

NIBM WORKING PAPER SERIES

**Managers' Behavioural Influence Tactics:
The Role of Managers' Work Experience and Span of Supervision**

Shomi Srivastava

Working Paper
(WP38/2024)



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BANK MANAGEMENT
Pune, Maharashtra, 411048
INDIA
April 2024

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Bank Management.

NIBM working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review for Journal or Book Publication

© 2024 by Shomi Srivastava

Citation Guideline:

Srivastava, Shomi (2024), "Managers' Behavioural Influence Tactics: The Role of Managers' Work Experience and Span of Supervision". NIBM Working Paper WP38/April.

https://www.nibmindia.org/static/working_paper/NIBM_WP38_SS.pdf

**Managers' Behavioural Influence Tactics:
The Role of Managers' Work Experience and Span of Supervision.**

Shomi Srivastava

NIBM Working Paper No. 38

April 2024

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research to investigate the impact of work experience and span of supervision on the choice of behavioral influence tactics. The research examines the consultation tactic and exemplification tactic as the dependent variables. Path coefficient and Multivariate analysis identified a significant relationship between work experience and span of supervision with the choice of consultation tactic and exemplification influence tactic. Consultation tactic and Exemplification were explained with the positive relationship with Span of Supervision and Work Experience.

Key words

Organizational influence process, Consultation tactic, Exemplification, Work experience, Span of supervision, Path coefficient, and MONOVA.

Shomi Srivastava (*Corresponding Author*)

National Institute of Bank Management, Pune

shomi@nibmindia.org

Managers' Behavioural Influence Tactics: The Role of Managers' Work Experience and Span of Supervision.

Introduction

Research in social influence process is having longstanding of almost seventy years. During these years work in the area has advanced, but many of the elementary features continued more or less the same. It has become a body of knowledge to explain various interpersonal dynamics in social and organizational context. It is considered as one of the most important process to enhance the managerial effectiveness. The initial work in the area concentrated on identification of behavioural influence tactics (Goffman, 1955; Jones, 1964; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980). Subsequent work progressed through identification of context specific influence tactics, identification of antecedents, and classifying consequences of use of various behavioural influence tactics. The basic premises of social influence process is agent of influence tries to change the target of influence in some intended fashion. It happens in an interpersonal interaction sequences. The objective of the influence process is to enhance the effectiveness of manager through the influence process to accomplish organizational goals. In today's organizational context, as authority which is embedded in organizational position is not sufficient enough to accomplish organizational goals, managers use various influence tactics to achieve the goals. Studies have been conducted to identify the effectiveness of various influence tactics in different context.

This paper attempts to identify some of very prominent antecedents which determine the managers' choice of behavioural influence tactics in an organizational context. Some applicable hypothesis was established to investigate the connection between these variables to improve our perceptiveness for the constructs. We consider this research paper, at one side is very pertinent for enhancing the managerial effectiveness, and other side, as it is not explored much with rigor, so fill the gap in this area was also the objective of this investigation.

Literature Review

Behavioural Influence Tactics

In a social interaction, it is inevitable for people to interact and influence others. It is viewed as the most basic form of social and organizational behaviour. Cartwright (1965) provides a useful working definition of the concept of influence. He stated that when a manager 'O' (agent of influence) exerts influence, on manager 'P' (target of influence), we may say that 'O' has influenced 'P.' When a manager uses influence tactic to get something done from another, it is an exercise of influence behaviour (Tedeschi, Schlenker, & Londskolds, 1972). The influence process has a notion of change. The objective of the process to change the behaviour of target in an intended fashion (Mowday, 1978). Academic work on persuasion and compliance have also contributed significantly to the process. In the influence process, the persuasion or compliance is integral part to accomplish the influence objectives.

Influence process has assumed a substantial significance in managerial effectiveness in an organizational context. Influence processes facilitate to strengthen managerial effectiveness which in turn realizes organizational goals and organizational success. Therefore, influence process by and large underwrites to an organizational goal with a mediation of managerial effectiveness. Managerial effectiveness and influence process appear to be compactly and inextricably conjoined with each other. Therefore, Influence process is viewed as the most essential contributing factor of managerial efficacy. Researchers through empirical work have validated the relation between influence process and managerial effectiveness. Bass (1990) has opined that influence process is a major determinant of managerial success. As managerial effectiveness is very decisively hinged on successful exercise or application of influence process, so understanding of the process is pivotal.

Managers exercise influence behaviour in an organizational context for variety of reasons. To make improvements in the organizational strategy, adjustments or modifications in organizational goal, to accomplish organizational purposes etc. are major factors to exercise the influence strategies in an organizational setting. The managers' influence attempts sometimes bring results and sometimes they do not. In other way, manager's influence attempt on occasion is successful or not. The success or failure of exercise of influence differs on an array of situational aspects. Indeed, there has to be a goodness of fit between the goal of influence exercise and choice of behavioural strategy. The choice of behavioural influence tactic will be different when the objective is to achieve an organizational goal than to achieve personal goals. It is possible that a manager will prefer logical reasoning tactic when objective of influence to achieve organizational goals. At the same, the manager may use ingratiation tactic to realise personal goals. Hence, the managers' exercise of influence process is determined by situational features. It comprises direction of influence, objective of influence, gender, age, leadership style, power, work motivation, organizational politics, LMX, organizational design and organizational culture.

The most prominent aspect of exercise of influence is behavioural influence tactics. The influence process is mediated, shaped, and exercised by behavioural influence tactics. A literature review on behavioural influence tactics recognised some of the measures of influence process (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1982; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Chavez & Seifert, 2005; Yukl, Seifert, & Chavez, 2008).

Srivastava (1998) developed a scale for quantification behavioural influence tactics in Indian context. The scale consists of Intimidation, Disparagement, Use of authority, Coalition formation, Assertiveness, Exchange of benefit, Logical reasoning, Consultation tactic, Exemplification, Ethnic identity, Ingratiation and Supplication tactics.

Measure related to two influence tactics, Consultation and Exemplification, were used in the research. Brief description of these two tactics are described here. **Consultation Tactics-** the tactic is studied extensively in influence process literature (Lu et al, 2019; Leong, Bond, & Fu, 2007; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Fu et al, 2004; Jensen, 2007; Sparrowe, Soetijpto, & Kraimer, 2006; Yukl & Chavez, 2002). Consultation tactics pursues involvement of target of influence by the agent of influence. It includes making use of partnerships in achieving goals. Involving others is central to consultation tactic. Agent of influence often show that we all belong to one family to influence others. Often

citing that organizational objectives are more meaningful. To influence others, agent of influence strive for target's contributions. Jensen (2007) found that in group decision making, the tactic is frequently used by agents of influence. A leader seeks consultation of subordinates in in organizational context for a variety of reasons to accomplish organizational goals. A participative leadership styles is an effective leadership style in organizations. The whole idea of participative leadership style is very critically contingent on consultation tactic. The proactive influence tactic is centre of collaboration enhancement in an organizational context. Managers are encouraged to use consultation for higher organizational performance. **Exemplification-** various aspects of exemplification as influence tactics is identified in management literature (Bolino et al, 2008). In the exemplification, actor works as a role model to influence others. If a manager wants his subordinates to reach office on time, he/her comes office on time. Agent of influence cites unique example of one's self. The tactic has premised that others do not deny a discussion to higher objectives or higher values. Persons try to influence others by presenting themselves as an ideal person. They give examples of their personal ideals. Exemplification tactic is more preferable in downward and lateral context in comparison to upward direction. A superior and colleague may present himself/herself as an example to influence his/her subordinates or colleague. A leader when try to influence a subordinate, the exemplification may be an effective tactic of influence in an organizational context. It is considered as most proactive influence behaviour to disseminate principal centred management in an organizational context.

Influence tactics and work experience

A manager is having working experience in organization which plays very crucial aspects in various facets of managerial effectiveness. Here, operational definition of work experience is number of years of working of a manager presently the job having (Groth et al., 2002; McEnrue, 1988). As the work experience of a manager plays a pivotal role in success of managerial effectiveness, it constitutes an important element in shaping the work behaviour of managers. Though the work experience determines the managers' job behaviour but at the same few research have been done to explore the dynamics of various facets of work experience in an organizational context (Bedeian, et al., 1992). Whether shorter or longer experience has implications for managerial effectiveness. Researchers have identified various categories of work experience i.e. engagement stage, advancement stage, and maintenance stage. A number of studies have used work experience as the independent or moderating variable to determine the cause of various outcomes related to organizational effectiveness. Managers that are identified as the most valuable resources are those with longer rather than shorter work experience. While proposing the job experience model, Katz (1980) opined that job satisfaction is contingent with the work experience of a manager. He found positive relationship between job satisfaction and work experience. Katz (1980) suggested that job satisfaction is time dependent. McDaniel, Schmidt, & Hunter (1988) established that higher work experience with an organization reflected with higher level of performance. The human capital theory also explores the relationship between performance and work experience (Becker, 1964; Coleman, 1988). Work experience brings skills and knowledge to an organization (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). It also increases positive behaviours like exemplification and consultation (Cohen, 1993). The skills and experiences which are gained through higher work experiences increase managers' value at work and enhance an organizational performance (Nafukho et. al, 2004). Myers,

Griffith, Daugherty, & Lusch (2004) opined that through organizational experience managers acquire higher job knowledge and skills which reflect in enhanced human capital of the managers. Further, Ng & Feldman (2010) investigated extensively the relationship between performance and organizational experience. Studies have also explored the relationship between work experience with organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational commitment (Ng & Feldman, 2010). As there is an empirical evidence that work experience determines a number of positive organizational outcomes, work experience significantly predicts the organizational and managerial effectiveness. Ng and Feldman (2010) found managers' with greater work experience expressed less preference for task oriented behaviours. As the research has indicated that work experience is one and the same with job satisfaction, performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, organizational commitment, increase in human capital, and higher skill and knowledge.

Though works related to work experience largely connects with organizational performing, but many other organizational behaviours are also determined by the experience. Social influence process is also dependent managers' work experience in various circumstances. Does the work experience of a manager determine the choice of behavioural influence tactics? Empirical exertions are silent on the research question. Because this question is very relevant in connection with choice of highly proactive behavioural influence tactics like Consultation and Exemplification tactics. These influence strategies enhances collaboration, team work, and trust eco-system in organizations (Consultation tactic). It also promotes the value based management at work places (Exemplification). The impact of work experience on the choice of these influence tactics has very notable role to enact in decreeing the effectiveness of managers. The research explores the linkages between work experiences and influence tactics i.e. Consultation tactic and Exemplification. It is important to analyses what kind of work experience will stimulate the use of consultation tactic (which is hallmark to build teamwork) and exemplification tactic (which is highly condescending influence tactic). Studies have found high work experience will lead to positive organizational behaviour like consultation and exemplification behaviour (Kim, 2018). Studies have shown that more the experience in organization higher the relationship oriented behaviours by the managers (Carstensen, Issacowitz, & Charles, 1999). A manager with high work experience in an organization cossets to behaviours like assisting subordinates, formulating positive advices, altruism etc. (Ng & Feldman, 2020). Super (1957) opined that very high work experience accompanied with mentoring to others in an organizational context. Exemplification carries similarity with mentoring skills. Vecchio and Boatwright (2002) indicated that increase in the work experience will lead to low the choice for hard influence tactics like use of authority, assertiveness, and intimidation (pressure). At the same, relationship oriented tactics like Consultation tactic and Exemplification behavioural tactics will be preferred more when work experience of managers' increase. Hence,

Hypothesis 1: Higher the work experience will lead to more the preference for Consultation tactics and Exemplification.

Hypothesis 2: Lower the work experience will lead to higher the preference for Consultation tactics and lower the Exemplification tactic.

Managers' influence tactics and span of supervision

Span of supervision is a very prominent aspect of job behaviour. It is a group related construct. Span of supervision, either small or big, has an implication for leadership style of managers. Span of supervision effects various organizational related outcomes like citizenship behaviour, commitment, job satisfaction, job design, motivation, leadership process, empowerment, performance etc. Span of supervision has a range of function to play in social influence process. It may determine the numerous attributes of social influence process. Span of supervision shapes the quality of interpersonal relationships of managers by regulating the group dynamics in an organizational context. In a large group scenario, supervisors cannot spend much time with their subordinates. In this situation, there will be lesser interactions between subordinates and supervisors. It brings a number of outlooks in the quality of interactions between both of them. It had been empirically observed as span of supervision became larger, bond amongst boss and juniors fall off (Cogliser & Schriesheim, 2000; Green, Anderson, & Shivers, 1996).

Large or small span of supervision determines distance between superior and subordinates. If superior and subordinates are in distant relationship, they may prefer positive interpersonal relationship. In this situation, managers incline to give emphasis to take care of good interpersonal relationship. In a distant relationship, only broader aspects are observed by superiors and daily hassles are filtered out. At the same time, managers come across concerns related to performance in larger span of supervision context (Kerr, et al., 1974). The distant relationship correspondingly induces inadequacies to happen with good interpersonal association (Schriesheim, Castro, & Yammarino, 2000). Alternatively, with a smaller span of supervision, superiors and subordinates share a good amount of time. It may develop into a frictional or intimate relationship. Latane (1981) observed the phenomena of diffusion of influence in a social context. It indicates that impact of some influence tactics are diluted in group situation (when span of supervision is larger) in comparison to individual situation (where span of supervision is smaller). Research have indicated that success in exercise of particular influence tactics depends on eminence of interpersonal connection between agent of influence and target of influence. Accordingly, Guerin (1994) found that a class of influence tactics works better in small group situations than in a large group. He stated that ingratiation and assertiveness tactics were more effective in a small span of supervision in comparison to a large span of supervision. It can be assumed that some tactics are divided on their impact when the span of supervision was large. Further, exchange of benefit tactic is easy to exercise in a small span of supervision in comparison to large spans of supervision. It had been empirically found that relationship between logical reasoning and span of supervision is interspersed (Latane, 1981; Newton & Mann, 1980). It opined that logical reasoning tactics was effective in small and large spans of supervision. Gurien (1995) found that exchange of benefit and assertiveness tactics were used more with a small span of supervision than a large span of supervision. Gurien (1995) did not find a significant difference for ingratiation tactic in small and large groups. Logical reasoning was preferred equally in small and large span of supervision. Otherwise logical reasoning will be preferred more in a large span of supervision in comparison to a small span of supervision. Graen & Uhl-Bien (1995) found that good interpersonal relationship between agent of influence and target of influence determined the success in getting exemplification and consultation tactics. We hypothesis that:

Hypothesis I: Exemplification will be more effective in small span of supervision in comparison of large span of supervision.

Hypothesis II: Consultation will be more effective in small span of supervision in comparison of large span of supervision.

Work experience of managers very critically regulate the interpersonal experience process. If an organization is promoting advanced proactive influence strategies like exemplification and consultation tactics what is the role of managers' experience. It is very important question for the people management for organization. Managers are having different span of control. It also extend a role in the choice of behavioural influence tactics. There is few research on how work experience and span of supervision determine behavioural influence tactics. This study was initiated to demonstrate how the situational factors determined the choice of influence tactics. Two situations variables: 1. Work experience and 2. Span of supervision determine the exercise of Consultation tactic and Exemplification behavioural influence tactics.

Methodology

Sample

The study was conducted on 526 professionals working in organizations (banking & finance, insurance, audit, administration, manufacturing, Information Technology etc.) Respondents having superiors and subordinates were qualified for the study. Average age of the respondents was 37.40 years. In the study, 421 (80 percent) were male and 102 (19.4 percent) were female. Respondents employed in technical work made up 36.5 percent of the total respondents and respondents in non-technical work made up 63.5 percent of the total respondents. Respondents varied in work experience: 29.8 percent had up to 1 years of experience, 19.6 percent had 1 years and one month to 5 years of work experience, 16.2 percent of respondents had 5 years and one month to 10 years of work experience, and 34.4 percent managers were in a bracket of 5 years and plus work involvement. In terms of number of subordinates, 72.1 percent of respondents had 0-10 subordinates. 19.8 percent had 11-50 subordinates, and 7.8 percent had more than 51 subordinates. Respondents varied in terms of their educational qualifications: 48.1 percent were graduates, 25.7 percent were post-graduates, 19.8 percent were Diploma/Master's in Business Administration, 4.2 percent were M.Phil. /Doctoral Degree, and 2.1 percent respondents were undergraduates.

Measure

Measures consisted of two dimensions of influence tactics. To measure these influence tactics, SIS was used. The scale measures frequency with which behavioural influence tactics are used in an organizational context. There were ten items in the SIS. Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence tactics had five items each. Operational definition of each tactic is given below:

1. **Consultation Tactic**- Person seeks target's participation in making a decision or in planning on how to implement a proposal policy, strategy or change (Yukl & Falbe, 1990).

2. **Exemplification**- Person edifies or presents himself as an example on the ground of integrity and moral worthiness.

Span of Supervision

Span of Supervision was controlled at three levels. 1. 0 – 10 Subordinates, 2. 10 – 50 Subordinates, and 3. More than 50 Subordinates. These number of subordinates are presently working under the respondents at present.

Work Experience

Work Experience of respondents were controlled at four points. 1: 0 to 1 year of experience, II: 1 year and one month to 5 years, III: 5 years and one month to 10 years, and IV: More than 10 years.

Measure also had a section of information relating to age, gender, position & roles, nature of work (technical or non-technical). The scale consisted of ten items (10). Average five (5) items were congregated into each dimension. Respondents rated their preference for influence tactics on a five-point Likert scale. Scale value varied from “never” (1), “Very Less” (2), “Sometimes” (3), “Often” (4), and “frequently” (5). Range of score was one (1) to five (5). Scale has a section of personal information. The questionnaire consisted the following instruction: “In any organization, different behaviours are used to influence others. This study is linked to these behaviours. It takes 10 minutes to fill this questionnaire. Some people like you will participate in it. Whatever you are going to tell will only be used for research purposes. It is not important to write to your name on the questionnaire. Will you cooperate? It took 10 minutes of time to fill the questionnaire. The data collection for the study was done from work place of respondents. To eliminate the social desirability factor in the response of respondents, it was asked ‘What behaviour managers use to influence others (superiors, subordinates, and colleagues) in organization.’

Results

[Table 1]

[Table 2]

[Table 3]

Table 3 displays the outcomes of path analysis by showing t-test, p-values, and f-square. According to Hair et al, (2014), t-test should be greater than 1.96 and p-value (probability value) should be lesser than .05. In the study, Effect of two independent variables (span of Supervision and Work Experience) was assessed on two dimensions (Consultation tactics and Exemplification) of influence tactics. Table 3 showed that beta value of Span of Supervision determined the choice of Consultation tactic and Exemplification. It means goodness of fit exists between these span of Supervision and two dimensions of influence behaviour. It showed that Span of Supervision had a significant relationship with Consultation tactic and Exemplification. F-square values showed the medium effect of Span of Supervision on Consultation tactic. Table 3 also showed the strong effect of Span of Supervision on Exemplification influence behaviour. Table 3 also showed the path analysis between Work Experience and two dimensions of

influence tactics (Consultation tactic and Exemplification). Beta value of Work Experience influenced the preference for Consultation tactic and Exemplification. It suggested that as managers' Work Experience increased, use of Consultation tactic and Exemplification also increased because the p-value is less than 0.05. Table 1 shows that f-square value of Work Experience on Consultation tactic, Exemplification. As the f-square value is more than threshold value of $> .350$, it showed that Work Experience has strong effect on Consultation tactic and Exemplification.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) Analysis:

Effect of Span of Supervision and Work Experience on Influence Tactics

[Table 4]

Table 4 presented the Box's Test of Equality of Covariance. We have Box's M (868.65) which is not significant at .05 level. It indicated that there is a homogeneity of covariance.

[Table 5]

Table 5 presented the results of multivariate MANOVA test. Analysis of the MANOVA results were done by using the Wilk's Lambda, Hotelling's Trace and Roy's Largest Root test (Everitt & Dunn, 1991). For Work Experience as independent variable, using the alpha level of 0.05, results indicated that test results are significant. Wilk's Lambda value is .714, $F(df=36) = 1.27$, $p > .0$ which is not significant. F test indicated that there were no significant difference among the Work Experience of managers' group on a linear combination of the two dimensions of influence tactics (dependent variables). At the same, results indicated that for Work Experience variable, Roy's Largest Root value is higher than Hotelling's Trace. Roy's Largest Root value is .051, $F(df=12) = 2.14$, $p < .05$. The significant F value suggested that Work Experience categories had a significant difference with two dimensions of influence tactics. Table 5 presented the multivariate tests results for the independent variable, span of Supervision. For the span of Supervision independent variable, using Wilk's Lambda test at alpha level of 0.05, results indicated that test results are significant. Wilk's Lambda value is .726, $F(24, 1006) = 1.65$, $p < .05$. The significant F test indicated that there was a significant difference among the Work Experience of managers' group on a linear combination of the two dimensions of influence tactics (dependent variables). The Roy's Largest Root value for interaction effect between span of Supervision and Work Experience showed in Table 5. Roy's Largest Root test is at alpha level .05. Table 5 indicated that the interaction effect was significant. Roy's Largest Root test value .050, $F(12, 508) = 2.09$, $p < .05$. The results of multivariate test indicated that Work Experience and span of Supervision jointly determine the choice of twelve dimensions of influence tactics.

[Table 6]

Table 6 indicated that p-values of all the twelve dimensions of influence tactics were more than 0.05 (Levene, 1960). Hence, no heterogeneity is present in the dataset of twelve dimensions of influence tactics and data set is suitable for applying F-Test.

[Table 7]

[Table 8]

The table 7 indicated that p-value of ANOVA of independent variable Work Experience is significant for Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence tactics. Span of Supervision was significant for Exemplification influence tactic. As for span of Supervision, sig. values for Consultation Tactic and Exemplification were less than 0.05. So, there is no significant difference for Consultation tactic with Span of Supervision. Only Consultation Tactics is having significant difference among various categories of span of Supervision. In interaction effect, p-value of ANOVA was significant for Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence behaviours.

Discussion

Span of Supervision (number of subordinates with a manager) and Work Experience have important considerations on the functioning of a manager. Research has indicated that Span of Supervision is related with performance of organization, degrees of formal and informal elements with subordinates, kind of interpersonal interaction with subordinates, superiors and colleagues. In the research, we explored the impact of Span of Supervision on choice of Consultation tactics and Exemplification behavioural influence tactics. In the study, Span of Supervision as an independent variable operationally defined as the number of subordinates a manager was managing. Objective of the research was to observe the effect of Span of Supervision on choice of manager's Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence tactic. The findings indicated that Span of Supervision determined the choice Consultation and Exemplification tactics. Findings of the study indicated that as the Span of Supervision of managers increased, choice for Consultation tactic and Exemplification also increased. MANOVA test result also indicated the relationship between Span of Supervision and choice of Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence tactic. Latane (1981) observed that threats might be effective in a smaller span of supervision than in a larger span of supervision. Harkins and Petty (1983) suggested that impact of influence is weakened when span of supervision is large. Latane (1981) observed the phenomena of diffusion of influence in a social context. Results of the study indicated that increased Span of Supervision had increased the use of Consultation tactic and Exemplification. These tactics are soft tactics not hard tactics of influence like threat etc. The result had supported the Latane (1981) assertions on relationship between choice of influence tactics and Span of Supervision. The result also supported the Harkins and Petty (1983) assertions on 'diffusion of influence' theory. As Large Span of Supervision has a diffusion impact, so managers preferred Consultation tactic and Exemplification tactic. The result found that as Span of Supervision increased positive influence tactics like Consultation tactic and Exemplification increased.

The study also explored the relationship between Work Experience and behavioural influence tactics. Work Experience (independent variable) is operationally defined as an amount of time (no. of years) a manager has spent in an organization. Results of MANOVA test found the effect of Work Experience on choice of Consultation tactic and Exemplification influence tactics. It was found that managers' choice for Consultation tactic and Exemplification increased as managers' experience had increased. Previous research has indicated that Work Experience had positive correlation with entrenched relationship, increase tie with organization, competence, positive behaviour and performance (Granovetter 1985; Rousseau & Mclean Parks, 1993; Salancik, 1977). It opined that the positive behaviour of managers' increased use of

influence tactics like Consultation tactic and Exemplification. Vecchio and Boatwright (2002) studied the relationship between work experience and leader's use of influence tactics. They found managers' with greater work experience expressed less preference for task oriented behaviours. Vecchio and Boatwright (2002) findings were validated by findings of the research. The empirical confirmation of the analysis revealed, as managers' Work Experience increased more soft tactics (relationship oriented) like Consultation tactic and Exemplification increased.

Consultation tactic and Exemplification were explained with the positive relationship with Span of Supervision and Work Experience. Both these independent variables (Span of Supervision and Work Experience) were also to some extent related. As the manager's Work Experience increased the Span of Supervision also increases. Hence, Consultation tactic and Exemplification both had showed positive relationship with both the independent variables. Interaction effect were also significant for both Consultation tactic and Exemplification.

Limitations and directions for future research

As this study is based on cross-sectional data, future studies can be conducted on data based on longitudinal data. The longitudinal data can help to establish relationship between Span of Supervision, Work Experience, and choice of behavioural influence tactics.

The SIS has limitations due to sensitivity in measurements. Some innovative methodological initiatives might be taken to develop a more refined instrument to check the social desirability in responses in influence process research. Some new methodologies are required to overcome the bias for a proper understanding of the behavioural influence mechanism. It is advisable to introduce other methods such as observation, recording, content analysis, etc. to study the process.

Research has reported the use of influence tactics in combination. By and large, influencing others by using a combination of influence tactics remains unexplored. Future studies can design how to use SIS to study the use of combination and sequence of tactics to persuade others.

Conclusion

This study explored the relationship between Span of Supervision, Work Experience, and behavioural influence tactics (consultation tactic and exemplification). The study suggested that as Span of Supervision and Work Experience of Managers increased the choice of Consultation tactic and Exemplification behavioural influence tactics also increased.

References

- Bass, B. M. 1990. From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 18, pp. 19-32.
- Bedeian, A. G., Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. 1992. Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 40, pp. 33-48.
- Becker G. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H. & Gilstrap, J. B. 2008. A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviours. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 1080-1109.
- Cartwright, D. 1965. Influence, leadership, control. In J. G. March (Ed.) *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rank McNally.
- Carstensen, L. L., Issacowitz, D. M., & Charles, S. T. 1999. Taking time seriously: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 54, pp. 165-181.
- Cogliser, C. C. & Schriesheim, C. A. 2000. Exploring work unit context and leader-member exchange: A multi-level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 21, pp. 487-511.
- Cohen, A. 1993. Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 14, pp. 143-159.
- Coleman, J. S. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, pp. 95-120.
- Everitt, B. S. & Dunn, G. 1991. *Applied multivariate data analysis*. Edward Arnold. London.
- Fu, P. P., Kennedy, J., Tata, J., Yukl, G., Bond, M. H., Peng, T. K., & Cheosakul, A. 2004. The impact of societal cultural values and individual social beliefs on the perceived effectiveness of managerial influence strategies: A meso approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35, pp. 284-305.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, No. 3, pp. 481-510.
- Green, S. G., Anderson, S. E., & Shivers, S. L. 1996. Demographic and organizational influences on leaders-member exchange and related work attitudes. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 66, pp. 203-214.
- Groth, M., Goldman, B. M., Gilliland, S. W., & Bies, R. J. (2002). Commitment to legal claiming: influence of attributions, social guidance, and organizational tenure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 781-788.

- Guerin, B. 1995. The use of group views when giving opinions about unknown, group-salient, or neutral items. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 135, No. 1, pp. 57–61.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2014), *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Harkins, S. G. & Petty, R. E. 1983. Social context effects in persuasion: The effects of multiple sources and multiple targets. *Basic group processes*. Springer
- Jensen, J. J. 2007. Getting one's way in policy debates: Influence tactics used in group decision-making setting. *Public Administration Review*. March- April, pp. 216-227.
- Judge, T. A., Cable, D. M., Boudreau, J. W., & Bretz, R. D. 1995. An empirical investigation of the predictors of executive career success. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 485–519.
- Katz, R. 1980. Time and work: Toward an integrative perspective. *Research in organizational behaviour*, Vol. 2, pp. 37-71.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C. A., Murphy, C. J., & Stogdill, R. M. 1974. Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol. 12, pp. 62-82.
- Kipnis, D. & Schmidt, S. M. 1982. *Profile of organizational influence strategies*. San Diego: University Associates.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. 1980. Intraorganizational influence tactics explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 44, pp. 440-452.
- Kim, J. 2018. The effects of relative organizational tenure on job behaviour in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 335-355.
- Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 343–356.
- Leong, J. L. T, Bond, M. H. & Fu, P. P. 2007. Perceived effectiveness of influence strategies among Hong Kong managers. *Asia Pacific Journal Manage*. Vol. 24, pp. 75-96.
- Levene, H. 1960. Robuse tests for equality of variances. In I. Olkin (Ed.) *Contributions to Probability and Statistics*. Stanford University Press.
- Lu, S. Bartol, K. Venkataramani, V. Zheng, X. & Liu, X. 2019. Pitching novel ideas to the boss: The interactive effects of employees' idea enactment and influence tactics on creativity assessment and implementation. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 62, No. 2, pp 579-606.
- McDaniel, M. A., Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. 1988. Job experience correlates of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73, No. 2, pp. 327–330.

- McEnrue, M. P. 1988. Length of experience and the performance of managers in the establishment phase of their career. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 31, pp. 175-185.
- Myers M. B., Griffith D. A., Daugherty P. J., & Lusch R. F. 2004. Maximizing the human capital equation in logistics: Education, experience, and skills. *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 25, pp. 211-232.
- Nafukho F. M., Hairston N., & Brooks K. 2004. Human capital theory: Implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International*, Vol. 7, pp. 545-551.
- Newton, J. W., & Mann, L. 1980. Crowd size as a factor in the persuasion process: A study of religious crusade meetings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 874-883.
- Ng T. W. H., & Feldman D. C. 2010. Organizational tenure and job performance. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36, pp. 1220-1250.
- Rousseau, D.M. & Parks, I.M. 1993. The Contracts of Individuals and Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 15, pp. 41-43.
- Salancik, G. (1977) Commitment and the Control of Organizational Behavior and Belief. In: Staw, B. and Salancik, G., Eds., *New Directions in Organizational Behavior*, St. Clair Press, Chicago, 1-54.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Yammarino, F. J. 2000. Investigating contingencies: An examination of the impact of span of supervision and upward controllingness on leaders-member exchange using traditional and multivariate within-and between-entities analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, No. 5, pp. 659-677.
- 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*, Vol. 75, pp. 246-257.
- Sparrowe, R. T., Soetjipto, B. W., & Kraimer, M. L. 2006. Do leaders' influence tactics relate to members' helping behaviour? It depends on the quality of the relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 49, No. 6, 1194-1208.
- Srivastava, S. 1998. Social influence scale. PhD Thesis, Centre of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences & Department of Psychology, University of Allahabad, Allahabad.
- Tedeschi, J. T., Schlenker, B. R. & Lonskolds, S. (1972). The exercise of power and influence: The sources of influence. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.) *The Social Influence Process*. Aldine, Chicago.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Boatwright, K. J. (2002). Preferences for idealized styles of supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 13. No. 4, pp. 327-342.

- Yukl, G. & Falbe, C. M. 1990. Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 75, No. 2, pp. 132-140.
- Yukl, G. 1989. Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 251-289.
- Yukl, G., & Chavez, C. 2002. Influence tactics and leader effectiveness. In L. Neider, & C. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Research in management* (Vol. 2, pp. 139-165). Charlotte: 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*. Vol. 26, No. 6, pp. 705-725.
- Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F. & Chavez, C. 2008. Validation of the extended influence behaviour questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 609-621.

Table 1
Model Summary for Consultation Tactics

Model Summary^b

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>	<i>Durbin-Watson</i>
1	.824 ^a	.679	.651	.86891	1.966

a. Predictors: (Constant), Span of Control, Organizational Tenure

b. Dependent Variable: Consultation Tactics

Table 2
ANOVA Results for Consultation Tactics

ANOVA^a

<i>Model</i>		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	Regression	6.121	2	3.061	4.054	0.018
	Residual	394.867	523	.755		
	Total	400.989	525			

a. Dependent Variable: Consultation Tactics

b. Predictors: (Constant), Span of Control, Organizational Tenure

Table 3
Path Coefficients for Consultation Tactics

Coefficients^a

<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Collinearity Statistics</i>	
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>			<i>Tolerance</i>	<i>VIF</i>
1	(Constant)	3.273	.112		29.150	.000		
	Organizational Tenure	.812	.031	.802	2.399	.017	.978	1.023
	Span of Control	.766	.061	.720	2.728	.007	.978	1.023

a. Dependent Variable: Consultation Tactics

Table 4
Model summary for Exemplification

Model Summary^b

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>	<i>Durbin-Watson</i>
1	0.822	.675	.661	1.22401	1.966

a. Predictors: (Constant), Span of Control, Organizational Tenure

b. Dependent Variable: Exemplification

Table 5
ANOVA Results for Exemplification

ANOVA^a

<i>Model</i>		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	Regression	11.906	2	5.953	3.973	0.019
	Residual	783.556	523	1.498		
	Total	795.462	525			

a. Dependent Variable: Exemplification

b. Predictors: (Constant), Span of Control, Organizational Tenure

Table 6
Path Coefficient for Exemplification Tactics

Coefficients^a

<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Collinearity Statistics</i>	
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>			<i>Tolerance</i>	<i>VIF</i>
1	(Constant)	2.568	.158		16.237	.000		
	Organizational Tenure	.722	.044	.712	2.808	.005	.978	1.023
	Span of Control	.715	.086	.701	2.175	.019	.978	1.023

a. Dependent Variable: Exemplification

Table 7
MANOVA Results

Multivariate Tests^a

<i>Effect</i>		<i>Value</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Hypothesis df</i>	<i>Error df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.870	1712.114 ^b	2.000	513.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.130	1712.114 ^b	2.000	513.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	6.675	1712.114 ^b	2.000	513.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	6.675	1712.114 ^b	2.000	513.000	.000
Organizational Tenure	Pillai's Trace	.020	1.738	6.000	1028.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.980	1.743 ^b	6.000	1026.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.020	1.749	6.000	1024.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.020	3.490 ^c	3.000	514.000	.000
SpanofControl	Pillai's Trace	.013	1.694	4.000	1028.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.987	1.693 ^b	4.000	1026.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.013	1.691	4.000	1024.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.010	2.667 ^c	2.000	514.000	.000
Organizational Tenure * SpanofControl	Pillai's Trace	.017	.723	12.000	1028.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.983	.723 ^b	12.000	1026.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.017	.723	12.000	1024.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.014	1.178 ^c	6.000	514.000	.000

a. Design: Intercept + OrganizationalTenure + SpanofControl + OrganizationalTenure * SpanofControl

b. Exact statistic

c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

Table 8
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Consultation Tactics	7.859 ^a	11	.714	.934	.507
	Exemplification	30.747 ^b	11	2.795	1.879	.040
Intercept	Consultation Tactics	2246.125	1	2246.125	2936.709	.000
	Exemplification	1430.677	1	1430.677	961.624	.000
Organizational Tenure	Consultation Tactics	.153	3	.051	3.067	.020
	Exemplification	15.535	3	5.178	3.480	.016
Span of Control	Consultation Tactics	4.079	2	2.039	3.667	.007
	Exemplification	2.365	2	1.183	4.795	.005
Organizational Tenure * Span of Control	Consultation Tactics	1.257	6	.210	3.274	.009
	Exemplification	10.366	6	1.728	3.161	.003
Error	Consultation Tactics	393.130	514	.765		
	Exemplification	764.715	514	1.488		
Total	Consultation Tactics	6959.800	526			
	Exemplification	5098.160	526			
Corrected Total	Consultation Tactics	400.989	525			
	Exemplification	795.462	525			

a. R Squared = .620 (Adjusted R Squared = .601)

b. R Squared = .639 (Adjusted R Squared = .618)