psychology students (n=30). Adjectives were presented in two lists - productive and unproductive. Subjects were asked to rate the favorability of each adjective on a five point scale (1=very unfavorable; 5= very favorable) and to indicate which adjectives were unknown to them. Adjectives which were designated as unknown by three or more subjects were replaced with synonyms and ratings were obtained for these synonyms.

Working with productive and non-productive items separately, pairs of adjectives were formed. These pairs had the following characteristics:

- Mean favorability ratings were within one half standard deviation
- No adjectives from the same character type were paired
- The pairings between different character types was balanced so that the same number of between-type pairings occurred.

These pairs were placed into two checklists (productive and non-productive adjectives).

Note that Fromm provided fewer adjectives for certain Character types than for others.

Thus there are more items for some character types.

These pairs became the *Paired Adjectives Checklist*. The *Paired Adjectives Checklist* was then administered to 90 different introductory psychology students. Scales for Receptive, Exploitive, Hoarding and Marketing were created by taking the percentage of endorsed items associated with each character type and multiplying by 100 to

eliminate decimals. Table 6 shows scale means, variances and alphas. Table 7 contains scale inter-correlations. Appendix A1 contains item statistics and appendices A2 through A5 contain scale item-total correlations and scale alphas. The *Paired Adjectives Checklist* appears in Appendix 6.

**Table 6. Paired Adjectives Checklist means, variances and alphas**

Scale	No. Items	Mean	Std. Error of Mean	Std. Deviation	Alpha
Exploitive	14	51.43	2.04	19.40	.60
Hoarding	21	44.07	1.43	13.57	.48
Marketing	16	49.51	1.67	15.88	.51
Receptive	18	47.96	1.54	14.65	.50

N=90.

**Table 7. Paired Adjectives Checklist Scale Inter-Correlations**

	Receptive	Marketing	Hoarding
Marketing	-.51**		
Hoarding	.25*	-.77**	
Exploitive	-.69**	.50**	-.56**

\*  $p < .05$  ..  $p < .001$

As can be seen from an examination of these tables, scales variances and alphas for each of the scales are acceptable, providing between subject variability and within scale homogeneity. Further, Table 7 shows a pattern of scale inter-correlations as expected based on Fromm's (1947) discussion of the affinity between character types.

### **Situation Variables**

As has been mentioned above, situational variables will be directly manipulated through role plays. Three of the five variables discussed in Table 4 will be manipulated and two held constant in each role play. The two which will be held constant are: **Goals**, in each case the subject will seek an organizational goal; **Continued Relationship**, in each situation the subject will interact with either a customer or a potential customer with whom a continued relationship is desired. Note that organizational goals have been demonstrated to lead to stronger influence tactics while desire for a continued relationship has been shown to lead to the use of weaker tactics.

The three remaining variables: quality of affective relationship, relative power, and degree of expected resistance will be manipulated as described below.

### **Role plays**

Each subject participated in three different role plays. In each of the three role play situations described below a sales representative of a consumers goods company was videotaped while participating in an assessment center designed to evaluate potential for promotion into sales management. The subjects interact in the role play with current sales managers who have undergone three days of training in conducting the role plays. These managers were provided with scripts, role descriptions and practice trials for each of the role plays to create consistency. Before each role play the subjects reviewed relevant material and spend 30 to 90 minutes (depending on the situation) preparing. All role plays were scheduled to last for fifteen minutes. Actual time varied between 12 and 17 minutes. Subjects were aware that they were being video taped.

### Situation 1. (*Strong Condition*)

In this situation:

- quality of the affective relationship is poor,
- the power holder is relatively more powerful than the target
- expected resistance is high.

Description:

During this situation the subject meets with the owner of a retail outlet who has violated a merchandising contract, still wishes to be paid on the contract, and has had a strained encounter with the subject's subordinate sales representative. The subject has received two phone messages (on audio tape): one from the store owner and one from the subordinate sales representative. The sales representative indicates that one of his accounts is in violation of a merchandising contract, and when he insisted on the store being brought into line with the contract, the merchant became abusive and threw him out of the store. The merchant's call is a complaint about the sales representative's abusive nature and an insistence on payment. The merchant does not dispute the fact that he has violated the merchandising contract. In addition to these messages the subject has a copy of the contract, documentation of the contract violations, and full discretion to pay or withhold payments from the merchant or to cancel the contract.

Variable manipulations:

- **Affective relationship:** *Poor* - the merchant has called complaining and is agitated and abusive both on the call and during the meeting.
- **Relative power:** *Power holder* - the subject has full discretion over the merchandising payments to the merchant, and the legitimate power of the contract. Further the merchandising payments are a significant source of regular revenue for the merchant, helping to control the variability (ambiguity) of monthly revenue while the sales volume of this store is a small part of the subject's territory and would cause minimal disruption if the contract were canceled.
- **Expected resistance:** *High* - the merchant has already refused to comply with the contract after having the violation noted by a sales representative.

### Situation 2. (*Weak condition*)

In this situation:

- quality of the affective relationship is good
- the power holder is relatively less powerful than the target
- expected resistance is low

**Description:**

The subject has received a request from an owner of a chain of retail outlets to make a sales presentation. The presentation concerns a merchandising agreement to cover the entire chain of stores. The subject has received basic financial information about the chain and has "visited" one store in the chain. (This was accomplished via a five minute video "walk through" of the store in which the subject is shown the store layout and location in detail of a typical store in the chain.) Subjects also have at their disposal appropriate contracts, sales volume information, merchandising payment schedules and full discretion to enter into any merchandising contract within defined company parameters.

**Variable Manipulations**

- **Affective Relationship: Good** - the subject has been invited to make the presentation, is told that the target enjoyed a good relationship with the subject's "predecessor", and the role player maintains a cordial, polite attitude throughout the meeting.
- **Relative Power: Target** - the target's chain of stores would represent a very significant and important sale for the power holder. Although merchandising payments would represent additional income for the chain they would not represent a substantial portion of revenue. In addition the target has complete discretion to enter merchandising agreements with the subject's competitors (substitutability).
- **Expected resistance: Low** - the subject has been invited to make the presentation and the target has expressed an interest in entering into an agreement.

**Situation 3. (Mixed condition)****In this situation:**

- quality of the affective relationship is neutral
- neither the power holder nor the target is relatively more powerful
- expected resistance is unknown

**Description:**

The subject is paying a sales call on a wholesaler customer. This customer's current volume of sales in certain product categories are low, harming profitability both of the customer (target) and the power holder. The purpose of the sales call is for the power holder to influence the target to work more aggressively with ten of the target's retail customers to increase sales. The power holder has financial and sales volume information both on the target wholesaler and many of the wholesaler's customer

accounts. In addition, the power holder has a bonus payment schedule which describes monetary rewards the target can earn by increasing volume in certain product categories. On entering the role play the subject expects to be meeting with both co-owners of the wholesaler (siblings). Immediately upon entering the subject learns that one of the owners is unavailable for the meeting and has been unavailable to help run the business for some time.

#### Variable Manipulations:

- **Affective Relationship:** *Neutral* - the target and the power holder's organization have an amicable relationship although that has come under pressure recently as the target lost a key account due to action on the part of the power holder's organization.
- **Power :** *Neutral* - the power holder has the ability to provide numerous resources to the target (bonus money, information, expertise), however, the target's actions with his(her) customers directly impact the power holder's job performance.
- **Expected resistance:** *Neutral* - the target has no information as to why sales volume in these product categories or with certain retail accounts are low.

#### Dependent Measures

The dependent measure in the study is the **frequency of use** of each of the six influence tactics under consideration. Usage frequency will be measured as follows:

A rater will view the videotape of a subject in a situation (role play). The rater will pause the tape every 45 seconds and code that period of time as either one of the six tactics or no tactic attempted. Note that ratings are of usage not success, therefore all attempts will be captured. The length of the role plays are between 12 and 17 minutes long, yielding between 15 and 25 observations per subject per situation.

In the event that a subject attempts a tactic more than once over the course of the 45 second observation period only one instance will be coded. For example, Subject: "I insist that you do this".....pause....."I really insist that you do this!!". would be coded as one instance of assertive behavior.

In the event that the subject attempts more than one tactic during an observation period the "predominant" tactic will be code. This will be a judgement on the part

of the rater based on relative time spent and relative emphasis on the part of the power holder.

For example,

Subject: "If you work with these customers you will increase your business, have a better working relationship with my company and position yourself as the top quality wholesaler in the area. And, you can even earn a larger Masters bonus payment"

This would be coded as reasoning even though the subject also used a bargaining statement.

As an additional example,

Subject: "I would really appreciate it if you came into compliance with our merchandising contract, it would mean a lot to me - really help me in my business and it would certainly help to improve our relationship. AND IF YOU DON'T I'LL CANCEL THE CONTRACT AND YOU'LL NEVER SEE A MERCHANDISING DOLLAR AGAIN!!".

This would be coded as assertive, even though most of the time was spent using the friendly (ingratiating) tactic, do to the relative emphasis the power holder placed on the coercive tactic.

## **Raters**

### *Training*

Each rater underwent one day of training which involved reviewing and discussing definitions and written samples of each influence tactic. Raters then viewed and rated sample tapes jointly, pausing to discuss the coding of each behavior sample, in order to develop a consensus for ratings. This process continued until raters achieved unanimity of ratings for each behavior coding for an entire role play.

### *Rating*

Subjects were rated by a single rater. Raters were blind to subjects scores on the Paired Adjectives Checklist and situation conditions. To check inter-rater reliability 6 subjects

(15% of the sample) were rated by all raters individually. These subjects each had a designated "actual" rater whose ratings were used in the analysis. Other rater's scores for these subjects were used only to test inter-rater reliability. The following procedure, known as generalizability theory (Crocker and Algina 1986) was used to determine inter-rater reliability.

### *Reliability Testing*

Generalizability theory, derived from classical test theory, seeks to estimate the reliability of rater judgements, as a sample of the universe of raters, under differing experimental conditions (e.g. single rater judging all subjects, different raters judging different subjects, etc). Generalizability theory follows classical test theory in that estimates of reliability are based on the ratio of true to error variance in observed scores. It differs from classical test theory in that there is also considered to be "true" rater variance. That is, an individual's true score will vary somewhat as a function of rater, regardless of error. Thus an individual is thought to have a true score which is the mean of the universe of potential raters as well as a true score for each individual rater. Therefore the generalizability coefficient is the ratio of variance in an individual's true score to the variance in rater scores plus error. This procedure takes into account both error in the classic sense as well as systematic differences in rater judgements when estimating reliability.

Estimates of the generalizability coefficient for experimental situations in which single, different raters will rate different subjects in the actual experiment are calculated using the mean square estimates from a one-way repeated measures ANOVA where

several raters rate each subject and a rater factor is treated as a repeated measure. In this case, the mean square term for the subjects less the mean square residual term, divided by the number of raters, serves as an estimate of the variance of the true scores while the mean square residual term is treated as an estimate of the variance of the "true" rater variance plus the error variance. The generalizability coefficient is then calculated as:

$$p^2_i = \frac{(ms_p - ms_r)/n_i}{((ms_p - ms_r)/n_i) + ms_r}$$

Where:

$p^2_i$  = generalizability coefficient

$ms_p$  = mean square subjects term from repeated measures ANOVA

$ms_r$  = mean square residual term from repeated measures ANOVA

$n_i$  = number of raters in the repeated measures design

The generalizability coefficient is then interpreted as any other reliability estimate. For the purpose of the present investigation each influence tactic use in a subject X situation instance will be treated as a separate observation for the reliability analysis. Therefore, using six subjects will yield 108 observations.

### **Data Analysis**

Once all ratings of subjects were collected hypotheses were examined as follows. A 3X4 within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA was conducted using Situation (3 levels) as the within-subjects factor and Character type (4 levels). Use of the six influence tactics were the repeated measures dependent variables. Following a test of the

overall model, post-hoc analyses were conducted to test specific hypotheses. Post-hoc evaluations of the situation main effect were used to test Hypothesis 1 which predicts overall situation effects. These post-hoc analyses included the one-way MANOVA with situation (3 levels) as the independent variable and the six influence tactics as the dependant variables followed by six ANOVAs testing differences across situations for each of the influence tactics. Relevant t-tests follow these ANOVAs

Post-hoc analyses of the interaction between character type and influence tactic selection were used to test Hypotheses 2 & 3 concerning the Hoarding and Marketing characters respectively. These analyses included six two-way ANOVAs using each influence tactic as a dependent variable as well as two additional two-way ANOVAs using summarized strong and weak tactic use as dependant variables. Relevant t-tests follow.

A post-hoc analysis of the three way interaction from the main MANOVA was used to test Hypotheses 4 & 5 concerning the Receptive and Exploitive characters, respectively. Post-hoc analyses included each of the analyses used to test hypotheses 1 through 3 except those using the summarized strong and weak tactic variables.

**-Section VI-**

**Paired Adjective Checklist**

Of the 54 subjects in the study, 52 returned usable *Paired Adjective Checklists* and 43 had full, usable videotapes of all three role play situations. In total 42 usable sets of subject data were collected. Of these 42 subjects, 30 were male and 12 female. In total, there were 37 male and 17 female subjects. The following tables summarize the results of the *Paired Adjective Checklist*.

Table 8a. Paired Adjective Checklist Score Distribution

Highest Character Score	N	Percent
Exploitive	25	46.3
Hoarding	10	18.5
Marketing	10	18.5
Receptive	7	13.0
Missing	2	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	

Table 8b. Paired Adjective Checklist Score Distribution by usable videotape

Highest Character Score	Complete Role plays	Incomplete Role plays
Exploitive	21	4
Hoarding	7	3
Marketing	9	1
Receptive	5	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 9. Paired Adjective Checklist Means and Standard Deviations for Fromm character type scores

	Mean	SD
Hoarding	.44	.13
Marketing	.53	.17
Receptive	.36	.14
Exploitive	.60	.18

n=42

Table 10. Correlation among Fromm character type score

	Receptive	Marketing	Hoarding
Marketing	-.63*		
Hoarding	.22	-.71*	
Exploitive	-.68*	.47*	-.39*

\* p ≤ .01, n = 42.

Table 11. Fromm character scores by highest scoring character type.  
Means and standard deviations.

	Exploitive Type	Hoarding Type	Marketing Type	Receptive Type
Exploitive Score	<b>.73</b> / .11	.43 / .12	.61 / .12	.42 / .11
Hoarding Score	.43 / .11	<b>.60</b> / <b>.07</b>	.35 / .07	.44 / .05
Marketing Score	.55 / .16	.41 / .08	<b>.71</b> / <b>.11</b>	.43 / .09
Receptive Score	.31 / .11	.39 / .11	.31 / .13	<b>.59</b> / <b>.03</b>

Scores in bold are significantly differently different than other scores in the row at  $p < .05$ .  
mean / standard deviation;  $n = 42$

An examination of these tables shows that subjects were distributed among all four Fromm character types although there was an over weighting of the Exploitive type (46.3% of subjects). No gender differences were observed among Fromm character type scores. Mean scores on the *Paired Adjective Checklist* from Table 11 suggest that distinct character types did emerge. The pattern of correlations present in Table 10 indicates that there are affinities between different character types. Note that the pattern of correlations present in Table 10 is identical to the pattern of correlations described in Table 7, which shows results from a different population.

### **Influence Tactic Measures**

#### *Raters*

As described in Section V a check of rater consistency was conducted. Three raters were used in the study. Six subjects were rated by all raters. This yielded 18 observations for comparison of each influence tactic and 108 observations to check overall reliability. Remaining subjects were divided for rating among the three raters.

Using generalizability theory (Croker and Algina, 1986) as described in Section V.  $p^2_i$  was computed for each influence tactic and as an overall estimate of rater reliability. Table 12 summarizes these results. For the individual influence tactics  $p^2_i$  ranged from .92 to 1.00 with an overall estimate of  $p^2_i = .98$ . These results indicate rater scoring of influence tactic use was highly reliable.

Table 12. Summary of rater reliability estimates.

Mean Square	Overall	Bargaining	Friendliness	Reason	Assertive	Coercive	Upward Appeals
Subject	28.34	8.05	26.96	50.91	11.73	0.67	3.26
Rater	0.04	0.02	1.63	0.22	0.91	0	0.06
Residual	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.4	0.18	0	0.09
N. Raters	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
N.Observations	108	18	18	18	18	18	18
N. Subjects	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
$p^2_i =$	0.98	0.92	0.97	0.98	0.96	1.00	0.92

### *Influence tactic measures*

It was intended that the measure of influence tactic use would be the actual number of times a subject used an influence tactic within a situation. However the results of a within subjects ANOVA show that the number of observation periods across the three situations was significantly different ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 13. Comparison of number of observations across situations.  
Results of Within Subjects ANOVA.

	SS	DF	MS	F
Error (Within + Residual)	450.27	82	5.49	
Number of Observations	791.06	2	395.53	72.03*

\*  $p < .0001$

The mean number of observations were as follows: Situation A (strong condition), 14.36; Situation B (weak condition), 18.48; Situation C (mixed condition), 20.36. Thus the percentage of time spent in an influence attempt rather than the actual number of observed uses would be a better measure of influence tactic use. The percentage of time an influence tactic is used is defined as the number of observed uses of the tactic divided by the number of observations for that situation. Table 14 summarizes this information.

Table 14. Percentage of time spent and number of influence attempts made by situation. Means and standard deviations.

Variable	Percent of time		Number of Attempts	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Situation A (strong condition)</b>				
Assertive	.10	.15	1.36	1.83
Bargaining	.08	.08	1.00	1.13
Coercive	.00	.03	0.05	0.31
Friendliness	.14	.09	2.00	1.31
Reason	.38	.16	5.62	2.56
Upward appeal	.06	.09	0.76	1.08
<b>Situation B (weak condition)</b>				
Assertive	.02	.05	0.38	0.94
Bargaining	.04	.07	0.71	1.35
Coercive	.00	.00	0.00	0.00
Friendliness	.12	.11	2.26	2.08
Reason	.68	.16	12.67	3.48
Upward Appeal	.01	.02	0.10	0.37
<b>Situation C (mixed condition)</b>				
Assertive	.01	.03	0.21	0.56
Bargaining	.03	.06	0.60	1.29
Coercive	.00	.00	0.00	0.00
Friendliness	.13	.11	2.71	2.22
Reason	.63	.16	12.88	3.89
Upward Appeal	.01	.03	0.07	0.46

### **Manipulation Check**

A check was conducted of the manipulations used to create the strong, weak and mixed conditions in the three role play situations. The three raters, who were blind to the role play conditions, were asked to rate each role play on a five point scale using the questionnaire in Appendix 7.

This questionnaire was administered after all other ratings were made. The questionnaire asked for ratings of the “power” of the subject relative to the role player, the quality of the relationship between the subject and the role player, and the amount of resistance displayed by the role player. Actual resistance on the part of the role player rather than expected resistance on the part of the subject was used for two reasons. First, subjects were told how much resistance to expect in each role play. Second, role players were instructed to provide a specified degree of resistance for each situation. Thus this manipulation check was actually a check on the fidelity of the role players to their instructions. Results of the questionnaire appear in Table 15.

**Table 15. Results of manipulation check.**

	<b>Situation A (Strong)</b>	<b>Situation C (Mixed)</b>	<b>Situation B (Weak)</b>
<b>Relative power</b> (1=role player, 5=subject)	3.7	3.7	2.0
<b>Quality of Relationship</b> (1=good , 5=poor)*	3.7	2.3	1.3
<b>Displayed resistance</b> (1= very little, 5=very much)	3.7	3.3	2.0
<b>Mean</b>	3.7	2.76	1.76

\* Scale from questionnaire reversed.

For the manipulation to be effective it would be expected that the strong condition would receive the highest average ratings while the weak condition received the lowest average ratings. As can be seen in the table above the situations conformed to their intended conditions. The one exception is that the subject was perceived by the raters as having more power in the mixed condition than would be expected.

### **Hypothesis 1**

In order to test hypothesis 1, that “strong” situational conditions (situation A) would lead to a greater use of strong influence tactics while “weak” situational conditions (situation B) would lead to the use of weak influence tactics, the following analyses were conducted. A repeated measures within-subjects MANOVA (SPSS PC) was conducted using situation as the within-subjects factor and total strong tactic use and total weak tactic use as the dependent variables. The overall results appear in Table 16.

Table 16. Use of strong and weak influence tactics in different conditions  
Within-Subjects Repeated Measures MANOVA

	<b>SS</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>F</b>
Error (Within + Residual)	.74	82	.01	
Situation	.54	2	.27	29.96*

\*  $p < .0001$

Subsequent post-hoc within-subject repeated measures ANOVAs for total weak and total strong influence tactic use by situation were both significant at  $p < .001$ . Table 17 shows the results of the post-hoc mean comparisons following the ANOVA analyses.

Table 17. Percentage of time spent using strong and weak influence tactics under different conditions. Mean comparisons.

	<b>Total Strong Tactic Usage</b>	<b>Total Weak Tactic Usage</b>
<b>Situation A (Strong Condition)</b>	.16 <sup>A** B**</sup>	.59 <sup>C** D**</sup>
<b>Situation B (Weak Condition)</b>	.03 <sup>A</sup>	.85 <sup>C E*</sup>
<b>Situation C (Mixed Condition)</b>	.02 <sup>B</sup>	.79 <sup>D E</sup>

Means with the same letter superscript are significantly different.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .0001$

As can be seen from a review of Table 17, strong tactics were used significantly more under strong conditions (16%) than under either weak or mixed conditions. There was no difference in usage of strong tactics under weak and mixed conditions as would have been expected. Weak tactics were used significantly more often under weak than either strong or mixed conditions and more frequently under mixed than strong conditions (85%, 59% and 79%, respectively) as predicted. These results provide strong support for Hypothesis 1.

### **Hypotheses 2 to 5**

Hypotheses 2 through 5 are concerned with the use of influence tactics by subjects identified as different Fromm character types under different situational conditions. Before investigating the individual hypotheses an overall within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA (SPSS PC) was conducted. Situation (3 levels) was the within subjects factor, Fromm character type (4 levels) was the between subjects factor and each of the six influence tactics were dependent repeated measures.

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 18. Table 19 provides a summary of the means and standard deviations of each of the influence tactics under each

situation by Fromm type, including total strong tactic use, total weak tactic use, and “no influence attempt”.

Table 18. Use of influence tactics by Fromm type under different situations.  
Within-subjects repeated measures MANOVA.

	SS	DF	MS	F
Situation	.03	2	.02	7.82*
Tactic	22.47	5	4.49	305.01*
Situation by Tactic	2.07	10	.21	25.53*
Fromm Type	.00	3	.00	.01 <i>ns</i>
Fromm Type by Situation	.01	6	.00	.96 <i>ns</i>
Fromm Type by Tactic	.28	15	.02	1.25 <i>ns</i>
Fromm Type by Tactic by Situation	.29	30	.01	1.21 <i>ns</i>

\*  $p < .0001$

Total use of influence attempts differed by situation. The percentage of time spent in “no attempt” was as follows: .25, .17 and .18 for the strong, weak, and mixed condition situations, respectively. Post-hoc analysis revealed that the “no attempt” rating was significantly different only for the strong and weak condition comparison ( $p < .05$ ). “No attempt” ratings were made when a subject made no attempt at influencing the role player for the entire observation period (45 seconds). This most commonly occurred when role player activity consumed the observation period. The strong situation provided the opportunity for greatest role player activity.

Table 19 . Percentage of time spent using various influence tactics.  
Means and standard deviations.

	Fromm Type							
	Exploitive		Hording		Marketing		Receptive	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Situation A (Strong)</b>								
Assertive	.07	.10	.06	.11	.12	.14	.24	.29
Coercive	.00	.00	.03	.07	.00	.00	.00	.00
Upward Appeals	.06	.09	.08	.08	.03	.06	.04	.05
<i>Total Strong</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.17</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.28</i>	<i>.28</i>
Bargaining	.07	.07	.09	.08	.08	.09	.03	.07
Friendliness	.16	.11	.14	.06	.12	.05	.08	.11
Reason	.38	.18	.32	.13	.43	.12	.41	.19
<i>Total Weak</i>	<i>.61</i>	<i>.16</i>	<i>.55</i>	<i>.14</i>	<i>.63</i>	<i>.15</i>	<i>.52</i>	<i>.27</i>
No Attempts	.25	.12	.28	.12	.22	.11	.20	.13
<b>Situation B (Weak)</b>								
Assertive	.03	.07	.02	.03	.01	.02	.00	.00
Coercive	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Upward Appeals	.01	.03	.01	.03	.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>Total Strong</i>	<i>.04</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>.05</i>	<i>.01</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.00</i>	<i>.00</i>
Bargaining	.05	.09	.08	.04	.02	.04	.00	.00
Friendliness	.15	.14	.12	.06	.08	.08	.09	.06
Reason	.65	.19	.69	.10	.72	.16	.75	.14
<i>Total Weak</i>	<i>.84</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>.89</i>	<i>.05</i>	<i>.82</i>	<i>.09</i>	<i>.84</i>	<i>.13</i>
No Attempts	.17	.21	.08	.03	.16	.08	.16	.13
<b>Situation C (Mixed)</b>								
Assertive	.01	.03	.01	.02	.01	.03	.02	.05
Coercive	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Upward Appeal	.01	.04	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>Total Strong</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.06</i>	<i>.01</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.01</i>	<i>.03</i>	<i>.02</i>	<i>.05</i>
Bargaining	.04	.08	.05	.08	.01	.02	.00	.00
Friendliness	.12	.10	.21	.10	.11	.14	.16	.09
Reason	.65	.14	.51	.16	.69	.18	.62	.20
<i>Total Weak</i>	<i>.80</i>	<i>.12</i>	<i>.78</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.80</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.77</i>	<i>.17</i>
No Attempts	.18	.08	.22	.14	.19	.07	.22	.16

The overall use of each influence attempt across Fromm character type and situation was significantly different. Table 20 below lists these variables in order of mean usage. All means are significantly different at  $p < .005$  with the exception of the comparison of assertiveness and upward appeal,  $p < .05$  and assertiveness and bargaining. ns.

Table 20. Total percent use of influence tactic  
Means and standard deviations

<b>Influence tactic</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Influence tactic</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Reason	.59	.12	Assertive	.03	.05
Friendliness	.13	.06	Upward Appeal	.02	.03
Bargaining	.04	.05	Coercive	.00	.01

The observed differences in overall tactic use were not predicted in any of the hypotheses. However, the predominant use of reason and the limited use of the stronger tactics (i.e, assertiveness, upward appeals and coercive) is consistent with the influence tactic literature described in Section II.

The significant interaction of influence tactic and situation was predicted by Hypothesis 1 and demonstrated in Table 16 as well. The results presented in Tables 18 and 19 further refine these findings. From Table 14, it can be seen that use of reason, as a predominate weak influence tactic, rises from a use rate of 38% of observations in the strong condition to 68% and 63% in the weak and mixed conditions, respectively. It can also be seen in Table 14 that assertiveness increases to 14% in the strong condition from 2% and 1% in the weak and mixed conditions, respectively, while the use of upward

appeals increases to 6% in the strong condition from 1% in both the weak and mixed conditions. Coerciveness was used only under the strong condition.

The effect of Fromm character type on influence tactic use, the Fromm type by situation interaction, the Fromm type by tactic interaction and the three way interaction between Fromm type, situation and tactic use were all not significant. This would provide no support for Hypotheses 2 through 5 which predict that tactic use would change as a result of Fromm type and the interaction between Fromm type and situation.

However, a review of Table 19 does reveal some tendencies in the predicted directions. Further, a review of Table 11 shows that while it is possible to separate subjects into Fromm types based on the results of the *Paired Adjectives Checklist*, these individuals will still endorse items from other Fromm character types consistent with the identified correlations in Table 10. This is consistent with Fromm (1965;118) "Yet, in reality, we always deal with blends, for a character never represents one of the ... orientation(s) exclusively." Given these findings an alternative method of testing Hypotheses 2 through 5 is to examine the pattern of correlations between subjects' scores on each Fromm character type and the extent (time spent) of use of each of the influence tactics under different situations.

The following two correlation tables provide an opportunity to review these patterns. Table 21 shows the correlations between Fromm character type score for each subject's 4 scores on the *Paired Adjective Checklist* and the subject's use of strong and weak tactics in total and under each condition. This table can be used to review hypotheses 2 and 3.

Table 21. Fromm character type scores and strong and weak influence tactic usage.  
Correlation table.

	Hoarding Score	Marketing Score	Receptive Score	Exploitive Score
Total strong tactic use Situation A (Strong condition)	.29*	-.39**	.29*	
Total strong tactic use Situation B (Weak condition)	.41***			
Total strong tactic use Situation C (Mixed condition)	.27*			
Total strong tactic use	.41***	-.38**		
<hr/>				
Total weak tactic use Situation A (Strong condition)		.26*		
Total weak tactic use Situation B (Weak condition)				
Total weak tactic use Situation C (Mixed condition)	-.47***	.39**		
Total weak tactic use	-.32**			

n = 42; \*p < .09 ns; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p < .01

Correlations not approaching significance are not shown.

Hypothesis 2 states that the Hoarding character type will use strong tactics under all three conditions. Table 21 shows that subjects' Hoarding scores are positively correlated with overall use of strong tactics ( $r = .41$ ), use of strong tactics under weak situational conditions ( $r = .41$ ), and negatively correlated with the use of weak tactics overall ( $r = -.32$ ) and under weak situational conditions ( $r = -.47$ ). Further, subjects' Hoarding scores approached a significant correlation with the use of strong tactics in both the strong ( $r = .29$ , ns) and mixed ( $r = .27$ , ns) conditions. This pattern of relationships

supports the hypothesis that the Hoarding character will use strong influence tactics despite situational cues which contraindicate their use.

Hypothesis 3 states that the Marketing character will use weak influence tactics regardless of situational cues. Table 21 shows that subjects' Marketing character type scores were negatively correlated with the overall use of strong tactics ( $r = -.38$ ) and the use of strong tactics under strong situational conditions ( $r = -.39$ ), as well as positively correlated with the use of weak tactics under mixed situational conditions ( $r = .39$ ). Further, subjects' Marketing character type scores approached a significant correlation with the use of weak tactics under strong situational conditions ( $r = .26$ , ns). This pattern of correlations supports the hypothesis that the Marketing character will use weak tactics despite situational cues that they are contraindicated.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 describe the specific, situation appropriate, influence tactic(s) that the Receptive and Exploitive characters, respectively, would employ. Table 22 presents the correlations of Fromm character type scores with each influence tactic under each situational condition. Correlations relevant to these two hypotheses appear in bold. An examination of these correlations reveals that neither hypothesis is supported. Subjects' Receptive scores are not correlated with the use of bargaining, friendliness or upward appeals under any situational conditions with the exception of the use of friendliness under weak situational conditions ( $r = -.33$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The direction of this correlation does not support the hypothesis. Subjects' Exploitive scores are uncorrelated with assertiveness, coerciveness, bargaining, or reason under any of the situational conditions.

Table 22. Fromm character type and influence tactic use under different situational conditions.

Correlation table.

		Exploitive	Hoarding	Marketing	Receptive
<b>Strong Condition</b>	Assertiveness	<b>-.07</b>	.11	-.28	.27
	Coerciveness <sup>1</sup>	<b>-.22</b>	.32*	-.09	.02
	Upward Appeals	-.21	.29	-.27	<b>.10</b>
	Bargaining	-.02	.10	.03	-.14
	Friendliness	.08	.05	.09	-.10
	Reason	.03	-.28	.21	-.02
<b>Weak Condition</b>	Assertiveness	.05	.40**	-.30*	-.12
	Upward Appeals	.08	.11	.06	-.09
	Bargaining	<b>-.02</b>	.49**	-.26	<b>-.13</b>
	Friendliness	.25	.05	.16	<b>-.33*</b>
	Reason	<b>-.26</b>	-.17	-.11	.37*
<b>Mixed Condition</b>	Assertiveness	<b>.02</b>	.23	-.23	-.03
	Upward Appeals	.16	.25	-.15	<b>-.10</b>
	Bargaining	<b>-.04</b>	.34*	-.18	<b>-.10</b>
	Friendliness	-.25	.10	-.17	<b>-.10</b>
	Reason	<b>.18</b>	<b>-.53**</b>	.46**	-.19

n = 42; \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01

1. Use of the coercive tactic occurred under the strong condition only.

- Section VII -

**Discussion**

Systematic research, led by Kipnis and his associates, has produced a parsimonious and well defined description of interpersonal influence tactics. The situational cues associated with these tactics have been previously investigated in a variety of studies. These studies were either laboratory studies (Goodstat & Kipnis, 1970; Fordor, 1974; Michnier & Schwertfeger, 1972) or relied exclusively on precept measures (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Kipnis, et at, 1984; Kipnis, et al, 1980; Wilkins & Kipnis, 1978). The present investigation, building on this body of literature, used behavioral observation in a real world setting to test the effect of these situational cues on influence tactic selection. The results of the study fully support the findings of prior research.

Situational cues (relative power, quality of relationship, resistance) led power holders to select weak or strong influence tactics as predicted. Further, even under strong situational cues power holders still attempted a large number of weak tactics. This pattern, consistent with previous research, suggests that power holders will begin with weak tactics, escalating to stronger tactics only under certain situational cues. It is notable that the coercive tactic, arguably the most forceful of the strong tactics, was used only under the strong cue conditions.

This study focused on a complete system of personality, that of Erich Fromm. Past research on the effect of personality on influence tactic selection has focused on discrete personality variables. Social character type as described by Erich Fromm (1946)

is an observer oriented approach to understanding personality whose fundamental basis is an individual's response to personal and social power. This makes Fromm's social character theory particularly attractive to investigations of individual differences in the selection of influence tactics. This was believed to be a useful way of understanding the mediating effect of personality on influence tactic selection.

Fromm's theory leads to the hypotheses that the Hoarding and the Marketing characters would be the least adaptive characters, relying exclusively on strong and weak tactics, respectively. Results of the study showed that individuals described as Hoarding and Marketing types did not exclusively or even predominately rely on these tactics to the exclusion of social cues.

However, as stated in Section VI, it may be naive to attempt to categorize an individual exclusively in a particular social character type. Fromm himself argued against such an exclusive categorization. Given this, one would expect that a subject's degree of Hoarding or Marketing character would be related to their tendency to use strong and weak tactics, respectively, even in the presence of contradictory social cues (situations). This was found to be the case. Subjects' Hoarding character type scores were significantly related to their use of strong tactics over all and to their use of strong tactics in weak and mixed conditions; circumstances which would normally argue for the use of weak tactics. Similarly, subjects' Marketing character type scores were significantly related to the avoidance of strong tactics in general and the use of weak tactics under strong conditions.

The Receptive and Exploitive character types were expected to be the most adaptable, displaying specific, situationally appropriate, weak and strong tactics. These two characters, neither as unique types nor as blended aspects of individual personality, were demonstrated to predict usage of any specific influence tactic. This would support the notion that these two character types were the most adaptable to social cues in interpersonal influence situations yet adds no predictive ability concerning the behavior of the Receptive and Exploitive characters in such situations.

It is interesting to note that the character types, Hoarding and Marketing, which were demonstrated to impact influence tactic selection, share an affinity based on interpersonal distance. These character types share a preference for interpersonal distance in social situations. The Marketing character accomplishes this in an active manner and the Hoarding character accomplishes this in a passive manner. The two character types not shown to impact influence tactic selection (Receptive and Exploitive) share an affinity for interpersonal closeness. The Receptive character accomplishes this in a passive manner while the Exploitive character does so in an active manner. It is perhaps no surprise that the character types associated with social engagement (Receptive, Exploitive) were adept at reading social cues and conforming closely to situationally appropriate behavior while the character types associated with social detachment (Marketing and Hoarding) responded less from social cues and more from their internal perspectives.

In summary, the present investigation demonstrated the distinct impact of social cues to individuals' selection of interpersonal influence tactics. Further, it was demonstrated that the Hoarding and Marketing character types, which share an affinity for interpersonal distance, can be used to predict the tendency of individuals to use situationally inappropriate influence tactics. Specifically, the Hoarding character will tend toward strong influence tactics while the Marketing character will tend toward the use of weak tactics, regardless of the social cues present in the situation. The Receptive and Exploitive characters, which share an affinity for interpersonal closeness, were not demonstrated to impact the selection of influence tactic.

#### **Limitation of the Study and Areas for Future Research**

The present study contains several limitations. As in many field investigations, perfect controls were not possible. Twelve of the fifty-four subjects' data were incomplete and excluded from the sample. Due to constraints of the organization conducting the assessment center it was not possible to manipulate whether goals were organizational or personal ( they were organizational) and whether a continued relationship between the power holder and target was desired (it was). Future research should seek to manipulate these two situational cues.

Further, there were two limitations on the use of influence tactics by the subjects. First, as a consequence of the stimulus situations (individual role plays) it was impossible to measure the use of coalition building as an influence tactic. Second, subjects were always observed attempting to influence an individual from a customer organization. No

situation observed the subjects' attempts to influence subordinates, superiors or intra-organizational peers. These are areas of considerable interest and in need of investigation in a field setting.

One important limitation of the study concerns the identification of Fromm character type. Social character type is typically identified through clinical observation. To provide for use of this theory in the present study a *Paired Adjectives Checklist* was developed. This instrument seeks to identify the strength of all four character types in an individual. Further research is necessary to refine this instrument. Specifically, scale alphas ranged from .48 to .60 with a relatively small sample size ( $n=90$ ). While this was sufficient for the present investigation and encouraging to see the same pattern (means and inter-scale correlations) among the subjects in the experiment, further research to increase the reliability of these measures is necessary.

In summary, two factors limit the findings of the present investigation: moderate sample size ( $n=42$ ) and modest reliability of the Fromm character type measure (mean  $\alpha = .52$ ). These should be corrected in any replication. Two factors limit the generalizability of these findings: exclusion of the coercive tactic and exclusive investigation of inter-organizational peers (customers). Future research should expand the present investigation by conducting field studies of subordinate, supervisor and intra-organizational peers.

One new area of research pointed to by the present study is a further refinement of the use of Fromm character type to predict influence tactic usage. Further investigation of the Receptive and Hoarding types is necessary as the present study failed to explain

their effect in influence tactic selection. In addition, research is needed to understand the impact of the pattern or “blended character” of an individual on influence tactic selection. Evidence for this is presented in the significant relationship of individuals’ Hoarding and Marketing scores to influence tactic selection. Such research should pay particular attention to the theoretical affinities between character types.

A second area for investigation would be the application of Fromm’s character orientation concepts to influence attempts by groups. Fromm applied the notion of character orientations to societal groups at large (1955) . He notes that, similar to individuals, different character orientations tend to predominate in social organizations as an adaptation to that organization’s social-economic milieu. Therefore it is possible to speculate that the tactics an organization chooses to use in it’s attempts to influence significant others (individuals or groups) may depend, in part, on the character orientation the organization manifests. This perspective would provide a new way for researchers to conceptualize the ways in which organizational “personality” impacts an organization’s behavior.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated a consistent theme in industrial / organizational psychology: situational cues largely determine which behavior, from a range of appropriate behaviors, an individual will demonstrate in response to a stimulus, with personality mediating the relationship. Specifically, three situational cues: expected resistance, power differences, quality of affective relationship, hypothesized to effect choice of influence strategy were shown to do so. Further, an individual’s orientation to the Marketing and Hording character types mediated this response. Individuals with

stronger Marketing orientations consistently used weak influence tactics while individuals with stronger Hording orientations more frequently used strong influence tactics, regardless of the situational cues. This implies that individuals have characteristic ways of understanding and responding to the world around them. On a practical level, this study indicates that it would be of value for individuals to become aware of their own characteristic responses to influence situations. By doing so, individuals would be better able to respond in situationally appropriate ways, increasing their chances for successful encounters.

## **Appendix A1**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist Items Statistics**

Number of valid observations (listwise) = 90.00

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Variance	Minimum	Maximum	Valid N	Label
ABL_CHNG	.66	.48	.23	0	1	90	able to ch
ABL_CLMS	.42	.50	.25	0	1	90	able to ma
ABL_INIT	.62	.49	.24	0	1	90	able to ta
ACCEPTIN	.63	.48	.23	0	1	90	accepting
ACTIVE	.50	.50	.25	0	1	90	
AGRESSIV	.62	.49	.24	0	1	90	agressive
AIMLESS	.72	.45	.20	0	1	90	
ANXIOUS	.81	.39	.15	0	1	90	
ARROGANT	.51	.50	.25	0	1	90	
CALM	.37	.48	.23	0	1	90	
CAPTIVAT	.18	.38	.15	0	1	90	captivatin
CAREFULL	.34	.48	.23	0	1	90	
CAUTIOUS	.51	.50	.25	0	1	90	
CHARMING	.56	.50	.25	0	1	90	
CHILDISH	.40	.49	.24	0	1	90	
CMP_STRS	.38	.49	.24	0	1	90	composed u
COLD	.43	.50	.25	0	1	90	
CONCIET	.49	.50	.25	0	1	90	conceited
COWARDLY	.30	.46	.21	0	1	90	
CURIOUS	.69	.47	.22	0	1	90	
DEPENDAN	.38	.49	.24	0	1	90	dependant
DEVOTED	.66	.48	.23	0	1	90	
ECONOMIC	.38	.49	.24	0	1	90	economical
EFFICIEN	.50	.50	.25	0	1	90	efficient
EGOCENTR	.66	.48	.23	0	1	90	egocentric
EXPERIME	.57	.50	.25	0	1	90	experiment
EXPLOT	.70	.46	.21	0	1	90	exploitive
FUSSY	.97	.18	.03	0	1	90	
FWD_DOK	.64	.48	.23	0	1	90	foward loo
GENEROUS	.82	.38	.15	0	1	90	
GULIBLE	.32	.47	.22	0	1	90	
IDEALIST	.54	.50	.25	0	1	90	idealistic
IMPULSIV	.49	.50	.25	0	1	90	impulsive
INCONSI	.28	.45	.20	0	1	90	inconsista
INDIFFER	.52	.50	.25	0	1	90	indifferen
INTELLEC	.50	.50	.25	0	1	90	intellectu
INTELLIG	.46	.50	.25	0	1	90	intelligen
LIFELESS	.27	.44	.20	0	1	90	
LOYAL	.62	.49	.24	0	1	90	
MODEST	.42	.50	.25	0	1	90	
OBSESSN	.17	.37	.14	0	1	90	obsessiona
OP_MIND	.80	.40	.16	0	1	90	open minde
OPINLESS	.48	.50	.25	0	1	90	opinionles
OPPORTUN	.56	.50	.25	0	1	90	opportunis
OPTIMIST	.81	.39	.15	0	1	90	optimistic
ORDERLY	.34	.48	.23	0	1	90	
OVERACT	.50	.50	.25	0	1	90	overactive

## **Appendix A2**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Exploitive Scale**

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

1.	ACTIVE	
2.	ABL_CLMS	able to make claims
3.	ABL_INIT	able to take initiative
4.	AGRESSIV	agressive
5.	CAPTIVAT	captivating
6.	CONCIET	conceited
7.	ARROGANT	
8.	EGOCENTR	egocentric
9.	IMPULSIV	impulsive
10.	PROUD	
11.	RASH	
12.	S_CONF	self confident
13.	SEDUCING	
14.	EXPLOIT	exploitive

## Correlation Matrix

	ACTIVE	ABL_CLMS	ABL_INIT	AGRESSIV	CAPTIVAT
ACTIVE	1.0000				
ABL_CLMS	.0000	1.0000			
ABL_INIT	.1375	-.1227	1.0000		
AGRESSIV	.0458	.1093	.1964	1.0000	
CAPTIVAT	.1744	-.1033	-.0573	.0027	1.0000
CONCIET	.0889	.0190	.1661	.1661	-.0478
ARROGANT	.0000	-.0190	.0173	.2007	.0478
EGOCENTR	-.1169	-.1852	.1586	-.1308	-.0911
IMPULSIV	.2667	.1090	.0285	.0744	.0103
PROUD	.0228	.0359	.0366	.0836	.0132
RASH	.0000	-.0299	.1964	.1964	.0027
S_CONF	.0000	.0572	.1276	.1771	.0642
SEDUCING	.0891	-.2134	-.0061	.2236	.0893
EXPLOIT	.3152	.1178	.1900	.1400	-.0127

  

	CONCIET	ARROGANT	EGOCENTR	IMPULSIV	PROUD
CONCIET	1.0000				
ARROGANT	.2006	1.0000			
EGOCENTR	.2412	.1798	1.0000		
IMPULSIV	.0217	.2451	.1944	1.0000	
PROUD	.0507	.1773	.0453	.4154	1.0000
RASH	.1202	.2924	.1586	.0744	.2246
S_CONF	.2550	.1771	-.1190	-.0811	-.1039
SEDUCING	.1990	.3356	.2562	.2436	.2437
EXPLOIT	.3492	.1358	-.0153	.2522	.1243

Number of valid observations (listwise) = 90.00

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Variance	Minimum	Maximum	Valid N	Label
PASSIVE	.24	.43	.19	0	1	90	passive /
PATIENT	.53	.50	.25	0	1	90	
POLITE	.67	.47	.22	0	1	90	
POSSESSV	.76	.43	.19	0	1	90	possessive
PRACTICL	.54	.50	.25	0	1	90	paractical
PROUD	.61	.49	.24	0	1	90	
PURPOSE	.12	.33	.11	0	1	90	purposeful
RASH	.62	.49	.24	0	1	90	
RESERVED	.42	.50	.25	0	1	90	
RESPONSI	.91	.29	.08	0	1	90	responsive
S CONF	.31	.47	.22	0	1	90	self confi
SEDUCING	.47	.50	.25	0	1	90	
SENSITIV	.88	.33	.11	0	1	90	sensitive
SENTIMEN	.78	.42	.17	0	1	90	sentiminet
SILLY	.60	.49	.24	0	1	90	
SLUGGISH	.37	.48	.23	0	1	90	
SOC ADJ	.38	.49	.24	0	1	90	socially a
SOCIAL	.32	.47	.22	0	1	90	
SPINELES	.37	.48	.23	0	1	90	spineless
STINGY	.61	.49	.24	0	1	90	
STUBBORN	.68	.47	.22	0	1	90	
SUBMISS	.43	.50	.25	0	1	90	submissive
SUPERFIC	.56	.50	.25	0	1	90	superficia
SUSPICIO	.72	.45	.20	0	1	90	suspicious
SYSTEMAT	.36	.48	.23	0	1	90	systematic
TACTLESS	.68	.47	.22	0	1	90	
TENDER	.19	.39	.15	0	1	90	
TOLERAN1	.44	.50	.25	0	1	90	
TOLERANT	.42	.50	.25	0	1	90	
TRUSTING	.58	.50	.25	0	1	90	
NAL ALN	.40	.49	.24	0	1	90	unable to
ONDISCRM	.21	.41	.17	0	1	90	undiscrimi
UNIMAGIN	.59	.49	.24	0	1	90	unimaginat
UNPRINC	.33	.47	.22	0	1	90	unprincipl
UNREALIS	.19	.39	.15	0	1	90	unrealisti
UNWAVER	.18	.38	.15	0	1	90	unwavering
UNYIELD	.09	.29	.08	0	1	90	unyielding
WASTEFUL	.51	.50	.25	0	1	90	
WISH THN	.82	.38	.15	0	1	90	wishful th
WITTY	.47	.50	.25	0	1	90	
WO FUTUR	.39	.49	.24	0	1	90	without fu
WO PRIDE	.27	.44	.20	0	1	90	without pr
WO PRINC	.02	.15	.02	0	1	90	without pr
WO'S CNF	.60	.49	.24	0	1	90	with out s
YOUTHFUL	.57	.50	.25	0	1	90	

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

## Correlation Matrix

	RASH	S_CONF	SEDUCING	EXPLOT
RASH	1.0000			
S_CONF	.0286	1.0000		
SEDUCING	.1776	-.0513	1.0000	
EXPLOT	.1900	.1257	.1264	1.0000

N of Cases = 90.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables		
	7.2000	7.3753	2.7157	14		
Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	.5143	.1778	.7000	.5222	3.9375	.0204
Item Variances	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	.2334	.1478	.2528	.1050	1.7103	.0008

## Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
ACTIVE	6.7000	6.6393	.1865	.2328	.5914
ABL_CLMS	6.7778	7.2310	-.0383	.1626	.6307
ABL_INIT	6.5778	6.6287	.2027	.1912	.5881
AGRESSIV	6.5778	6.4265	.2877	.2199	.5725
CAPTIVAT	7.0222	7.1905	.0179	.0754	.6133
CONCIET	6.7111	6.2302	.3555	.2904	.5590
ARROGANT	6.6889	6.1493	.3904	.2571	.5521
EGOCENTR	6.5444	6.8576	.1156	.3219	.6032
IMPULSIV	6.7111	6.2077	.3652	.3687	.5571
PROUD	6.5889	6.4695	.2668	.2568	.5764
RASH	6.5778	6.3591	.3166	.1988	.5671
S_CONF	6.8889	6.8639	.1208	.1806	.6018
SEDUCING	6.7333	6.2876	.3323	.3094	.5636
EXPLOT	6.5000	6.2303	.4054	.2879	.5520

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Reliability Coefficients 14 items  
Alpha = .5997 Standardized item alpha = .5922

## **Appendix A3**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Receptive Scale**

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

1.	CHARMING	
2.	ACCEPTIN	accepting
3.	COWARDLY	
4.	DEPENDAN	dependant
5.	GULIBLE	
6.	MODEST	
7.	PASSIVE	passive / without initiative
8.	OPINLESS	opinionless
9.	SENSITIV	sensitive
10.	SPINELES	spineless
11.	TENDER	
12.	TRUSTING	
13.	RESPONSI	responsive
14.	SUBMISS	submissive
15.	UNREALIS	unrealistic
16.	WISH_THN	wishful thinking
17.	WO_S_CNF	with out self confidence
18.	UNPRINC	unprincipled

\*\*\* Warning \*\*\* Determinant of matrix is close to zero: 1.614E-14

Statistics based on inverse matrix for scale ALPHA  
are meaningless and printed as .

N of Cases = 90.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables			
	8.6333	6.9539	2.6370	18			
Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance	
	.4796	.1889	.9111	.7222	4.8235	.0498	
Item Variances	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance	
	.2048	.0819	.2523	.1704	3.0808	.0028	

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

## Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
CHARMING	8.0778	6.5444	.0625	.	.5045
ACCEPTIN	8.0000	6.8989	-.0706	.	.5309
COWARDLY	8.3333	5.8652	.3926	.	.4331
DEPENDAN	8.2556	6.1699	.2256	.	.4686
GULIBLE	8.3111	6.1718	.2404	.	.4659
MODEST	8.2111	6.6628	.0173	.	.5140
PASSIVE	8.3889	6.3302	.2009	.	.4751
OPINLESS	8.1556	5.8407	.3546	.	.4378
SENSITIV	7.7556	6.5014	.2048	.	.4778
SPINELES	8.2667	6.0404	.2849	.	.4554
TENDER	8.4444	6.2497	.2791	.	.4621
TRUSTING	8.0556	6.6373	.0273	.	.5119
RESPONSI	7.7222	6.9220	-.0332	.	.5092
SUBMISS	8.2000	6.0045	.2871	.	.4541
UNREALIS	8.4444	6.7665	.0159	.	.5080
WISH_THN	7.8111	6.4920	.1603	.	.4833
WO_S_CNF	8.0333	6.3022	.1653	.	.4819
UNPRINC	8.3000	6.5494	.0741	.	.5009

Reliability Coefficients 18 items

Alpha = .4975

Standardized item alpha = .4922

## **Appendix A4**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Hoarding Scale**

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

1.	CALM	
2.	CAUTIOUS	
3.	CAREFULL	
4.	COLD	
5.	ECONOMIC	economical
6.	FUSSY	
7.	LOYAL	
8.	LIFELESS	
9.	PATIENT	
10.	PRACTICL	paractical
11.	OBSESSN	obsessional
12.	ORDERLY	
13.	RESERVED	
14.	SLUGGISH	
15.	STUBBORN	
16.	SYSTEMAT	systematic
17.	SUSPICIO	suspicious
18.	UNIMAGIN	unimaginative
19.	UNWAVER	unwavering
20.	UNYIELD	unyielding
21.	CMP_STRS	composed under stress

\*\*\* Warning \*\*\* Determinant of matrix is close to zero: 2.765E-17

Statistics based on inverse matrix for scale ALPHA  
are meaningless and printed as .

N of Cases = 90.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables			
	9.2556	8.1250	2.8504	21			
Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance	
	.4407	.0889	.9667	.8778	10.8750	.0417	
Item Variances	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance	
	.2091	.0326	.2527	.2201	7.7548	.0035	

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

## Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
CALM	8.8889	7.5381	.1323	.	.4723
CAUTIOUS	8.7444	7.0238	.3184	.	.4325
CAREFULL	8.9111	7.6549	.0914	.	.4803
COLD	8.8222	7.5860	.1059	.	.4779
ECONOMIC	8.8778	7.3894	.1878	.	.4611
FUSSY	8.2889	8.0280	.0630	.	.4812
LOYAL	8.6333	7.3809	.1911	.	.4604
LIFELESS	8.9889	7.4044	.2160	.	.4566
PATIENT	8.7222	7.4833	.1419	.	.4705
PRACTICL	8.7111	7.6235	.0906	.	.4810
OBSESSN	9.0889	7.9246	.0284	.	.4881
ORDERLY	8.9111	7.4077	.1880	.	.4612
RESERVED	8.8333	7.1067	.2913	.	.4389
SLUGGISH	8.8889	7.9201	-.0110	.	.5003
STUBBORN	8.5778	7.9995	-.0359	.	.5040
SYSTEMAT	8.9000	7.3270	.2173	.	.4552
SUSPICIO	8.5333	7.8247	.0386	.	.4893
UNIMAGIN	8.6667	7.5281	.1297	.	.4730
UNWAVER	9.0778	7.1737	.3901	.	.4301
UNYIELD	9.1667	7.8708	.1073	.	.4764
CMP_STRS	8.8778	7.5692	.1186	.	.4751

## Reliability Coefficients 21 items

Alpha = .4826

Standardized item alpha = .4824

## **Appendix A5**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist Internal Reliability Analysis - Marketing Scale**

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

1.	AIMLESS	
2.	ABL CHNG	able to change
3.	EXPERIME	experimenting
4.	FWD LOOK	foward looking
5.	INTELLIG	intelligent
6.	OP MIND	open minded
7.	OPPORTUN	opportunistic
8.	PURPOSE	purposeful
9.	SOCIAL	
10.	SUPERFIC	superficial
11.	UNAL ALN	unable to be alone
12.	WITTY	
13.	WO FUTUR	without future or past
14.	WO PRINC	without principles or values
15.	YOUTHFUL	
16.	TACTLESS	

\* \* \* Warning \* \* \* Determinant of matrix is close to zero: 4.748E-13

Statistics based on inverse matrix for scale ALPHA  
are meaningless and printed as .

N of Cases = 90.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables		
	7.9222	6.4546	2.5406	16		
Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	.4951	.0222	.8000	.7778	36.0000	.0439
Item Variances	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	.2112	.0220	.2517	.2297	11.4545	.0040

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

## Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
AIMLESS	7.2000	6.2742	-.0100	.	.5291
ABL_CHNG	7.2667	5.8607	.1580	.	.4955
EXPERIME	7.3556	5.5351	.2862	.	.4655
FWD_LOOK	7.2778	5.9332	.1235	.	.5032
INTELLIG	7.4667	5.8022	.1664	.	.4939
OP_MIND	7.1222	6.1085	.0927	.	.5072
OPFORTUN	7.3667	5.3135	.3869	.	.4405
PURPOSE	7.8000	6.2292	.0711	.	.5090
SOCIAL	7.6000	5.7483	.2154	.	.4829
SUPERFIC	7.3667	6.0326	.0702	.	.5157
UNAL_ALN	7.5222	5.6905	.2218	.	.4810
WITTY	7.4556	5.4868	.3047	.	.4609
WO_FUTUR	7.5333	5.8921	.1353	.	.5008
WO_PRINC	7.9000	6.3607	.0962	.	.5061
YOUTHFUL	7.3556	5.5800	.2660	.	.4704
TACTLESS	7.2444	5.8946	.1486	.	.4975

Reliability Coefficients 16 items

Alpha = .5084 Standardized item alpha = .4929

## **Appendix A6**

### **Paired Adjectives Checklist**

## DESCRIPTIVE ADJECTIVE PAIRS

Listed below are pairs of descriptions which can be used to describe people. The pairs on the left are often considered to be "positive" while those on the right are often considered "negative". For each pair, chose the one description that is most like you. Chose one from *every pair* even if you feel that both are like you or that neither one is like you. Fill in the box next to your choice from each pair.

Rember, pick one description from every pair.

- |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> captivating         | <input type="checkbox"/> composed                | <input type="checkbox"/> without pride           | <input type="checkbox"/> conceited                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> generous            | <input type="checkbox"/> under stress            | <input type="checkbox"/> aimless                 | <input type="checkbox"/> wasteful                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> curious             | <input type="checkbox"/> able to take initiative | <input type="checkbox"/> anxious                 | <input type="checkbox"/> opinionless                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> self-confident      | <input type="checkbox"/> open minded             | <input type="checkbox"/> unrealistic             | <input type="checkbox"/> arrogant                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> youthful            | <input type="checkbox"/> tender                  | <input type="checkbox"/> submissive              | <input type="checkbox"/> exploitative                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> modest              | <input type="checkbox"/> reserved                | <input type="checkbox"/> opportunistic           | <input type="checkbox"/> cowardly                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> patient             | <input type="checkbox"/> experimenting           | <input type="checkbox"/> rash                    | <input type="checkbox"/> overactive                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> witty               | <input type="checkbox"/> impulsive               | <input type="checkbox"/> sluggish                | <input type="checkbox"/> intellectualistic           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> active              | <input type="checkbox"/> cautious                | <input type="checkbox"/> stubborn                | <input type="checkbox"/> possessive                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> efficient           | <input type="checkbox"/> optimistic              | <input type="checkbox"/> gullible                | <input type="checkbox"/> passive/without initiative  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> able to make claims | <input type="checkbox"/> unwavering              | <input type="checkbox"/> seducing                | <input type="checkbox"/> superficial                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> charming            | <input type="checkbox"/> purposeful              | <input type="checkbox"/> indifferent             | <input type="checkbox"/> cold                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> practical           | <input type="checkbox"/> sensitive               | <input type="checkbox"/> without self-confidence | <input type="checkbox"/> wishful thinking            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> intelligent         | <input type="checkbox"/> forward-looking         | <input type="checkbox"/> unable to be alone      | <input type="checkbox"/> obsessional                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> proud               | <input type="checkbox"/> systematic              | <input type="checkbox"/> indiscriminating        | <input type="checkbox"/> fussy                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> economical          | <input type="checkbox"/> idealistic              | <input type="checkbox"/> sentimental             | <input type="checkbox"/> without principle or values |
| <input type="checkbox"/> socially adjusted   | <input type="checkbox"/> tolerant                | <input type="checkbox"/> stingy                  | <input type="checkbox"/> without a future or a past  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> loyal               | <input type="checkbox"/> social                  | <input type="checkbox"/> spineless               | <input type="checkbox"/> unimaginative               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> calm                | <input type="checkbox"/> polite                  | <input type="checkbox"/> tactless                | <input type="checkbox"/> unimaginitive               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> accepting           | <input type="checkbox"/> devoted                 | <input type="checkbox"/> lifeless                | <input type="checkbox"/> aggressive                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> able to change      | <input type="checkbox"/> carefull                | <input type="checkbox"/> unprincipled            | <input type="checkbox"/> dependent                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> orderly             | <input type="checkbox"/> responsive              | <input type="checkbox"/> egocentric              | <input type="checkbox"/> inconsistent                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tolerant            | <input type="checkbox"/> unyielding              | <input type="checkbox"/> childish                | <input type="checkbox"/> suspicious                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> trusting            |  | <input type="checkbox"/> silly                   |  |

## **Appendix A7**

### **Manipulation Check Questionnaire**

## Appendix 7. Manipulation Check

### Rater Questionnaire

1) In Situation A rate the "power" of the subject relative to the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Role player                      Both were                      Subject  
 More Powerful                      Equally Powerful                      more powerful

2) In Situation A rate the quality of the relationship between the subject and the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Poor                                      Neutral                                      Good

3) In Situation A rate the degree of resistance displayed by the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Very Little                      Moderate                      Very Much

---

4) In Situation B rate the "power" of the subject relative to the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Role player                      Both were                      Subject  
 More Powerful                      Equally Powerful                      more powerful

5) In Situation B rate the quality of the relationship between the subject and the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Poor                                      Neutral                                      Good

6) In Situation B rate the degree of resistance displayed by the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Very Little                      Moderate                      Very Much

---

7) In Situation C rate the "power" of the subject relative to the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Role player                      Both were                      Subject  
 More Powerful                      Equally Powerful                      more powerful

8) In Situation C rate the quality of the relationship between the subject and the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Poor                                      Neutral                                      Good

9) In Situation C rate the degree of resistance displayed by the role player.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5  
 Very Little                      Moderate                      Very Much

**Appendix A8**  
**Rater Coding Form**

Rater

Influence Roleplay Rater Form

Subject No.

Scenario	Obs1	Obs2	Obs3	Obs4	Obs5	Obs6	Obs7	Obs8	Obs9	Obs10	Obs11	Obs12	Obs13	Obs14	Obs15	Obs16	Obs17	Obs18	Obs19	Obs20	Last Obs	
Bargaining																						
Friendliness																						
Reason																						
Assertiveness																						
Coercive																						
Upward Appeals																						
No attempt																						

Scenario	Obs1	Obs2	Obs3	Obs4	Obs5	Obs6	Obs7	Obs8	Obs9	Obs10	Obs11	Obs12	Obs13	Obs14	Obs15	Obs16	Obs17	Obs18	Obs19	Obs20	Last Obs	
Bargaining																						
Friendliness																						
Reason																						
Assertiveness																						
Coercive																						
Upward Appeals																						
No attempt																						

Scenario	Obs1	Obs2	Obs3	Obs4	Obs5	Obs6	Obs7	Obs8	Obs9	Obs10	Obs11	Obs12	Obs13	Obs14	Obs15	Obs16	Obs17	Obs18	Obs19	Obs20	Last Obs	
Bargaining																						
Friendliness																						
Reason																						
Assertiveness																						
Coercive																						
Upward Appeals																						
No attempt																						

## References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkl-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row.
- Allen, R.W., Madison, D.L., Porter, L.W., Renwick, P.A., & Mayes, B.T. (1979). Organization politics: Tactics and Characteristics of its actors. California Management Review, 22, 77-83.
- Allport, G.W. (1937). Personality: A psychological interpretation. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Allport, G.W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Henry Holt.
- Argyris, C. (1957). The individual and organization: some problems of mutual adjustment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 1-24.
- Barrick, M.R. and Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-25.
- Cartwright, D. (1959). A field theoretical conception of power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.) Studies in Social Power (pp. 183-220). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Crocker, L. and Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Crozier, M. (1964). The bureaucratic phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahl, R.A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2, 201-215.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five factor model. In M.R. Rosenzweig & L.W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology (pp. 417-440). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Erez, M. and Rim, Y. (1982). The relationships between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. Human Relations, 35, 871-878.
- Etzioni, A. (1987). Organizational control structure. In March, J.G. (Ed.), Handbook of organizations (Vol II) (pp.650-677). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations. Rev. Ed. New York: Free Press.

- Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.
- Fodor, E.M. (1974). Disparagement by a subordinate as an influence on the use of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 652-655.
- French, J.R.P. and Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.) Studies in Social Power (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Fromm, E. (1941). Escape from freedom. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Fromm, E. (1947). Man for himself. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Fromm, E. (1955). The sane society. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Fromm, E. (1956). The art of loving. New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.
- Fromm, E. (1976). To have or to be? New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.
- Funder, D.C. (1991). Global traits: A neo-Allportian approach to personality. American Psychological Society, 2, 31-39.
- Gamson, W.A. (1968). Power and discontent. Homewood, Il.: The Dorsey Press.
- Goodstadt, B. and Kipnis, D. (1970). Situational influences on the use of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 201-207.
- Greiner L.E. and Schein, V.E. (1988). A revisionist look at power and OD. The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 25, 59-61.
- Hickson, D.J., Hinnings, C.R., Lee, C.A., Schneck, R.E., & Pennings, J.M. (1971). A strategic contingencies theory of intra-organizational power. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 216-228.
- Hinnings, C.R., Hickson, D.J., Pennings, J.M., & Schenck, R.E. & Pennings, J.M. (1974). Structural conditions of intra-organizational power. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 22-42.
- Hogan, R.T. (1990). Personality and personality measurement. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds.) Handbook of industrial-organizational psychology, (Vol. 2, pp 873-919). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.

- House R.J. and Singh, J.V. (1987). Organizational behavior: Some new directions for I/O psychology. Annual Review of Psychology, 38, 669-718.
- James, W. (1890). The principles of psychology. New York, NY: Henry Holt & Co.
- Izraeli, D.N. (1975). The middle manager and the tactics of power expansion: A case study. Sloan Management Review, 16, 57-69.
- Kanter, R.M. (1987). Power failure in management circuits. In J.M. Shafritz & J.S. Ott (Eds.), Classics of organization theory (pp. 349-363). Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kipnis, D. (1976). The powerholders. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kipnis, D. and Cosentino, J. (1969). Use of leadership powers in industry. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 460-466.
- Kipnis D. and Schmidt, S.M. (1983). An influence perspective on bargaining within organizations. In M.H. Brazerman and R.J. Lewicki (Eds.), Negotiating in organizations (pp. 303-319). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., Saffin-Smith, C., & Wilkinson, I. (1984). Patterns of managerial influence: Shotgun managers, tacticians, and bystanders. Organizational Dynamics, 58-67.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., & Wilkinson, I. (1982). Profiles of organizational influence strategies: trainer's manual. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 440-452.
- Lawler, E.G. & Bacharach, S.B. (1976). Outcome alternatives and value as criteria for multi-strategy evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 885-894.
- Mainiero, L.A. (1986). An empirical investigation of the relationship perceived position power and task and career sources of dependency in organizations. Psychological Reports, 59, 431-438.

- McClelland, D.C. (1975). Power: the inner experience. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- McClelland, D.C. (1985). Human Motivations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Mechanic, D. (1962). Sources of power of lower participants in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, 349-364.
- Michner, H.A. & Schwerfeger, M. (1972). Liking as a determinant of power tactic preference. Sociometry, 35, 190-202.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mowday, R.T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 137-156.
- Mowday, R.T. (1979). Leader characteristics, self-confidence and methods of upward influence in organizational decision situations. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 709-725.
- Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 4, 44-49.
- Patchen, M. (1974). The locus and basis of influence and organizational decisions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11, 195-221.
- Perreault, W.D., Jr. & Miles R.H. (1978). Influence strategy mixes in complex organizations. Behavioral Science, 23, 86-98.
- Perrow, C. (1986). Complex organizations: A critical essay (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.
- Pettigrew, A.M. (1973). The politics of organizational decision making. London: Tavistock.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Marshfield, Ma: Pittman Publishing Inc.
- Raven, B. (1974) The comparative analysis of power and power preference. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power (pp. 172-198). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

- Rim, Y. & Erez, M. (1980). A note about tactics used to influence superiors, co-workers, and subordinates. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 319-321.
- Salancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Who gets power-and how they hold onto it: a strategic contingency model of power. Organizational Dynamics, 3-21.
- Schilit, W.K. & Locke, E.A. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, 304-316.
- Schein, V.E. (1977). Individual power and political behaviors in organizations: An inadequately explored reality. Academy of Management Review, 2, 64-72.
- Schriesheim, C.A. & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson Subscales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 246-257.
- Taylor, H.R. (1986). Power at work. Personnel Journal, 42-49.
- Tedeschi, J.T. (Ed.). (1974). Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Wilhelm, R (1985). Lao Tzu: Tao Te Ching. New York, NY: Viking, Penguin Inc.
- Wilkinson, I. & Kipnis, D. (1978). Interfirm use of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 315-320.