

Effect of Influence Tactics on Workers' Performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana- Kogi State

¹Abdul-Khadir Musa Ismail, ²UmarGunu Suleiman, ³Ari Mohammed Abdullahi, ⁴Halilu Ramalan, ⁵Hussaini Mohammed Ndakwesu & ⁶Ibrahim, Kabiru Bashiru

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}*Department of Business Administration & Management,
Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa, Nasarawa State*

Article DOI: 10.48028/ijprds/ijargpgm.v2.i1.13

Abstract

Influence is a primary social mechanism through which a leader enacts his or her leadership using various tactics to influence others. This study is an attempt to investigate the effect of influence tactics on worker's performance in Dangote Cement Plc, Obajana- Kogi State. Specifically, it was designed to examine the effect of appeal to higher authority; ingratiation; impression management; and persuasion tactics (as the dependent variables) on worker's performance. A descriptive-survey research design was adopted, while purposive sampling technique was employed to arrive at a sample size of fifty-eight (58) from the research population of 151 senior staff, frontline managers and management personnel of the organization. Out of the fifty-eight questionnaires administered to the staff, only forty-eight were returned. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between the two variables using the regression coefficients (Beta values). Results showed that ingratiation has a negative and insignificant effect on performance; impression management have positive and insignificant effect on worker's performance; but appeal to higher authority and persuasion tactics had positive effect on worker's performance in Dangote Cement Plc, Obajana- Kogi State. The study recommended that management of the firm should adopt the use of persuasion and appeal to higher authority considering their positive effect on worker's performance; the use of ingratiation as an influence tactics should be minimized; and impression management should be encouraged.

Keywords: *Influence tactics, Persuasion, Ingratiation, impression management*

Corresponding Author: **Abdul-Khadir Musa Ismail**

Background to the Study

Influence is part of every social interaction (Kemper & Collins, 1990). This is also true in the context of business organization, which (since physical interactions are highly required in this type of setting) is based almost entirely on social interactions. Influence has long been recognized as an essential element of leadership. It is a primary social mechanism through which a leader enacts his or her leadership. A commonly used definition is that leadership is all about influence and that influence is “a process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task” (Kemper & Collins, 1990).

Dangote Cement Plc, Obajana is one of the most successful cement manufacturing companies in Nigeria. Previously, the company has witnessed a slight drop in performance which the company attributed to poor leadership / management style adopted by its managers in the various departments (at both management/ supervisory levels). This is because most managers in the company are constantly battling with how best to influence their employees in order to stimulate best behavior required to achieve maximum performance in the work place. The company decided to invest hugely on leadership training programme at its Dangote Academy which was established since 2010 to organize and provide technical, management and leadership training to its managers. The central focus of the training program was to acquaint the managers with various techniques of influencing workers behavior using different influence tactics such as appeal to higher authority, ingratiation, impression management and persuasion among many. The purpose is to find new ways of improving workers performance through the application of such influence tactics – a shift from the traditional method of merely passing instructions and orders by leaders for workers to follow. In the area of staff perceptions of managers, some managers do not take into consideration the idea that when they act using any leadership style; the style actually exhibits somehow different degree of influence on their behavior. The managers had in recent times began to shift ground by adopting the new technique - using those influence tactics in the discharge of their leadership functions and the researcher intends to examine the extent to which those influence tactics affect workers performance in the company.

Research Objectives

It is against the aforementioned issue that this study is specifically carried out to:

1. To investigate the extent to which appeal to higher authority affect workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.
2. To examine the effect of ingratiation on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.
3. To determine the effect of impression management on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.
4. To determine the effect of persuasion on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does appeal to higher authority affect workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State?
2. How does ingratiation affects workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State?
3. To what extent does impression management affects workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State?
4. How does persuasion affects workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State?

Research Hypothesis

- Ho₁: Appeal to higher authority does not have any significant effect on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.
- Ho₂: Ingratiation does not have any significant effect on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.
- Ho₃: Impression management does not have any significant effect on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State; and
- Ho₄: Persuasion does not have any significant effect on workers' performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State.

Conceptual Framework

Influence and Influence Tactics

Influence is a primary social mechanism which a leader enacts his or her leadership (Chemers, 2000). It is defined as a force one person (the agent) exerts on someone else (the target) to induce a change in the target, including changes in behaviors, opinions, attitudes, goals, needs and values and the ability to affect the behavior of others in a particular direction (Hall, 2017). We can infer from this definition that influence is a transaction in which person B is induced by person A to behave in a certain way. Person A has power over person B to the extent A can get B to do something that B would otherwise not do. Simply put influence is changing someone's behavior by making an impact in a situation where one ordinarily wouldn't have control.

Many literature and researches addresses the science of influence. In the early 1980s, Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson initiated one of the main streams of research on influencing behavior. They spearheaded an empirical approach for studying the process of influence by collecting critical incident reports in which people in a work setting described how they "got their way" with someone else in their organization. Leveraging these reports, they developed an instrument called the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS) to measure the frequency with which various people within organizations use specific influence tactics. This original instrument has been used and refined over the last 30 years to provide a solid foundation for our understanding of the influencing behaviors that people actually use in the workplace.

A primary contribution to thinking about leader's influence behavior has been researches on influence tactics. Initially, nine influence tactics were identified and confirmed through works by Yukl and Falbe (1990), Yukl, Lepsinger and Lucia (1991), Yukl and Tracey, 1992). These

tactics according to them comprises: ingratiation, impression management, legitimating which is behavior intended to establish the legitimacy of a request such as calling upon a higher authority or organization policies and rules; rational persuasion which involves presenting logical arguments and factual evidence; inspirational appeal which utilizes an emotional appeal and attempts to link the request to the target's values, hopes or ideals; consultation which allows the target to be involved in the decision with the aim of increasing their motivation to implement the decision; exchange tactics which involves the explicit or implicit offer of a reward; personal appeals which draws upon the targets loyalty or friendship by requesting a favor; ingratiation tactics which is behavior such as offering compliments or doing a favor that makes the target feel favorably towards you; pressure tactics including threats and assertive behavior such as repeated demands or frequent checking; and coalition tactics which involve the use of multiple agents acting together to influence another person. A further two tactics were added in the late 1990s (Yukl and Chavez, 2002). These were explaining how carrying out a request will benefit the target personally; and collaboration which involves offering to provide relevant assistance if the target will comply with the request

Influence tactics is repertoire of eight specific strategies used to influence others' behaviors which include; assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanctions, exchange of benefits, upward appeal, inspirational appeal, and consultation. People differ in their attitudes, perception, performance as well as goal directed behavior; what may be motivational to one individual may not be motivational to another as there is no "hard and fast rule" on how to motivate individuals especially in the work place.

Significant empirical researches has been undertaken in examining the relative effectiveness of the 11 identified influence tactics to determine whether the tactics result in commitment, compliance or resistance to the request (Falbe and Yukl, 1992; Fu and Yuki, 2000; Yuki, Chavez and Seifert, 2005; Yuki2006). Findings are varied: in one key study, inspirational appeal and consultation were rated as most effective, and pressure, legitimating, and coalition tactics as least effective (Yukl and Tracey, 1992). Quinley (1996) studied the use of influence tactics among mid-level managers in some selected community colleges in the U.S and reported a variety of influence behaviors categorized into influence dimensions (ingratiation, pressure and legitimating) using correlation analysis to conduct his investigations reveals that they are all positively correlated with performance.

Another study found that the tactics of upward appeal and bargaining were negatively correlated with perceived manager effectiveness (Brennan et al 1993), while a third identified rational persuasion, consultation, coalition, and inspirational appeals as more effective in gaining subordinates' commitment to safety-related tasks or initiatives (Clarke and Ward, 2006). A meta-analysis of 23 studies investigating the effect of influence tactics on work outcomes found that ingratiation and rationality had positive effects on work outcomes. Importantly, the meta-analysis authors, Higgins, Judge and Ferris (2003) identified some key limitations with the research to date, particularly relating to the methodology of using laboratory settings to investigate responses to influence tactics. They found some key differences in results that appeared to be due to the methodology used; noting "ingratiation

has a much stronger effect on work outcomes in the laboratory,' than in the field". Also, Higgins, Judge and Ferris (2003) using meta-analysis technique estimated the impact of influence tactics on work outcome of selected U.S firms and the result indicated that ingratiation and rationality have positive impact on work outcomes. This finding corroborates with that of Chaturvedi and Srivasta (2014).

Despite these arrays of research there seems to be a problem with their findings which has been their transactional and experimental nature; the studies have generally been conducted in a laboratory- type environment using scenarios, detached from the real-life leadership context and in isolation from other factors such as the leader subordinate relationship and the organizational context.

Empirically, Rogue (2017) conducted a study on the effect of influence tactics on employees' openness toward others on innovation in some selected Indian firms. Eighty five employees and fifteen supervisors/team leaders were selected for the study using correlation analysis and found that persuasion and coalition has positive relationship with employees' innovations. Dhirman (2017) in India found out that ingratiation has positive effect on the effectiveness of decisions in some selected Indian firms. Shin, Sean – Hyun (2019) using qualitative research method (multiple regression analysis, three step multiple regression analysis found out that ingratiation, appeals and pressure have positive effect on job performance of employees in the Korean service industry.

Overview of Selected Influence Tactics

Appeal to higher authority

Appeal to higher authority is popularly referred to as upward appeal in the study of influence tactics by Yukl and Falbe, 1990. It seeks influence through the approval/acceptance of those in higher positions within the organization prior to making a request of someone.

Ingratiation

Ingratiation is a psychological technique in which an individual attempts to influence another person by becoming more likeable to their target (Schwartz, 1999). This term was coined by social psychologist Edward E. Jones, who further defined ingratiation as "a class of strategic behaviors illicitly designed to influence a particular other person concerning the attractiveness of one's personal qualities. Following are some specific tactics of employing ingratiation:

- i. Complimentary -enhancement: the act of using compliments or flattery to improve the esteem of another individual.
- ii. Conformity in opinion, judgment, and behavior: altering the expression of one's personal opinions to match the opinion(s) of another individual.
- iii. Self-presentation or self-promotion: explicit presentation of an individual's own characteristics, typically done in a favorable manner.
- iv. Rendering favors: Performing helpful requests for another individual.
- v. Modesty: Moderating the estimation of one's own abilities, sometimes seen as self-deprecation.
- vi. Expression of humor: any event shared by an individual with the target individual that is intended to be amusing.

- vii. Instrumental Dependency: the act of convincing the target individual that the ingratiation is completely dependent upon him/her.
- viii. Name-dropping: the act of referencing one or more other individuals in a conversation with the intent of using the reference(s) to increase perceived attractiveness or credibility.

Impression management

Impression management is defined as "the process by which people control the impressions others form of them." While these terms may seem similar, it is important to note that impression management represents a larger construct of which ingratiation is a component. In other words, ingratiation is a method of impression management. Impression management is a conscious or subconscious process in which people attempt to influence the perceptions of other people about a person, object or event. They do so by regulating and controlling information in social interaction. It was first conceptualized by Erving Goffman in 1959, and then was expanded upon in 1967. An example of impression management theory in play is in sports such as soccer. At an important game, a player would want to showcase themselves in the best light possible, because there are college recruiters watching. This person would try and perform their best to show off their skills. Their main goal may be to impress the college recruiters in a way that maximizes their chances of being chosen for a college team rather than winning the game.

Impression management is usually used synonymously with self-presentation, in which a person tries to influence the perception of their image. The notion of impression management was first applied to face-to-face communication, but then was expanded to apply to computer-mediated communication. The concept of impression management is applicable to academic fields of study such as psychology and sociology as well as practical fields such as corporate communication and media.

Persuasion

Persuasion is an umbrella term of influence. Persuasion can attempt to influence a person's beliefs, attitudes, intentions, motivations, or behaviors. In business, persuasion is a process aimed at changing a person's (or a group's) attitude or behavior toward some event, idea, object, or other person(s), by using written, spoken words or visual tools to convey information, feelings, or reasoning, or a combination thereof.

Concept of Employee Performance

Employee performance is a sign of the capacity of an employee to efficiently achieve independent goals (Venkatraman and Ramanujam, 1986). One of the elements that is assessable is the employees' performance through the level of their productivity. Several researches have been introducing various methods to evaluate employee performance (Wong and Wong, 2007; Prajogo, 2007). This includes the quality, quantity, knowledge or creativity of individual towards the accomplished works that are in accordance with the responsibility during a specified period- in other words, the assessment systems must have some standard parameters that can be relied upon.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that supports this study is;

Leader -Member Exchange (LMX) Theory

Leader member exchange theory has its primary focus on the quality of the social exchange relationship between leaders and subordinates. This endorses the importance of the leader - follower relationship and the influence practices which occur within that relationship, with research findings that effective leaders use quality relational exchanges to satisfy the psychological contract and achieve enhanced follower performance (Wang et al., 2005). LMX theory contends that a leader's influence is born out of trust, respect and mutual obligation between the leader and the subordinate. Further, LMX research indicates that the process is cyclical: a leader's behaviors create the relationships (high LMX or otherwise) and the quality of these relationships determines the leader's relative levels of influence, impacting on his/her behavior (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX research offers elucidation for possible influence tactics. One study found that the extent to which goals are similar or mutually-reinforcing, positively impacts on the quality of leader member relationships. Another study reported that the quality of the leader member relationship moderated the effect of downward- influence tactics on helping behaviors (Sparrowe et al., 2006).

Methodology

Descriptive-survey research design was adopted for this study. This present an oriented methodology used to investigate population by selecting samples to analyze and discover occurrences. Questionnaire was mainly used as an instrument of data collection. The study's population is one hundred and fifty-one (151) members of Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana - Kogi State across six (6) departments. Stratified sampling technique was employed to purposively draw a sample size of fifty-eight (58) staff. All the senior staff and management personnel were given equal opportunity of being selected to serve as the sample of the study.

The questionnaire was made up of two (2) sections; A and B. Section A consist of personal data relating to the respondents, while section B is the main body which is in relation to the variables of the research work. It was design that the respondent tick appropriately from the options provided. The questionnaire was designed using the 5-point Likert scale of Strongly Agree (SA) =5; Agree (A) =4; Undecided (UD) =3; Disagree (D) =2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) =1). The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The alpha values for each instrument under study should not be less than 0.6%. The test yield the following alpha coefficient: 0.82, 0.72, 0.80 and 0.74 for appeal to higher authority, Ingratiation, impression management and persuasion respectively. Based on this result, the variables have alpha value above 0.6, which means that all the variables in the instrument are deemed reliable. Out of the fifty-eight questionnaires distributed to the staff, only forty-eight were returned. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis to evaluate the effect of influence tactics on workers' performance at 0.05 α level. Thus, the model is as follows:

$$WP = \beta_0 + \beta_{1Aph} + \beta_{2Ig} + \beta_{3imgt} + \beta_{4Per} + \mu$$

Where;

WP = Workers' performance

β_0 = Constant

$\beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 \beta_4$ = Coefficients of each variables

Aph = Appeal to higher authority

Ig = Ingratiation

Imgt = Impression management

Per = Persuasion

Error term is denoted as μ

Results and Discussions

The results of the analysis are given below:

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Age Distribution

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative
Valid 18-25years	1	2.7	2.7	2.7
26-35years	10	27.0	27.0	29.7
36-45years	13	35.1	35.1	64.9
46-years and above	13	35.1	35.1	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.00	

Source: Field Survey (2019)

This table reveals that 1 or 2.7% respondent are in the age category of 18 -25 years, 10 or 27% respondents are in the age category of 26 – 35 years, 13 or 35.1% respondents are in the age category of 36 – 45 years, while the remaining 13 or 35.1% respondents are in the age category of 46 years and above. This indicates that the majority of the respondents are within the age range of 36 – 45 years and 46 years above.

Table 2: Appeal to higher authority influences worker's performances

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent	Cumulative
Valid Strongly Agree	16	43.2	43.2	43.2
Agree	6	16.2	16.2	59.5
Undecided	3	8.1	8.1	67.6
Disagree	7	18.9	18.9	86.5
Strongly Disagree	5	13.5	13.5	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The table shows that 16 or 43.2% of the respondents strongly agreed that appeal to higher authority influences employees performance, 6 or 16.2% agreed, 3 or 8.1% responded

undecided, 7 or 18.9% disagreed and the remaining 5 or 13.3% strongly disagreed with the statement. This indicates majority of the respondents agreed that appeal to higher authority influences employee's performance with 59.5%.

Table 3: Ingratiation influences worker's performances

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent	Cumulative
Valid Strongly Agree	7	18.9	18.9	18.9
Agree	13	35.1	35.1	54.1
Undecided	4	10.8	10.8	64.9
Disagree	4	10.8	10.8	75.7
Strongly Disagree	9	24.3	24.3	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The table shows that 7 or 18.9% of the respondents strongly agreed that ingratiation influences employees performance, 13 or 35.1% agreed, 4 or 10.8% responded undecided, 4 or 10.8% disagreed and the remaining 9 or 24.3% strongly disagreed with the statement. This indicates majority of the respondents agreed that ingratiation influences workers' performance with 54.1%.

Table 4: Impression management influences worker's performance

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent	Cumulative
Valid Strongly Agree	11	29.7	29.7	29.7
Agree	17	45.9	45.9	75.7
Undecided	2	5.4	5.4	81.1
Disagree	4	10.8	10.8	91.9
Strongly Disagree	3	8.1	8.1	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The table indicates that 11 or 29.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that impression management influences employees performance, 17 or 45.9% agreed, 2 or 5.1% responded undecided, 4 or 10.8% disagreed and the remaining 3 or 8.1% strongly disagreed with the statement. This means that bulk of the respondents agreed that impression management influences worker's performance with 75.7%.

Table 5: Persuasion influences worker's performance

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent	Cumulative
Valid Strongly Agree	3	8.1	8.1	8.1
Agree	2	5.4	5.4	13.5
Undecided	2	5.4	5.4	18.9
Disagree	4	10.8	10.8	29.7
Strongly Disagree	26	70.3	70.3	100.0
Total	37	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The table indicates that 3 or 8.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that persuasion influences employees performance, 2 or 5.4% agreed, 2 or 5.4% were undecided, 4 or 10.8% disagreed while the remaining 26 or 70% strongly disagreed with the statement. This means that bulk of the respondents agreed that persuasion influences employee's performance.

Test of Hypothesis

To achieve the objective of this study, the following regression result was obtained:

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.765	.585	.533	.998

a. Predictors: (Constant), Per, Ig, Aph, Imgt

The coefficient of determination which measures the goodness fit of the model as revealed by R-square (R^2) indicates that 58.5% of the variations observed in the dependent variable were explained by variations in the independent variable. The test of goodness of fit as indicated by R^2 was properly adjusted by the Adjusted R-Square to 53.3%.

Table 7: ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Regression	15.598	4	11.211	11.260	.000 ^b
Residual	10.415	32	.996		
Total	26.013	36			

a. Dependent Variable

b. Predictors: (Constant), Per, Ig, Aph, Imgt

As can be seen, the calculated F-statistics is 11.26 with degrees of freedom of 2 and 32, significant level at $P < .000$ probability level. This means that a significant difference in the level of influence of the predictors (Per, Ig, Aph, Imgt) on dependent variable was found ($F(2, 32) = 11.26, P < .001$).

Table 8: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
	β	Std. Error			
(Constant)	.135	.851		-.159	.875
Aph	.330	.127	.348	2.592	.014
Ig	-.015	.130	-.015	-.113	.911
Img	.279	.188	.235	1.482	.148
Per	.400	.144	.445	2.779	.009

The regression line is $WP = 0.135 + 0.330Aph - 0.151Ig + 0.271Img + 0.40 Per$. In this line, the value of the intercept which is 0.135, shows that the employees' performance will experience a 0.135 (i.e. 13%) increase when all other variables are held constant. The estimate coefficients which are 0.330 (appeal to higher authority) shows that a unit changes in appeal to higher authority will cause a 33% increase in worker's performance. The result corroborates with that of Shin, and Sean-Hyun (2019) and that of Chaturvedi and Srivastava (2014); -0.015 (ingratiation) shows that a unit change in ingratiation will cause 1.51% decrease in workers performance. The result is not similar to that of Quinley (1996); 0.279 (impression management) shows that a unit change in impression management will cause a 27.9% increase in worker's performance, 0.400 (Persuasion) shows that a unit change in persuasion will cause a 40% increase in workers performance. The result is similar to that of Rogue (2017).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The result proved that relationship exists between the various influence tactics variables and worker's performance in Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State, positively and negatively. The conclusion of the study is that; appeal to higher authority has positive and significant effect on employees' performance; ingratiation has negative and no significant effect on employees' performance; impression management has positive and no significant effect on employees' performance; and persuasion has positive and significant effect on employees' performance of Dangote Cement PLC, Obajana -Kogi State. Based on the findings of this study, the following are recommended:

1. Appeal to higher authority should be adopted for use to ensure optimum employees' performance;
2. The use of ingratiation by the organization should be discarded since its effect on workers performance is negative;
3. Impression management though not significant but with a positive relationship on employees' performance should also be adopted by the management; and
4. Persuasion be adopted and used as it ensures workers' performance and commitment to their job.

References

- Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 39-49.
- Cable, D. M. & Judge, T. A. (2003). Managers' upward influence tactic strategies: The role of manager personality and supervisor leadership style, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(2), 197.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, Noah, J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591-621.
- Chaturvedi, S., & Srivattava, A. K. (2014). An Overview of Upward Influence Tactics, *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, 6, (3), 265-274.
- About Dangote (2019). Retrieved from: www.dangotegroup.com.
- Dhirman, A. (2017). Effect of upwards Influence tactics on managerial decision making: Working Paper Series, Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta, Retrieved from: <http://faculty.live.iimcal.ac.in/wkgpapapers>.
- Erez, M., & Rim, Y (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables, *Human Relations*, 35, 877-878.
- Green, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relation-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- Erez, M., Rim, Y, & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. target. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59, 25-39.
- Hall, A. (2017). *Influence: The essence of leadership*, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Extension, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources.
- Higgins, A.C., Judge, T.A. & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24, (1), 89-106, www.jstor.org.
- Kipnis, D. (1984). The Use of power in organizations and in interpersonal settings, *Applied Social Psychology Annual*, 5, 179-210.
- Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward influence styles: relationship with performance evaluations, salary, and stress, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 528-542.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way, *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 65(4), 440-452

- Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 137-156.
- Quinley, J. W. (1996). *Use of influence tactics among mid-level managers in the community college*, Paper Presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, 36th, Albuquerque.
- Rangus, K. (2017). Influence and employees openness towards others and innovation in India, *Research and Application: The Management Journal*, 49, (2).
- Schilit, W. K., & Locke, E. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 304-316.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Yammarino, F. J. (2016). Investigating contingencies: An examination of the impact of span of supervision and upward control on Leader-Member Exchange using traditional and multivariate within- and between- entities analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 659-677.
- Shin, L. R., & Sean-Hyun, S. (2019). Impact of managerial influence tactics on job creativity and performance: A Focus on Korean Airline service employees, *Journal of Sustainability*, 11(16), 4429, Retrieved: <https://doi.org>.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hill, K. (1981). Controlling acquiescence response bias by item reversal: The effect on questionnaire validity, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 9, 1101-1114.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson subscales, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (3), 246-257.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Hinkin, T. R., & Podsakoff, N. (1991). Can ipsative and single item measures produce erroneous results in field studies of the five French and Raven bases of power? An empirical investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 106-114.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Neider, L. L. (Eds.). (2006). *Power and influence in organizations*, Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management*, 19(2), 385-417.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 2, 3-43.

- Schwartz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions Shape the Answers, *American Psychologist*, 54, 93–105.
- Schwartz, R. W. (1998). Physician leadership: A new imperative for surgical educators, *American Journal of Surgery*, 176, 38-40.
- Schwartz, R. W. (2000). Programs for the development of physician leaders: A circular process in its infancy." *Academic Medicine*, 75(2), 133-140.
- Schwartz, R. W., & Pogge, C. (2000). Physician leadership: Essential skills in a changing environment. *The American Journal of Surgery*, 180(3), 187- 192.
- Schwartz, R. W., Pogge, C., Gillis, S. A., & Holsinger, J. W. (2000). Programs for the development of physician leaders: A curricular process in its infancy. *Academic Medicine*, 75(2), 133-140.
- Shortell, S. M., Schmittiel, J., Wang, M. C., Li, R., Gillies, R. R., Casalino, L. P., Bodenheimer, T., & Rundall, T. G. (2005). An empirical assessment of high performing physician organizations: Results from a national study, *Medical Care Research and Review*. 62(4), 407–434.
- Thisday Newspaper (2019). *Dangote cement maintains leadership*, Retrieved from: www.thisdaylive.com
- Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations. (2nd edition)*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations. (4th edition)*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations. (6th edition)*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research, *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yukl, G., & Chavez, C. (2002). *Influence tactics and leader effectiveness. In Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (Eds.). (2001). Leadership (pp. 139-165). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.*
- Yukl, G., Chavez, C., & Seifert, C. F. (2005). Assessing the construct validity and utility of two new influence tactics, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 705-725.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 1990; 75(2), 132-140
- Wang, H. L., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and performance and organizational citizenship behavior, *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 420-432.