

Influence Strategies & Organizational Success: Moderating Effect of Organizational Culture

Sangeeta Tripathi & Nachiketa Tripathi

The study investigates how organizational culture affects the relationship between downward influence strategies and organizational success. Organizations were classified into two categories (participative and manipulative) and two separate sets of stepwise multiple regressions were performed for each dependent variable, considering influence strategies as independent variable and organizational success variables as dependent variables. The results indicate that participative culture encourages the use of personalized relationship, exchange of benefits and assertiveness, and discourages the use of asserting expertise and negative sanctions to facilitate the success of the organization. Personalized relationship may increase commitment but it is also likely to make organization less effective.

Organizational Culture & Productivity

In work settings, managers influence the subordinates to accomplish the organizational goals to make organizations successful in their ventures. How effective would be the influence of managers on subordinates depends on various factors. Organizational culture could be one such factor. Therefore, in the present study an attempt has been made to see how organizational culture moderates the relationship between influence strategies and effectiveness, commitment and job satisfaction.

Culture makes the difference across organizations and their productivity.

Sangeeta Tripathi is Head, Department of Business Administration, North Eastern Regional Institute of Management, Joya Nagar, Guwahati 781022. **Nachiketa Tripathi** is Associate Professor (Psychology & OB) Department of H.S.S., Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati 781 039. Email: nachi@iitg.ernet.in. An earlier version of this paper was presented at XXV International Congress of Applied Psychology held in Singapore on July 7-12, 2002.

Culture makes the difference across organizations and their productivity. Culture is what a group learns over a period of time as that group tries to solve its problems of survival in an external environment and its problems of internal integra-

tion (Schein 1990). Moreover, such learning is simultaneously a behavioural, cognitive and emotional process. Culture can be understood as (a) a pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problem of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, (e) is to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. Uttal (1983) defines organizational culture as shared values (what is important) and beliefs (how things work) that interact with an organization's structure and control systems to produce behavioural norms (the way we do things around here). Niehoff, Enz and Grover (1990) suggest that the overall management culture and management style, driven by top management actions, are strongly related to the degree of employee commitment and these effects vary for different organizational settings. At the organizational level, several aspects of the organization, including perceived structures and management processes, were found to be predictive of commitment (De Cotis & Summers 1987).

Organization's culture as a system of shared norms and beliefs tend to influence management structures.

An organization's culture can be assessed through management style and operational practices. In turn organization's culture as a system of shared norms and beliefs tend to influence

management structures. In order to see the role of organizational culture in the success of the organization, it was decided to use it as a moderator.

Managers at all levels behave in different ways while dealing with their subordinates, peers and bosses. Their strategies differ depending on who the target is, and what the goal of influence attempt is. One of the most important determinants of managerial effectiveness is success in influencing people and developing their commitment to task objectives (Yukl 1989). The organizational work is carried out in a setting of power and influence. A manager's job is to read these realities correctly and marshal sufficient power to influence the achievement of organizational objectives.

The strategies can be classified into three categories: (a) Upward Strategies (used by people to influence superiors or seniors), (b) Downward Strategies (used by managers to obtain compliance from subordinates), and (c) Lateral Strategies (used among peers). For the present study downward influence strategies (DIS) have been used which include: (1) Rationality, (2) Assertiveness, (3) Ingratiation, (4) Use of Sanction, (5) Showing Expertise, (6) Personalized Relationship, and (7) Exchange of Benefits.

Organizational Success can be explained in terms of key variables, which are likely to increase efforts of the employees in the organization, and these efforts are manifested in employees' effectiveness, performance and the well

being of individual members. In the present study some of the success variables, namely, Job Satisfaction (JS), Effectiveness (EFF) and organizational commitment (OCMT) have been studied. Organizational Commitment as defined by Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) has three major components, namely, a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals, b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership. Research conducted within this framework has indicated that commitment is not only a predictor of employee retention (Porter et al. 1974, Koch & Steers 1978), but may also be a predictor of employee effort and performance (Mowday, Porter & Dubin 1974, Mowday, Steers & Porter 1979).

JS can be explained in terms of an individual's reaction to the job experience. It is defined as a job attitude, which is consistent pattern of thoughts, feelings, and behaviour toward some aspect of the job. JS is typically described as affective or emotional component. When the affect of the attitude is positive, it is called JS; when it is negative, it is called job dissatisfaction.

EFF has been defined as the ability of an organization to mobilize its centre of power for action, production, and adaptation (Mott 1972).

Though attempts have been made to see the direct relationship of influence strategies, and culture with organizational success (Tripathi, Kapoor &

Tripathi 2000, Tripathi & Tripathi 2001) there seems to be no attempt to relate influence strategies and organizational success in the perspective of moderating effect of organizational culture (OC). Another rationale can be found in the suggestion made by Ansari (1990) that future research should focus on the role of other variables like culture in determining the relationship between managerial behaviour and influence strategies. The prime focus of the present study was to examine the role of culture as moderator in the relationship between influence strategies and organizational success. Research questions posed in the present study are following:

1. How does OC moderate the relationship between influence strategies and job satisfaction?
2. How does OC moderate the relationship between influence strategies and organizational commitment?
3. How does OC moderate the relationship between influence strategies and effectiveness?

In this study downward influence strategies were considered the major independent variable whereas dependent variables were JS, OCMT and EFF, and OC was the moderating variable. As evident in the previous researches that organizations differ in terms of their culture (e.g., soft and synergetic, Sinha 1990, Growth centered, person centered, mixed and weak culture, Amarchand & Jayaraj 1992), it was expected that in the present study too organizations would differ in terms of their culture. Litera-

ture shows that in the area of climate research organizations have differed in terms of favourable and unfavourable climate (Ansari 1990). Therefore, it would be possible to differentiate organizations on these similar dimensions. In a favourable culture, the use of such influence strategies as rationality, assertiveness, and positive sanction is likely to increase the success of the organization. Sinha (1990) found that organizations with synergetic culture (which is very close to favourable culture) were able to maintain assertive management with the help of systems and procedures for close supervision, appropriate incentives and rewards. On the other hand, in a less favourable culture, such strategies as negative sanction, exchange of benefits and personalized relation are likely to be used more frequently and they will hamper the success of the organization. This expectation is based on Sinha's (1990) finding that soft work culture (which is very close to unfavourable culture) is characterized by strong tendency to meet personal and social obligations at the cost of work.

Sample

The study was conducted in 10 different organizations (Five each in pub-

Organizations with synergetic culture were able to maintain assertive management with the help of systems and procedures for close supervision, appropriate incentives and rewards.

lic and private sectors) of an industrial city in northern India. For this purpose, 200 lower and middle level managers were contacted personally and requested to fill the questionnaire comprising measures of organizational culture, influence strategies, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and effectiveness. Average age of the public sector respondents was 44 years, whereas in the private sector average age was 35 years. The educational qualification of all the respondents was graduation or above. In the private sector organizations, average work experience was 6 years, whereas in the public sector it was 19 years.

Measures

Strategy measures comprised 38 items drawn from various sources available in current literature (e.g., Falbo 1977, Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson 1980). This measure included DIS of Rationality, Assertiveness, Ingratiation, Use of Sanctions, Showing Expertise, Personalized Relationship and Exchange of Benefits. Respondents were asked to indicate on a 7 point scale (1- Never; 7- Always) the frequency with which their bosses engaged during the past six months in the behaviours indicated by the scale items. All the items of influence strategy scale were submitted to factor analysis, which resulted in 6 interpretable factors, accounting for 58 % of variance. These factors were labelled as (1) Asserting Expertise, (2) Rational Rewards, (3) Personalized Relationship, (4) Negative Sanction, (5) Exchange of Benefits, and (6) Assertiveness.

DIS measures coefficients Alpha ranged from .80 to .85 which seems to be fairly adequate. All scales are moderately correlated with each other except Negative Sanction which has very low correlation with Asserting Expertise and Rational Rewards. Average correlation among scales was .41.

OC is measured through OC inventory developed by Cooke and Lafferty (1983). It is a self report paper-and-pencil diagnostic instrument designed to measure normative beliefs and shared behavioural expectations in organizations. Normative beliefs are cognitions held by an individual regarding others' expectations for his behaviour as a member of a particular group or organization (Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). Shared behavioural expectations are those normative beliefs that are held in common by the members of a group or organization (Homans 1950, Mills 1967). The inventory focuses on 12 sets of thinking and behavioural styles that might be required for people to "fit in" and "meet expectations" in their organization or sub-unit. These 12 sets of normative beliefs and behavioural expectations can be categorized into three general types of OC, namely, Constructive, Passive-Defensive, and Aggressive-Defensive.

1. **Constructive Cultures:** In which members are encouraged to interact with others and approach tasks in ways that will help them meet their higher order **satisfaction** needs, are characterized by Achievement, Self-actualizing, Humanistic-encouraging and Affiliative norms.

2. **Passive-Defensive Cultures:** In which members believe they must interact with people in ways that will not threaten their own security, are characterized by Approval, Conventional, Dependent and Avoidance norms.

3. **Aggressive-Defensive Cultures:** In which members are expected to approach tasks in forceful ways to protect their status and security, are characterized by Perfectionistic, Competitive, Oppositional and Power norms.

There were total 120 statements in the inventory, 10 statements each for the earlier mentioned 12 sets of normative belief. Total score on one set of normative belief is considered as a single score for further analysis. Subjects were asked to rate each item on 7-point scale (ranging from 1 = to almost no extent to 7 = to a very great extent). The set of items with their appropriate scores were subjected to varimax rotated factor analysis. Factor analysis extracted 2 factors accounting for 74.6 % of variance.

Factor one consists of nine cultural styles which seem to make 3 clusters of styles in particular — first cluster is of Approval, Conventional and Dependent culture, which shows the tendency to be in concordance with others. Second cluster consists of Achievement, Self-actualizing, Competitive and Perfectionistic Culture. It emphasizes the task orientation aspect of work culture. Third cluster is a mixture of Affiliative and Humanistic-encouraging culture, which shows the relation orientation aspect of

culture. This first factor is named as Participative Culture. This type of culture presents a picture which is near to an ideal type of culture. Here a combination of work values and social values both can be noticed. This type of culture should be more conducive to work. It believes in a constructive approach to work. It is similar to Synergetic work culture as described by Sinha (1990), where employees make collective efforts to realize the shared goals of high productivity.

Second factor consists of three cultural styles — Oppositional, Avoidance and Power culture. This factor is named as Manipulative Culture. Nature of items in this factor presents the picture of a culture where people play very defensive role. Their main aim is to gain power, and in order to maintain their authority they play politics. Their policy is to oppose everything and point out mistakes but without exposing themselves. They remain aloof and detached from the situation and never take initiative so that they may not be blamed for any problem or disturbance of any sort that may arise. This fact is worth noticing that Manipulative Culture has negative loadings on Achievement Culture and Self-actualizing culture while Participative Culture has negative loading on Avoidance Culture. This makes the basic difference between the two types of culture. Both the factors exhibited well over .50 reliability level, i.e., .95 and .72. Factor 1 and Factor 2 of OC are moderately correlated with each other indicating a considerable non-overlapping variance in the dimensions.

Manipulative Culture has negative loadings on Achievement Culture and Self-actualizing culture while Participative Culture has negative loading on Avoidance Culture

A nine item scale by Cook and Wall (1980) is used to measure OCMT. It consists of three dimensions — Organizational identity, Organizational Involvement and Loyalty. Respondents were asked to rate on a 7 point scale (ranging from 1 = No, I strongly disagree to 7 = Yes, I strongly agree), the extent to which they agree with these items. All items with their appropriate scores were subjected to varimax rotated factor analysis. Three factors were extracted accounting for 58 % of total variance and these factors were labelled as (1) Identification with Involvement, (2) Calculative Commitment and (3) Loyalty. First factor of commitment has fairly adequate reliability coefficient. But factors 2 and 3 have Alpha below .50. It may be reasoned that these factors were made up of only 2 items. However, these scales have very low inter-correlation with an average of .14.

JS is measured through Schnake's (1983) 11 items scale, having three dimensions — Social Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Satisfaction. Subjects were asked to respond to these items on a 7 point scale (ranging from 1 = very satisfied to 7 = very dissatisfied) indicating the amount of their satisfaction. Since the rating scale was in opposite direction with relation to other measures in the present study,

item scores in this measure were reversed. When submitted to varimax rotated factor analysis these items contributed to 3 factors, accounting for 60 % of variance and these factors were labelled as (1) Social Satisfaction, (2) Extrinsic Satisfaction, and (3) Intrinsic Satisfaction. There were satisfactory reliability coefficients for JS measures. These ranged from .60 to .76. Scales are moderately correlated with an average of .48.

An eight-item scale by Mott (1972) was used for measuring EFF. The scale consists of such dimensions as quality, quantity, efficiency, adaptability and flexibility. All the items are around average (between 2.5 and 3.0), except item number 2 that belongs to quality with the mean of 2.44. The overall EFF was computed by taking the average of all the EFF items.

Results & Discussion

In order to examine the moderating effect of culture, it was of interest to see if the 10 organizations had significantly different cultures. The mean scores given in table 1 reveal that organizations 3,5,6,8,9,10 had participative culture. However, organization 8 is high on manipulative culture also but on the basis of its means on other variables and the information drawn from other sources, this organization was included in the category of participative culture. On the other hand, organizations 1,2,4 and 7 were included in the manipulative culture category. Thus in the final analysis, organizations were classified

on the basis of having participative or manipulative culture. Finally, one way ANOVA was performed on culture dimensions to check if there existed a significant difference between the two types of organizations. Scores on both the culture dimensions reflected a highly significant difference ($p < .01$) between the classified organizations.

Table 1: Mean Scores on Culture Factors (N=200)

Organizations	CULTURE	
	Participative	Manipulative
01	387.20 (7)	119.70 (7)
02	384.10 (8)	125.95 (9)
03	462.00 (2)	106.25 (2)
04	381.75 (9)	122.40 (8)
05	401.60 (6)	112.75 (3)
06	405.55 (4)	105.90 (1)
07	348.45 (10)	119.00 (6)
08	517.95 (1)	127.00 (10)
09	418.55 (3)	116.00 (5)
10	405.10 (5)	113.70 (4)
<i>F (1,198)</i>	41.61**	9.59**

** = $p < .01$

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate ranks; Participative Culture: The higher the rank, the less participative the culture.

Manipulative Culture: The higher the rank, the more manipulative the culture.

Influence Strategies & Job Satisfaction

In order to test for the effects, the organizational culture might have on the job satisfaction and influence strategies relationship, two separate sets of stepwise multiple regression analysis were performed. The zero-order correlations between job satisfaction and

influence strategies in two types of culture reported in table 2 show that in a participative culture asserting expertise and negative sanction are negatively correlated with all three types of job satisfaction, i.e., social, extrinsic and intrinsic. Personalized relationship is not related at all with any of the job satisfaction dimensions. Exchange of benefits and assertiveness has significant negative relation with social and extrinsic satisfaction. On the other hand, in a manipulative culture, asserting expertise, assertiveness and personalized relationship have positive significant correlation with extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction. Rational rewards is positively correlated with social, extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction, whereas, all three types of satisfaction are negatively correlated with negative sanction.

Personalized relationship is not related at all with any of the job satisfaction dimensions.

Table 3 shows the findings in terms of the particular combination of influence tactics that best predicted each factor of job satisfaction. It is evident that there is a meaningful pattern of relationship between downward influence strategies and job satisfaction as a function of organizational culture. It appears in a participative culture social and extrinsic satisfaction are negatively predicted by negative sanction and asserting expertise. Only personalized relationship is positively predicting the extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction is negatively predicted by asserting expertise.

Table 2: Zero-Order Correlations Between Downward Influence Strategies and Job Satisfaction — Sub Group Analysis

	Participative Culture (N=120)						Manipulative Culture (N=80)					
	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS
Job Satisfaction												
Social Satisfaction	-.31**	.10	.00	-.42**	-.26**	-.29**	.19	.39**	.08	-.34**	-.07	-.08
Extrinsic Satisfaction	-.37**	.07	.00	-.29**	-.25**	-.25**	.27**	.37**	.22*	-.26**	.08	.24*
Intrinsic Satisfaction	-.20**	-.05	.00	-.14	-.06	-.11	.37**	.33**	.33**	-.22*	.07	.23*

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

AE = Asserting Expertise; RR = Rational Rewards; PR = Personalized Relationship; NS = Negative Sanction; EB = Exchange of Benefits; AS = Assertiveness.

On the other hand, in a manipulative culture, social satisfaction is predicted by rational rewards positively and by assertiveness negatively. Extrinsic satisfaction is predicted by assertiveness positively and by negative sanction negatively. Negative sanction is negatively predicting intrinsic satisfaction also. These findings make moderating effect of culture very clear that less use of negative sanction and asserting expertise and frequent use of personalized relation would enhance job satisfaction in a participative culture whereas in a manipulative culture more use of rational rewards, less use of negative sanction and a balanced use of assertive-ness will increase job satisfaction.

Low performers and high performers are equally dissatisfied with the leaders who employ non-contingent punishment.

These can be interpreted with the help of findings of Podsakoff, Todor and Skov (1982) that low performers and high performers are equally dissatisfied with the leaders who employ non-contingent punishment. There is only one similarity regarding the use of strategies between two types of culture that is, they both are discouraging the use of negative sanction. As Yukl and Tracey (1992) also suggest that pressure is seen as an inappropriate form of influence behaviour and target resentment about an agent's use of coercion is likely to result in target resistance. In the study by Dosier, Case and Keys (1988) of downward critical incidents, there was a marginally significant ($p < .10$) negative relationship between pressure tactics (threatening, warning and embarrassing) and the success of an influence attempt.

Present results suggest that participative culture is encouraging the use of indirect and non-rational strategy of personalized relationship

Table 3: Regression Coefficients Between Downward Influence Strategies and Job Satisfaction — Sub Group Analysis

Job Satisfaction	Participative Culture (N=120)		Manipulative Culture (N=80)	
	Strategies	Beta	Strategies	Beta
Social Satisfaction	Negative Sanction	-.40**	Rational Rewards	.39**
	Asserting Expertise	-.21**	Assertiveness	-.33**
	R ²	.20	R ²	.22
Extrinsic Satisfaction	Asserting Expertise	-.35**	Negative Sanction	-.30**
	Negative Sanction	-.21**	Assertiveness	.21*
	Personalized Relationship	.19*	R ²	.13
Intrinsic Satisfaction	Asserting Expertise	-.21**	Negative Sanction	-.26**
	R ²	.04	R ²	.07

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

to enhance job satisfaction. Participative culture includes the norms of approval and conventional cultural styles also, and this finding gets its support in Falbo's (1977) findings that people, who are more concerned with social approval report using more indirect (less disruptive) strategies in getting their way than people who are less concerned about social approval. Some evidence exists as to how managers influence their seniors and subordinates under different norms prevailing in the organization (Cheng 1983, Singh 1990). It is relevant here to mention Singh and Singh's (1994) suggestion that norm of work conduciveness helped in exercising soft and subtle influence tactics. Moreover, it was found that less powerful managers under the competitive norms resorted to soft but formal influence tactics with their seniors, whereas under the norms of cooperation they successfully exchanged resource with their subordinates (Tjosvold 1990).

On the other hand, manipulative culture recommends the use of rational rewards and little use of assertiveness whenever needed. Sometimes use of assertiveness may be discouraged also. Kipnis et al. (1980) found that respondents who frequently sought personal assistance from target persons used ingratiation tactics; respondents who frequently assigned work to target persons used assertiveness. If seen through Falbo's (1977) point of view that in contrast to participative culture, in a manipulative culture direct and rational strategies are suggested to enhance job satisfaction.

In contrast to participative culture, in a manipulative culture direct and rational strategies are suggested to enhance job satisfaction.

Influence Strategies & Commitment

Under this head are presented data pertaining to how organizational culture affects the relationship between influence strategies and commitment. It is clear from the table 4 that in a participative culture, identification with involvement has significant positive correlation with rational rewards, personalized relationship, negative sanction, exchange of benefits and assertiveness whereas calculative commitment is related significantly only with assertiveness. Loyalty is correlated with rational rewards, exchange of benefits and assertiveness. On the other hand, in a manipulative culture, identification with involvement is positively correlated with rational rewards and asserting expertise but negatively correlated with negative sanction and exchange of benefits. Calculative commitment is positively and significantly correlated with personalized relationship and assertiveness whereas loyalty has the only significant correlation coefficient with personalized relationship.

Table 5 reports the multiple regression coefficients of downward influence strategies with each factor of commitment. It is evident that in a participative culture, exchange of benefits is predicting identification with involvement positively accounting for 11 % of vari-

Table 4: Zero-Order Correlations between Downward Influence Strategies and Organizational Commitment — Sub Group Analysis

	Participative Culture (N=120)						Manipulative Culture (N=80)					
	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS
Commitment												
Identification with Involvement	.09	.25**	.20*	.24**	.35**	.22**	.31**	.33**	.13	-.35**	-.33**	.07
Calculative Commitment	-.01	.08	.17	.12	.15	.21*	.18	.16	.25*	-.18	.00	.23*
Loyalty	.10	.20*	.10	.14	.25**	.31**	.15	.14	.23*	-.12	.00	.16

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

AE = Asserting Expertise; RR = Rational Rewards; PR = Personalized Relationship; NS = Negative Sanction; EB = Exchange of Benefits; AS = Assertiveness.

ance. However, assertiveness is predicting calculative commitment and loyalty in a positive way but asserting expertise is predicting calculative commitment in a negative way. On the other side, in a manipulative culture, the picture is little bit different. Identification with involvement is predicted by exchange of benefits in a negative direction and by asserting expertise in a positive direction contributing a total of 18 % variance whereas calculative commitment is predicted by personalized relationship positively and by negative sanction negatively with a variance of 11 %. Personalized relationship is also predicting loyalty positively accounting for 4 % of variance. It is evident from the findings that frequent use of assertiveness and exchange of benefits and less use of asserting expertise are likely to increase the commitment in a participative culture, whereas frequent use of personalized relationship and asserting expertise and rare use of exchange of benefits and negative sanction would enhance the level of commitment in a manipulative culture.

Participative culture is encouraging the use of rational strategies but not accepting the strategy of asserting expertise whereas manipulative culture is relying more on the use of non-rational strategies to enhance commitment.

It seems that participative culture is encouraging the use of rational strategies but not accepting the strategy of asserting expertise whereas manipula-

Table 5: Regression Coefficients between Downward Influence Strategies and Organizational Commitment — Sub Group Analysis

Organizational Commitment	Participative Culture (N=120)		Manipulative Culture (N=80)	
	Strategies	Beta	Strategies	Beta
Identification with Involvement	Exchange of Benefits	.33**	Exchange of Benefits	-.31**
	Asserting Expertise	.32**		
	R ²	.11	R ²	.18
Calculative Commitment	Assertiveness	.23**	Personalised Relationship	.25**
	Assertive Expertise	-.22*	Negative Sanction	-.23*
	R ²	.09	R ²	.11
Loyalty	Assertiveness	.31**	Personalized Relationship	.20*
R ²	.09		R ²	.04

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

tive culture is relying more on the use of non-rational strategies to enhance commitment.

A possible reason for this may be that in a participative culture people themselves are rational and competent enough so they accept rationality in the form of exchange of benefits and assertiveness for the reason that their boss is superior in position not for the reason that he is superior in knowledge or expertise whereas in a manipulative culture people may be lacking in self control and adequate knowledge so that they are guided by superior's expertise and nurturance. Exchange stactics involve explicit or implicit offers by an agent to provide a favour or benefit to the target in return

for doing what the agent requests. Yukl (1990) suggested that to be effective the agent must offer something the target considers desirable and appropriate. Schmidt and Locke (1982) found that exchange (trading job related benefits) was more likely to be successful than unsuccessful in upward critical incidents described by targets. But no significant effects of exchange tactics (offering to trade favours or concessions) were found in the study of upward incidents by Case, Dosier, Murkinson and Keys (1988). A strong support can be found in Yukl and Tracey (1992) results in which exchange correlated significantly ($p < .01$)

with task commitment for subordinates and peers usefulness of personalized relationship in a manipulative culture can be supported by Yukl and Tracey's (1992) finding that personal appeal correlated significantly with task commitment for subordinates and peers. When a target has strong feelings of friendship toward the agent it is more likely that the agent can appeal successfully to the target to do something unusual or extra as a special favour (e.g. do some of my work, make a change to accommodate me, Yukl 1990).

Influence Strategies & Effectiveness

Table 6 shows the zero-order correlations between effectiveness and downward influence strategies. It is

clear that in a participative culture, overall effectiveness is related to all strategies except asserting expertise. On the other hand in a manipulative culture overall effectiveness is positively and significantly correlated with asserting expertise and rational rewards but negatively related to negative sanction. Table 7 presents the multiple regression coefficients between effectiveness and downward influence strategies. It appears that in a participative culture, overall effectiveness is predicted by assertiveness accounting for an 11 % of variance whereas in a manipulative culture, overall effectiveness is predicted by rational rewards positively and by personalized relationship negatively with a variance of 14%. Results indicate that EFF will be increased by frequent use of assertiveness in a participative culture. This can be supported by the findings of Kipnis et al. (1980) which reported a frequent use of assertiveness and rationality tactics to improve a target person's performance. In a manipulative culture it would be increased by the frequent use of rational rewards and less use of personalized relationship. There exists a substantial amount of evidence (Greene & Podsakoff 1978, Podsakoff et al. 1982) that rewards made contingent upon performance cause subsequent increase in performance

Above results show clearly that in a manipulative culture personalized relationship is decreasing the effectiveness. Personalized relationship is so much inherent in the manipulative culture that people are expected to remain busy in

Table 6: Zero-Order Correlations between Downward Influence Strategies and Effectiveness — Sub Group Analysis

	Participative Culture (N=120)						Manipulative Culture (N=80)					
	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS	AE	RR	PR	NS	EB	AS
Effectiveness												
Effectiveness (Overall)	.08	.25**	.19*	.29**	.25**	.33**	.31**	.36**	.05	-.26**	-.12	.07

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

AE = Asserting Expertise; RR = Rational Rewards; PR = Personalized Relationship; NS = Negative Sanction;
EB = Exchange of Benefits; AS = Assertiveness.

Table 7 : Regression Coefficients between Downward Influence Strategies and Effectiveness — Sub Group Analysis

Effectiveness	Participative Culture (N=120)		Manipulative Culture (N=80)	
	Strategies	Beta	Strategies	Beta
Effectiveness (Overall)	Assertiveness	.33**	Rational Rewards	.26**
			Personalized Relationship	-.41**\
	R ²	.11	R ²	.14

obliging others just for their profits while work and organizational interest suffers, and these pro-work factors are displaced from the centre. As Dayal (1976) has noted social relationship and organizational performance is not separated in India. Loyalty often gets priority over efficiency. Intrinsic work values are sure to suffer in such a personalized work culture.

Social relationship and organizational performance is not separated in India. Loyalty often gets priority over efficiency. Intrinsic work values are sure to suffer in such a personalized work culture.

Conclusions & Implications

The main objective of the study was to see how the culture of the organization moderates the relationship between influence strategies and organizational success. Results suggest that in a participative culture strategies of personalized relationship, exchange of benefits and assertiveness are found to contrib-

ute in the success of the organization. On the other hand, manipulative culture suggests use of rational rewards, asserting expertise and a balanced use of personalized relationship to enhance the success of the organization.

The findings of this study are important for managers, scholars and

researchers also. It reveals that culture works as a moderator, if managers use appropriate influence strategies contingent upon the respective culture, it would be more successful. Participative culture found in the present research may be recommended as an ideal type of culture. In other words, management should strive for this type of culture.

References

- Amarchand, D. & Jayaraj, B.J. (1992), *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, New Delhi: Global Business Press.
- Ansari, M.A. (1990), *Managing People at Work: Leadership Styles and Influence Strategies*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Case, T., Dosier, L., Murkinson, G. & Keys, B. (1988), "How Managers Influence Superiors: A Study of Upward Influence Tactics", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 9 (4): 25-31.
- Cheng, J.L.C. (1983), "Organizational Context and Upward Influence: An Experimental Study of the Use of Power Tactics", *Group and Organization Studies*, 8: 337-55.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980), "New Work Attitude Measures of Trust, Organizational Commitment and Personal Need Fulfillment",

- Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53: 39-52.
- Cooke, R.A. & Lafferty, J.C. (1983), Level V: Organizational Culture Inventory - Form I, Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Dayal, I. (1976). Cultural Factors in Designing Performance Appraisal System. New Delhi: SRC of Industrial Relations and Human Resources.
- DeCotis, T.A. & Summers, T.P. (1987), "A Path Analysis of a Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment", *Human Relations*, 40(7): 445-70.
- Dosier, L., Case, T. & Keys, B. (1988), "How Managers Influence Subordinates: An Empirical Study of Downward Influence Tactics", *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 9 (5): 22-28.
- Falbo, T. (1977), "Multidimensional Scaling of Power Strategies", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35 (8): 537-47.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975), Belief, Attitude and Intention in Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Greene, C.N. & Podsakoff, P.M. (1978), "Effects of Removal of Pay Incentives: A Field Experiment", in Susbauer, J. C. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1978 Meeting of National Academy of Management: 206-10.
- Homans, G. (1950), The Human Group, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M. & Wilkinson, I. (1980), "Intraorganizational Influence Tactics: Explorations in Getting One's Way", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65: 440-52.
- Koch, J. L. & Steers, R.M. (1978), "Job Attachment, Satisfaction, and Turnover among Public Sector Employees", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 12: 119-128.
- Mills, T. M. (1967), The Sociology of Small Groups, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mott, P.E. (1972), The Characteristics of Effective Organization, New York: Harper & Row.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. & Dubin, R. (1974), "Unit Performance, Situational Factors and Employee Attitudes in Spatially Separated Work Units", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12: 231-48.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1979), "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14: 224-47.
- Niehoff, B.P., Enz, C.A. & Grover, R.A. (1990), "The Impact of Top Management Actions on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions", *Group and Organization Studies*, 15 (3): 337- 52.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Todor, W.D. & Skov, R. (1982), "Effects of Leader Contingent and Non-contingent Reward and Punishment Behaviours on Subordinate Performance and Satisfaction", *Academy of Management Journal*, 25 (4): 810-21.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974), "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59: 603-09.
- Schein, E. H. (1990), "Organizational Culture", *American Psychologist*, 45(2): 109-19.
- Schmidt, W. K. & Locke, E. (1982), "A Study of Upward Influence in Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27: 304-16.
- Schnake, M. E. (1983), "An Empirical Assessment of the Effects of Affective Response in the Measurement of Organizational Climate", *Personnel Psychology*, 36: 791-807.
- Singh, C.B.P. (1990), "Power Play in Public Sector: In Search of Work Culture", *Management and Labour Studies*, 15: 61-68.
- Singh, C.B.P. & Singh, R.R. (1994), "Managing People at Work through Influence Tactics",

- Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 29 (3): 339-52.
- Sinha, J.B.P. (1990), *Work Culture in the Indian Context*, New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Tjosvold, D. (1990), "Power in Cooperative and Competitive Organizational Contexts", *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130 (2): 249-58.
- Tripathi, S. & Tripathi, N. (2001), "Influence Strategies and Organizational Success", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36(3): 283-300.
- Tripathi, S., Kapoor, A. & Tripathi, N. (2000), "Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36(1): 24-40.
- Uttal, B. (1983), *The Corporate Culture Vultures*, Fortune.
- Yukl, G. (1990), *Skills for Managers and Leaders*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. & Tracey, J.B. (1992), "Consequences of Influence Tactics Used with Subordinates, Peers and the Boss", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (4): 525-35.
- Yukl, G.A. (1989), *Leadership in Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.