

**MANAGERS IN THE NAFTA COUNTRIES:  
A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES  
TOWARDS UPWARD INFLUENCE STRATEGIES**

CAROLYN P. EGRI  
Simon Fraser University

DAVID A. RALSTON  
University of Oklahoma

CHERYL S. MURRAY  
Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce

JOEL D. NICHOLSON  
San Francisco State University

**Abstract**

This paper presents a cross-cultural comparison of U.S., Canadian-Anglophone, Canadian-Francophone and Mexican managers' attitudes towards upward influence strategies. Generally, it was found that all four groups have similar perspectives in terms of the relative acceptability of various influence strategies. However, examination of absolute ratings of influence behaviors suggests that Canadian-Francophones could serve as a cultural "linking-pin" along a continuum anchored by Anglo cultures at one end and the Latin American culture of Mexico at the other. Implications for cross-cultural interactions within the NAFTA region are discussed.

Key words: Upward influence tactics; Cross-cultural attitudes; Managers; NAFTA

Ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) created one of the largest markets in the world. The member nations (Canada, the U.S., and Mexico) consist of 375 million consumers and have a combined GNP in excess of US\$6.5 trillion. This historic agreement removes many barriers to trade and investment among the member nations, and in turn, open access to this huge internal market should help make many firms in the NAFTA region more globally competitive through economies of scale and rationalized production (Jain and Ralston, 1996). During the first five years of the NAFTA (1 January 1994 to 31 December 1998), total trade in goods and services among the three member nations increased by approximately 76% to more than US\$531 billion (Canada Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1999; SECOFI, 1999; U.S. Census Bureau, 1999). During the first five years of the NAFTA, Canada and the U.S. continued to be each other's largest trading partner with an 80% increase in trade resulting in an over US\$1 billion daily exchange in goods and services. Mexico is now the U.S.'s third largest trading partner (113% increase in total trade 1993-98) and Canada's third largest source of imports and tenth largest export market (39% increase in total trade 1993-98). The U.S. and Canada are Mexico's largest export markets (respectively, first and second). In 1998, 32% of the U.S.'s total world trade (compared to 28% in 1993); 82% of Mexico's total trade (78% in 1993), and 77% of Canada's total trade (74% in 1993) was with other NAFTA countries. The NAFTA has also brought significant increases in direct foreign investment within the North American region. U.S. direct investment in Canada has increased by 63% (to US\$98 billion) while Canadian investment in the U.S. has increased by 86% (to US\$85 billion). During the same period, Mexico's direct investment in Canada has tripled to US\$310 million whereas Canadian investment in Mexico has increased by 324% to US\$1.5 billion. In total, these trade and investment statistics demonstrate the strong and rapid impact of NAFTA to create a more integrated North American economy.

One implication of the strengthening of economic ties within the NAFTA region is the increased importance of developing effective working relationships across national and cultural boundaries. In particular, there is a greater need to accommodate behaviors of the other culture when individuals from

Anglo and Latin American cultures work together (Gabrielidis et al., 1997; Kelley et al., 1987; Morris and Pavett, 1992; Stephens and Greer, 1995). This mutual accommodation encompasses a vast array of managerial behaviors. One significant category of these behaviors that is an important part of a manager's effectiveness is the ability to influence other members of the organization to obtain desired outcomes (Allen et al., 1979; Kipnis et al., 1980; Mayes and Allen, 1977; Schreisheim and Hinkin, 1990; Yukl and Falbe, 1989; Yukl and Tracey, 1992).

Managers, in the attainment of their work objectives, often need to direct subordinates. Frequently these managers also need to influence their superiors, over whom they possess no formal power (Organ and Bateman, 1990). To exert this type of influence a manager must develop and utilize a set of informal influence strategies (Ansari and Kapoor, 1982; Kipnis and Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1979; Porter et al., 1981; Schilit and Locke, 1982; Tandon et al., 1991). Research comparing managers from Asian and Western cultures has shown that while they use all the various types of strategies available, national culture appears to play an important role in determining preference for certain influence strategies (Ralston et al., 1994; Ralston et al., 1993; Ralston, Terpstra et al., 1995; Schermerhorn and Bond, 1991).

The successful use of upward influence strategies has been shown to be instrumental in managers attaining desired outcomes (both professional and personal) from their superiors (Deluga and Perry, 1991). Therefore, upward influence relates to the effectiveness and success of both the organization and the individual. Since influence style is a relevant part of the overall superior-subordinate relationship, and since the ability of superiors and subordinates to function together effectively clearly affects organizational performance, managers can benefit from enhanced understanding of cultural differences in influence styles (Ralston, Terpstra et al. 1995) in order that they may appropriately exercise influence within culturally mixed situations. As such, NAFTA heightens the need for individuals from different cultures of North America to work together more closely for organizational success.

Given the importance of individuals from NAFTA countries being able to work together effectively, and given the relevance of influence style to workplace harmony and productivity, this paper will focus

upon the upward influence styles of managers from the NAFTA countries. In addition, while it can be argued that there may be regional cultural differences within the U.S.A. and Mexico, we believe that the regional difference most likely to have an impact on influence style behavior (as well as basic values) will be found in Canada. In the U.S., the predominant culture is Anglo; in Mexico, the predominant culture is Latin; but in Canada, there are two clear-cut geographically based cultural groups. The recent sovereignty association referendum held in Quebec epitomizes the substantial cultural differences between French-speaking Francophones (Latin culture) and English-speaking Anglophones (Anglo culture) (Chanlat and Bedard, 1991; Maclean's, 1995). Thus, the NAFTA alliance clearly consists of at least four distinct macro-level cultures.

Previous research has compared Americans and Canadians (Connor et al., 1993; Evans et al., 1993; O'Grady and Lane, 1992; Sirota and Greenwood, 1971; Ronen and Kraut, 1977), Anglophones and Francophones (Chanlat and Bedard, 1991; Jain et al., 1979; Kanungo and Bhatnagar, 1978; Kanungo et al., 1976; Major et al., 1994), and Mexicans and Americans (Condon, 1985; Gabrielidis et al., 1997; Kras, 1989; Morris and Pavett, 1992; Ramos, 1962; Stephens and Greer, 1995). However, with the exception of the Adler, Graham and Gehrke (1987) study on negotiation styles, no study has simultaneously compared the dynamics of the relationships among these four groups that will likely determine the success (or failure) of NAFTA. Therefore, in this study we compare attitudes towards upward influence styles of four groups of managers: Americans, Canadian-Anglophones, Canadian-Francophones, and Mexicans. Due to the limited cross-cultural influence research available for these groups, the foundation for our hypotheses of the relationships among these groups will be based primarily on the cross-cultural values research.

### **CULTURAL DIFFERENCES AMONG THE NAFTA COUNTRIES**

Ronen and Shenkar's (1985) analysis of nine cross-cultural studies identified eight country clusters and one independent group. National units for clustering were justified on the basis of the common legal,

political and social environments within national boundaries. They also identified three dimensions underlying these clusters (geography, language and religion). In this categorization scheme, the U.S.A. and Canada are situated within the Anglo country cluster while Mexico is located in the Latin American cluster. Canadian-Francophones, per se, were not included in the Ronen and Shenkar analysis. However, because of the obvious French influence for this group, we will include some discussion of French culture as a possible surrogate indicator of the Francophone culture. Thus, it is important to note that Ronen and Shenkar's Latin European cluster--which includes France--is located between the Latin American and Anglo clusters, suggesting that French cultural values are somewhere between those of Mexico, on the one hand, and the U.S.A. and the Canadian-Anglophones, on the other.

### **Differences in Managerial Values**

Looking next at the cross-cultural research by Hofstede and Bond (1988), we see data consistent with Ronen and Shenkar's country clusters. As shown in Table 1, the U.S.A., Canada, France, and Mexico differ on the cultural dimensions of power distance, individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity.

-----

Insert Table 1 about here

-----

Hofstede (1980) noted that small power distance cultures (such as the U.S.A. and Anglophone Canada) emphasize interdependence and less hierarchical organizational structures with a preference for democratic and consultative decision-making styles. In contrast, large power distance cultures (such as Mexico, and to a lesser degree France) emphasize dependence within hierarchical organizational structures and autocratic, directive, and centralized decision-making styles. Similarly, in groups which have weak uncertainty avoidance (the U.S.A. and Anglophone Canada) there is less resistance to change, a willingness to take risks, less acceptance of rules and regulations, and a view of conflict as natural and inevitable. Alternatively, groups which are characterized as having strong uncertainty avoidance (France

and Mexico) value conservatism, risk avoidance, security, and law and order through written rules and regulations.

Finally, in groups with high individualism (the U.S.A., Anglophone Canada, and to a lesser degree, France) there is a self-orientation which values individual autonomy, initiative, pleasure, security, and decision-making. In contrast, groups with low individualism (Mexico) exhibit a collective orientation that emphasizes the importance of expertise, order, and group decision-making to support the interests of one's familial in-group (e.g., nuclear family, extended family, clan). In collectivistic societies, the maintenance of strong kinship-based ties (particularism) takes precedence over other types of social, economic and institutional relationships. In high individualism cultures, in-groups may be better described as like-groups, where the relationships tend to be more numerous, segmented, transitory, and subordinate to a person's needs and goals rather than to a stable in-group. As such, high individualism is associated with the value of universalism in which institutionalized obligations are to the wider society rather than to a particular in-group (Gabrielidis et al., 1997; Hofstede, 1980, 1991; Triandis et al., 1988).

Fukuyama (1995) defined trust as shared norms concerning ethical behavior and reciprocal moral obligations, and proposed that familialism is characteristic of low-trust cultures while universalism is characteristic of high-trust cultures. In low-trust societies such as China, France and other Latin societies, the radius of trust is confined to family and kinship systems (familialism) whereas in high-trust societies such as the U.S.A., Japan and Germany, the radius of trust is non-family based and extends to the wider society (universalism). Fukuyama proposed that there is an inverse relationship between the radius of trust and the requirement for rules and coercive enforcement mechanisms to regulate institutional and societal relationships. In low-trust cultures, these additional regulatory requirements and lower "spontaneous sociability" (defined as the ability to form new groups) constrain the development of larger economic institutions, organizational innovation, and subsequently, international competitiveness.

In a preliminary test of Fukuyama's theory, Strong and Weber (1998) found that senior executives and strategic planners in large power distance cultures (including France and Mexico) had significantly higher levels of self-interest than those in small power distance cultures (the U.S.A. and Anglo-Canada). However, no significant cultural differences in self-interest were found based on individualism—collectivism. In respect to the trust dimension of beliefs about the expected conduct of others, only one significant cultural difference was found. Executives in large power distance—high individualism cultures (e.g., France, Spain) held a significantly lower level of positive belief in others than those in other culture groups. Based on their findings, Strong and Weber (1998) concluded that trust is not a culturally embedded construct but rather it is relationship specific and highly dependent on contextual factors. However, the study's small sample size (only 4 and 13 subjects in two of the four country groups) may have been a factor in the lack of statistically significant cultural differences.

In their study of U.S. firms' cross-border marketing partnerships, Aulakh et al. (1996) found that interorganizational trust was positively related with cooperative bilateral norms of continuity expectations (that the relationship would continue into the future), flexibility (willingness to make adjustments due to changing circumstances), and information exchange (formal and informal sharing of meaningful and timely information). In regards to monitoring mechanisms to deter opportunistic behavior, they found that informal social control was positively related to relationship trust and partnership performance whereas formal output control and process control were not related to relationship trust, and that output control was detrimental to performance. As identified by Aulakh et al. (1996), the most effective way to enhance inter-organizational trust and performance in cross-cultural partnerships is by creating a system of shared organizational values and beliefs (a common organizational culture) rather than through formal bureaucratic means. Their finding that U.S. firms had lower levels of trust with Central/South American firms than with Asian and European firms is especially relevant to the present study of cross-cultural differences within the NAFTA region.

In sum, we see a sharp contrast that can be used to form polar points on a continuum. At one end of this continuum is a self-oriented, high-trust culture with democratic ideals (as epitomized by the U.S.A.) and at the other end is an autocratic, group-oriented and low-trust culture (as epitomized by Mexico). Along this continuum, we now have to place the Canadian-Anglophones and the Canadian-Francophones. Previous cross-cultural studies have typically categorized Canada (more specifically English Canada) as being closely aligned to the U.S.A. in terms of cultural value dimensions (Connor et al., 1993; Hofstede, 1980; Shenkar and Ronen, 1987; Sirota and Greenwood, 1971; Ronen and Kraut, 1977). However, there have been recent studies which have identified differences in work values between Canadian-Anglophone and U.S. managers (Evans et al., 1992; O'Grady and Lane, 1992).

Within Canada, as was often argued during the Quebec separation referendum in October 1995, Quebec is a distinct society culturally, linguistically, politically, and legally (Maclean's, 1995). Unlike the rest of Canada, the province of Quebec was established as a French colony. French remains the mother language for the vast majority of Quebecers. The dominant religion in Quebec is Roman Catholic, not Protestant which is the predominant religion in the other Canadian provinces. The Quebec provincial legal system is based on the Roman Code rather than English common law principles, which is the basis of law in the other provinces. These are but a few of the differences which would suggest that Quebec has more in common with the Latin European cluster of countries (e.g., France) than the Anglo cluster of countries (Chanlat and Bedard, 1991; Ronen and Shenkar, 1985).

However, Quebec's geographic location and its close economic, political and socio-cultural linkages with English Canada and the U.S.A. may have been influential factors in shaping Canadian-Francophone cultural values. As observed by Chanlat and Bedard (1991), the collective identity of French-Canadian society has undergone significant change since 1960. While integrating the economic values of Western Anglo society during this period, there has also been an affirmation of social, cultural, and political values of earlier French-Canadian society. These findings suggest that a crossvergence effect in values formation (Ralston, Gustafson, et al., 1993a) may have occurred or may be occurring. In contrast to the

convergence hypothesis of values formation which proposes that industrialization has fueled the evolution of a common global value system (Neghandi, 1975), the crossvergence hypothesis proposes that cultural values systems change is a more selective and adaptive process. The implication is that Francophone Quebec has developed a unique cultural value system which incorporates both Anglo and Latin European values. Thus, Canadian-Francophones should be more similar to Mexican culture than either of the Anglo cluster cultures will be. On the continuum, we hypothesize that the U.S. Americans and Canadian-Anglophones will cluster near the democratic, self-oriented end of the continuum, with the Mexicans near the other end, and the Canadian-Francophones somewhere between these extremes. Thus, one question that this study explores is: to what degree do current Canadian-Francophone managers share common influence styles with their geographic, Anglo cluster counterparts and to what degree are they similar to their Latin culture counterparts? The answer to this question may have implications for the work compatibility of Canadian-Francophones with individuals from these other cultures. In effect, it may be that the Canadian-Francophones are a cultural "linking-pin" between the Anglo and Mexican cultures, as well as other Latin American cultures.

### **Differences in Managerial Styles**

In regards to cross-cultural differences in managerial styles, there have been several studies concerned with U.S. and Mexican managers. The higher authoritative orientation of Mexico compared to the U.S.A. has been confirmed by a number of researchers (Condon, 1985; Hofstede, 1980; Kras, 1989; Ramos, 1962; Stephens and Greer, 1995). In her study of U.S. and Mexican executives, Kras (1989) found that U.S. executives worked within more egalitarian work environments whereas for Mexican executives, power and authority were concentrated at the upper levels of their organizational environments. Morris and Pavett (1992) compared the management style differences and productivity in a U.S. parent plant and its Mexican maquiladora operation. They found that although labor productivity was equal at the two facilities, managers in the U.S. plant practiced a consultative managerial style whereas managers in the Mexican plant practiced more benevolent authoritative managerial styles.

In their study of managers and professionals in U.S.-Mexican joint ventures, Stephens and Greer (1995) confirmed previous findings of cultural differences in managerial styles. While Mexican managers practiced a predominantly authoritarian managerial style, those Mexican managers who worked for U.S. multinational corporations were more similar to U.S. managers than their counterparts who worked for Mexican firms. In regards to impression management, they found that U.S. managers emphasized substance (facts or content) over form (presentation) more than Mexican managers. Thus, the findings of these studies are consistent with the values research that we used to build a theoretical continuum upon which to base the relationships of the four groups for our hypotheses.

Several studies of Canadian managers have found that Canadian-Anglophones are more individualist, while Canadian-Francophones are more collectivist in their values, motivations and behaviors (Jain et al., 1979; Kanungo and Bhatnagar, 1978; Kanungo et al., 1976; McCarrey et al., 1977; McCarrey et al., 1989; McCarrey et al., 1984). In a more recent study, Major et al. (1994) found that Anglophone and Francophone public sector middle-managers were very similar in terms of their individualist-collectivist orientation. While this finding is consistent with findings from two other studies (Gosselin and McCarrey, 1980; Nightingale and Toulouse, 1977), one problematic aspect is that this sample of Anglophone managers was located in Ottawa. As the national capital city located on the border between Ontario and Quebec, Ottawa could be regarded as unique in terms of the potential for cultural convergence which draws into question these managers' representativeness of the majority of Canadian-Anglophones. Therefore, we agree with the majority of the research that indicates that the managerial style of Canadian-Francophones residing in the province of Quebec is different from that of the majority of Canadian-Anglophones (Chanlat and Bedard, 1991; Jain et al., 1979; Kanungo and Bhatnagar, 1978; Kanungo et al., 1976; McCarrey et al., 1977; McCarrey et al., 1989; McCarrey et al., 1984). Again, these findings are consistent with the theoretical continuum of value differences for these countries. Having established the theoretical relationships among the groups in our study, we will now review the upward influence research to provide a basis for the direction of our hypothesized relationships.

## **CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH ON UPWARD INFLUENCE TACTICS**

The study of upward influence tactics in organizations began decades ago, but with research done almost exclusively in the U.S. Only fairly recently has the empirical investigation of this aspect of managerial behavior been cross-culturally studied (e.g., Fu and Yukl, 1998; Schermerhorn and Bond, 1991). Thus, we begin our review using the U.S. research as a starting point, and we then move to the limited cross-cultural research that has been done during the past decade to establish the directional relationships for the dimensions of upward influence used in this study.

In U.S. studies of upward influence tactics, the frequently identified tactics are: assertiveness, sanctions, blocking, rational persuasion, exchange, coalitions, ingratiation, upward appeals, and consultation (Farmer et al., 1997; Judge and Bretz, 1994; Kipnis and Schmidt, 1988; Kipnis et al., 1980; Mintzberg, 1983; Schilit and Locke, 1982; Schriesheim and Hinkin, 1990; Voyer, 1994; Yukl and Falbe, 1990; Yukl et al., 1993). These influence tactics in turn have been grouped into meta-categories of hard tactics (those involving both position power and coercive tactics, such as blocking or blackmail), soft tactics (involving the use of personal power and power sharing, such as ingratiation, upward appeals, consultation), and rational tactics, such as rational persuasion, and exchange (Falbe and Yukl, 1992; Farmer et al., 1997; Kipnis and Schmidt, 1988). Empirical studies of preferences for different types of political tactics have shown that rational and informational persuasion tactics are generally preferred over soft, and that soft are preferred over hard tactics (Falbe and Yukl, 1992; Kipnis and Schmidt, 1988; Mowday, 1978; Schilit and Locke, 1982; Yukl et al., 1993). Yukl and Falbe (1990) have also found that the relative frequency of use of various influence tactics is consistent regardless of directionality (upward, lateral and downward).

Cross-culturally, low power distance cultures stress reward, legitimate and expert power sources while high power distance cultures stress coercive and referent power sources (Morris and Pavett, 1992). Cross-cultural research on upward influence tactics has been primarily concerned with differences

between U.S. and Asian subjects. In their comparison of U.S. and Hong Kong Chinese subjects, Shermerhorn and Bond (1991) found that U.S. subjects preferred the influence tactics of ingratiation, rationality and exchange while Hong Kong Chinese subjects preferred assertiveness. Dolecheck and Dolecheck (1987) had similar conclusions regarding U.S. and Hong Kong managers' views of ethical political behavior. Ralston et al.'s (1994) study of U.S. and Hong Kong Chinese managers' ethical perceptions of influence tactics, found significant differences for all but the personal networking tactic. Specifically, U.S. managers perceived a higher acceptability for the tactics of good soldier (getting ahead through hard work that benefits the organization), rational persuasion, image management and ingratiation. In contrast, the Hong Kong managers viewed information control and strong-arm coercion as more acceptable than U.S. managers did. In a study which compared strategies of upward influence preferences of Americans working in the U.S., expatriate Americans working in Hong Kong, and Hong Kong Chinese working in Hong Kong (Ralston, Terpstra et al. 1995), the findings of the previous study were confirmed, with two exceptions. American managers preferred personal networking more than the Hong Kong Chinese managers did, and no significant differences in preference for impression management was found. And finally, Fu and Yukl's (1998) study of U.S. and Chinese managers' preferences for various influence tactics revealed that U.S. managers had a higher preference for exchange, consultation and rational persuasion/organizational influence tactics while Chinese managers had a higher preference for coalition, personal and upward appeals, informal and rational persuasion/individual tactics. However, it should be noted that they found that U.S. and Chinese managers had similar preference rankings for influence tactics as well as no differences in their preferences for pressure, ingratiation and inspirational appeal tactics.

Studies of the business negotiation styles of Americans, Canadians and Mexicans have revealed several important cultural differences. Adler et al. (1987) conducted a 2-person, buyer-seller negotiation simulation involving businesspeople from Canada (Francophone and Anglophone), the U.S. and Mexico. The pairs in the negotiations were both from their cultural grouping. They found that American and

Canadian-Anglophone businesspeople utilized a more cooperative negotiating style while the Canadian-Francophone and Mexican businesspeople utilized a more competitive negotiating style. In their study of American and Mexican students' preferred conflict resolution styles, Gabrielidis et al. (1997) found that Mexican students scored higher on accommodation and collaborative styles which are concerned with others' outcomes. Even so, both American and Mexican students' order of preferences were similar in that collaboration and accommodation styles were preferred over avoidance and competition styles. Adler and Graham (1989) examined differences between intra-cultural and cross-cultural negotiations between U.S. and Japanese businesspeople, and between Canadian-Anglophone and Canadian-Francophone businesspeople. They found that Canadian-Francophones adopted a more cooperative problem-solving approach when engaged in cross-cultural negotiations whereas there were no significant behavioral changes for the other three groups

### **HYPOTHESES**

While previous cross-cultural research studies on upward influence tactics have not included either Canadian-Francophone or Mexican subjects, they do offer guidance in formulating hypotheses for this study. As identified by Hofstede (1980) and Ronen and Shenkar (1985), the Hong Kong and Mexican cultures are similar in three respects. They are both large power distance, low individualism and moderately masculine cultures. The one cultural dimension on which they are different is uncertainty avoidance--Hong Kong is low while Mexico is high. Given these similarities, it is expected that Mexican managers would have views similar to Hong Kong managers concerning the acceptability of various upward influence tactics. Based on previous cross-cultural values research, we would expect that members of hierarchical, collectivistic and low-trust cultures (such as Mexico and Hong Kong) would find hard influence tactics involving the use of position power and coercion to be relatively more acceptable than would members of egalitarian, individualistic and high-trust cultures (such as the U.S.A. and Anglophone Canada). Alternatively, we would expect that members of egalitarian, individualistic

and high-trust cultures view rational and soft influence tactics (which rely heavily on the use of personal or individual power sources) as being relatively more acceptable than would members of hierarchical, collectivistic and low-trust cultures.

In respect to American and Canadian-Anglophone managers, previous cross-cultural research (Adler et al., 1987; Connor et al., 1993; Hofstede, 1980; Shenkar and Ronen, 1987) suggests that these two groups will be very similar in their views of upward influence tactics. In regards to Canadian-Francophone managers, ascertaining their position on the acceptability of upward influence tactics is more complex. On the one hand, Major et al. (1994) found that Canadian-Francophone and Canadian-Anglophone managers are very similar in terms of their work and personal values. On the other hand, Adler et al. (1987) found that the negotiating style of Canadian-Francophone businesspeople was very similar to that of Mexican businesspeople and significantly different from their Canadian-Anglophone and American counterparts. While negotiating is only one type of influence tactic, it is expected that Canadian-Francophones would be more like Mexicans in terms of this and other types of upward influence tactics.

In this study, the perceptions of the relative acceptability of following types of upward influence strategies were studied: Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior; Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior; Destructive/Legal Behavior; Destructive/Illegal Behavior. Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior is viewed as the "organizational man" approach to upward influence because it prescribes behaviors that tend to be directly beneficial to the organization. For example, such behaviors include self-enhancement and personal ingratiation tactics such as volunteering for high profile projects, helping subordinates develop their skills, developing mentor relationships, and maintaining good working relationships with others in the organization. Non-Destructive Legal Behaviors epitomize the "me first" approach in that these behaviors show self interest being above the interests for others or the organization, but are behaviors that tend not to be harmful to the organization, and may actually turn out to be beneficial to the

organization. These behaviors include impression management tactics which promote one's visibility and reputation in the organization (although sometimes at the expense of others).

Destructive Legal Behaviors can be categorized as the "get out of my way or get trampled" approach because, while these behaviors are basically legal, they often tend to directly hurt others or the organization. These tactics would include information control and manipulation tactics such as obtaining and communicating information to discredit others, withholding information that would benefit others, and putting false information on a job resume. Finally, Destructive Illegal Behaviors identify a "burn, pillage and plunder" approach to gaining influence, because these behaviors which are harmful to others also tend to be illegal. This dimension includes coercive tactics such as blackmail, stealing valuable corporate documents and harassment. In sum, the four dimensions of the Influence Style Hierarchy constitute a continuum of ethical and moral behavior within organizations with Organizationally Sanctioned Behaviors at one end representing the most ethical influence style and Destructive/Illegal Behaviors at the other end representing the least ethical and moral influence style.

Research utilizing the Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions has been conducted with U.S. and Hong Kong managers (Ralston et al., 1994). They found that American managers viewed Organizationally Sanctioned behavior as more ethically acceptable than did Hong Kong managers. Alternatively, Hong Kong managers viewed Destructive/Legal and Destructive/Illegal behaviors as more ethical than did the American managers. No significant cross-cultural difference in acceptability was observed for the Non-Destructive/Legal behavior dimension.

To develop the directionality of our hypotheses, we extrapolated from previous research findings and those of the Ronen and Shenkar country cluster relationships which show the Far East, Latin American, Latin European, and Anglo clusters arranged in that order. Thus, one would expect that Mexican and Canadian-Francophone managers would share somewhat similar views as to the ethics of these influence behaviors. Similarly, American and Canadian-Anglophone managers would share a

common ethical perspective. In respect to the ethical acceptability of these types of behaviors, the hypotheses to be tested in this research study are the following:

Hypothesis 1: American and Canadian-Anglophone managers will find **Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior** more acceptable than will Canadian-Francophone managers, while Canadian-Francophone managers will find them more acceptable than Mexican managers.

Hypothesis 2: American and Canadian-Anglophone managers will find **Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior** more acceptable than will Canadian-Francophone managers, while Canadian-Francophone managers will find them more acceptable than Mexican managers.

Hypothesis 3: Mexican managers will find **Destructive/Legal Behavior** more acceptable than will Canadian-Francophone managers, while Canadian-Francophone managers will find them more acceptable than Canadian-Anglophone and American managers.

Hypothesis 4: Mexican managers will find **Destructive/Illegal Behavior** more acceptable than will Canadian-Francophone, while Canadian-Francophone managers will find them more acceptable than Canadian-Anglophone and American managers.

## METHODOLOGY

### Sample

Subjects for this study were 714 full-time managers and professionals in the United States, Mexico and Canada (Anglophones and Francophones) and were obtained in the following manners. The American sample were randomly selected (using SPSS random selection procedure) from a larger database consisting of 1184 managers located in all regions of the U.S.A. This database was obtained using a mail survey to U.S. managers who had been identified through a professional database service. These questionnaires were mailed out to the managers during 1995 with a response rate of 28%.

The Mexican sample was obtained with the assistance of Cendex, the Center for Export Development at the Central Zone of the ITESM system. In 1995, a Spanish language version of the questionnaire was sent out to 500 managers of middle-sized business firms. Eighty-eight questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 17.6%. In early 1996, a second wave of 175 questionnaires were sent out to Mexican managers resulting in an additional 93 questionnaires (response rate = 53%). In the second wave, all respondents were called twice to ask them to remember to return the survey. No significant demographic or attitudinal differences were found between the two Mexican data collections. Thus, they were combined for a total of 181 Mexican managers.

The Canadian-Anglophone sample was obtained by sending an English language version of the questionnaire to alumni of an Executive MBA program located in Western Canada. Of the 455 survey questionnaires which were mailed out in 1995, 188 usable questionnaires were received for a total response rate of 41%. The Canadian-Francophone sample was obtained by sending a French language version of the questionnaire to MBA alumni of a major Francophone university in Quebec. Of the 476 questionnaires that were sent out in late 1995, a total of 177 usable questionnaires were received for a response rate of 37%.

To ensure the cultural representativeness of samples, subjects were removed if they were not citizens of their respective country. In addition, subjects were removed from the Canadian-Francophone sample if their mother language was not French and they had not spent the first 15 years of their lives in Quebec. Canadian-Anglophone subjects who had spent the first 15 years of their lives in Quebec or were currently employed in Quebec were also removed from the sample. As a result, the study sample was reduced to 198 Americans, 164 Canadian-Anglophones, 173 Canadian-Francophones, and 179 Mexicans.

As can be seen in Table 2, there were a number of differences in subjects' demographic characteristics among the four groups (all group differences significant at the  $p < .05$  level). Compared to subjects in the other three groups, the Mexican group was significantly younger in age ( $F = 79.03$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and held lower level positions in their organizations ( $F = 97.15$ ,  $df=9$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The Canadian-

Anglophone group was also significantly older than either the Canadian-Francophone or American groups. The American and Mexican groups had a greater proportion of females than the Canadian-Anglophone group which in turn had relatively more females than the Canadian-Francophone group ( $F = 67.27, df=3, p<.001$ ). In respect to organizational size, the American and Canadian-Anglophone subjects were currently employed in larger organizations than the Mexican and Canadian-Francophone subjects ( $F = 117.03, df=6, p<.001$ ). Given the demographic differences between the groups, these factors were controlled for in the data analyses.

-----

Insert Table 2 about here

-----

### **Instrument**

One concern in comparative cross-cultural research is the equivalency of organizational constructs and measures across culturally diverse groups (Riordan and Vandenberg, 1994). To ameliorate this concern, the Strategies of Upward Influence (SUI) instrument utilized in this study is a cross-culturally developed measure of attitudes towards upward influence tactics. Briefly, the instrument development process employed a nominal group technique (NGT) process using practicing managers to identify upward influence tactics that were subsequently used to create the 38 scenario items. This development process began with U.S. and Hong Kong managers (see Ralston et al., 1994; Ralston, Terpstra et al., 1995) and was later expanded to include managers from Germany and France. Factor analysis was utilized to allocate the 38 items to the four Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions (see Appendix A). For the Canadian-Francophone and Mexican subjects, the English language version of the Strategies of Upward Influence questionnaire was translated into and back-translated from both French and Spanish. Differences between the translation and the back-translation were reconciled by the translator, back-translator and a third person fluent in the relevant languages.

In a study of this nature which deals with the sensitive information of upward influence attempts, a further concern is the possibility of subjects "faking" desirable responses (Anastasi, 1982). To mediate the threat of social desirability bias (especially in respect to coercive influence tactics), subjects were asked to indicate how acceptable each of the 38 items on the Strategies of Upward Influence instrument were for co-workers to use as a means of influencing a superior. The value '8' indicated that the item was extremely acceptable, while the value '1' indicated that an item was extremely unacceptable. Thus, the higher the score, the greater was the acceptability of the influence tactic. By asking subjects to indicate the acceptability of the use of these tactics by co-workers rather than report on activities that they personally engage in, the goal was to make subjects more willing to respond candidly - even if in reality, they were responding about themselves.

### **Procedure**

As identified by other cross-cultural researchers (Leung and Bond, 1989; Ralston, Cunniff and Gustafson, 1995; Smith et al., 1996), there are often cultural differences in responses to questionnaire scale items administered in different languages. This source of cultural bias draws into question the direct comparison of mean scores between subjects from different cultures. To eliminate this cultural response bias, subjects' scores for each influence dimension were converted to standard scores using the following procedure. Within each cultural group, the overall means and standard deviations for the 38 Strategies of Upward Influence items were calculated. Then, subjects' scores for each dimension were converted to standard scores using the following equation:

$$SS_{(i,j)} = [S_{(i)} - \mu_{(j)}] / \sigma_{(j)}$$

where,  $SS_{(i,j)}$  = the subject's standard score for dimension  $i$  in group  $j$ ,  $S_{(i)}$  = subject's score for dimension  $i$ ,  $\mu_{(j)}$  = overall mean of Strategies of Upward Influence item scores for group  $j$ , and  $\sigma_{(j)}$  = overall standard deviation of item scores for group  $j$ . The resulting standard score represents the relative acceptability of an influence tactic or strategy for subjects within each group.

The second step of the analysis was to examine the relative rankings in acceptability for the four Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions for managers in the four groups. The third step was to perform a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance with the four Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions as the dependent variables and the four demographic variables of age, gender, position level, and organizational size entered as covariates. If the MANCOVA was significant, ANCOVAs for the dependent measure dimensions were conducted. Finally, for ANCOVA analyses found to be significant, Duncan multiple comparison tests were conducted to identify group differences among the four groups of managers.

## RESULTS

The internal reliability for the Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions were: Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .78$ ); Non-Destructive Legal Behavior ( $\alpha = .67$ ); Destructive Legal Behavior ( $\alpha = .81$ ); and Destructive Illegal Behavior ( $\alpha = .88$ ). These scale reliabilities compare favorably with those obtained by Fu and Yukl (1998) in their study of U.S. and Chinese managers' preferences for influence tactics. As shown in Table 3, the mean rankings of standard scores obtained for each group reveals that the rank order of acceptability of the four Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions is as follows: Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior > Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior > Destructive/Legal Behavior > Destructive/Illegal Behavior. The significant Kendall's coefficients of concordance among the rankings (Siegel and Castellan, 1988) suggests that there is substantial agreement among managers in the four country groups on the relative acceptability of these influence strategies. However, group comparisons of mean rankings indicate significant differences in the absolute acceptability of all influence strategies (all Kruskal-Wallis  $\chi^2$  significant at  $p < .001$  level).

-----

Insert Table 3 about here

-----

The MANCOVA for the influence style hierarchy dimensions was significant (overall Wilks

$\lambda = .9805$ ,  $F = 2.9308$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The only significant covariate was age, which was negatively related to scores on the Organizationally Sanctioned ( $p < .01$ ) and Non-Destructive Legal ( $p < .05$ ) Behavior dimensions. None of the other covariates (gender, position, and organizational size) attained significance. The means, standard deviations and ANCOVA results are presented in Table 4. The effect sizes (eta-squared) indicate that with the exception of the Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior dimension, cultural group has a significant effect on perceptions of the acceptability of these different influence styles.

-----

Insert Table 4 about here

-----

Specifically, on the Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior dimension, Canadian-Anglophone managers scored significantly higher than the U.S. managers who scored higher than the Canadian-Francophone managers who in turn, scored higher than the Mexican managers ( $F = 43.36$ ,  $p < .001$ ). In respect to both the Destructive/Legal Behavior ( $F = 31.40$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and Destructive/Illegal Behavior ( $F = 134.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ) dimensions, Mexican managers scored significantly higher than Canadian-Francophone managers who scored higher than both American and Canadian-Anglophone managers. The only significant covariate in these ANCOVAs was age which was negatively related to scores on the Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior ( $t = -3.09$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior ( $t = -2.35$ ,  $p < .05$ ) dimensions. There were no other significant main or interaction effects observed.

In summary, strong support was found for the hypothesized group differences for three of the four Influence Style Hierarchy dimensions. The results for Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior (Hypothesis 1), Destructive/Legal Behavior (Hypothesis 3), and Destructive/Illegal Behavior (Hypothesis 4) support the crossvergence perspective in that the Canadian-Francophone manager group appears to be a linking-pin between the Anglophone cultures and the Mexican culture. In addition, the lack of cultural group difference on the acceptability of Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior (Hypothesis 2) supports the cultural convergence perspective for this type of influence style as also found by Ralston et al. (1994).

One unexpected finding was the significant differences between the U.S. and Canadian-Anglophone managers. Although it was hypothesized that these two managerial groups would have similar scores, the Canadian-Anglophone group had more extreme scores (in the hypothesized directions) than the American group on all but one influence style dimension. Given the absence of any significant interactions between group and age, these findings challenge the hypothesized universality of these Anglo cultures in respect to attitudes towards upward influence strategies.

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The findings of this study offer several insights into cross-cultural similarities and differences in attitudes towards upward influence behaviors tactics, in general, and for organizations within the NAFTA region, in particular. First, this study found that American, Canadian (Anglophone and Francophone) and Mexican managers share a common perspective on the relative acceptability of various types of influence strategies. Previous research has indicated a similar trend for Asian (China, Hong Kong and India) and European (Germany and the Netherlands) managers (Fu and Yukl, 1998; Ralston et al., 1994; Ralston et al., 1997), thus providing preliminary evidence that an acceptability hierarchy of influence behaviors may be universal.

However, as revealed by the inter-group differences in this study as well as previous ones, the degree of relative acceptability that a culture attaches to these general categories of influence style can vary significantly. Specifically, this study found significant differences between Canadian-Anglophone, U.S., Canadian-Francophone and Mexican managers in terms of the absolute acceptability of different types of upward influence behaviors. This study's findings provide moderate support for the crossvergent perspective (Ralston, Holt et al., 1995) in that the Canadian-Francophones appear to be a cultural "linking-pin" in influence styles between the Anglo and Mexican cultures in North America. As such, they can be regarded as a "Janus" who faces and understands the other more divergent cultures and can play an important role in facilitating effective work relationships in joint ventures, business negotiations and other organizational interactions that involve members of more divergent cultural groups. For

example, a national Canadian firm may find it strategically advantageous to utilize Canadian-Francophones in negotiating business contracts with Mexican firms. Interestingly, these findings also suggest that U.S. culture may be a "linking-pin" between Canadian-Anglophone and Canadian-Francophone managers in this regard. As found in a number of previous studies (Adler and Graham, 1989; 1987; Evans et al., 1992; O'Grady and Lane, 1992), there are significant differences in work-related values, attitudes and behaviors between Canadian-Anglophone and U.S. managers. One implication for managerial practice is that U.S. and Canadian-Anglophone managers should not assume that they hold the same attitudes even though they share a common language.

Additionally, the attitudinal differences between the two Canadian groups demonstrates the importance of understanding regional cultural differences, as also found in previous studies (Adler et al., 1987; Jain et al., 1979; Kanungo and Bhatnagar, 1978; Kanungo et al., 1976; McCarrey et al., 1977; McCarrey et al., 1989). The findings of these more recent studies sharply contrast with the earlier work of Hofstede (1980) that suggests all of Canada is similar to the U.S., when in fact, both Canadian subcultures are different from the U.S., although in different directions. One possible explanation for the attitudinal differences between the Canadian Anglophone and Francophone managers could be that the political issues separating the Anglophones and Francophones in Canada might be causing the Francophone minority to move toward solidarity of its culture with an "us-versus-them" mentality, rather convergence with the ideas and values of the Canadian-Anglophone culture. Therefore, this study reinforces the importance of understanding the unique circumstances of the groups under study, as well as the phenomenon being analyzed. The implications for companies operating within Canada are that there appears to be two distinct managerial sub-cultures that have substantively different perspectives on interpersonal interactions, and that not understanding these differences may lead to less than productive relationships.

### **Directions for Future Research**

The present research demonstrates that there are cross-cultural differences in attitudes towards various upward influence tactics. In focusing on attitudes rather than self-reports of influence behaviors, this study minimized social desirability bias, especially in respect to coercive influence tactics. As suggested by Ajzen (1991), the potential problem of tenuous attitude-behavior linkages was addressed in this study by focusing on specific (rather than global) attitudes towards specific behaviors. Even so, future research is needed to determine the extent to which these cultural differences in attitudes are reflected in actual managerial influence behaviors as well as the efficacy of various influence strategies to obtain desired outcomes. The findings from this study, which examined cross-cultural differences, identifies the need for further research in at least two areas. First, research is needed to examine regional and subpopulation differences in influence styles within countries, as well as in all members of the global economic community. Second, research is needed to better understand the control mechanisms that best regulate these cross-cultural influence relationships.

**Exerting influence across cultures.** Further research is needed to explore the effect of upward influence behaviors across cultures. This study investigated cultural differences in influence strategy preferences where the initiator and target of an upward influence tactic were in the same organization and most likely, members of the same cultural group. As such, this study provides important information regarding cultural group differences in intra-cultural relationships. However, to what extent are these findings generalizable to intercultural relationships where the initiator and the target are from two different cultures? While further empirical research is needed to definitively answer this question, previous cross-cultural research would lead us to expect the following. As proposed by Fukuyama (1995), one important characteristic of high-trust cultures is their spontaneous sociability to form new groups based on an alignment of interests rather than on stable in-groups. Coupled with Adler and Graham's (1989) study of business negotiation styles, we would expect few, if any, differences between the intra-cultural and intercultural upward influence strategies of members of high-trust U.S. and Canadian-Anglophone cultures. In contrast, collectivistic low-trust cultures' emphasis on loyalty to and

identification with one's familial in-group suggests that the relative acceptability of coercive or unethical upward influence strategies would be higher in situations involving members of cultural out-groups (Fukuyama, 1995; Gabrielidis et al., 1997; Hofstede, 1980; Triandis et al., 1988). Although this would be expected for Mexicans in intercultural relationships, it is less clear whether this would also be the case for Canadian-Francophones. While Adler et al. (1987) found Canadian-Francophones were similar to Mexican managers in terms of their negotiating styles, this study found that Canadian-Francophones' attitudes towards upward influence strategies were most often in-between and significantly different from both Anglophones and Mexicans. Even though Adler and Graham (1989) found Canadian-Francophones were more cooperative in intercultural negotiations than in intra-cultural negotiations, further research is needed to confirm whether this is also true for Canadian-Francophones' upward influence strategies.

**Identifying effective control mechanisms.** Although it is predicted that experience and time will ameliorate cultural-ethical issues (Shenas, 1993) as well as result in an international convergence of values and behaviors among those engaged in cross-cultural relationships (Strong and Weber, 1998), the case of the Canadian-Francophones argues that at best, there will be a selective crossvergence of cultural values. Thus, one managerial implication of the relatively higher acceptance of unethical upward influence strategies in intercultural relationships with organizations in low-trust cultures is the need for control mechanisms to regulate relationships. As found by Aulakh et al. (1996), social control mechanisms are more effective than process or output control mechanisms in enhancing inter-organizational trust and organizational performance. Thus, concerted efforts to develop a mutual organizational culture based on common values, beliefs, behavioral norms and practices would be advisable. The first step in this process could be a culture audit to determine facets of cultural convergence and divergence with potential partner organizations. The next step would be making explicit mutually acceptable managerial practices and codes of conduct. The importance attributed to kinship and friendship ties in Mexican culture (Gabrielidis et al., 1997) suggests that developing personal and social relationships would be an essential aspect of cross-cultural organizational relationships. In

effect, the impetus would be to widen the radius of trust to encompass an organizational culture ingroup to counterbalance societal familialism.

### **A Final Thought**

In summation, this study has shown that while there are substantial cross-cultural similarities in terms of relative preferences for various upward influence tactics, the observed attitudinal differences suggests that the NAFTA alliance is still a multi-cultural one. Thus, for companies to be successful in doing business with another member of the alliance it is necessary to be aware of not only national differences, but also regional and subpopulation differences such as the Canadian Anglophone-Francophone contrasts in influence styles highlighted in this study. Our findings also raise questions as to whether the Francophones could serve as a cultural linking-pin, not because they are too much like the majority Anglo-Canadian culture, but because they may be too dissimilar from it. To more fully test the impact of the NAFTA partnership on the upward influence tactics of its members, longitudinal research is needed to determine if the increased cross-cultural contact among these groups due to the NAFTA partnership has moved these managers even more toward a crossvergent perspective than has already taken place. Thus, it should prove interesting to replicate this effort in three to five years to evaluate whether the current cross-cultural differences remain.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J., Graham, J.L., 1989. Cross-cultural interaction: The international comparison fallacy? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20, 515-37.
- Adler, N.J., Graham, J.L., Gehrke, T.S., 1987. Business negotiations in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. *Journal of Business Research*, 15, 411-29.
- Ajzen, I., 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50, 179-211.
- Allen, R.W., Madison, D.L., Porter, L.W., Renwick, P.A., Mayes, B.T., 1979. Organization politics: Tactics and characteristics of its actors. *California Management Review*, 22, 77-83
- Anastasi, A., 1982. Psychological testing (2nd ed.). MacMillan: New York.
- Ansari, M.A., Kapoor, A., 1987. Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 39-49.
- Aulakh, P.S., Kotabe, M., Sahay, A., 1996. Trust and performance in cross-border marketing partnerships: A behavioral approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(5), 1005-1032.
- Canada Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 1999. *The NAFTA at five years: A partnership at work*. Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Canada.
- Chanlat, A., Bedard, R., 1991. Managing in the Quebec style: Originality and vulnerability. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 21(3), 10-37.
- Condon, J.C., 1985. *Good neighbors: Communicating with the Mexicans*. Intercultural Press: Yarmouth, ME.
- Connor, P.E., Becker, B.W., Kakuyama, T., Moore, L.F., 1993. A cross-national comparative study of managerial values: United States, Canada, and Japan. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 8, 3-29.

- Deluga, R.J., Perry, J.T., 1991. The relationship of subordinate upward influence behavior, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 239-52.
- Dolechek, M.M., Dolecheck, C., 1987. Business ethics: A comparison of attitudes of managers in Hong Kong and the United States. *Hong Kong Manager*, 1, 28-43.
- Evans, W., Lane, H.W., O'Grady, S., 1992. *Border crossings: Doing business in the U.S.* Prentice-Hall Canada: Scarborough, ON.
- Falbe, C.M., Yukl, G., 1992. Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 638-52.
- Farmer, S.M., Maslyn, J.M., Fedor, D.B., Goodman, J.S., 1997. Putting upward influence strategies in context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(1), 17-42.
- Fu, P.P., Yukl, G., 1998. Impact of national culture on managerial influence tactics: A comparison between the United States and China. Paper presented at the 1998 Academy of Management Meetings, San Diego, CA.
- Fukuyama, F., 1995. *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity.* New York: The Free Press.
- Gabrielidis, C., Stephan, W.G., Ybarra, O., Dos Santos Pearson, V.M., Villareal, L. 1997. Preferred styles of conflict resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 661-677.
- Gosselin, A., McCarrey, M.W.. 1980. L'orientation motivationnelle au travail de professeurs de langue seconde francophones et anglophones. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 12, 384-92.
- Hofstede, G., 1980. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.* Sage: Newbury Park, CA.
- Hofstede, G., 1991. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* New York: McGraw Hill.

- Hofstede, G., Bond, M.H., 1988. The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 12-13.
- Jain, H.C., Normand, J., Kanungo, R.N.. 1979. Job motivation of Canadian Anglophone and Francophone hospital employees. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 11, 160-3.
- Jain, S.C., Ralston, D.A., 1996. *The North American Free Trade Agreement: An overview*. In: S.C. Jain, D. A. Ralston, NAFTA: A three-way partnership for free trade and growth. University of Connecticut: Storrs, CT.
- Judge, T.A., Bretz, Jr., R.D., 1994. Political influence behavior and career success. *Journal of Management*, 29, 43-65.
- Kanungo, R.N., Bhatnagar, J.K., 1978. Achievement orientation and occupational values: A comparative study of young French and English Canadians. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 12, 384-92.
- Kanungo, R.N., Gorn, C.J., Dauderis, H.J., 1976. Motivational orientation of Canadian Anglophone and Francophone managers. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 8, 107-21.
- Kelley, L., Whatley, A., Worthley, R., 1987. Assessing the effects of culture on managerial attitudes: A three-culture test. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18(2), 17-31.
- Kras, E.S., 1989. *Management in two cultures*. Intercultural Press: Yarmouth, ME.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., 1988. Upward-influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluations, salary, and stress. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 528-42.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., Wilkinson, I., 1980. Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-52.
- Leung, K., & Bond, M.H., 1989. On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 133-51.
- Maclean's. 1995. *The choice in Quebec*. October 30, 18-33.

- Major, M., McCarrey, M., Mercier, P., Gasse, Y., 1994. Meanings of work and personal values of Canadian Anglophone and Francophone middle managers. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 11, 251-63.
- Mayes, B.T., Allen, R.W., 1977. Toward a theory of organizational politics. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 672-78.
- McCarrey, M.W., Ahmed, S., Gasse, Y., Conrad, G., Seguin, S., Major, M., Mercier, P., 1989. The subjective culture of public sector women and men managers: A common instrumental/ expressive value orientation or two different worlds? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 274-82.
- McCarrey, M.W., Edwards, S., Jones, R., 1977. The influence of ethnolinguistic group membership, sex, and position level on motivational orientation of Canadian anglophone and francophone employees. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 274-82.
- McCarrey, M.W., Gasse, Y., Moore, L.F., 1984. Work value goals and instrumentalities: A comparison of Canadian west-coast Anglophone and Quebec City Francophone managers. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 33, 291-303.
- Mintzberg, H., 1983. Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Morris, T., Pavett, C.M., 1992. Management style and productivity in two cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23, 169-79.
- Mowday, R.T., 1978. The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 137-58.
- Negandhi, A.R., 1975. Comparative management and organizational theory: A marriage needed. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 334-344.
- Nightingale, D.V., Toulouse, J-M., 1977. Value structure, process and reactions/adjustments: A comparison of organizations. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 37-48.

- O'Grady, S., Lane, H.W., 1992. Culture: An unnoticed barrier to Canadian retail performance in the United States. Academy of International Business Annual Meeting, Brussels.
- Organ, D.W., Bateman, T., 1990. *Organizational behavior: An applied psychological approach*. Richard D. Irwin: Homewood, IL.
- Porter, L.W., Allen, R.W., Angle, H.L., 1981. The politics of upward influence in organizations. In: L.L. Cummings, B.M. Staw, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
- Ralston, D.A., Cunniff, M.K., Gustafson, D.A., 1995. Cultural accommodation: The effect of language on the responses of bilingual Hong Kong Chinese managers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 714-27.
- Ralston, D.A., Giacalone, R.A., Terpstra, R.H., 1994. Ethical perceptions of organizational politics: A comparative evaluation of American and Hong Kong managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, 989-99.
- Ralston, D.A., Gustafson, D.J., Cheung, G., Terpstra, R.H., 1993a. Differences in managerial values: A study of U.S., Hong Kong and PRC managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24, 249-75.
- Ralston, D.A., Gustafson, D.J., Mainiero, L., Umstot, D., 1993b. Strategies of upward influence: A cross-national comparison of Hong Kong and U.S. managers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 10(2), 33-51.
- Ralston, D.A., Holt, D.H., Terpstra, R.H., Yu, K., 1995. The impact of culture and ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. In: D.P. Moore, Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings: Vancouver, BC.
- Ralston, D.A., Terpstra, R.H., Cunniff, M.K., Gustafson, D.J., 1995. Do expatriates change their behaviors to fit a foreign culture? A study of American expatriates' strategies of upward influence. *Management International Review*, 35, 109-22.

- Ralston, D.A., Vollmer, G., Srinivasan, N., Nicholson, J., 1996. Strategies of upward influence in different cultures: A study of six countries from Europe, Asia, and the Americas. Unpublished working paper.
- Ramos, S., 1962. Profile of man and culture in Mexico. University of Texas Press: Austin, TX.
- Riordan, C.M., Vandenberg, R.J., 1994. A central question in cross-cultural research: Do employees of different cultures interpret work-related measures in an equivalent manner? *Journal of Management*, 20, 643-71.
- Ronen, S., Kraut, A.I., 1977. Similarities among countries based on employee work values and attitudes. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, 12(2), 89-96.
- Ronen, S., Shenkar, O., 1985. Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435-54.
- Schilit, W.K., Locke, E.A., 1982. A study of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 27, 304-16.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Hinkin, T.R., 1990. Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 246-57.
- SECOFI, 1999. SECOFI-NAFTA Reports: U.S. Trade Analysis, July 1999; Mexico Exports by Region, July 1999; Mexico Imports by Region, 1999. [SECOFI-NAFTA, Mexican Ministry of Commerce and Industrial Development] [WWW document]. URL <http://www.naftaworks.org>
- Shenas, D.G., 1993. A comparative study of ethical issues in international business: The case of American and Japanese business transactions. *International Journal of Management*, 10(1), 39-47.
- Shenkar, O., Simcha, R., 1987. Structure and importance of work goals among managers in the PRC. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 564-76.

- Shermerhorn, J.R., Bond, M.H., 1991. Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: A comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 8, 147-58.
- Siegel, S., Castellan, Jr., N.J., 1988. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill: Toronto, ONT.
- Sirota, D., Greenwood, J.M., 1971. Understand your overseas work force. *Harvard Business Review*, 49(1), 53-60.
- Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., Wang, Z.M., 1996. The manager as mediator of alternative meanings: A pilot study from China, the USA and U.K. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(1), 115-37.
- Stephens, G.K., Greer, C.R., 1995. Doing business in Mexico: Understanding cultural differences. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24(1), 39-55.
- Strong, K., Weber, J., 1998. The myth of trusting culture. *Business and Society*, 37(2), 157-183.
- Tandon, K., Ansari, M.A., Kapoor, A., 1991. Attributing upward influence attempts in organizations. *Journal of Psychology*, 125, 59-63.
- Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M.J., Asai, M., Lucca, N., 1988. Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323-338.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 1999. FT900 Report. U.S. International Trade in Goods and Services. Washington, DC: Foreign Trade Division, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Voyer, J.J., 1994. Coercive organizational politics and organizational outcomes: An interpretive study. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 72-85.
- Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M., 1990. Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 132-40.

Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M., Youn, J.Y., 1993. Patterns of influence behavior for managers. *Group and Organization Management*, 18, 5-28.

Yukl, G., Tracey, J.B., 1992. Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 525-35.

**TABLE 1**

**Scores on Hofstede's Power Distance, Individualism-Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance  
and Masculinity Dimensions for the U.S., Canada, France, and Mexico**

---

Country	Power Distance	Individualism-Collectivism	Uncertainty Avoidance	Masculinity
U.S.A.	40	91	46	62
Canada	39	80	48	52
France	68	71	86	43
Mexico	81	30	82	69

---

Source: Adapted from G., Hofstede and M.H. Bond, 1988. The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 12-13.

**TABLE 2**  
**Demographic Data for the Four Groups of Managers (N=714)**

	U.S.A. (n=198)	Canada- Anglophone (n=164)	Canada- Francophone (n=173)	Mexico (n=179)
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	55%	72%	90%	56%
Female	45%	28%	10%	44%
<b>Age</b>				
Mean years (std.dev.)	43.7 (8.6)	47.9 (7.3)	45.0 (6.2)	34.8 (10.2)
<b>Current Position</b>				
Professional	7%	10%	8%	30%
First-level Manager	21%	11%	20%	26%
Middle-level Manager	36%	27%	23%	31%
Upper-level Manager	37%	52%	49%	14%
<b>Size of Company</b>				
< 100 employees	8%	36%	43%	36%
100-1000 employees	65%	21%	28%	47%
> 1000 employees	27%	43%	29%	18%

**TABLE 3**  
**Mean Ranks of Standard Scores of Upward Influence Tactics and**  
**Influence Style Hierarchy Dimensions for the Four Groups**

Influence Style Hierarchy Dimensions	Total Sample	U.S.A.	Canada- Anglo	Canada- Franco	Mexico	Kruskal-Wallis $H(\chi^2)$
Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior	3.96	3.93	3.98	3.96	3.98	501.57***
Non-Destructive/ Legal Behavior	3.01	2.98	3.00	3.04	3.00	30.92***
Destructive/ Legal Behavior	1.92	1.96	1.96	1.90	1.84	447.03***
Destructive/ Illegal Behavior	1.12	1.12	1.06	1.10	1.17	565.62***
Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W)	.93***	.89***	.96***	.95***	.94***	

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

**TABLE 4**  
**Standard Scores, Standard Deviations, and ANCOVA Results**  
**for the Four Groups on Influence Style Hierarchy Dimensions**

Influence Style Hierarchy Dimensions	Groups	Standardized Mean	SD	F	Eta- Squared <sup>1</sup>	Group Differences <sup>2</sup> (p < .05)
Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior	United States	5.98	1.55	43.36***	.37	C-A > US > C-F > M
	Canada-Anglo	7.31	1.73			
	Canada-Franco	3.18	1.15			
	Mexico	2.60	1.22			
Non-Destructive/ Legal Behavior	United States	1.47	1.90	3.06	.01	
	Canada-Anglo	2.34	2.06			
	Canada-Franco	1.33	1.53			
	Mexico	.73	1.46			
Destructive/ Legal Behavior	United States	- 5.43	2.34	31.40***	.20	M > C-F > US > C-A
	Canada-Anglo	- 6.79	1.90			
	Canada-Franco	- 2.97	1.24			
	Mexico	- 2.46	1.35			
Destructive/ Illegal Behavior	United States	-10.94	.57	134.04***	.28	M > C-F > C-A > US
	Canada-Anglo	- 8.03	1.52			
	Canada-Franco	- 4.13	1.40			
	Mexico	- 2.81	1.26			

<sup>1</sup> Eta-squared statistics for all the covariates (age, gender, organization size, position level) were less than .019

<sup>2</sup> Group abbreviations: US = United States; C-A = Canada-Anglophone; C-F = Canada-Francophone; M = Mexico.

\*\*\* p < .001.

## Appendix

### Strategies of Upward Influence Items

#### Items

1. try to increase their credibility by obtaining a diploma or advanced degree, such as an MBA.
2. spread rumors about someone or something that stands in the way of their advancement.
3. volunteer for undesirable tasks to make themselves appreciated by the superior.
4. hire a criminal to seriously injure a competitor for a promotion.
5. try to influence the boss to make a bad decision, if that decision would help them to get ahead.
6. learn the likes and dislikes of important people in the organization in order to avoid offending these people.
7. use detrimental information to blackmail a person who is in a position to help them get ahead in the organization.
8. become well known within the organization by volunteering for high profile projects.
9. support the views of important people in the organization, even when they do not agree with these views.
10. use their network of friends to discredit a person competing with them for a possible promotion.
11. withhold information to make someone else look bad.
12. identify and work for an influential superior who could help them get an advancement.
13. attempt to act in a manner that they believe will result in others admiring them.
14. take credit for a good job that was done by their subordinates.
15. use their technical expertise to make the superior dependent upon them.
16. demonstrate the ability to get the job done.
17. threaten to quit the company if their demands are not met.
18. put a listening device, such as a tape recorder, in the office of a competitor for a promotion to get information about this person.
19. threaten to give valuable company information to someone outside the organization if their demands are not met.
20. help subordinates to develop their skills so that the subordinates, in turn, will be in a position to help them attain their objectives.
21. offer sexual favors to a superior.
22. blame another for their own mistakes.
23. dress the way successful business people dress.
24. try to create a situation where a competitor for a promotion might be caught using illegal drugs or engaging in some other illegal activity.
25. try to get the answers to a job promotion examination to insure that they would score higher than the others taking the exam.
26. put false information on a job resume to make themselves look better than they really are.
27. behave in a manner that is seen as appropriate in the company.
28. develop an in-depth knowledge of the work assignments.
29. try to develop contacts who might be able to provide detrimental information about one of the competitors for a promotion.
30. ask to be given the responsibility for an important project.
31. make sure that the important people in the organization hear of their accomplishments.
32. not bypass the superior and go to someone at a higher level in the organizational chain of command for fear of alienating the superior .
33. steal secret corporate documents and give them to another company in return for a better job at the other company.

34. maintain good working relationships with other employees, even if they dislike these other employees.
35. seek to build a relationship with a senior person who could serve as a mentor.
36. make anonymous, threatening phone calls to psychologically stress a competitor for a promotion.
37. work overtime, if necessary, to get the job done.
38. quit the company to take a better job with a new company.

**Item Allocation for the Influence Style Hierarchy Dimensions**

Organizationally Sanctioned Behavior Items: 3, 8, 16, 20, 23, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37

Non-Destructive/Legal Behavior Items: 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 31, 38

Destructive/Legal Behavior Items: 2, 5, 10, 11, 21, 22, 26, 29

Destructive/Illegal Behavior Items: 4, 7, 18, 19, 24, 25, 33, 36