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Abstract
This paper examines the relationship between leadership styles and downward influence tactics on its outcome. The moderating effect of the subordinates’ competency level is explored in this literature review to develop the proposed framework. Propositions are postulated linking leadership styles, downward influence tactics, subordinates’ competency level and organizational citizenship behavior. Implications for research and practice are also discussed.
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1. Introduction and Objective of the Study
Recent research efforts have sought to examine the specific influencing tactics used by superiors to effect changes in the decision and actions of their subordinates. These proactive actions have been termed as influence tactics (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Mowday, 1978). Influence occurred when an influence leader behavior designed to alter a member behavior or attitudes (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy as cited in Wren, 1995). Although in many situations the word “influence” is used interchangeably with power and influence tactics (Pfeffer, 1981; Mintzberg, 1973, 1983), Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Morrman and Fetter (1990) demonstrated that power alone is not enough in describing a leader’s effectiveness in influencing people. Effective leaders must have the ability to recognize when to use different tactics of influence as well as the skill necessary to effectively carry out these influence attempts (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, 1998; Bolino & Turnley, 2003).

A number of researchers have identified categories of proactive behaviors called influence tactics used by superior with different target and objectives (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Erez & Rim, 1982; Erez, Rim & Keider, 1986; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984). More recently, there have been several researchers suggested that leadership research needs to focus more on “fundamental” issues, such as influence processes that characterize leader-follower interaction (Bass, 1990; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Yukl, 1989). Research has shown that leaders’ effectiveness with subordinates depends heavily on their abilities to accomplish things through subordinates (Uytterhoeven 1972; Ruello, 1973). Consequently, the more the leader enters into a set of reciprocal relationships, the more the leader becomes skillful in influencing the subordinates. Moreover, in terms of using downward influence tactics effectively, several empirical studies offer strong support for the idea that the most effective leaders in organizations understand the nature of influence, “what” influence tactics are available to them, and “how” and “when” to use those tactics (Case, Dosier, Murkison & Keys, 1988; Kaplan, 1986; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1978; Schilit & Locke, 1982; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). These works seems to infer that influence is important in all human relationships.

There have been few studies done to investigate the superior downward influence tactics in Malaysian work settings with relates to leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. There is no study been done to
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investigate subordinates’ competence level as moderator. Thus, this research is carry out with an intention
to achieve greater understanding of adopting the appropriate downward influence tactics and leadership
styles to enable the superiors to better achieve their objectives in maintaining organizational citizenship
behavior. Secondly, this research is conducted in Malaysian cultural setting with diverse social and
organizational culture. It will be interesting to look at how Malaysian workforce responds to different
influence tactics as social behavior is usually implanted and entrenched in a given society. The research is
important to address question confronting our industrial society concerned with the issue on how can the
skills of managers be enriched so as to make it possible for them to act with greater proficiency when their
contributions are from dealing with and through people especially their subordinates. One way of looking
into this issue is from the “influence” perspectives of the interpersonal interactions that occur across
organizational levels characterized by the phrase “superior-subordinate relationships”.

In fact, there is a significant focus of interpersonal relationship researches due to our belief that sound
superior-subordinate relationships are important and consistent with humanistic and cooperative work
environment sought by contemporary managers. It is also believed that positive interpersonal relationship
at workplace is able to increase subordinates’ organization citizenship behavior (OCB). The subordinates
with high levels of OCB are more likely to be committed to the organization (William & Anderson, 1991;
Smith, Organ & Near, 1983). Therefore, it is worthwhile for the superior to be aware of the existence of
multiple sources of influence in work situations and how it promote subordinates’ OCB since negative
outcome itself could lead to many organizational dysfunctions such as decline in work performances,
absenteeism and high turnover (Lamude, 1994; Motowidlo, 2003). According to Williams and Anderson
(1991) superior’s tactics of influence with subordinates and subordinates’ OCB are inter-related. Different
approach of influence styles can trigger negative consequences, which further increases sensitivity and
susceptibility to misunderstanding, which in turn increases dissatisfaction. Thus, prevention of
subordinates’ negative outcome is important when deals with different influence tactics. This becomes a
vicious cycle that many organization leaders need to address downward influence tactics and its
consequences more systematically.

On the other hand, there was a substantial amount of the research attention in the context of upward
influence directional. Little attention has been given in linking the types of downward influence styles.
Knowing how downward influence tactics related to transformational or transactional leadership,
competence level and its consequence will enable the superior to change or maintain his/her influence
tactics to achieve the desirable outcomes. Thus, this study seeks to find out the correlate and outcome of
downward influence that would ultimately contribute to the knowledge of organizational management and
behavior in this area.

Research Questions
The delineation of research question is to find out the downward influence tactics employed by superior in
the Malaysian companies, what are the correlate and consequence of influence tactics and how it affects
subordinates. This research also provides information about the appropriateness and effectiveness of each
style as it pertains to specific outcome (Yukl, Kim & Falbe, 1996). This study also sought to answer the
following research questions.

• Are there any predictable relationships between leadership styles, downward influence tactics and
  subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour?
• Can leadership styles be predictors of the exercise of downward influence tactics and
  subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour?
• Are there any significant differences in subordinates’ organizational citizenship behaviour when
  subjected to downward influence tactics?
• What is the distribution of the use of downward influence tactics in Malaysian companies?
• Can subordinates’ competence level moderate the relationship between the leadership style and
  downward influence tactics?

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review
The following sections provide the theoretical foundation and review of the relevant constructs and
variables as well as their interactions as shown in Figure 1. The main part discusses the constructs and
variables, their known relationships, theoretical perspective that link downward Influence tactics and those
that contribute in explaining the determinant and outcome of downward influence tactics such as leadership styles and organizational citizenship behaviour as well as subordinates’ competence level as moderator plays in this relationship.

Figure 1: Proposed Model of Downward Influence Tactics and Interactions

Influence and Influence Tactics
Kipnis et al. (1980) labels of assertiveness, coalitions, exchange, ingratiation, rationality and upward appeal represent a broad segment of the influence tactic literature. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) replicated the study of Kipnis et al. (1980) and developed new items to measure the same subscales. Yukl and colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993; Yukl, Kim & Falbe, 1996) examined influence tactics from the perspectives of both agent and target and also extended the work of Kipnis et al. (1980) by identifying the additional tactics of inspirational appeal, consultation, legitimating, pressure, and personal appeal. Yukl and Falbe (1990) determined that inspirational appeal and consultation were the most frequently used in downward influence tactics. For the purpose of this study, the researchers have chosen Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) downward influence tactics. It is among the most popular downward influence used in research. In fact, Yukl and his colleagues model was based on Kipnis et al. (1980) influence styles. This work leads them to identify the primary tactics leaders used in downward direction is defined in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Definition of Influence Tactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Appeals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Yukl & Falbe (1990) and Yukl & Tracey (1992)

Leadership Styles
Past researchers have studied on transactional leadership as the core component of effective leadership behavior in organizations prior to the introduction of transformational leadership theory into the literature (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; House, 1977). Transactional leadership is based on exchange relationship
subordinates agreed with, accepted, or complied with the superior in exchange for rewards, resources or the avoidance of disciplinary action (Podsakoff, Todor & Skov, 1982; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Previous research has shown transactional contingent reward style leadership to be positively related to followers’ commitment, satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior and performance (Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; Hunt & Schuler, 1976; Podsakoff, Todor, Grover & Huber, 1984; Goodwin, Wofford & Whittington, 2001).

More recently, there are many empirical work on transformational leadership focused on the extent to which transformational leadership augments the effect of transactional leadership in explaining various outcomes. For example, leader effectiveness (Hatter & Bass, 1988), subordinate satisfaction (Seltzer & Bass, 1990) and subordinate effort (Bass, 1985), and little is known about the transformational-transactional leadership and the influence tactics although there are several writers highlighted the important of studying power and influence processes (Bass, 1990; Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Yukl, 1989). These recommendations seem particularly relevant for transformational leadership research as the literature suggests that (1) the pursuit of visionary influence objectives is a distinguishing feature of transformational leadership, (2) transactional and transformational leaders employ different kinds of influence strategies to obtain follower conformity, and (3) transactional and transformational leaders elicit different patterns of follower conformity (Kelman, 1958; Howell, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986). This new genre of leadership advocates that transformational leaders can motivate followers to perform beyond the normal call of duty. There is also considerable empirical support that such leaders produce leadership effects such as high follower motivation, satisfaction, and commitment (Reimers & Barbuto, 2002; Deluga, 1988; Lok & Crawford)

Subordinates’ Competency Level
Superior exercises of influence styles can be affected by subordinates’ competence level. If subordinate competence level is high, superior may use soft tactics such as inspirational appeal and consultation (Snyder & Bruning, 1985). On the other hand, assuming subordinates’ competency is low, superior may be expected to use hard tactics like pressure (Salam, 1998). This could be due to superior who lack confidence in their own capabilities may feel threatened by highly competent subordinates.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)
Bateman and Organ (1983) introduced the construct of OCB, drawing upon concepts of super role behaviors presented by Katz and Kahn (1966). Examples of employees OCB include, accepting extra duties and responsibilities at work, work overtime when needed, and helping subordinates with their work (Masterson, Lewis, Goldman & Taylor, 1996; Organ, 1988). Determining why individuals engage in OCB has occupied a substantial amount of research attention in both organizational behavior and social psychology (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; McNeely & Meglino, 1994). Most research on OCB as focused on individual antecedents. For example, researchers have suggested that there is a relationship between OCB and satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983) commitment (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986), perceptions of fairness (Folger, 1993; Martin & Bies, 1991; Moorman, Rohit & Zaltman, 1993; Tepper & Taylor, 2003), perceptions of pay equity (Organ, 1988).

3. Hypothesized Relationship
Leadership Styles and Downward Influence Tactics
Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) have conceptualized the transactional and transformational leadership. Burns (1978) viewed transformational leadership as a process of activating followers’ higher level needs by inspiring higher ideals and raising moral consciousness. Burns contrasted the heroic, agent of transformational leadership with the transactional leader, who invokes exchange processes in order to satisfy followers’ self-interests (i.e., exchanging pay and other benefits for follower effort). According to Bass (1985), transactional leadership enhances the likelihood that followers will display expected levels of performance (by providing desired rewards contingent on acceptable performance and by clarifying role expectations when followers do not meet performance standards). Transformational leadership involves heightening follower motivation to accomplish goals that exceed expectations by instilling pride and confidence, communicating personal respect, facilitating creative and critical thinking and providing inspiration. However, transformational leaders frequently employ transactional behaviors to accomplish routine tasks (Avolio & Bass, 1988).
It may be predicted that transactional leaders frequently exert influence by offering to reciprocate or exchange favours (i.e., exchange tactics). Transactional leader employs exchange tactics including promises of future commitments and personal incentives to gain the subordinates help. Previous research suggests that when transactional leaders believe that softer tactics are unlikely to be effective, they resort to legitimating tactics (Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Legitimating also may be efficacious for influencing subordinates to comply to the requests mandated by organizational policies, rules, or procedures (Kipnis, 1984). Study by Vroom and Jago (1988) showed a link between legitimating to authoritarian leadership. This implied that legitimating influence tactics is associated with transactional leadership. Finally, pressure tactic may be the most effective strategy for influencing subordinates by using demands, persistence, and repeated requests when subordinates “sit and wait for others to take the necessary initiatives imposed by the tasks” (Avolio, 1999, p. 38). Study by Tepper (2000) has provided support that transactional leaders employed pressure tactics more frequently than transformational leaders.

However, it may be expected that transformational leaders employ more personally involving influence tactics (e.g., personal appeals, inspirational appeals, consultation, and rationality) than their transactional counterparts (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, 1998). There are several reasons for suspecting an association between influence tactics and transformational leadership. Leaders’ behaviours that inspire others to change their beliefs and values (Bass, 1997) reminiscent of inspirational appeal. Inspirational appeals refer to the use of values and ideals to arouse an emotional response in the subordinates (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Seifert, 2002). The request is presented in such a way that it resonates with the subordinate’s needs, values and ideals. Inspirational appeals are known to be an effective tool to raise the subordinate’s enthusiasm towards the request (Yukl et al., 1996). Transformational leader inspires and challenge subordinates to achieve beyond their self-expectations by raising their self-confidence (Bass, 1997, 1998). Thus, inspirational appeals tactic is expected to be associated with transformational leadership who often communicate with vivid imagery and symbols in a way that generates enthusiasm (Yukl, 2002). In addition, transformational leader should be more likely to influence subordinates by getting them personally involved and committed to a project through consultation tactics, including participate them to contribute and suggest ways to improve a proposal or help plan an activity (Yukl, 2002; Yukl et al., 1996; Yukl & Seifert, 2002; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Furthermore, transformational leader who take into account individual subordinate’s accomplishment by praising and flattery to make them feel liked by the superior can show a positive effects on work outcomes (Higgins, Judge & Ferris, 2003). Ingratiation involves flattery and favours doing enhancing managerial liking of the subordinate. Therefore, it was hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 1a: Transactional leadership is positively associated with exchange, legitimating and pressure tactics.
Hypothesis 1a: Transformational leadership is positively associated with inspirational appeal, consultation and ingratiation.

In addition, superior reacts differently to different subordinates’ competence level. Lowin and Craig (1968) have reported in their field experiment that supervisors reacted more warmly and collegially to a subordinate when the latter worked efficiently. Greene (1975) in a longitudinal study concluded that managers initiated more structure and showed less consideration for sub-part performers. Subordinates competence level also raise the question whether leadership styles and influence tactics differ when a leader deal with low competence subordinates as compared to high competence subordinates. After all, the contributions of relatively low competence subordinates are expected to be inferior. If transactional leader uses pressure tactics to force low competence to comply, this may result in negative outcome. It will be easier for a leader to decide the types of influence tactics should be used to handle less competent subordinates, because these tactics will allow the superior to decide if, and to what extent, the influence will be accepted by subordinates. Therefore, subordinate competence level i.e. the extent to which subordinates is effective in doing their work is suspected to moderate the relationship between leadership styles and downward influence tactics. Past research has shown that this variable tend to be correlated (Payne & Pugh, 1976). Therefore, it was hypothesized that;

Hypothesis 1c: Subordinate’s competence level will moderate the relationship between leadership
styles and downward influence tactics.

**Leadership styles and Organizational Citizenship Behavior**

We will test the hypothesis about the relationships between both transformational and transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Transformational leadership has been consistently linked to followers’ higher level of OCB (Geyer & Steyrer, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivusubramaniam, 1996; Onnen, 1987). On the other hand, transactional leadership has been negatively link to follower low level of OBC (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Graham (1988) has suggested that the most important effects of transformational leadership behavior should be on extra-role behaviors that exceed the requirements of in-role expectations. These extra role behaviors are best articulated by the OCB construct developed by Organ (1988); Deluga, (1995), Organ and Konovsky (1989), Podsakoff et al. (1990). OCB refers to the behavior of an employee that is discretionary, not rewarded or recognized in an explicit way the organization, and tends to promote efficient and effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). Results of past research show transformational leadership behavior to have a positive relationship with OCB (Graham, 1988; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Whittington, 1997). Although the relationship between transactional leadership and OCB has not been empirically examined, Graham (1988) suggests that the instrumental compliance to obtain rewards required by transactional leadership may suggest a reduction in OCB when working for a transactional leader.

OCB is behavior, largely discretionary and seldom included in formal job description. Transformational leaders motivate followers by getting them to internalize and prioritize a larger collective cause over individual interests. Individuals who are intrinsically motivated to fulfill a collective vision without expecting immediate personal and tangible gains may be inclined to contribute toward achieving the shared workplace goal in ways that their roles do not prescribe. These individuals make these contributions because their senses of self-worth and self-concepts are enhanced in making these contributions. Individuals for whom this link between the interests of self and others has not been established are less likely to make largely discretionary, non-tangibly rewarded contributions. A positive association between transformational leadership and OCB is expected and has been supported empirically (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990). Thus, the hypothesis is stated as follows:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Transformational leadership style is positively correlated with OCB whereby, transactional leadership style is negatively correlated with OCB

**Downward Influence Tactics and Outcome**

Organizational influence researchers (e.g. Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Lepsinger & Lucia, 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Pfeffer 1981) generally assert that superior who exhib its inspirational appeal, consultation and ingratiation tactics are more prone to foster a cordial dyadic relationships among superiors and subordinates. These tactics are related to an effective influence management. Conceptual and empirical research on influence tactics and OCB have flourished concurrently but only recently have their conceptual overlaps in behaviour and motive content been pointed out (e.g., Bolino, 1999; Eastman, 1994; Ferris, Bhawuk, Fedor & Judge, 1995). Because of the past investigation of influence tactics and OCB separately, little is known about their level of distinctiveness. This omission represents a research need because both of these categories of behaviour are common within organizations and both have been found to be associated with supervisor-subordinate relationship quality and important organizational outcomes.

The current study was designed to address this gap in the literature by evaluating whether or not supervisor downward influence tactics and OCB are distinct constructs and whether they have a differential impact on superior-subordinate relations. Researchers have found that influence tactics are often used by superiors as a means of obtaining personal goals, promoting their own self interest, exercising social control, and changing the behaviour of others (Ferris & Judge, 1991; Ferris, Russ & Fandt, 1989; Kipnis et al., 1980; Barry & Watson, 1996). The successful used of these tactics tend to be able to reduce resistance by the subordinates' (Pfeffer, 1981; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Initial conceptual and theoretical work in influence tactics research suggested that ingratiation by superior would enhance supervisor-subordinate relationship (Jones, 1964; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Ingatiation tactics used by superior to impress
their employees with the objective of being better liked (Kipnis et al., 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Wayne & Liden, 1995). These tactics include flattery, favour-doing, emphasizing what they have in common with their subordinates and de-emphasizing their differences (Krone, 1992). Research has demonstrated that these tactics are effective in gaining positive outcomes from the subordinates.

On the other hand, researchers have generally maintained that OCB demonstrated by employee arises from a sense of obligation and from personality traits (Bolino, 1999). Social exchange theory is the basis for arguing this behavior (Niehoff, 2000). According to Blau (1964) and Organ (1988) the employment relationship engenders feelings of personal obligation when subordinates are treated well by superiors feel obligated to discharge their obligation by engaging in extra-role behaviours directed at helping others and the organization. Several studies on the inspirational appeal and consultation and ingratiation tactics show consistent results in subordinates’ OCB (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Likewise, other studies recorded that superior uses pressure, legitimating and exchange tactics are linked to negative effect on subordinates’ OCB (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Schriesheim & Hinkin 1990). Thus, it can be hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4a: Superior’s inspirational appeal, consultation and ingratiation have direct and positive effect on organization citizenship behavior.

Hypothesis 4b: Superior’s exchange, legitimating and pressure tactic have negative effect on organization citizenship behavior

4. Methodology and Research Design

Sampling Design
The sampling population is generated from the master list of factories registered with the Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers (FMM). We include manufacturing companies with the number of employees greater than 30 as our sample because this number chosen can reflect a more formalized structure and system of supervision that likely to exist and functioning. The sample size would be 350 respondents from executives, managers and professionals in Malaysian manufacturing companies to answer the survey questionnaires as they represent a group of more educated people who are more aware of the types of influence tactics used by their superiors. The stratified random sampling procedure will be used in selecting samples from the large database.

Research Instruments
Each of the measurements of relevant constructs was discussed here.

Downward Influence Tactics
Yukl’s Influence Behaviour Questionnaire-2000 (IBQ-2000) was used to measure downward influence tactics.

Leadership Styles
Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Morrman & Fetter (1990) transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI) was used to measure the leader behaviors in this study. The scale measures six dimensions of transformational leadership, including articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, having high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and providing intellectual stimulation. Previous research (cf. Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff et al. 1990) has provided strong evidence supporting hypothesized factor structure, internal consistency reliability, and concurrent and discriminant validity of the scale. A four-item contingent reward behavior scale (e.g., Podsakoff, Toddor, Grover & Huber 1984; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986) was used to assess the degree to which a leader provides positive feedback, such as recognition, informal rewards and approval, contingent on high performance levels. Contingent punishment was assessed with three items form Podsakoff et al.’s (1984) contingent punishment scale. Prior research (Podsakoff et al. 1984; Podsakoff, MacKenzie & Fetter, 1993; Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie & Williams, 1993) has shown these two scales to be unidimensional to possess good psychometric properties.
**Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)**

OCB scale was measured using a 7-item scale developed by Smith, Organ and Near (1983). The scale measures high and low of OCB. Respondents indicated the frequency in which they had engaged in the various citizenship behaviours. Responses were made on a 7-point scale. The coefficient alpha was .76 for altruism and .66 for compliance.

**Subordinates' Competence Level**

Wagner and Morse’s (1975) self-report measure of individual sense of competence was used to measure employee task competence in lieu of a more direct measure of competence level. Thirteen items were extracted from their larger pool of items for used based upon their factor loadings as reported in Wagner and Morse (1975). A sample item stated, “I honestly believe I have all the skills necessary to perform this task well.” All items were scaled on 7-point agree-disagree rating scales. Evidence pertaining to the reliability and predictive validity of this measure is located in several sources (Morse, 1976; Tharenou & Harker, 1984; Wagner & Morse, 1975).

**Data Analysis Procedure**

The main statistical techniques used will be the Path Analysis. Other statistical analysis to be employed is correlational analysis, moderated regression analysis, and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

**5. Benefit and Implications of the Proposed Research**

There are several specific implications expected from the present study. First, the research suggests that when the superior has a choice in the influence styles he/she emphasizes to achieve greater satisfaction with his/her supervision. For example influence attempt such as inspirational appeal, consultation and ingratiation tactics are expected to be more favourable than exchange, legitimating and pressure tactic. Second, in the selection of superior to lead a division of work, especially when the work group is highly experience and skilled, it is expected that certain characteristics or ability will assist in the management of such work group effectively. It may affect the influence style and the outcomes in a direct or indirect way.

Interaction or moderation effect of subordinates’ competence level are investigated and expected to shed light on how the variable provide direct and indirect effects on downward influence tactics and the outcomes. In an attempt to solicit subordinate super-ordinate effort in the organization, both satisfaction and OCB are included in the outcome variables of the study. Relationships must exist to highlight the relevant leadership and influence tactics that promotes such behaviour in the organization and this will have great practical significance.
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