



## Significance of Influence Strategies and Leadership Styles of Managerial Professionals

Rajasekhar T. and Vijayasree K.

School of Management Studies, LakiReddy Bali Reddy College of Engineering, Mylavaram, Krishna Dt. Andhra Pradesh, INDIA  
Cum Scientist, Cognitive Science Centre, LakiReddy Bali Reddy College of Engineering, Mylavaram, Krishna Dt. Andhra Pradesh, INDIA

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in)

Received 4<sup>th</sup> November 2012, revised 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012, accepted 12<sup>th</sup> November 2012

### Abstract

*The present investigation of the is to study the significance of influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal, service and business organizations. The sample consists of 50 middle level managers (Superiors) and 50 their employees (subordinates) in each organization. The statistical tools were employed means, SDs and Step-wise Multiple Regression Analysis. The results shown that there are no varied between influence strategies and leadership styles of managers in commonweal organizations. In service organizations, culture prevails in varying significantly relations between influence strategies and leadership styles of managers. The influence strategies vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles of managers in business organizations.*

**Keywords:** strategies, exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, assertion, nurturant-task and participative.

### Introduction

The managerial professionals put into practice all policies, take decisions, reward people and motivate employees for goal accomplishment through different types of strategies. 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. Social influence processes are a pervasive aspect of organizational life. The work of organizations 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. Social influence processes are a pervasive aspect of organizational life. The work of organizations 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 various influence strategies can be classified into three categories: Upward and downward Strategies: Under this downward strategies category are included ways by which superiors influence their subordinates. For the present study downward influence strategies might be used which include,

**Rationality (R):** Rational persuasion or rationality involves the use of logical arguments and factual information to convince a target that the agent's request or proposal is feasible and consistent with shared objectives<sup>1</sup>. Writing detailed plans,

explaining the reasons for a request, giving facts and data, are all tactics involving rationality.

**Assertiveness (A):** It involves demanding, telling a person to comply, expressing anger verbally, pointing out rules, or becoming a nuisance.

**Ingratiation (I):** It involves making the other person feel important, inflating the importance of a request, showing a need, asking politely, acting friendly or humbly, or pretending that the other person is really going to make the decision. It is used to get one's way with the boss as well as to persuade coworkers and subordinates to act in specific ways. This influence strategy has been systematically investigated by some Indian researchers in a number of studies.

**Use of Sanctions (S):** The use of sanctions draws upon organizational rewards and punishments. Tactics include preventing salary increases or threatening an employee's job security in the case of negative sanction and increasing salary or promoting the person in the case of positive sanction.

**Showing Expertise (E):** In this strategy, the superior influences subordinates by showing competence and knowledge in work domain, and expects subordinates to comply with his/her superior knowledge.

**Personalized Relationship (P):** This strategy involves superior's warmth, support and care towards subordinates. Even,

superior's help extends beyond the work place to subordinates' personal matters and in exchange for this the superior expects the subordinate to comply.

**Exchange of Benefits (B):** Exchange tactics involve explicit or implicit offers by an agent to provide a favor or benefit to the target in return for doing what the agent requests.

An organization that is established as an instrument or means for achieving defined objectives has been referred to as formal organization. Its design specifies how goals are subdivided and reflected in subdivisions of the organization. Divisions, departments, sections, positions, jobs, and tasks make up this work structure. Thus, the formal organization is expected to behave impersonally in regard to relationships with clients or with its members. According to Weber's definition, entry and subsequent advancement is by merit or seniority. Employees receive a salary and enjoy a degree of tenure that safeguards them from the arbitrary influence of superiors or of powerful clients. The higher one's position in the hierarchy, the greater one's presumed expertise in adjudicating problems that may arise in the course of the work carried out at lower levels of the organization. It is this bureaucratic structure that forms the basis for the appointment of heads or chiefs of administrative subdivisions in the organization and endows them with the authority attached to their position.

In contrast to the appointed head or chief of an administrative unit, a leader emerges within the context of the informal organization that underlies the formal structure. The informal organization expresses the personal objectives and goals of the individual membership. Their objectives and goals may or may not coincide with those of the formal organization. The informal organization represents an extension of the social structures that generally characterize human life — the spontaneous emergence of groups and organizations as ends in themselves.

The leadership is the “process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task”. From Mahatma Gandhi to Winston Churchill to Martin Luther King, there are as many leadership styles as there are leaders. Fortunately, businesspeople and psychologists have developed useful and simple ways to describe the main styles of leadership, and these can help aspiring leaders understand which styles they should use. So, whether you manage a team at work, captain a sports team, or lead a major corporation, which approach is best? Consciously, or subconsciously, you'll probably use some of the leadership styles in this article at some point. Understanding these styles and their impact can help you develop your own, personal leadership style – and help you become a more effective leader. With this in mind, there are many different frameworks that have shaped our current understanding of leadership, and many of these have their place, just as long as they're used appropriately. This article looks at some of the most

common frameworks, and then looks at popular styles of leadership.

However, the managers' influence strategies and leadership styles play a vital role and influence the work attitudes of their employees. In this perspective, whether the managerial influence strategies are varied or similar while influence the organizational work and employees' perceptions in order to achieve the goals of organizations.

Sangeetha and Nachiketa<sup>2</sup> studied that to investigate the relationship between Downward Influence Strategies and Organisational Success, which includes Job Satisfaction (JS), Effectiveness (EFF) and Intention to Quit (IQ). This study is based on a sample of 200 middle level executives of 10 public and private sector organisations. The findings indicate that less use of Asserting Expertise and Negative Sanction and frequent use of Rational Rewards and Personalized Relationship would enhance the JS, and EFF is also likely to be enhanced by the use of Rational Rewards. Cable and Timothy<sup>3</sup> reveals that managers upward influence tactics strategies depended on the leadership styles of their target (their supervisor). Managers were more likely to use consultation and inspirational appeal tactics when their supervisor was a transformational leader, but were more likely to use exchange, coalition, legitimization and pressure tactics when their supervisor displayed a laissez-faire leadership style. Namjae et.al.<sup>4</sup> concluded that the media selection behavior will be affected by the personal upward influence strategy and the interpersonal relationship.

Rao et.al.<sup>5</sup>, studied that on the leadership or downward influence styles of American and Indian managers in the U.S. Their strategies were assessed using Kipnis and Schmidt's Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS) with a sample of 65 managers, of which 34 were of Indian nationality and 31 were of American nationality. Our findings suggest that Indian managers use significantly more Assertiveness and Higher Authority than American managers.

Sakinah et.al.<sup>6</sup> studied that to provide an in-depth analysis of the relationship between upward influence strategies and employees' career success. All three dimensions of upward influence strategies i.e. soft, hard and rational tactics have different effects towards career progression due to the nature of the tactics.

## Hypotheses

In the light of the above mentioned views, the hypotheses are formulated for our study. i. The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal organizations. ii. The influence strategies viz.,

exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in service organizations. iii. The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in business organizations.

**Sample:** The sample of the study is consisted of 50 middle level managers/section superintendents (superiors) and 50 employees (subordinates) in each organization viz., commonweal, service and business organizations. The data was collected in person was conducted in a region of Andhra Pradesh. For this purpose, the middle level managers and their employees were contacted personally and were requested to fill the questionnaire comprising measure of influence strategies and leadership styles.

**Variables studied: Influence strategies:** Power is exercised through the use of various behavioral strategies or methods. Both superiors and subordinates exercise their power but by using different methods, in different situations and for different reasons. There are different types of strategies used by superiors to influence their subordinates to get the work done by them. The strategies that are used are exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal and assertion. The research studies describe various types of strategies like upward, downward and lateral influence in organizations and some of them are described below.

**Assertiveness:** This involves demanding, telling a person to comply, expressing anger verbally, pointing out rules, or becoming a nuisance. Kipnis, Kipnis, et al.<sup>7</sup>, and Mowday<sup>8</sup>, found a greater use of these tactics in influencing persons at all levels (superiors, coworkers and subordinates).

**Coalition:** This involves such things as the use of steady pressure for compliance by obtaining the support of co-workers' and/or by 'obtaining the support of subordinates'. This technique is more often used to influence superiors than to influence subordinates or colleagues.

**Exchange:** This strategy is used by managers with superiors, peers and subordinates to get their work done. It involves such things as 'offering an exchange' or 'offering to make personal sacrifices'. Kipnis et al.<sup>7</sup>, and Mowday<sup>8</sup> mentioned the use of this strategy in organizations.

**Manipulations:** Informing or arguing in such a way that the recipient is not aware of being influenced is termed 'manipulation'<sup>8,9</sup>. Allen, et al.<sup>10</sup>, pointed out that this category of

tactics involve with holding, distorting the information (sort of outright lying) or overwhelming the target with too much information.

**Upward Appeal:** This involves bringing additional pressures for conformity on the target of influence by calling a person at a higher level in the organization to help.

Leadership styles:

Leadership is generally considered as a process of influencing the activities of a group in an effort to achieve certain organizational goals. Style is a way of behaving and therefore every person may have his own style of functioning. Researchers emphasized on three basic styles, i.e., authoritarian, nurturant-task, and participative leader behaviour. Later two more styles viz., bureaucratic and task orientation has been added to have a more flexible approach to explain and understand the phenomena more comprehensively.

**Nurturant-Task Style:** The nurturant-task leader helps his subordinates to grow up and assume greater responsibility, gives responsibility as much as his subordinates can handle; openly shows affection for those who work hard; if subordinates need help he helps as much as he can; has affection for his subordinates and listens to their personal problems and family matters.

**Participative Style:** The participative leader places high value to main-taining partnership in the group and treats group members as equals, gives total freedom to subordinates even to the extent that they may disagree with him; believes in joint decisions and interactions of seniors and subordinates, helps his subordinates as much as he can; believes that all have more or less equal potentials, and above all he is a friendly type.

**Bureaucratic Style:** The leader who has this style believes in hierarchical disposition, maintains fair impersonal relationship in the group; follows standard rules and regulations, believes in clean-out demarcation of responsibility and work, tries to confine himself to his own jurisdiction; and believes that if people follow everything in writing then there will be less probability of conflicts in the organizations.

**Authoritarian Style:** An authoritarian leader keeps important information to himself, considers power and prestige important for the control of subordinates; distinguishes considerably between his good and bad officers, takes most decisions himself and is confident of his own decisions; feels the necessity of strict supervision, cannot tolerate any interference, and feels that personal loyalty to the leader is an important virtue of a good subordinate.

The superiors' seven types of influence strategies were studied as independent variables and leadership styles, as perceived by the subordinates, as dependent variables for the study.

Instruments used: Influence Strategies:

The Ansari's<sup>1</sup>, downward influence strategy measures were employed to obtain information about how the superior go about changing the opinion of his subordinates, so that they agree with him. The scale containing 28 items was divided into seven types of strategies, viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, showing dependency, coalition and manipulation, upward appeal and assertion containing 5, 6, 3, 4, 4, 3 and 3 items each, respectively. The respondents have to respond on a 5 – point scale (very often 5, often 4, sometimes 3, seldom 2 and never 1). The maximum and minimum possible scores on exchange and challenge strategy are 25 and 5, on expertise and reason are 30 and 6, on personalized help are 15 and 3, on coalition and manipulation are 20 and 4, on showing dependency are 20 and 4, on upward appeal are 15 and 3 and on assertion are 15 and 3, respectively. It is an indication that the strategy which gets the highest score is being used by the superior to influence his subordinate to agree with him (highest score on a particular strategy clearly indicates that the same is used by the superiors in influencing their subordinates to agree with them). The values of the reliability and validity are to be established by test-retest method and they are exchange and challenge (0.71 and 0.84), expertise and reason (0.73 and 0.85), personalized help (0.62 and 0.78), coalition and manipulation (0.59 and 0.76), showing dependency (0.72 and 0.84), upward appeal (0.69 and 0.83) and assertion (0.56 and 0.74).

**Table-1**  
**Means and SDs scores of Superiors' Influence Strategies and leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal organizations**

Sr. No	Influence strategies	Mean	SD
1	Exchange and challenge	45.73	12.24
2	Expertise and reason	41.34	12.94
3	Personalized help	52.29	17.78
4	Coalition and manipulation	44.71	12.10
5	Showing dependency	43.02	10.09
6	Upward appeal	53.10	13.51
7	Assertion	50.31	13.52
8	Nurturant task leadership style	51.98	08.68
9	Participative leadership style	52.18	09.71
10	Bureaucratic leadership style	52.08	12.14
11	Authoritarian leadership style	41.97	12.72

**Leadership styles:** The Ansari's<sup>1</sup> leadership behaviour measures were used to measure the leadership styles of the superiors as perceived by their subordinates. The scale has 26 statements divided into 4 types of leadership styles-nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian, containing 9, 8, 3 and 6 items each, respectively. The respondents are to respond on a 5-point scale (quite true 5, true 4, doubtful 3, false 2 and quite false 1). The maximum and minimum possible scores on nurturant-task style are 45 and 9, on participative style 40 and 80 on bureaucratic style 15 and 3 and on authoritarian style 30 and 6, respectively.). The reliability and validity values are also to be established by test-retest method for leadership styles nurturant-task is 0.83 and 0.91 for participative style it is

0.81 and 0.90, for bureaucratic style it is 0.72 and 0.84, and for authoritarian style it is 0.65 and 0.80.

## Results and Discussion

The means and SDs scores of superiors influence strategies and leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal organizations are presented in Table-1.

The obtained means and SDs scores of superiors' influence strategies are exchange and challenge 45.73, 12.24, expertise and reason 41.34, 12.94, personalized help 52.29, 17.78, coalition and manipulation 44.71, 12.10 showing dependency 43.02, 10.09, upward appeal 53.10 13.51 and assertion 50.31, 13.52 respectively in commonweal organizations.

The obtained means and SDs scores of superiors' leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates are nurturant task (mean = 51.98, SD = 8.68), participative (mean = 52.18, SD = 9.71), bureaucratic (mean = 52.08, SD = 12.14) and authoritarian (mean = 41.97, SD = 12.72) respectively in commonweal organizations. It can be said that the most frequently used leadership style is participative style (mean = 52.18, SD = 9.71).

The first hypothesis is assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal organizations". The contribution of leadership styles on influence strategies in commonweal organizations is assessed using the stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Table 2 presents the results of step-wise multiple regression analysis for leadership styles (predictors) as perceived by the subordinates and superiors' influence strategies (criterion) in commonweal organizations.

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 0.27%, participative style 0.66%, bureaucratic style 0.10% and authoritarian style 0.01% to the exchange and challenge strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 1.09%, participative style 1.34%, nurturant task style 0.04%, and bureaucratic style 0.01% to the expertise and reason strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The bureaucratic style of leadership contributed 1.34% authoritarian style 0.22%, participative style 0.07% and nurturant-task style 0.01% to the personalized help strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 2.13%, participative style 1.48%, nurturant-task style 0.03% and bureaucratic style 0.03% to the coalition and manipulation strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

**Table-2**  
**Step-wise multiple regression analysis for the contribution of leadership style as perceived by the subordinates on superiors Influence strategies in commonweal organizations**

S.No.	Influence Strategies (Criterion)	Leadership Styles (Predictors)				
			Nurturant task	Participative	bureaucratic	Authoritarian
01	Exchange and Challenge	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.27	0.66	0.10	0.01
		F	0.27	0.45	0.33	0.24
		Order	1	2	3	4
02	Expertise and Reason	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.04	1.34	0.01	1.09
		F	0.81	1.21	0.60	1.08
		Order	3	2	4	1
03	Personalized help	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.01	0.07	1.34	0.22
		F	0.39	0.53	1.33	0.76
		Order	4	3	1	2
04	Coalition and Manipulation	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.03	1.48	0.03	2.13
		F	1.21	1.82	0.90	2.14
		Order	3	2	4	1
05	Showing Dependency	IR <sup>2</sup>	1.55	1.53	0.03	0.03
		F	1.14	1.34	0.89	0.67
		Order	1	2	3	4
06	Upward Appeal	IR <sup>2</sup>	1.39	0.06	0.35	0.07
		F	1.38	0.45	0.86	0.59
		Order	1	4	2	3
07	Assertion	IR <sup>2</sup>	3.10	0.15	0.01	0.28
		F	3.14	1.17	0.87	1.70
		Order	1	3	4	2

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 1.55%, participative style 1.53%, bureaucratic style 0.03% and authoritarian style 0.03% to the showing dependency strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 1.39%, bureaucratic style 0.35%, authoritarian style 0.07% and participative style 0.06% to the upward appeal strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 3.10%, authoritarian style 0.28%, participative style 0.15% and bureaucratic style 0.01% to the assertion strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

**Discussion:** In the commonweal organizations, nurturant-task style of superiors use a mixer of assertion, upward appeal, showing dependency and exchange and challenge strategies to influence their subordinates' work. They use less frequently such strategies as personalized help, expertise and reason and coalition and manipulation strategies. Participative styles of superiors were found to have shown preference for all the influence strategies. Bureaucratic style of superiors have reported a more frequent use of personalized help strategy than that of the other strategies, whereas the authoritarian style of superiors preferred expertise and reason, coalition and manipulation strategies to other

strategies to influence their subordinates' work. None of the leadership styles have contributed significantly to the various influence strategies in commonweal organizations. This may be attributed to the organizational culture that is prevalent in commonweal organizations. No meaningful relationship is found between leadership styles and influence strategies in commonweal organization.

Hence, The first hypothesis is assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in commonweal organizations" is not accepted as warranted.

The second hypothesis is assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in service organizations.

In service organizations, the obtained means and SDs scores of superiors' influence strategies are exchange and challenge 40.78, 7.88, expertise and reason 45.27, 6.53, personalized help 52.71, 10.46, coalition and manipulation 42.35, 6.22, showing dependency 42.54, 8.01, upward appeal 48.40, 11.63 and assertion 48.51, 8.87 respectively (table.3).

**Table-3**  
**Means and SDs scores of Superiors' Influence Strategies and leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates in service organizations**

Sl. No	Influence strategies	Mean	SD
1	Exchange and challenge	40.78	07.88
2	Expertise and reason	45.27	06.53
3	Personalized help	52.71	10.46
4	Coalition and manipulation	42.35	06.22
5	Showing dependency	42.54	08.01
6	Upward appeal	48.40	11.63
7	Assertion	48.51	08.87
8	Nurturant task leadership style	50.03	08.67
9	Participative leadership style	53.14	11.08
10	Bureaucratic leadership style	46.64	11.80
11	Authoritarian leadership style	38.86	10.87

The obtained means and SDs scores of superiors leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates are nurturant task (Mean

= 50.03, SD = 8.67), participative (mean = 53.14, SD = 11.08), bureaucratic (mean = 46.64, SD = 11.80) and authoritarian (mean = 38.86, SD = 10.87) respectively in service organizations. The leadership style most frequently used is participative style (mean = 53.14 and SD = 11.08) .

Table-4 presents the results of step-wise multiple regression analysis for leadership styles (predictors) as perceived by the subordinates and superiors' influence strategies (criterion) in the service organizations.

The participative style of leadership contributed 5.95%, authoritarian style 2.34%, nurturant-task style 2.14% and bureaucratic style 0.22% to the exchange and challenge strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are significant at 0.05 levels. The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 2.34%, bureaucratic style 1.29%, authoritarian style 0.24% and participative style 0.24% to the expertise and reason strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

Bureaucratic style of leadership contributed 4.78%, authoritarian style of leadership 2.60% and participative style of leadership 0.72% to the personalized help strategy of the superiors, all the 'F' values are significant at 0.05 level but nurturant-task style of leadership is 0.65, not significant at any level.

**Table-4**  
**Presents the results of step-wise multiple regression analysis for the contribution of leadership styles (predictors) as perceived by the subordinates and superiors' influence strategies (criterion) in the service organizations**

S.No.	Influence Strategies (Criterion)	Leadership Styles (Predictors)				
			Nurturant task	Participative	bureaucratic	Authoritarian
01	Exchange and Challenge	IR <sup>2</sup>	2.14	5.95	0.02	2.34
		F	3.73*	6.21*	2.78*	4.39*
		Order	3	1	4	2
02	Expertise and Reason	IR <sup>2</sup>	2.34	0.22	1.29	0.24
		F	2.35	1.01	1.83	1.29
		Order	1	4	2	3
03	Personalized help	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.65	0.72	4.78	2.60
		F	2.28	2.82*	4.92*	3.87*
		Order	4	3	1	2
04	Coalition and Manipulation	IR <sup>2</sup>	3.18	0.12	0.60	1.11
		F	3.23	1.25	1.65	2.18
		Order	1	4	3	2
05	Showing Dependency	IR <sup>2</sup>	2.93	0.26	0.99	0.11
		F	2.97	1.40	1.98	1.04
		Order	1	3	2	4
06	Upward Appeal	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.01	0.47	0.25	0.14
		F	0.21	0.47	0.35	0.28
		Order	4	1	2	3
07	Assertion	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.19
		F	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.18
		Order	2	4	3	1

\* Significant at 0.05 level

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 3.18%, authoritarian style 1.11%, bureaucratic style 0.60% and participative style 0.12% to the coalition and manipulation strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The nurturant-task style of leadership contributed 2.93%, bureaucratic style 0.99%, participative style 0.26% and authoritarian style 0.11% to the showing dependency strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The participative style of leadership contributed 0.47%, bureaucratic style 0.25%, authoritarian style 0.14% and nurturant-task style 0.01% to the upward appeal strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 0.19%, nurturant-task style 0.04%, bureaucratic style 0.01% and participative style 0.01% to the assertion strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

**Discussion:** Service organizations present a different picture. A meaningful relationship between leadership styles and influence strategies, is observed here. Nurturant-task style of superiors reported to have employed exchange and challenge strategy which is only contributed significantly, more often, than other strategies. Whereas the participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian leadership styles have significantly contributed, have shown similarities in their subordinates. They have used exchange and challenge and personalized help strategies more frequently than the other influence strategies. It may be due to the fact that a different organizational culture prevails in the service organizations.

The second hypothesis is assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in service organizations is accepted as warranted.

The third hypothesis is assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in business organizations.

In business organizations, the obtained means and SDs scores of superiors' influence strategies are exchange and challenge 51.69, 10.06, expertise and reason 51.36, 12.30, personalized help 48.27, 12.53, coalition and manipulation 38.94, 7.78, showing dependency 37.60, 7.47, upward appeal 47.74, 10.88 and assertion 51.08, 10.01 respectively.

The obtained means and SDs scores of superiors' leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates are nurturant-task (mean = 54.17, SD = 9.19), participative (mean = 53.58, SD = 10.12), bureaucratic (mean = 59.96, SD = 13.39) and authoritarian (mean = 33.53, SD = 8.31) respectively in business organizations.

**Table-5**  
**Means and SDs scores of Superiors' Influence Strategies and Leadership Styles as Perceived by the Subordinates in Business organizations.**

Sl. No	Influence strategies	Mean	SD
1	Exchange and challenge	51.69	10.06
2	Expertise and reason	51.36	12.30
3	Personalized help	48.27	12.53
4	Coalition and manipulation	38.94	07.78
5	Showing dependency	37.60	07.47
6	Upward appeal	47.74	10.88
7	Assertion	51.08	10.01
8	Nurturant task leadership style	54.17	09.19
9	Participative leadership style	53.58	10.12
10	Bureaucratic leadership style	59.96	13.39
11	Authoritarian leadership style	33.53	08.31

It can be said that the leadership i.e., the most frequently used is bureaucratic style (mean = 59.96 and SD = 13.39)

Table-6: step-wise multiple regression analysis for the contribution of leadership style as perceived by the subordinates on superiors influence strategies in business organizations

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 1.04%, bureaucratic style 0.22%, nurturant-task style 0.05% and participative style 0.01% to the exchange and challenge strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 5.49%, (significant at 0.05 level), nurturant-task style 4.42% (significant at 0.01 level), bureaucratic style 2.24% (significant at 0.01 level) and participative style 0.15% (significant at 0.05 level) to expertise and reason strategy of the superiors.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 1.49%, bureaucratic style 2.67%, participative style 0.32% and nurturant-task style 0.37% to the personalized help strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

The bureaucratic style of leadership contributed 3.92%, is (significant at 0.05 level), authoritarian style 0.15% (not significant), participative style 0.10% (not significant), and nurturant-task style 0.12% (not significant), to the coalition and manipulation strategy of the superiors.

The participative style of leadership contributed 1.27%, nurturant-task style 1.24%, authoritarian style 1.23% and bureaucratic style 0.44%, to the showing dependency strategy of the superiors. All the 'F' values are not significant.

Table-6

Presents the results of step-wise multiple regression analysis for the leadership styles (predictors) as perceived by the subordinates and superiors' strategies (criterion) in the business organizations

S.No.	Influence Strategies (Criterion)	Leadership Styles (Predictors)				
			Nurturant task	Participative	bureaucratic	Authoritarian
01	Exchange and Challenge	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.05	0.01	0.22	1.04
		F	0.43	0.32	0.62	1.03
		Order	3	4	2	1
02	Expertise and Reason	IR <sup>2</sup>	4.42	0.15	2.24	5.49
		F	5.34**	3.33*	4.43**	5.70*
		Order	2	4	3	1
03	Personalized help	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.37	0.32	2.67	1.49
		F	1.21	1.49	2.11	1.49
		Order	4	3	2	1
04	Coalition and Manipulation	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.12	0.10	3.92	0.15
		F	1.07	1.40	4.00*	2.06
		Order	4	3	1	2
05	Showing Dependency	IR <sup>2</sup>	1.24	1.27	0.44	1.23
		F	1.40	1.27	1.16	1.35
		Order	2	1	4	3
06	Upward Appeal	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.63	4.19	0.01	2.09
		F	2.38	4.293*	1.77	3.25*
		Order	3	1	4	2
07	Assertion	IR <sup>2</sup>	0.02	3.13	2.36	5.16
		F	2.83*	4.38*	3.82*	5.34*
		Order	4	2	3	1

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level; \* Significant at 0.05 level.

The participative style of leadership contributed 4.19%, authoritarian style 2.09%, nurturant-task style 0.63% and bureaucratic style 0.01% to the upward appeal strategy of the superiors. The 'F' values of the participative and authoritarian styles are significant at 0.05 level. Whereas, the styles of leadership ie., nurturant-task and bureaucratic 'F' values are not significant.

The authoritarian style of leadership contributed 5.16%, participative style 3.13%, bureaucratic style 2.36% and nurturant-task style 0.02% to the assertion strategy of superiors. All the 'F' values are significant at 0.05 level.

**Discussion:** Finally, in business organizations nurturant-task style of superiors have used expertise and reason and assertion influence strategies which have significantly contributed more often than the other strategies. Participative style of superiors reported to have used expertise and reason, upward appeal and assertion strategies which have contributed significantly more often than the other influence strategies. Bureaucratic style of superiors preferred expertise and reason, coalition and manipulation and assertion strategies which have significantly contributed more often than the other influence strategies, whereas authoritarian style of superiors have used expertise and reason, upward appeal and assertion influence strategies which have significantly contributed, more often, than the other influence strategies.

A significant finding of the study is that superiors in business organization have shown preference to expertise and reason and assertion strategies to other influence strategies. In no other organization, such as, commonweal and service organizations' superiors have used assertion strategy to influence their subordinates' work. In business organizations, because the emphasis is more on the task-performance of the employees, superiors repeatedly remind the subordinates what they should do, they pin-point work regularly and they also expect their subordinates to strictly follow the rules laid down by organization and there is also a high demand of work. It is expected that superiors, in business organizations, would use assertion strategy more often than the other influence strategies. The findings of the study support the prediction that the influence strategies employed by the immediate superiors do significantly vary with their leadership styles.

The third hypotheses assumed that "The influence strategies viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal, and assertion would vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles viz., nurturant-task participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian as perceived by the subordinates in business organizations" is accepted as warranted.



This finding is in line with the earlier studies of Rajasekhar<sup>11</sup> studied that the superiors' influence strategies have not influenced the job satisfaction(JS), Job involvement(JI) and work involvement (WI) and the superiors' leadership styles as perceived by subordinates, have influenced the JS, JI and WI of subordinates in business organizations. Posner and Koozes<sup>12</sup> and Ansari and Kapoor<sup>13</sup>, who also found a significant relation between superiors influence strategies and their leadership styles.

## Conclusions

No one leadership style has contributed significantly to the various influence strategies in commonweal organizations. The different organizational culture prevails in service organizations. Which leadership style significantly contribute to the influence strategies, depends on the situation in such organizations. The influence strategies vary significantly with respect to their leadership styles in business organizations.

## References

1. Ansari M.A., Managing People at work: Leadership Styles and Influence Strategies, Sage Publications, New Delhi (1990)
2. Tripathi Sangeetha and Tripathi Nachiketa, Influence strategies and Organizational success, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, **36(3)**, 283-300 (2001)
3. D.M. and Timothy A.J., Managers' upward influence strategies, the role of manager personality and supervisor leadership style, Journal of Organizational behavior, **24**, 197-214 (2003)
4. Namjae Ch., Park K. and Jen Su Ch., Effects of the Upward Influence Strategies on the Communication Media Selection, Contemporary Management Research, **4(2)**, 137-154 (2008)
5. Rao Asha, Kim Joosung, Sarachandra Sanjay, Mirabelli, Antoinette, Managing across cultures: influence strategies of American and Indian managers, Review of Business Research, **34(4)**, 197-205 (2007)
6. Sakinah Mat Zin, Nazlin Emieza Ngah, Norlaila Ibrahim, Upward Influence Strategies: Relationship with Academics' Career Advancement, World Applied Sciences Journal, **12**, 27-31 (2011)
7. Kipnis D., Schonidt S.M. and Wilkinson I. Intra-organizational influence tactics, Explorations in getting one's way, Journal of applied Psychology, **65**, 440-452 (1980)
8. R.T., The exercise of upward influence in organizations, Administrative Science Quarterly, **23**, 137-156 (1978)
9. L.W., Allen R.W. and Angle H.L., The politics of upward influence in organizations, In B.M. staw and I.I. cumings (eds.). Research in Organizational Behaviour, green which, JAI Press, **3**, 103-149 (1981)
10. Allen et. Al (1979)
11. T., Effect of superior-subordinate perceptions on their job satisfaction, job involvement, and work involvement in business organizations, Journal of Management and Research, **3(2)**, 06-18 (2010)
12. Posner and Koozes
13. Ansari M.A and Kapoor A. Organizational context and upward influence tactics, Organizational behavior and Human Decision Process, **40(1)**, 39-49 (1987)