Determination of the Relationship between Employee Exchange Influence tactics on Career Success in Nandi Hekima Sacco Limited, Kenya

[*]Sonoi A. Chepkosgei[1] Kering A. Kimeli[2]

[1,2]*Department of Business Management University of Eldoret, P.O.Box 1125-30100, Eldoret, Kenya*
Corresponding Author: Sonoi A. Chepkosgei[1]

Abstract: *The objective of the study was to determining the relationship between employee exchange influence tactics and career success. The study adopted a survey research design. Questionnaires were used to collect data and analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Scientists. The results of this study showed a positive relationship between influence tactics and career success ($F=8.727$, $R^2=0.214$, $P=0.006$), it was then recommended that, there is need for management to consider employee personal reputation as an integral component of career success and by extension organizational success.*
Keywords: *employee exchange, career success, influence tactics*

I.   INTRODUCTION

Influence is one among the most important determinants of managerial effectiveness (Yukl, 2002). The success of a subordinate to influence the target person depends on the tactics used by the subordinate. Influence tactics are classified based on their effectiveness on specific behavior (Yukl & Chavez, 2002). If a subordinate wishes to influence someone to carry out an immediate request, then he/she will use proactive tactics. Reactive tactics may be used to resist unwanted influence attempts.

Early research by Kipnis, Schmidt, Wilkinson (1990) identified several distinct types of proactive influence tactics for upward influence attempts with a boss that included; Rationality (The argent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show that a request or proposal is feasible and relevant for important task objectives). Exchange (The agent offers something to the target person to reciprocate at a later time, if the target will do what the agent requests).Ingratiation (The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an attempt to influence the target person to carry out requests or support a proposal). Pressure (The agent uses demands, threats, and persistent reminders to influence the target to do something). Consultation (The agent asks the target person to suggest improvements or help plan a proposed activity or change for which the target person's support is desired). Assertiveness (The agent forces the target person to get what he/she wants). Coalition (Agent uses support of others as to influence the target).

These classifications have been adopted by researchers studying impression management and development of personal reputation (McFarland, 2007; Tsai, 2010 & Zinko, 2007). Previous studies examined the directional differences in influence behavior (Yulk & Chavez, 2006; Higgins, Judge & Ferris., 2003; Yukl & Tracy, 1992). Their findings showed that, use of influence tactics is connected to hierarchical relationship between the agent and the target. There also was a report that tactics could be classified as strong, weak and rational where hard tactics signified use of authority and power, soft tactics involved the use of personal power and rational tactics relied on the use of logic. Studies on categories of tactics grouped by Fu(2002) to examine strategies used by supervisors on their subordinates allows investigation of combined tactics, as most managers tend to use more than one influence tactic.

Riggio (2008) suggested that, choice of agents' influence tactic is based on his/her evaluation of the parameters of leader-member relationship including the relative status of each individual. Success of an influence tactic is dependent on factors such as relative power of parties, the direction of influence attempt and the political skill of the influencer (Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony & Gilmore, 2003). Choice of influence tactic also affects the success of an influence attempt.

Even though these influence tactics have been proposed and believed to be relevant in organizational setting, only self-promotion and ingratiation have received substantial attention in literature (Yukl, 2005). In a study to examine the relationship between LMX and subordinate use of impression management with the boss (Wayne & Ferris, 2005) it was found that ingratiation correlated positively with LMX. Although more studies suggested a link between LMX and influence tactics, only ingratiation and assertiveness tactics used in upward influence attempts with superiors were examined.

A study by Yulk (2005) provided an extensive coverage of ingratiation literature and included self-promotion as a tactic of ingratiation. However, empirical evidence provided by Higgins, Chad & Judge (2003) show that self-promotion and ingratiation are indeed distinct influence tactics and should be treated as such. Therefore, theoretically and conceptually, it is important to distinguish self-promotion and ingratiation as independent influence tactics. Yulk (2003) found that, using a single tactic such as consultation was more effective than a single hard tactic such as self-promotion. This implies that, different tactics have differing degrees of effectiveness.

Despite vast research on the effects of influence tactics on work outcomes for some time now, there has been little attention devoted to obtaining a comprehensive assessment of the effects of influence tactics on career outcomes (Higgins, Judge & Ferris, 2003). In addition, previous attempts to analyze the effects of influence tactics have suffered several shortcomings that limit the confidence one can have in the results of such studies (Higgins, Judge, Ferris & Chad, 2003). Ng (2005), suggested that, influence tactics generates positive perception in others and may also enhance individual's subjective judgments about career attainments such as career satisfaction.

In a qualitative study investigating success of high-reputation managers in a plant, benefits of technology and newest analytical tools did not seem to be effective in influencing the success of plant managers but effective application of political skill did (Smith, Donde, Quinn, 2009). Managers show consistent patterns "interpersonal styles and abilities to influence others organizational politics". This is borrowed from the theory by Minzberg (1985) that organizations are inherently political and managers gain competitive advantage by acquiring political skills.

Organizational politics have been described as exercise of influence through persuasion, manipulation and negotiation. Organizational politics are now broadly seen to include those activities used to advocate for goals and influence that earn an individual a favorable image (Bendoly, 2008). Although use of influence tactics have been reported to be important in aligning strategic operations and management priorities (Bendoly, 2008) strategic management has only associated it with strategic level management. Lower level management has not been looked into to see how they apply their influence tactics not just upwards but to enhance success in their careers.

Career success refers to real or perceived achievements individuals have accumulated as a result of their work experiences (Judge, Cable, Boudreau & Bretz, 1995). Career success can be viewed as intrinsic or extrinsic. Extrinsic career success is observable and consists of highly tangible outcomes such as pay and ascendancy. Intrinsic success is individual's appraisal of his/her success and most commonly expressed in terms of job, career or life satisfaction (Judge, Higgins & Chad, 2005).

Career success is determined by factors such as combination of specific competencies and a performance record, along with network development, organizational politics and reputation building. Career success is not only determined by traditional factors including job-related skills and performance records but also by networking, politics and social effectiveness (Sorensen & Feldman, 2005). Political perspectives of organizational politics argue that performances, promotions, compensation which manifest career success are strongly affected by organizational politics.

Today's competitive environment calls for social effectiveness to facilitate effective interpersonal interactions and career progression (Ferris, Treadway, 2005). Socially effective individuals pose social awareness that enable them to adjust and calibrate behavior to different situations in a genuine and sincere manner. The competencies of these individuals inspire others and as such performances and career success evaluations decisions makes through linkages such as reputation (Perrewe, 2007).

Personal reputation build by socially effective individuals tend to be effective because they make use of network-building activities and influence tactics to transmit signals that establish a favorable image to recipients (Ferris, 2007). It has been suggested that, socially effective individuals form strong relationships with supervisors in order to get rewards associated with their personal reputations. Social activities of employees play an important role in shaping perceptions and assessment of their characters and potentials. Perceptions influence the degree to which individuals are successful in their careers through their ability to obtain organizational resources such as rewards and positions (Judge, 2007). Empirical evidence shows that, there is a link between career success and tactics of influence (Ferris, 2003) although consideration has been give to ingration and self-promotion.

Organizational politics especially those linked to human resource decisions are so prevalent such that perceptions of raters exhibit more influence on decisions than the target employees behavior and aggregate contribution (Ferris, Basik & Buckley, 2008). From organizational politics perspective, careers can be seen as political campaigns (Inkson, 2004) involving contact hunting, self promotion (Higgins et al., 2003) and use of influence tactics (Ferris, 2007). The success of such campaigns depends on individual competencies that enable the effective management and projection of positive image across work environments that influence the assessment of performance and career potential. Empirical evidence show social effectiveness to be related to

salary, promotion, and career satisfaction (Ng, 2005) yet the research is limited in scope and focused on general organization politics.

1.1 Methodology
Survey research design was used in the study to predict the past and present reputations of employees in Nandi Hekima Sacco. Regression analysis and other statistical tools were applied. Primary data was collected using questionnaires that formed the primary source of data.

1.2 Model specification
To determine the cause-effect strength of influence tactics and career success, simple linear regression was used. The regression equation $(CS=\beta_1 +\beta_2 TAC+E)$
Where CS= Career success, $\beta_{1=}$ Y Intercept, β_2=Gradient of the regression, TAC= Influence Tactics and E= error term normally distributed about a mean of 0.
The data was then analyzed with the aid of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 and the results appropriately interpreted.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

2.1 Exchange Influence Tactics Used by Employees

The tactics used by the employees to influence their career success were evaluated and the results are as shown in Table 4.3. To determine the influence tactic with the highest frequency, multiple set analyses was done and frequencies obtained were as shown in Table 4.3. The study sought to investigate the influence tactic mostly used by employees to influence success in their careers. The results in Table 4.6 show that, the most frequent influence tactic (75.8), friendliness and consideration for others is used by employees to influence perception of others. Employees share experiences with others (63.6). Influential employee gives good technical advice (60.6%).

Table 3.1: Exchange Influence Tactics Used by Employees to influence Career Success

Influence Tactics	Frequency of Cases (N)	Percent of Cases (%)
The Employee:		
Places organizations' interest before his/her interest	8	25.0
Possesses the required skills and knowledge	22	66.7
Is friendly and has consideration for others	25	75.8
Is trustworthy, honest and believable	21	63.6
Perform the required tasks independently and accurately	22	66.7
Gives me good technical advice	20	60.6
Shares with me his/her experiences in training	21	63.6
Provides me with sound job related advice	19	57.6
Ask feedback from colleagues	19	57.6

Influential employees possess the required skills and knowledge66.7%. Most influential employees place organizational interest before their own interest25.0%. Employees who are influential ask feedback from colleagues57.6%.

2 .2 Career Success

The respondents were asked to rate their perception on the evaluated employee's career success using a five point likert-scale. The responses were then analyzed using multiple response analysis and the frequencies captured in Table 4.4. The results in Table 4.4 show that the most prevalent characteristic of career success exhibited by the evaluated employees is high productivity with a frequency whose percentage is 60.7%. Having greater promotions than non-social employees was deemed to be the least exhibited attribute shown by the evaluated employees with the lowest frequency of 2 and a percentage of 7.1%.

Table 3.2: Employee Career Success

The Employee:	Frequency (%)	Percentage of Cases (%)
Has higher salary compensation than non-social employee	2	7.1
Has greater promotions than non-social employees	6	21.4
Productivity his high	17	60.7
Provides subordinates with sound job related advice	13	46.4
Completes tasks with less effort	7	25.0
Receives greater attention from elites in the organization	13	46.4
Has improved knowledge on the job	16	57.1
Is more visible in the organization	17	60.7

(Source: Primary data 2013)

1.3.3 Correlation of Exchange Influence Tactics Used and Career Success
Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationships between influence tactics used by evaluated employees and career success. The correlation coefficient (r) was used to measure the strength and direction of the relationship between tactics used by evaluated employees and career success.

Table 3.3: Correlation of Exchange Influence Tactics used and career success

Correlation of influence tactics and career success			
		Tactics used by employees	Career Success
Tactics used by employees	Pearson Correlation	1	.463**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006
	N	36	34
Career Success	Pearson Correlation	.463**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	
	N	34	34

(Source: primary data 2013)

Results showed a moderate positive relationship (R=0.463, p=0.006) relationship between influence tactics used by evaluated employees and career success that was statistically significant at 99% confidence level.

1.3.4 Regression of Exchange Influence Tactics on Career Success and Hypothesis Testing
In order to investigate the relationship between influence tactics used by evaluated employees and career success, hypothesis one was set.

Hypothesis One
H_{O1}: There is no significant linear relationship between tactics used by evaluated employees and career success. Regression analysis was carried out to test the null hypothesis. From the regression output (Appendix 3) and hence the regression parameters β_1 and β_2 obtained the hypothesis was tested by constructing the following linear model: $CS = \beta_1 + \beta_2 TAC$ where: CS is Career Success (the dependent variable) β_1 is the y-intercept, β_2 is gradient of the regression line and TAC denotes Tactics (the independent variable).

The values of the coefficients β_1 and β_2 were found to be 1.328 and 0.533 respectively from the regression output in Appendix 3. Thus the linear equation relating career success and tactics used took the form $CS = 1.328 + 0.533 TAC$. This model has correlation of determination, $R^2 = 0.214$, which meant that 21.4% of the variation in career success is explained by tactics used by the employees. This model is significant (F = 8.727 and $p = 0.006$ which is less than the significance level of 0.01, and t=2.954 that is greater than the threshold of 2 for t-values) while $ß \neq 0$. Hence the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there is sufficient evidence, at 99% significance level, that there is a significant positive linear relationship between influence tactics and career success.

Summary
In reference to classification of tactics adopted by Zinko (2007), McFarland (2007), & Tsai (2010), rationality, coalition, exchange, ingratiation and consultation are used by employees to influence the perception of their supervisors. Rationality in this case was represented by use of required skills and technical advice to influence. Coalition was represented by sharing of training experiences. Exchange was reflected by giving technical advice. Ingratiation was reflected by friendliness and consideration for others and consultation was represented by asking feedback from colleagues.

Subordinates use influence tactics to develop favorable reputations and build closer relationships with their supervisors. Proactive influence tactics are used by employees to acquire immediate request from supervisors and use reactive influence tactics to resist any unwanted influence attempt from either top management or bottom management or across. Choice of influence tactic will always affect success of influence. Use of more than one influence tactic reinforces the strength of influence.

III. Conclusions And Recommendations
Q   Employees use influence tactics to generate positive perceptions in the eyes of observers that enhance judgments about their career attainments such as job satisfaction. This implies that, all influence tactics examined have a positive relationship with career success with most prevalent influence tactic (75.8%) being friendly and having consideration for others being used by employees. Organizations should therefore, be keen to create an environment that supports development of positive reputations of its employees that leads to development of careers and increased productivity.

References

[1] Bendoly, (2008) Bendoly, Bacharach D. G& Powell G., The role of operational interdependence   and supervisory experience on management assessments of resource planning systems, Journal of Operations Management 17, pp. 93–106.

[2] Ferris, G.R., Treadway, D.C., Perrewe, Douglas, C., & Lux, S. (2007). Political skill in organizations. Journal of Management, 33, 290-320.

[3] Ferris, G.r., Zinko, R.A., Brouer, R.H., Buckley, M.R., & Harvey, M.G. (2008). Strategic bullying as a supplementary, balanced perspective on destructive leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 18, 195-206.

[4] Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. Journal of Management, 31, 126–152.

[5] Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2002). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the United States and China. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 251-266.

[6] Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. A. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24,89–106.

[7] Inkson, K. (2004). Images of career: Nine key metaphors. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65, 96–111

[8] Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1990). Upward influence styles: Relationship with performance, evaluation, salary, and stress. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33, 528-542.

[9] Lewis P., Saunders M., & Adrian T., (2009). Research Methods for Business Studies, 5THED, Prentice Hall.

[10] McFarland, L.A., Yun, G., Harold, C.M., Viera, L. & Moore, L.G. (2007), "An examination of impression management use and effectiveness across assessment center exercises: the role of competency demands", Personnel Psychology, Vol. 58, pp. 949-81.

[11] Mugenda. O.L, & Mugenda. A.G., (2003). Research Methods; Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, African Center of Technology Studies , Nairobi

[12] Riggio, R. E., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The emotional and socialintelligences of effective leadership. Journal of Managerial Psychology,23, 2, 169-185.

[13] Saunders, M; Lewis,L and Thornhill,A. (2009) Research Methods for Business Students(4thEdn). Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.

[14] Smith, A. D., Plowman, D., Duchon, D., & Quinn, A. (2009). A qualitative study of high-reputation plant managers: Political skill and successful outcomes. Journal of Operations Management, 27,   428–443.

[15] Sorensen L T., & Feldman, D.C.(2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 58, 367-408.

[16] Tsai, W., Huang, T., Wu, C. & Lo, I. (2010). Disentangling the Effects of Applicant Defensive Impression Management Tactics in Job Interviews. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 18: 131-140.

[17] Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. S., Liden R. C. (1997). "Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective." Academy of Management Journal 40, 82-111.

[18] Yukl, G., & Chavez, C. (2006). Influence tactics and leader effectiveness. In L. L. Neider & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), Leadership (pp. 139-165). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

[19] Yukl, G., Macdonald., & Seifert, C. F. (2005). Assessing the construct validity and utility of two new influence tactics. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(6), 705−725.

[20] Yukl, G., & Chavez, C. (2002). Influence tactics and leader effectiveness. In L. L. Neider & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), Leadership (pp. 139-165). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

[21] Zinko, R. A., Ferris, G. R. , Blass, F. R. , & Laird, M. D. (2007). Toward a theory of reputation in organizations. In J.J. Martocchio (Ed.) Research in personnel and human resources management. Oxford, UK: JAI Press/Elsevier Science Ltd