THE GREAT COURSES®

Influence: Mastering Life's Most Powerful Skill

Course Guidebook

Professor Kenneth G. Brown
The University of Iowa

Kenneth G. Brown, Ph.D., SPHR®

Professor of Management and Organizations
The University of Iowa

Professor Kenneth G. Brown is Professor of Management and Organizations and Research Fellow in the Henry B. Tippie College of Business at The University of Iowa. He also serves as Professor of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies in the College of Education. After graduating with university and departmental honors in Psychology from the University of Maryland, College Park, Professor Brown attended Michigan State University, where he earned his M.A. and Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In 2012, he worked as a visiting scholar at both Monash University and Deakin University in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Professor Brown conducts research on learning and motivation. He also studies the science-practice gap as it relates to everyday management practices. He is coauthor of a textbook entitled *Human Resource Management: Linking Strategy to Practice* and is certified as a Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR®). His research appears in many journals and edited books and has been discussed in *The Wall Street Journal*, among other media outlets. For his scholarly work, Professor Brown has received annual research awards from both the American Society for Training and Development and the Society for Human Resource Management. He also has received awards for best paper published in *Human Resource Management* and *Academy of Management Learning and Education*.

Professor Brown is actively involved in service to his profession. He has served on numerous national committees, including an elected term on the Executive Committee of the Human Resources Division of the Academy of Management. He currently serves as editor in chief of the premier educational journal in the business disciplines, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. He also has served or is currently serving on the editorial boards of *Academy of Management Review*, *Cornell Hospitality*

Quarterly, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *Human Resource Management*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Education*, *Organization Management Journal*, and *Personnel Psychology*.

Professor Brown taught his first university course as an undergraduate student; since that time, he has been recognized for his teaching efforts with a variety of awards. He was twice voted as the Students' Choice for Faculty Excellence in the Tippie College and was selected to give the university's Last Lecture in 2011. He also has won the highest teaching honor bestowed at The University of Iowa, the President and Provost Award for Teaching Excellence. Professor Brown uses a wide variety of teaching methods in his courses, including participation in real-world service-learning projects. His students have worked on projects with many local organizations, including the Iowa Valley Habitat for Humanity ReStore, the Iowa City Animal Care and Adoption Center, the Council for International Visitors to Iowa Cities, and The Crisis Center of Johnson County. ■

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Influence: Mastering Life's Most Powerful Skill

Scope:

Influence and persuasion are fundamental to everyday life. From the alarm clock that startles us awake in the morning to the commercial interruptions of our favorite evening television shows, we are bombarded with efforts to get us to do, say, or believe particular things. This series of lectures will help you to better understand influence across the spectrum, from the mundane alarm clock to the symbol-driven political strategy that averted civil war in post-apartheid South Africa.

This course explores the factors that contribute to success stories, such as Nelson Mandela's in South Africa. It illustrates how some people harness the power of influence to achieve worthwhile goals at home, at work, and in their social lives. In addition to positive examples, the course also offers cautionary tales, such as the Ponzi scheme run by Bernie Madoff, because it's crucial to understand the influence tactics used by people who intend to take advantage of us.

The course introduces a model to depict the components of an influence attempt that contribute to its success or failure. The ATTiC model is an acronym representing four fundamental elements: agent, target, tactic, and context. As the course explains, ATTiC is more than an acronym; it is also a useful metaphor. Many factors that determine the success or failure of influence operate outside of conscious awareness. In this way, the four factors are much like the attic of a house—always present, even when the residents aren't thinking about it. In the same way, factors that make us susceptible to influence are built into our basic psychology. By bringing these factors to light, this course not only helps you develop the skills that will make you a more influential person, but it also provides practical guidelines for resisting influence attempts when doing so is in your best interests.

The first seven lectures review research and examples of each component of the ATTiC model. The remaining lectures cover more specific applications of influence, including impression management, sales, public speaking,

negotiation, and leadership. In these lectures, we will see how the four elements of influence play out in everyday situations. These lectures also offer suggestions for using your new understanding of influence to achieve better results in these situations.

Scope

A Model for Successful Influence
Lecture 1

Everywhere we turn, we find influence—both positive and negative—in action. In this course, we'll explore how some people harness the power of influence to achieve worthwhile goals at home, at work, and in their social lives. But we should never forget that influence can be used against us—that we can be swayed to buy things we don't need and pressured to perform actions we shouldn't. For this reason, we will also analyze cautionary tales related to influence. Our goals in the course will be to develop skills in using influence and to learn to resist outside influence when it's sensible to do so.

Pervasive Influence

- Research psychologist Kevin Dutton claims that we are subjected to influence attempts around 400 times a day! And business author Daniel Pink suggests in his latest book that we're always selling something—even if it's just an idea.

- At first, these claims might seem overstated, but think back over the conversations you had just yesterday. How many times did someone suggest a course of action to you? "Let's remodel the master bath," or "Why don't we eat out tonight?" And don't forget the steady bombardment of advertising. If you count all those pop-up ads that assail you on the Internet, then 400 influence attempts might actually seem low.

- Of course, not every attempt at influence succeeds. Some political campaigns, for instance, excite people and win votes, but others fall flat. In this course, we will examine the mechanisms that contribute to the success or failure of persuasion.

Outcomes of Persuasion

- What are the possible outcomes of an effort at persuasion? A management scholar might identify three: conflict, compliance, and commitment.

- Conflict occurs when the target of your influence resists your ideas or even fights against you. Conflict is, in effect, a failure of influence. Successful influence, on the other hand, results in one of the other two outcomes: compliance or commitment.

- In our day-to-day interactions, we often strive for commitment but will settle for compliance. Commitment means that people buy in completely and internalize what they are being convinced to believe. Often, managers work toward the goal of commitment from their employees—in such areas as customer service or job safety—but will settle for compliance.

Components of an Influence Attempt

- In most influence attempts, we can identify four components that play a critical role in determining success or failure: (1) the agent, that is, the person who is trying to exert influence; (2) the target, the person or group whom the agent is trying to influence; (3) tactics, what an agent says or does to accomplish his or her aims; and (4) the context, the circumstances that shape the interaction of the agent and target. We can remember these components with the acronym ATTiC.

- ATTiC is more than an acronym; it is also a useful metaphor. Many factors that determine the success or failure of influence operate outside of our conscious awareness.
  - Consider the agent, for example—the person who is trying to exert an influence. Some people you meet seem immediately trustworthy or likeable, and you might find their claims and arguments compelling.

In a political speech, ATTiC breaks down as follows: the politician (agent), the crowd of listeners (target), the content and delivery of the speech (tactics), and the setting (context).

o Bob Cialdini, author of the bestseller *Influence: Science and Practice*, argues that influence often happens in a "click-whirr" fashion. It's as if a switch was clicked, and an automatic routine whirrs into action. Something about the agent or, perhaps, the tactic quickly starts a process that ends with compliance or commitment, without any intervening conscious thought.

o In this way, the four factors are much like the attic of your house. Your attic is always present even when you aren't thinking about it. In the same way, factors that make us susceptible to influence are built into our basic psychology and often operate outside of our conscious awareness.

o The better you understand the natural mechanisms that result in influence, the more you can use them to your advantage and correct for them when someone is using them against you.

The Successful Agent

- According to Cialdini, "liking" is a major principle of successful influence. In other words, an agent's success is often based on how well he or she is liked by other people. When people like you, they are more likely to listen to your arguments and be convinced by them. They are also more likely to want to please you and go along with your wants and desires.

- One important pathway to liking is perceived similarity. When people see you as similar to them in some fashion, they immediately—and almost automatically—like you more.
  - o In one study published by Professor Jerry Burger and his colleagues from Santa Clara University, 62 percent of female undergraduate participants agreed to help a fellow student with whom they thought they shared a birthday, compared to 34 percent who agreed to help when they believed they and the other student had different birthdays.

  - o In a similar study, Professor Burger found that students contributed more than twice as much to a cause ($2.07 versus $1.00) when they thought they shared the same name as the requestor.

  - o In these studies, participants were not aware that they had been influenced by the incidental similarity between themselves and the person making a request. The increase in liking and helping happened outside of their awareness, hidden away in the ATTiC of their minds, so to speak.

- These studies suggest that agents can be more effective influencers when they tap into the power of incidental similarity and liking. If you want to be more influential, you might think about highlighting similarities between you and the people with whom you're talking.

The Receptive Target

- Throughout this course, we'll look at many characteristics that might make a target more receptive to influence. One that might be surprising is the target's home country.

- Rod Bond and Peter Smith, both from the University of Sussex in England, examined 133 compliance studies drawn from 17 different countries. Their analysis revealed that studies conducted in collectivist countries found higher rates of conformity to group opinion than studies conducted in individualist countries. In other words, people from collectivist societies seem to be more susceptible to group influence than people from individualist societies.

- University of Illinois scholar Harry Triandis describes individualist and collectivist societies as follows: In an individualist culture, it is acceptable for a person to place more importance on personal goals than collective goals. In collectivist cultures, it is expected that a person will place more importance on collective goals than personal ones. Collectivist countries include China, Korea, Japan, Brazil, Argentina, and Egypt. Individualist countries include Germany, Canada, the United States, Australia, Holland, and England.

Tactics That Work

- As we all know, some influence tactics work better than others. Imagine, for example, that you want to influence your boss to promote you. What tactics work best—focusing on the job or focusing on your supervisor?

- Business professors Tim Judge and Bob Bretz found that supervisor-focused influence had a much more positive effect; those who focused their influence on the job had lower salaries and fewer promotions than those who focused on their supervisors.

- In other words, tactics that make your boss like you may be more important than tactics that demonstrate your competence.

Taking Advantage of Context

- Context may include what has happened recently or what is happening right now around you. Most compelling is what other people are doing. We all have a natural tendency to make sense of the world based on how others react to it. If you hear a strange sound while walking through a store, you look around. If no one else seems concerned, you will conclude that all is well and continue on your way.

- One of the most classic psychology experiments of the 20th century related to context was conducted by Solomon Asch at Swarthmore College.

    o In Asch's study, a participant was brought into a room with a number of research confederates. The participant was told that he was participating in a study of visual acuity. Two large cards were shown to the group. On one card was a single line—the target line. On the other card was a set of three lines of varying length.

    o Each person in the room was asked, "Which of the three lines matches the target the line?" When the majority of the confederates selected the wrong line, one-third of participants also gave the incorrect answer. They reported something they knew to be false, just to agree with others in the room.

    o In another set of studies, Asch varied the number of confederates who identified the wrong line. When only one confederate gave an incorrect answer, the number of errors made by subjects was quite low. But the subjects' error rate increased when two or three confederates identified the wrong line. Further increases in the number of mistaken confederates added a little to the error rate but not much. Thus, three seems to be a magic number for bring about conformity.

Application: The ATTiC Concept

- In this lecture, we've begun to explore the components of the ATTiC acronym—agent, target, tactics, and context—and we've begun

to see how these components help determine whether a particular influence attempt results in conflict, compliance, or commitment.

- To help you consolidate this information, try this suggestion the next time you find yourself being convinced by someone else: Stop and think about what's going on in the ATTiC. Are there factors outside your awareness that are having an effect on you? For example, is someone arguing that you should believe a certain argument because other people do? If so, imagine an equal number of people advancing the opposite argument. This approach may help you to think more critically about the issue yourself.

- Another activity to try is this: The next time you're out to dinner, try to leverage similarity to get better service. Ask your server a few questions to find some similarity and point it out. If Professor Burger's results hold up, you might get a little extra attention during your meal.

Suggested Reading

Cialdini, *Influence: Science and Practice*.

Dutton, *Split-Second Persuasion*.

Activities to Try

1. The next time you find yourself being convinced of something, stop and ask yourself: What's going on in the ATTiC? Is there something going on outside of your awareness that is having an effect on you? Becoming aware may help you to think more critically about the issue.

2. The next time you're out to dinner, try to leverage similarity to get better service. Ask your server a few questions to find some similarity and point it out. If research results hold up, you might just get a little extra attention during your meal.

Real-World Influence Scenario

Imagine that you and three business associates are on a trip in a large city. Your work is done for the day, and you're enjoying a meal at a restaurant together. You've agreed to use the remainder of your free night to spend some time together, but you haven't decided what to do next. Your preference is to see a musical that's been on your wish list for more than a year. Another member of the group proposes a walking tour. How can you apply ATTiC to influence your colleagues to see the show you would like to see?

- **Agent**: If you're well-liked, you may have already convinced your colleagues to see the show. If you have to work a little harder than that, highlight similarities, such as shared interests, among you.

- **Target**: Find out whether your colleagues are from collectivist or individualist cultures. If they are more collectivist in orientation, they may be more likely to go along to preserve harmony in the group. If they are more individualistic, you may have to work a bit harder to convince them.

- **Tactics**: Remember, tactics that make your targets like you may be more important than other considerations. Compliment your colleagues on their good taste, and explain why that good taste would result in their enjoyment of the show!

- **Context**: Having most of the group on your side will dramatically increase your chance of winning over the colleague who is proposing an alternative plan. If possible, you can even try to win over the other members of the group in advance.

Characteristics of Influential Agents
Lecture 2

In the last lecture, we introduced the ATTiC concept, our acronym and metaphor for the four key factors that contribute to the success or failure of any influence attempt. In this lecture, we'll take a closer look at the A in ATTiC—the agent, or the person who is trying to influence someone else. We'll identify some of the most important characteristics of the influential agent, and we'll explore how those characteristics play out in real-world situations.

Physical Attractiveness

- In the last lecture, we saw that similarity led to liking, which allowed agents to be more persuasive. Another characteristic that leads lead to liking and more effective influence is physical attractiveness.

- University of Texas Professor Judy Langlois and her colleagues examined research results across hundreds of studies testing to see whether perceptions of physical attractiveness varied across people and cultures and whether judgments of attractiveness correlate with other judgments about people. For example, when someone is more attractive, is that person also judged to be more intelligent?
  - Across 67 studies, the researchers found fairly high agreement about what constituted more and less physically attractive individuals. Agreement was even high across ethnicities and cultures and for judgments of children and adults.
  - Factors associated with physical attractiveness, regardless of culture, include symmetrical and proportionately balanced features, large eyes, a small nose, and prominent cheekbones.

- Langlois and her colleagues also looked across many studies to see whether children and adults judged as attractive would also be seen as having other positive characteristics.

- o They examined judgments of academic competence, adjustment, interpersonal competence, and social appeal for children and adults.

- o Across every one of these dimensions, 75 percent of attractive children were judged to be above the mean, while only 25 percent of unattractive children were judged to be above the mean. In adults, these figures were 63 percent above the mean for attractive faces, and 37 percent above the mean for unattractive faces.

- Further, Langlois and colleagues examined studies measuring how people treat more and less attractive people. They found that attractive children and adults receive more attention, cooperation, and care from other people than those judged unattractive.

- These results have important ramifications for influence. Attractive agents have an advantage over everyone else because the targets of their influence will, without consciously deciding to do so, think positively of them and be more likely to cooperate. All other factors being equal, an attractive agent is more likely to be persuasive.

- In addition to the effects of general attractiveness, other research suggests that specific facial features contribute to judgments of an agent's trustworthiness.
  - o Professor Constantin Rezlescu of University College London and colleagues across the United Kingdom and the United States used a virtual money-lending game to show how much we trust people with different facial features.

  - o The average amount lent to people with "trustworthy" faces was almost 50 percent more than that lent to people with "untrustworthy" faces. Even when given negative credit information about the people to whom they were lending, subjects lent slightly more to those with trustworthy faces.

- The faces used in the study were created through detailed simulation work by Alexander Todorov at Princeton. Todorov's mathematical models created a somewhat feminine-looking trustworthy face—narrower, with wider eyes, arching eyebrows, and a mouth that curves up at the sides—along with a more masculine-looking untrustworthy face—wider, with a larger nose and eyebrows, and a mouth that curves down at the sides.

- One explanation for our tendency to make snap judgments of people's trustworthiness based on facial features comes from evolutionary theory. As social animals, humans need to make quick judgments about potential threats among the people with whom we interact. Thus, fast processing of heavily masculine features that are commonly associated with aggression leads to a judgment that someone is a risk and should not be trusted.

The Three Cs
- Of course, how you look isn't all that matters in your ability to influence others. We can all think of examples of average-looking or even below-average-looking leaders who have won over a company or even a country. What have these agents done over time to build credibility and trust with their targets of influence?
  - First, such leaders have ability—skills and competencies that allow them to do things effectively. In other words, trustworthy people are competent.

  - Second, trustworthy people are benevolent or caring.

  - Third, they have integrity—they abide by a set of clear and sensible principles. In other words, trustworthy people are consistent.

- To lay the groundwork for future success as an agent of influence, practice these three Cs: competence, caring, and consistency.

- This model allows us to move beyond initial impressions and offers specific suggestions for you to develop a reputation for

trustworthiness. Any agent who wishes to influence other people can work to correct any misperceptions that occur as a result of facial features or other factors outside of the agent's control.

Group Identification

- The assumption that an agent and a target are "on the same team" can also influence judgments. In fact, there's a long history of research in social psychology about the powerful effects of being placed on the same team.

- One of the most famous of these experiments was conducted by Muzafer Sherif in 1954. Sherif took 22 boys, ages 11 and 12, to a summer camp at Robbers Cave State Park in Oklahoma. The boys were split into two camps—the Rattlers and the Eagles—and, over the course of two weeks, went through three phases of an experiment.

  o In the first phase, the teams worked independently, and the relationships among the boys were studied. In the second phase, the groups were introduced to each other and asked to

© Fuse/Thinkstock.

Social psychology research shows that we are more likely to trust and listen to someone who is perceived to be a teammate, whether in sports or in business.

compete in a series of contests. In the third phase, the groups were brought together and given tasks at which they had to collaborate.

- o During the second phase, a variety of conflicts emerged between the two groups. Each group raided the other's cabins; the boys cursed each other and fought.

- o After the contests were over, the boys were asked to rate the characteristics of each group. Not surprisingly, they rated their own group favorably and the other group unfavorably.

- In everyday work or school situations, we don't typically find overt competition between groups, but does the general process of bias toward the ingroup and against the outgroup occur in these settings also? In terms of influence, is someone on your own team more likely to be trusted?
  - o Social psychologist Henri Tajfel and his colleagues were interested in whether more neutral situations might lead to the same kinds of intergroup conflict. Rather than inducing competition, as Sherif had done, Tajfel simply grouped people together arbitrarily and then observed how subjects treated and rated their ingroups versus an outgroup.

  - o The findings suggest that a mere sense of shared group membership can increase liking and trust. Agents who are most influential are those who have some overlap in group membership with their targets.

Charisma
- Charisma, which involves saying the right things in the right way, is often considered a rare and magical quality of leadership that arouses loyalty and enthusiasm. However, a growing body of evidence suggests that with training, anyone can become more charismatic.

- A study by John Antonakis, Marika Fenley, and Sue Liechti, all from the University of Lausanne, compared managers who received charisma training to those who did not. Although the groups were similar before training, the trained group showed higher levels of charisma after training, according to their colleagues at work.
  - o The training included tips on charismatic speaking and specific feedback for the trainees on the ways in which they were and were not charismatic.

  - o Thus, charisma isn't some magical inborn ability; it is something that anyone can develop with feedback and practice.

- *The Charisma Myth* by Olivia Fox Cabane offers helpful advice on developing charisma, including the idea that "charisma begins in the mind." She provides a series of exercises to help people become more confident and rid themselves of physical and psychological discomfort.
  - o Cabane notes that charismatic people take charge of situations and change them to work in their favor. Reducing your own physical discomfort in a situation prevents you from communicating a series of nonverbal messages that undermine any sense that you're charismatic.

  - o For psychological discomfort, Cabane suggests an exercise called responsibility transfer. When you begin to get anxious, follow these steps: (1) sit comfortably and relax, (2) take a few deep breaths, (3) imagine a benevolent, caring presence, and (4) imagine lifting the weight of everything you are anxious about and placing it in the hands of this presence.

Application: Charisma Training
- The next time you meet someone new, make sure you are both comfortable. Get the setting right so that you can focus your attention on getting to know the person, rather than worrying about being too hot or cold or dealing with other physical discomforts.

- Next, try one of Cabane's training tools to improve nonverbal behaviors.
  - Begin by adopting the body language of someone who is depressed, slumping your shoulders and hanging your head. Maintaining that position, try to imagine being excited. You may find that it's difficult to conjure excitement in this posture.

  - Next, do the opposite; smile and raised your arms in the air as if you've just won a jackpot. Maintain that position and try to feel depressed.

  - This exercise may help remind you that the mind reads the body and allows it to guide mood. Smiling and standing up straight may actually help you feel more confident! Do this exercise before you head into a meeting or conversation in which you are trying to influence someone—it may give you the extra boost you need.

Suggested Reading

Cabane, *The Charisma Myth*.

Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif, *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation*.

Activities to Try

1. The next time you meet someone new, make sure you are both comfortable. Get the setting right so that you can focus your attention on getting to know the person, rather than worrying about physical discomforts.

2. Adopt the body language of someone who is depressed: Slump your shoulders and hang your head. Then, keeping that position, try to imagine being excited. Now, do the opposite: Put a smile on your face and raise your arms in the air as if you've just won the big game or a jackpot. Maintain that position and try to feel depressed. Doing this

exercise a few times may help remind you that the mind allows the body to guide mood.

Real-World Influence Scenario

On the first day of a new job, your boss says to you, "You look a lot like my ex-husband." Then she adds sarcastically, "I guess I'll have to get used to that." For reasons that have nothing to do with you, you are starting off in hole. To use a budgeting analogy, you're starting out with a trust deficit.

Your best bet to develop trust in this situation is to remember the three Cs. Work hard to build knowledge and be **competent** at your job; look after your boss's interests and be **caring**; and demonstrate a concern for fairness and be **consistent** in how you make decisions. If you pursue these qualities vigorously, you can increase your trustworthiness and the chances that your boss will trust you with greater responsibility and a promotion in the future. In other words, by building your trustworthiness, you create greater opportunity to wield your influence in the workplace.

The Dark Side of Influence
Lecture 3

In our last lecture, we discussed the positive characteristics of agents that helped them to be persuasive. In this lecture, we'll delve into the negative characteristics that lead people to use persuasion to exploit others. We'll explore the characteristics of con artists and learn the differences between con artists and people who are skilled, ethical persuaders. Research has confirmed what is now being called a "dark triad" of personality characteristics, and people with these characteristics are more likely to lie, cheat, and steal from others. In the context of influence, these types of people are more likely to have harmful motives and use deceitful methods. Clearly, it is helpful to know more about such people to avoid their tricks.

Bernie Madoff's Ponzi Scheme
- On June 29, 2009, Bernie Madoff, head of a well-known investment firm, was sentenced to 150 years in prison for running one of the biggest financial frauds in U.S. history. Madoff was operating what's known as a Ponzi scheme. The scheme is named for Charles Ponzi, who attracted investors in the 1920s with a promised high rate of return and propped up the lie by paying his earliest investors with money from new investors. The scheme worked until Ponzi ran out of new investors.

- In his version of the Ponzi scheme, Madoff falsified investment records to show dramatic returns. In actuality, he was paying early investors with new investment money and spending some of the original deposits to fund an extravagant lifestyle.
  - At the time of his indictment, Madoff had an investment portfolio that his records showed was worth $64.8 billion.

  - But according to the trustee appointed to liquidate the accounts and pay back investors, the amount of money invested in Madoff's fund was only $36 billion. On top of that, about half of what had gone into the fund was missing.

- Madoff's personality seemed to combine charm and influence with a callous disregard for others. Among many different types of personality characteristics, three are central to this type of behavior: Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy. Researchers refer to these as the "dark triad" of personality.

Machiavellianism
- Machiavellianism is named, of course, for the Italian philosopher Niccolo Machiavelli. Individuals who score high in Machiavellianism on personality tests tend to be those who manipulate others for their own gain.

- A team of European researchers designed an interesting experiment that captures Machiavellianism in action.
  - Participants in this experiment were given an opportunity to play a game in which they alternated between playing with a computer and with a person. In both conditions, players decided how much money from a designated pot they would share with their human or electronic partners.

  - If the partners thought the amount of money offered to them wasn't fair, they could choose to punish the players by reducing how much money they got to keep. In other words, partners could take revenge if they thought that the players were being stingy. Of course, the computer did not make judgments about the players' stinginess.

  - Players who scored higher in Machiavellianism withheld more money in trials with the computer and gave away just enough when they played with human partners to avoid being punished. Added up across all trials, higher Machiavellians earned the most.

  - Just as interesting in this study were imaging results for the brains of participants. MRI results indicated that those high in Machiavellianism had significant brain activity in a brain region associated with concerns for punishment. Machiavellians are

highly sensitive to punishment; thus, in the experiment, they acted with restraint when punishment was a factor, but when punishment was not possible, they kept all the money they could.

- Peter Jonason and Gregory Webster, two scholars who have studied the dark triad extensively, sought to boil down all measures of Machiavellianism, narcissism, and psychopathy into a short, easily-administered survey. They settled on 12 simple statements that scale people from low to high along these dimensions. Two of the statements used to measure Machiavellianism are: "I tend to manipulate others to get my way" and "I have used deceit or lied to get my way."

Narcissism
- Narcissists are those who are profoundly self-centered, a trait that leads to extravagantly self-serving behavior.

- One measure of narcissism used in management studies is the number of times an executive uses the first person in speeches. In quotes from an interview with Barbara Walters, Madoff used "I" frequently and tried to present a positive picture of his crimes.

- In their dark triad survey, Jonason and Webster use the following statements to measure narcissism: "I tend to want others to admire me" and "I tend to want others to pay attention to me."

Psychopathy
- When we hear the word "psychopath," we often imagine a serial killer, but the reality is far less dramatic. Many people who display signs of psychopathy are not violent, and very few commit violent crimes. The more accurate depiction of the psychopath is the rare individual who is not concerned with the feelings or welfare of others. This lack of empathy and sensitivity means that these individuals have fewer constraints on their behavior; thus, they are more likely to inflict pain or damage on others.

- This trait has been studied in detail by Robert Hare, who developed a clinical checklist that is commonly used to diagnosis psychopathy.

- In a 2011 book about Hare's checklist called *The Psychopath Test*, author Jon Ronson describes his meeting with Al Dunlap, the former CEO of Sunbeam. Ronson was interested in exploring whether Dunlap met the criteria of a psychopathic personality.
  - o Dunlap fit many of the characteristics on Hare's checklist but not all of them; further, Dunlap himself claimed that he feels sadness and remorse.

  - o According to Ronson's description, however, Dunlap continues to feel justified for making ruthless and sometimes unethical decisions in the context of helping Sunbeam return to profitability.

  - o In the end, Sunbeam went bankrupt because of the questionable business and accounting practices that Dunlap supported. As with Madoff, the primary beneficiary of Dunlap's activities was Dunlap himself.

- Jonason and Webster's statements to measure psychopathy are: "I tend to lack remorse" and "I tend to be callous or insensitive."

The Dark Triad in Males versus Females
- Is it the case that only men exhibit the dark triad characteristics or engage in the types of influence attempts—deceitful and manipulative—that the dark triad engenders?

- In a 2012 study, authors Peter Jonason, Sarah Slomski, and Jamie Partyka found that people who score high in narcissism and Machiavellianism tend to use hard influence tactics—those that involve demands or threats. In contrast, soft tactics involve appeals to logic or emotion.

- Jonason and his colleagues also found that men use hard tactics more often than women and that more men than women score high in the dark triad traits.

"The Toxic Triangle"

- In a 2007 paper entitled "The Toxic Triangle," authors Art Padilla, Robert Hogan, and Robert Kaiser use the term "destructive leadership" to explain what happens in a situation with a poisonous combination of agent, target, and context.

© George Doyle/Stockbyte.

Individuals who score high on dark triad traits are more likely than others to employ deception, lies, and trickery in their influence attempts.

- The paper uses Fidel Castro as an example. Castro did some positive things for Cuba, but he also engaged in campaigns to imprison and kill those who opposed him. Even at a young age, Castro was seen as idealistic, bold, and skilled at self-promotion. He also came to hate the United States and what it stood for. In this way, Castro fulfills the quintessential agent profile for a destructive leader—a narcissistic agent who espouses an ideology of hate.

- How could such a leader acquire and maintain power? At the time of the Cuban communist revolution, many Cuban citizens were ready for a charismatic leader promising power to the people. The troubled economic and political atmosphere at the time, marked by intense poverty and corruption, made a strong leader like Castro far more compelling. Many of the people who stood to lose the most—members of the middle class—fled the country, increasing

the relative number of supportive followers of Castro. Thus, both the target and the context were conducive to Castro's emergence as a powerful leader.

- Although it is not clear whether Castro's rise could have been avoided, it is useful to consider that certain targets of influence and certain contexts favor bold, risk-taking, and potentially destructive leaders. Awareness of this fact may be useful in helping opponents rally support against such leaders, preventing them from using influence tactics to gain too much power.

A Question of Ethics
- The ethicality of any influence attempt can be viewed along a continuum. Most people would agree that a politician who uses his or her likeability to influence voters to endorse a traffic intersection redesign that saves lives is "good." Most would also agree that someone who uses blatant lies drawn from a Machiavellian desire to cheat others out of money is "bad." But what about the sales pitch that involves no overt lie, just an omission of some detail to help structure the most compelling argument?

- There seems to be a line between the effective, ethical persuader and the con man.
  - o The con man's influence efforts are characterized by malice and misinformation. These characteristics capture both motive (a desire to win at another's expense) and method (outcome pursued at any cost).

  - o In contrast, the ethical persuader has both a socially beneficial motive and an ethical approach that involves accurate information. Some of the tools used by this persuader may be similar to those of the con man, but the difference in motive and the willingness to use accurate information make the influence attempt ethical.

- Another difference between an ethical persuader and a con artist is perspective. Con artists focus on the here and now and will use

any tactic at their disposal to get their way immediately. Ethical persuaders take the long view. They work to develop trusting relationships that set the stage for later influence.

Application: Practicing Skepticism

- How can you avoid becoming a victim of agents who have narcissistic, Machiavellian, and psychopathic personality traits? We all know not to believe someone who offers us something that is too good to be true. Put your skepticism to practice by looking for suspicious claims in newspapers, on television, and on the Internet.

- You should also adopt the advice of a Russian proverb: Trust but verify. If someone you don't know tries to gain your confidence, double-check that person's story. If you receive a suspicious e-mail, don't click on its links. Instead, do an online search to see if others have reported that e-mail as a fraud. When dealing with your investment advisor, ask for records of your transactions and a full explanation of both your gains and losses.

Suggested Reading

Henriques, *The Wizard of Lies*.

Ronson, *The Psychopath Test*.

Activities to Try

1. Look for suspicious claims in newspapers, on television, and on websites. What is it about the claims that makes them dubious?

2. The next time someone you don't know tries to gain your confidence, adopt the advice contained in a Russian proverb: Trust but verify. Double-check the agent's story. For example, you might check e-mails from an unknown source by doing an online search to see if others have reported that source as fraudulent.

Characteristics of Suggestible Targets
Lecture 4

In our last two lectures, we discussed characteristics of agents that made them more likely to be able to influence others. In this lecture, we shift to the target, examining the qualities that make people more likely to be influenced. Research indicates that some targets of influence are more suggestible than others. If you happen to be someone who has been called gullible, then knowledge and acceptance of this personal characteristic can help you escape becoming a victim of an influence expert with bad intentions.

Collectivism

- As we saw in an earlier lecture, experiments in social conformity show that some people are more likely to be concerned about and adhere to group norms. Such people are called collectivists. They value their connections with the group and will subsume individual preferences to the good of the group.

- Collectivism varies across individuals and cultures. Certain countries, such as Japan and Korea, have cultures that promote a high level of collectivism among their citizens. Countries with low levels of collectivism include the United States, Canada, and Australia.

- At these extremes, we observe differences in the way participants behave in social conformity experiments. Cultural collectivists are more likely to be influenced by others within a group to preserve harmony and consensus.

Suggestibility

- Another characteristic of targets that is relevant to persuasion is suggestibility. This term refers to a person's willingness to accept messages from the self or others. In effect, it is the likelihood that

something that is seen, heard, or felt will immediately be judged as true.

- One survey measure of suggestibility is the Multidimensional Iowa Suggestibility Scale (MISS). Created and owned by Professor Roman Kotov as part of his work as a doctoral student at the University of Iowa, MISS has dimensions that include consumer suggestibility, persuadability, peer conformity, and stubborn opinionatedness. These and other dimensions cover the various ways that information can come to people and potentially influence them—from the self, from peers, and from the media.

- Consumer suggestibility refers to how easily a person is persuaded by messages from the media about products and services. MISS statements related to this aspect of suggestibility include: "I often get information about products from commercials" and "After someone I know tries a new product, I will usually try it, too."

- Persuadability refers to how easily one is persuaded by information provided by peers. Those who strongly agree with the following statements have high scores on persuadability: "I can be convinced by a good argument" and "I get many good ideas from others."

- Peer conformity refers to how often someone conforms to the beliefs or activities of friends and colleagues in order to "fit in." Statements related to high peer conformity are: "My friends and I like the same things" and "I follow current fashion trends."

- As reported by Professor Kotov, the characteristic "stubborn opinionatedness" has a small but reliable negative correlation with other dimensions of suggestibility. Having higher levels of this characteristic renders someone less likely to be influenced by others. Statements related to this characteristic are: "I question what I see on the news" and "I have a strong opinion on most issues."

- Martin Brüne and colleagues from Ruhr University Bochum in Germany examined the relationship between suggestibility and acceptance of offers in an ultimatum game.
  - The ultimatum game is used in many decision-making studies and involves two players who interact to decide how they would share money given to them. In a typical sequence, one player is given some total of "money units." That player offers a percentage to a second player, who can either refuse or accept. If the second player accepts, both players keep the proposed sums, but if the second player refuses, neither player keeps any units.

  - As you might imagine, in the ultimatum game, a 50-50 split is considered fair, and everyone agrees to it. The interesting question is: What happens when the proposed split is not fair, say, 70-30? Is a player willing to refuse, even though it means that he or she won't get anything, just so the other player can't keep the unfair portion?

  - In Brüne's study, researchers found that in the most unfair situations—when a player was offered an 80-20 or 90-10 split—people with higher suggestibility were much more likely to acquiesce to the unfair proposal.

- Note that when an opportunity arises to influence someone and you are the agent, your chances of success depend not just on you but also on your target. If your target is more suggestible, then you are more likely to win even if what you're asking isn't fair. If your target is less suggestible, then you may not win even if you are a master at wielding influence.

Age

- Age is another important characteristic in determining how likely a target is to be influenced. Both younger and older adults are more susceptible to influence.

- Psychologists Laurence Steinberg and Kathryn Monahan, both from Temple University, examined people's resistance to peer influence. In this survey, participants were given pairs of opposing statements and asked to pick which statement described them better.

Older adults who are experiencing cognitive decline may become a target of choice for agents with bad intentions.

  Examples of such statements included the following: "Some people go along with their friends just to keep their friends happy" versus "Other people refuse to go along with what their friends want to do, even though they know it will make their friends unhappy."

  o The researchers found that preteens and teens were less resistant to peer influence. The ability to resist influence increased gradually in the teen years until age 20, at which point, it appeared to level off.

  o Thus, it seems true that the preteen and early teen years are filled with concerns about fitting in with peers; this means that those in this age group are more likely to be influenced by peers, either for good or for bad.

- Natalie Denburg and colleagues at the University of Iowa and University of Southern California examined the question of susceptibility to influence in older adults.

  o Denburg's work relies on what has been called the frontal lobe hypothesis of aging. This hypothesis suggests that as people age, changes occur in the prefrontal brain structures that undermine fundamental cognitive functions related to decision making. In some adults, these changes are disproportionately high.

- o The results of Denburg's research suggest that older adults who are experiencing a natural decline in cognitive functioning are less likely to comprehend deceptive advertising and, thus, more likely to be influenced to make a purchase.

Motivation
- Motivation is a central element to the study of attitude change. Social psychologists have studied attitude change for some time, and a number of useful theories have emerged. One of these is called dual process theory. As advanced by professors Richard Petty and John Cacioppo, this theory suggests that attitudes can change through either central or peripheral routes.
  - o Central routes are deliberate and effortful and occur when someone thinks carefully about a topic. The process here is one in which people collect information, deliberate on it, and then decide their attitudes toward the topic.

  - o Peripheral routes occur outside of attention and awareness. Typically, people change their minds via peripheral routes when reminded of something positive (or negative) while thinking about the topic.

- A now-classic study examining central and peripheral processing was published in the *Journal of Consumer Research* in 1983. This study found that people's attitudes after viewing an advertisement could not be predicted solely by argument strength (a central route) or by whether a famous endorser was used (a peripheral route). Another factor to be considered was whether or not people were motivated to pay attention.
  - o When people were made to believe that the information presented was personally relevant because they would be asked about it later, the strength of the arguments mattered. In this condition, having a famous endorser did not influence participants' attitudes toward the advertised product.

  - o When people did not think the material was personally relevant because they were unlikely to have to do anything with the

information later, the argument did not make a difference; attitudes were the same whether the arguments were strong or weak. But famous endorsers did make a difference!

o   In other words, when people aren't paying attention, peripheral cues, such as endorsers, are relevant. When people are paying attention, they pay enough attention to the argument that its quality matters.

o   Other studies have confirmed these findings. People are generally less likely to be influenced by extraneous factors if they are motivated to pay attention to the real arguments, the real features of the product, and so on. When targets are not motivated, they are more easily influenced by tactics that have little or nothing to do with the actual argument that is being used by the influencing agent.

- The findings we've seen related to age and motivation are further supported by a 2011 review article by scholars Guang-Xin Xie and David Boush. Consistent with dual process theory, this review found that people who are either distracted or not motivated are more likely to be susceptible to false claims in ads. The authors also found support for age as an important factor. Memory deficits in older adults increase the likelihood that a deceptive ad will be believed.

Application: Fighting Susceptibility
- In his book *Annals of Gullibility*, Stephen Greenspan offers four suggestions for fighting susceptibility: (1) Avoid acting impulsively, (2) design your own situations to avoid being pressured, (3) accept that you don't know everything, and (4) become more socially aware, paying careful attention to some of the characteristics and ploys of influence agents who have bad intentions.

- To find out how suggestible you are, take the short online version of MISS available online (http://medicine.stonybrookmedicine. edu/psychiatry/faculty/kotov_r; scroll down to "Psychological instruments and manuals"). If you think you tend to be high in

suggestibility, then be extra vigilant about overbuying or following friends into unwise activities.

- When you are about to make your next purchasing decision, step back and take some time to think. If an overbearing salesperson demands that you buy right away, ask yourself why that salesperson is in such a rush to close the sale. You might look for second opinions from someone who does not have a commission at stake or do some research in such sources as *Consumer Reports*.

Suggested Reading

Greenspan, *Annals of Gullibility*.

Petty and Cacioppo, *Communication and Persuasion*.

Activities to Try

1. Review the 21-item version of the Multidimensional Iowa Suggestibility Scale that is available online (http://medicine.stonybrookmedicine.edu/psychiatry/faculty/kotov_r; scroll down to "Psychological instruments and manuals"). Rate yourself to see your general level of suggestibility.

2. When you are about to make a significant decision, step back and take some extra time to think. Before you make a big purchase or a major decision, get second opinions from people who have no vested interest in your choice. If you see something advertised and it appeals to you, do research in such sources as *Consumer Reports* before buying.

Influence Tactics—Hard and Soft
Lecture 5

So far in this course, we've discussed both the positive and negative characteristics of agents that determine their use of influence and their success in influencing others. We've also looked at characteristics that make influence targets more or less susceptible to influence attempts. In this lecture, we will consider the second T in our ATTiC model: tactics. We'll focus on what has been learned about general approaches to winning people over. Most of the research we'll consider has been done in work settings, but these influence tactics can be used in your personal life, as well.

Hard and Soft Influence Tactics
- Organizational scholars have studied a series of tactics that people use to convince others at work. According to a 2011 study by Kevin Mullaney at the University of Illinois, most of these different tactics can be put into two categories: hard and soft.

- Hard tactics threaten the autonomy of the target; they attempt to get someone to think or do something specific by metaphorically pushing them in that direction. These tactics include making reference to formal authority, building a coalition, and applying pressure.

- In contrast, soft tactics support the autonomy of the target; they attempt to get someone to think or act in a certain way by making that alternative more appealing than others. These tactics include attempting to persuade with reason or with emotion, complimenting the target (ingratiation), and offering an exchange.

Outcomes of Influence Tactics
- In the first lecture of this course, we discussed three possible outcomes of an attempt to influence: commitment, compliance, and conflict.

- Professor Gary Yukl from the University at Albany has studied influence tactics extensively over the last 20 years. He developed a survey, the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ), that asks employees to rate how often their supervisors use nine influence tactics, both hard and soft.

- In one study using the IBQ, Yukl and Professor Bruce Tracey of Cornell University asked managers to distribute surveys to their employees, their peers, and their supervisors. Everyone who received a survey rated the managers on influence attempts and the effectiveness of influence efforts. More than 1,000 people filled out surveys for the 128 managers in the study. Yukl and Tracey found small differences in the kinds of tactics people use depending on whether they are trying to influence a subordinate, peer, or supervisor.
  - o Among other findings, the managers in the study used rational persuasion more often with their bosses than with their subordinates and coalition less often with their subordinates than with anyone else.

  - o These results seem to capture the power dynamics in most work organizations: Managers don't often need to develop strong arguments or coalitions to get employees to do their work.

- Two of the nine tactics in the Yukl and Tracey study consistently and positively related to an outcome of commitment. These were the soft tactics of rational persuasion and inspirational appeal.

Rational Persuasion
- Essentially, rational persuasion is about putting forward ideas for why a particular course of action is a good one and should be the way forward. When a mother tells a child to do something because she said so, she's not using rational persuasion. When you give a coworker three reasons to change a procedure, you're using rationality.

- A 2003 meta-analysis published in the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* found that rationality (as a general tactic) has the strongest

positive effect on work outcomes. In short, it is a good first "go to" tactic for getting commitment from people you are trying to influence at work.

- In many cases, doing a little research and preparing a list of reasons before an influence attempt can save time and streamline the process of change over using the hard tactic of pressure.

Inspiration
- Inspiration is about using appeals to value and higher-order principles to motivate action. When you tell a child to do something for the sake of safety, you're using pressure, not inspiration. When you tell a target that working together will help make the world a better place for children, then you're using inspiration.

- In raising money for a daycare center, an appeal to parents could point out the benefits of keeping tuition low while still paying teachers competitive salaries. Such an appeal is rational. But to convince parents to commit both time and money to the daycare center, a more appropriate appeal might be to highlight the remarkable sense of community fostered by the center and its ability to create a challenging and loving environment for children. This is an appeal to emotion and principle, not just reason.

- People follow inspirational leaders, such as Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Both of these men put themselves in a position to stand for a principle; when they asked their followers to take risks, they were asking them to serve a higher goal. Gandhi and Dr. King inspired people to work toward the dream of a better future, which is a powerful motivator for hard work and risk-taking behavior.

Listening: A Key to Successful Influence
- In their book *Real Influence*, Mark Goulston and John Ullmen emphasize the need to avoid hard tactics and offer tips for using soft tactics and gaining commitment. The core of their argument is quite simple: To gain commitment, agents have to listen in order to adjust their influence efforts to account for their targets' thoughts

© iStockphoto/Thinkstock.

One of the secrets to using rational persuasion and inspiration effectively is simply listening to your targets.

and feelings. The authors interviewed more than 100 high-level influencers and found that listening and adjusting are keys to success.

- Goulston and Ullmen's book is compelling because it does not give a specific formula for influence. Instead, it recommends learning as much as you can about the people involved in a given situation and understanding their views.

- With this information, you will discover how to frame your message—the persuasive reasons and the inspirational emotion—in a way that is tailored directly to the target and the context at hand.

Using Hard Tactics

- In some circumstances, commitment isn't a feasible or a necessary outcome. If you are primarily concerned with expedient, short-term compliance, then hard tactics may be appropriate. But as all parents know, putting a foot down hard can result in resistance!

- In some settings, hard tactics are necessary—especially when the issue is truly important and time is of the essence. If you want to stop a child from running into the street, you need to act quickly, and you use hard tactics precisely because you are looking out for the best interests of the child. In business, if your company is risking the loss of a great deal of money because of inaction and other tactics have failed, it may be time for some pressure.

- Gary Yukl's most recent work supports the idea that good managers are flexible and adapt their influence tactics to the demands of different situations. On area of day-to-day business in which this advice can be fruitfully applied is discipline. A technique called "discipline without punishment" combines soft and hard tactics in a way that is consistent with Yukl's advice to be flexible.
  - The idea of discipline without punishment was developed by Dick Grote. The goal is to motivate employees to choose better behavior and commit to it, but if they don't do so, to move them out the door.

  - Grote suggests that when a problem occurs with an employee, the manager should meet with the employee to identify the discrepancy between actual and desired performance, explain the reasons the employee's behavior must change, and seek agreement to change. Notice the use of rational persuasion here.

  - If bad performance continues, the manager has a second, more in-depth meeting to provide further explanations and reconfirm the employee's commitment to change. This continues the rational persuasion but begins to apply pressure, because the manager explains that the absence of change is a serious concern.

  - As the last step in this process, if unsatisfactory behavior continues, the employee is given a full paid day off to encourage thought. Giving a paid day off removes hostility from the situation and helps the employee realize that the manager is making an investment in his or her ability to change. Employees are asked to "consider their future with the

organization and decide if they are willing to meet standards." This is a combination of exchange (the employee is getting something) and pressure (the employee is told to consider not returning if he or she is not willing or able to change).

o This process requires the intentional use of a few different tactics, and it follows clear and deliberate steps that encourage the employee to play an active role. When done properly, it places the employee in an empowered position to choose between continued behavior and job loss or changed behavior and job retention.

Application: Building Influence Skills
- The next time you are trying to convince someone else to take action, stop to consider your own reasons for desiring a certain response from the other person—and then disregard those reasons. Think about the reasons that your target should want to take action. Those are the reasons you should use as the basis of your effort to persuade!

- As a second activity, ask a trusted friend or family member for feedback about how often you use hard and soft influence tactics. Do you make use of the more effective tactics—rational persuasion and inspirational appeal—consistently? Ask for advice about improving your tactics. Interestingly, consultation is an influence tactic of its own that has received some recent research attention. Consulting with others to get the information and ideas that will help you improve may actually help you build relationships that will allow for better influence outcomes in the future.

Suggested Reading

Goulston and Ullmen, *Real Influence*.

Grote, *Discipline without Punishment*.

1. The next time you are trying to convince someone else to take action, consider your own reasons for desiring a certain response. Then, discard those reasons. Consider the reasons that your target should want to take action. Use those points as the basis for your effort to persuade.

2. Ask trusted friends or family members how often they see you using hard and soft influence tactics. Do you consistently use the more effective tactics—rational persuasion and inspirational appeal? Ask for advice about how you could be better at persuading.

Real-World Scenario

Suppose you're asked to generate excitement about a new product among an existing team of salespeople. The team is already in place, and you are the outsider bringing in change. Everything you've heard suggests that this will be a tough job; this team has a reputation for sticking together and rejecting outsiders. What can you do to convince the members to get on board?

You should begin with listening and learning. Listening can be more difficult than it appears at first because you will bring many assumptions and biases to the situation. We all have the natural tendency to engage in selective listening to support what we already believe. Thus, in your first few days on the team, you are likely to come to the conclusion that everything you heard was right, and this team hates you.

But if you reach out and try to connect with the salespeople individually, you will learn a great deal about the team. For example, the reputation for rejecting outsiders might stem from having a string of bad supervisors in rapid succession. You might learn that the team members like and respect one another because they have a

long history together, and they may worry that an outsider will spoil their camaraderie.

Goulston and Ullmen suggest that to be influential, you have to begin with an understanding of the team members' perspectives. Learn how they perceive the situation, in this case, a new supervisor, a new product, and perhaps, other changes. Continue the effort to understand by asking the team members' opinions about the best way to move forward. Only when you see things from their point of view can you begin to see how you might move them from their way of thinking to an alternative.

In the case of the new product, the salespeople may believe that they already work well together and don't need much at all from a new supervisor to discover how this new product will fit into the existing line. In other words, what this team wants from you is support and protection from outside influence, not meddling in the team's day-to-day business. If this is how the situation plays out, then your job may be easier than you thought, but to figure that, you must be willing to set aside your assumptions and biases and listen to the team members' perspective.

How to Make the Most of Soft Tactics
Lecture 6

In our last lecture, we concluded that soft influence tactics generally work better than hard influence tactics. That is, you can be more effective in influencing others by making your suggested course of action more appealing, rather than by pressuring your targets. We also saw that soft tactics generally rely on providing rational arguments or emotionally laden information to get others to see that your way of doing things makes sense. In this lecture, we'll delve deeper into the use of soft tactics and learn what we can do to make them work even better. As we'll see, two important characteristics of agents that affect how well tactics work are the agent's power base and political skill.

Power Bases

- Power is generally defined as the capacity for acting or doing. In this regard, power and influence are related but not quite the same. Power is something that an agent possesses, and influence tactics are what an agent chooses to do to apply or leverage power to change someone else's mind or behavior.

- In a classic research article published in 1959, John French and Bertram Raven highlighted five forms of power, later expanding the list to six.
  - Coercive power is based on one's ability to threaten punishment. If you have authority to fire an employee or dock his or her pay, then you have coercive power.

  - Reward power is based on one's ability to promise monetary or nonmonetary compensation. If you have authority to pay a bonus or give time away from work when someone does what you ask, then you have reward power.

  - Legitimate power is based on the presence of formal or informal contracts. In the workplace, legitimate power arises

from job descriptions that specify who reports to whom. Usually, this form of power corresponds with coercive and reward power but not always. In some work environments, team leaders manage and coordinate work assignments without being given complete power to punish and reward.

o   Information power is based on one's ability to provide relevant facts and figures. When you have all the relevant facts and know who to talk to, then you have the capacity to provide or withhold information in relation to others who need it. Such information can be acquired in many ways, such as by knowing the right people and actively seeking to learn from them or simply from being in the right place at the right time.

o   Expert power is based on being recognized as having an extensive and relevant knowledge base. This type of power typically occurs as a result of formal education or experience and is not exactly the same as information power. However, expert power can also come from experience. French and Raven, in their article, use the example of a visitor deferring to the expertise of a local when asking for directions.

o   Referent power is based on people identifying with and admiring the agent in question. This power arises from loyalty and affection, and we see it in operation when employees are motivated to help a leader they admire. An example of someone who holds referent power is Sir Richard Branson, the founder and charismatic leader of Virgin Group.

•   It's easy to see connections between these power bases and hard and soft influence tactics. Coercive and reward power provide the base from which someone could use exchange tactics. For example, a supervisor could say, "I will consider the results of this assignment when I calculate bonuses later this year." Legitimate power provides a base from which someone could use pressure. Again, the supervisor might ask, "Do I have to remind you who does the firing around here?"

- Given such obvious connections, why do we distinguish between power and influence?
    - Many managers today have power given to them by the nature of their positions—coercive, reward, and legitimate power. But when trying to get employees to work harder or work differently, great managers may never draw on those powers. Instead, they may opt for the soft tactic of explaining why a change is needed.

    - Similarly, a manager may have both expert and referent power but may decide to use reward power via an exchange tactic to get employees to change their behavior. In other words, power and influence rely on each other but are not synonymous.

Positional Power and Influence in Action
- Imagine a situation in which you, a manager, have discovered that your company may lose a client to a competitor. The client is Jim's, and you think he should be worried and act quickly.

- You might say to Jim: "I just found out that your client, Hensley Enterprises, is unhappy and actively shopping around. This is serious, Jim. If you lose Hensley, then you'll be looking for work." As Jim's formal supervisor, you have coercive, reward, and legitimate power bases. In this case, you're leveraging the coercive power base of your position and applying a pressure tactic. You're trying to push Jim into action with a threat.

- There are other ways that you might push Jim into action using power derived from your position. For example, you might try a simple reference to your legitimate power: "Jim, I'm clearing everything else off your plate for the next 48 hours; I want you to get to work on keeping Hensley." Implicit here is the idea that you are the supervisor and you have power over Jim's responsibilities and assignments. This is also a pressure tactic, but it is gentler than the threat of firing.

- As a supervisor, you could also leverage reward power: "Jim, if you keep Hensley on our books, I'll make sure the effort is worth your while at bonus time."

- All of these situations have something in common. The power bases they depict—coercive, reward, and legitimate—derive from the agent's job title and responsibilities. As a result, this group of power bases is referred to collectively as positional power.

Personal Power and Influence in Action

- In the same scenario, with you as the supervisor, you might rely on informational power in dealing with Jim.
  - For example, you could say, "Jim, I just found out that your client, Hensley Enterprises, is unhappy and actively shopping around, including having lunch with a sales superstar from our main competitor. I've also heard that Hensley wants to cut both costs and inventory and is not satisfied with our bulk pricing deal. When is the last time you talked to your contacts at Hensley?"

  - The power base here has nothing to do with your position and everything to do with the information that you've accumulated and are passing along. This situation shows the use of informational power without any particular tactic being applied.

- The expert and referent power bases refer to how the agent is perceived by the target. If Jim sees you, his supervisor, as an expert and you raise questions about the handling of the account, Jim may ask questions to try to learn from you. In the same vein, if Jim admires you and strives to make you proud, then moving Jim to action will be quite easy.

- Expert and referent power, like informational power, are quintessentially personal. As a supervisor, you can use these personal bases of power to influence your employees, rather than relying on your formal position and its associated rewards and punishments.

When working with community committees or neighborhood volunteers, you need to build and leverage personal power to guide people to action.

- Developing personal power bases is not difficult. You can develop expert and informational power by actively seeking information from people and other sources. To gain expert power, seek out experiences, such as extra training or difficult work assignments, that will help demonstrate your knowledge to others.

Political Skill

- Political skill is defined as the ability to understand others and use that understanding to influence others more effectively. Basically, it's the degree to which someone can use influence tactics effectively. Gerry Ferris of Florida State University and his colleagues from around the country identified four dimensions of political skill:
  - o Social astuteness: Socially astute individuals comprehend subtle factors in social interactions; they are socially aware and sensitive to the interests of others.

- o Interpersonal influence: Individuals who wield interpersonal influence are subtle and convincing in their style, and they do this by being adaptive in their use of tactics.

- o Networking ability: Individuals with this skill know how to build and rely on a diverse and extensive network of people. They have many relationships that help them collect information and get things done.

- o Apparent sincerity: This dimension of political skill involves the credibility of an individual—the degree to which he or she appears to others to be genuine and to have integrity.

- Research by Ferris and colleagues suggests that social astuteness is particularly important as an overall skill. People who are high on this dimension are rated by supervisors as having better job performance, probably because they are able to work effectively with others and they are good at making sure their bosses see them performing well.

- Apparent sincerity refers to the idea that some people seem genuine and believable; such people are likely to have success with almost any influence effort. In her book *The Personal Credibility Factor*, Sandy Allgeier suggests these steps for gaining credibility:
  - o Take the time to learn what you need to know. The connection to informational power is clear here, but this is also about knowing how to do your job well. You cannot overlook the basic issue of being capable of doing what is expected of you.

  - o Keep all commitments.

  - o Honor confidences and avoid gossip.

  - o Know yourself—the good and the bad; show humility and recognize that you have both strengths and weaknesses.

- o Choose to value something in others; show concern and empathy for other people, finding something to appreciate and like. This is a key to building good relationships.

- o Ask questions and listen to the answers. This is the best way to learn.

Application: Developing Power and Credibility
- Referent power is about a relationship you have with others based on respect and admiration. How can you get people to respect you? As a start, initiate conversations with people you hope to influence in the future. Get to know their interests, values, and personal histories. Simply by listening, you will establish relationships based on respect.

- Choose a particular relationship you have (e.g., with a spouse/ significant other, a child, a coworker, or your boss). Now ask yourself: What specific steps can I take to improve my credibility with that person? The key word here is "specific." Don't just regurgitate Allgeier's list. Consider that one way to keep all your commitments is to make fewer and be more realistic about them. Writing down commitments as you make them may be a way to help you keep them.

Suggested Reading

Allgeier, *The Personal Credibility Factor*.

Ferris, et al., "Development and Validation of a Political Skill Inventory."

Pfeffer, *Power*.

Activities to Try

1. Build your referent power. Initiate conversations with people you hope to influence in the future. Make it a point to get to know them as well you can—their interests, values, and personal histories. Simply by listening, you will establish a relationship based on mutual respect.

2. Consider a particular relationship you have (e.g., with a spouse/ significant other, a child, a coworker, or your boss). Now ask yourself: What specific steps can I take to improve my credibility with that person? It's important to be as specific as possible and practice doing one thing better for three weeks.

How Context Shapes Influence
Lecture 7

Human beings are perceptive and social by nature; we constantly observe and interpret what those around us are doing, often without even being aware of it. In trying to make sense of our uncertain environment, we also frequently use the behavior of others as a guide. Of course, if you're aware of these tendencies, you can use that knowledge to your advantage in a moment of influence. In this lecture, we will look at the last element of the ATTiC model, context. We'll discuss three contextual cues identified by author Bob Cialdini to which people naturally respond: scarcity, authority, and social proof. When present, these cues dramatically affect how likely people are to be influenced.

Scarcity
- In many situations, people do not know the actual worth of an object or action. If you're asked to purchase a new smart phone with unique features for $500, you would not immediately know whether the phone is worth $500. One way you might determine whether this is a good deal is by looking at the context: How many of the phones are available? Is there competition for them? If there are only a few phones and everyone seems to want one, then the phone is scarce. And a mental shortcut we all use is that scarce goods are more valuable. Thus, if a particular context creates scarcity, it cues us into action.

- We can see the effects of scarcity in auctions for unique items, such as movie memorabilia or the work of famous artists, and in more mundane situations, such as the Black Friday sales on the day after Thanksgiving. Often, the same goods that are on sale on Black Friday are available for a similar price on the day before and the day after, but retailers take advantage of our natural instincts to value the scarce to get us moving.

- A similar mechanism operates when a school district or watchdog group "bans" an item; interest is raised on the part of the public. Such an action also sends a signal that the supply of the item may become restricted, and thus, the item will become more valuable. For example, when the Vatican condemned Sister Margaret A. Farley's 2006 book *Just Love: A Framework for Christian Sexual Ethics*, the book quickly rose from number 142,982 on Amazon's overall sales ranking to number 16.

© David Woolley/Lifesize/Thinkstock.

By understanding and using contextual cues, such as scarcity, savvy marketers can influence us to buy.

- The scholar James Chowning Davies has put forth a theory of political revolution suggesting that scarcity plays an important role here, as well. Davies examined high-profile political revolutions in Russia, Egypt, and the United States and developed what he called the "J curve" of revolution.

  o This occurs following prolonged progress in acquiring freedoms and goods, when a reversal creates a gap between expectations and reality. On a plot of growth in freedoms and goods over time, there would be a sudden dip, and the plot would resemble an upside-down letter *J*.

  o What happens following the dip can be considered in terms of scarcity in that as freedoms become increasingly available, there are commensurate increases in optimism and hope. But when there is a reversal, people begin to feel that those freedoms are threatened and, potentially, scarce. The fear of further reversals and even fewer freedoms in the future may be

one of the forces that pushes people to raise arms and revolt, that is, to fight to secure what suddenly feels scarce.

Authority

- In the 1960s, Stanley Milgram conducted his now well-known research into how far people would go to comply with orders.
  - In Milgram's experiment, a research participant was asked to play the role of teacher in helping another participant memorize pairs of words. When the learner (a research confederate) made a mistake in recalling the correct word, the teacher was instructed to push a lever that delivered an electric shock as punishment. As the learner made more mistakes, the teacher was instructed to deliver stronger shocks.

  - In reality, there were no shocks, but the learners acted as though there were. If the teacher asked the experimenter whether the shocks should continue, the experimenter would reply with one of four standard prompts. These short statements were the full extent of the continued efforts to influence participants to comply with the request to deliver punishment.

  - The majority of people obeyed the experimenter and continued to administer shocks, even after the learner seemed to become unresponsive. In the original study, 26 people out of 40 (65 percent) went on to administer shocks at a level labeled "450 Volts: Danger: Severe Shock" and beyond when the learner stopped responding.

  - Professor Jerry Burger from Santa Clara University conducted a partial replication of Milgram's experiment in 2009. Burger and his team found that 67 percent of men and 73 percent of women were prepared to continue to administer shocks beyond the 150-volt level.

- Additional studies by Milgram helped to explain why so many people were willing to continue the original experiment. Milgram found that proximity of the learner and of the authority figure (the

experimenter) to the subject made a significant difference. Research participants were less willing to fully comply when the learner was nearby and when the authority figure was remote.

- In his more recent experiment, Professor Burger tested another condition: having someone else in the room who modeled refusal.
  - This other person was also a confederate, but the research participant was told that this person would be a teacher in future rounds. As the shocks increased in intensity, the confederate would first say, "I don't know about this," followed by, "I don't think I can do this." The confederate said nothing else and did not make eye contact with the participant.

  - The rates of compliance for moving beyond 150 volts decreased slightly (55 percent for men and 68 percent for women), but the difference is not large enough to be statistically significant with the sample size used. Thus, even with one person modeling resistance, more than half of the participants in Burger's experiment were willing to follow orders and put another person in pain.

  - Clearly, a context that includes an authority figure is one that is highly prone to elicit compliance.

- Would it be easy for a manager to convince a subordinate to fake investment records or to inflate a quarterly earnings report by postdating a financial transaction? Given the results of Milgram's and Burger's experiments, it seems not only possible but likely that the average employee would comply. We would like to think that we have the strength of character to refuse, but research suggests otherwise. We use the authority of the person giving orders as an excuse to believe that we do not have personal responsibility.

- And therein lies the secret to helping reduce the power of authority: If people are told that they will be held personally responsible for their actions, they should be substantially less likely to succumb to pressure from an authority figure.

Social Proof

- In another experiment, Milgram had five research confederates stop and look up at a building on 42nd Street in New York City. He found that approximately 80 percent of people passing by also looked up. His results confirm that we all often make sense of the world around us by watching for cues from other people.

- Social proof came into the news in 1964 in the famous case of Catherine Genovese. Although 38 people heard Genovese's screams as she was being attacked in the street by an assailant with a knife, no one called the police. The incident sparked public outrage, as well as a host of research studies.
  - o In one of these studies, social psychologists Bibb Latané and John Darley sought to learn why no one helped Genovese. They asked a research confederate to slump over and appear to be passed out on a busy street or to feign an epileptic seizure.

  - o The researchers found that when the seizure occurred in front of a single person, that person would help 85 percent of the time. When it occurred in front of five people, help came only 31 percent of the time.

  - o This is the essence of social proof: If no one else is helping, people think that they shouldn't help either. Interestingly, studies also show that once one person steps in, others quickly follow.

- In his book on influence, Bob Cialdini reviews this evidence and offers good advice for ensuring that you get aid if you are in trouble in a crowd. Cialdini advises that you reduce all uncertainty by identifying a specific person in the crowd and asking for help. Once that person helps, others will follow, but to get the first person to move, you need to make sure he or she has a sense of personal responsibility.

- Advertisers use social proof extensively with such claims as "four out of five dentists" choose a particular brand of toothpaste or "10

million customers can't be wrong." Bartenders and church ushers use social proof by salting their tip jars and collection plates. In this way, social proof can be used to draw people to new products, services, and ideas.

- As Cialdini notes, social proof, like scarcity and authority, involves quick psychological processes that operate outside of our control. These processes are, in effect, shortcuts that our brains use to make sense of the social world and to make decisions. But these instantaneous processes can be used against us by unscrupulous people who lie about their authority or falsify numbers to establish social proof.

Application: Understanding Context
- To further explore the power of context, sit in public and watch people waiting in line at a store. Consider the level of conformity and the forces that create it. How many people don't seem to mimic others? How many seem willing to break out of the box and not follow what others are doing?

- To apply the scarcity tactic, try making yourself "scarce" when it comes to buying. The next time you are looking to buy a car, reach out via e-mail or the web to a few dealers. Find out if they have the car you'd like in stock and what deal you could get. Then visit the dealership where you would prefer to buy. Let the salesperson know that you have heard from three other dealers who are interested in your business. In this way, you are arguing that your business and your time are scarce. A salesperson who wants the sale should move at this point to make an offer that appeals to you!

Suggested Reading

Burger, "Replicating Milgram."

Latané and Darley, *The Unresponsive Bystander*.

Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*.

Activities to Try

1. Watch people waiting in line at a store. Consider the level of conformity and the forces that create it. What percentage of people don't seem to mimic others?

2. Do something to make yourself "scarce" in your next significant purchasing decision. For example, the next time you are looking to buy a car, contact a few dealers by e-mail to learn what they might offer you. Then, visit the dealership where you would prefer to buy. Tell the salesperson, "I would like to buy from you, but I don't have much time and I have prices from three other dealers. What is the best offer you can make me?" A salesperson who wants the sale should recognize that your time is scarce and move to make an offer that appeals to you!

Practicing Impression Management
Lecture 8

A corporate brand is more than just a product or logo; it is an idea that distinguishes one product or service from others. Interestingly, people can also have brands. Some people, because of careful attention to the impressions they make on others, have developed positive images that can work to their advantage in many situations. When we discuss brands in this way, they are not really distinct from the idea of reputation or image. What is useful to understand is that the techniques that companies use to build their brands can also be applied by individuals. In this lecture, we'll talk about active efforts to manage impressions, a topic that comes up frequently in business contexts.

Shaping Your Impression

- The term "impression management" refers to tactics people use to establish particular images or reputations. There is some overlap here with influence tactics, but the nature of the influence here is distinct. With impression management, you are generally trying to influence someone to believe that you are a good person or, in the context of a job interview, a good employee. That is, you are trying to create a "good impression" that can work to your advantage later.

- Most generally, impression management tactics can be self-focused (self-promoting) and other-focused (ingratiating). These two broad approaches have been studied in interview and workplace contexts.

- In a study conducted by Cornell's Tim Judge and Bob Bretz, graduates from two large universities, one on the East Coast and one in the Midwest, were asked to complete a survey about how they generally influence others at work and about their career outcomes, including current salary and number of promotions.
  - Controlling for other potential causes of career success, the researchers found that those who focused on job performance

had lower salaries and fewer promotions than those who focused on their supervisors.

o   Perhaps the greatest lesson from this particular study is that it is better to make your boss feel good than to make yourself look good, at least when it comes to getting your next promotion.

A Firm Handshake

- Impression management is particularly important in a job interview. In this situation, you have to meet your interviewer, answer some questions, and have the interviewer walk away saying, "That's the candidate we should hire!" How do you convince the interviewer to come to that conclusion?

- Research suggests that the handshake at the beginning of an interview can make a significant difference in the outcome.

The signals of competence and warmth sent by a strong handshake probably connect with people at a primitive level.

o   In one study conducted at the University of Iowa, Professor Greg Stewart and his colleagues and students explored the question of whether their handshakes helped undergraduates make a good impression.

o   Stewart and his colleagues offered a free mock interview service for students, during which the students were greeted by, and shook hands with, five research assistants. The assistants then rated the handshakes on several factors. The ratings by the five assistants were highly correlated, providing

a good indication that the ratings were a reliable measure of "handshake ability."

o The professional recruiter who conducted the interviews was not asked about the handshakes but rated each participant on his or her desirability for hire. The recruiter's ratings correlated highly with the handshake ability index. In fact, the quality of the handshake mattered more than any other variable analyzed in the study.

- A good handshake likely conveys two important messages: competence as a professional ("I am confident and strong") and positive feelings toward the recipient ("I am genuinely pleased to meet you"). These messages fit quite well with other research on person perception.
  - o For example, Susan Fiske, a professor of psychology at Princeton University, has worked with colleagues to show that people generally pick up on two cues when they first meet someone: competence and warmth (or caring).

  - o In a hiring situation, these signals translate to: "I am the kind of person who can get things done, and I can help you because I care about you." We tend to like and trust people who convey those messages and, as a result, are primed to be influenced by them.

Self-Promotion versus Ingratiation
- A 2002 study by Aleks Ellis goes into a bit more detail about the importance of self-promotion and ingratiation in successful job interviews. Ellis divided these two large categories into various specific tactics. For example, ingratiation was broken into opinion conformity and other enhancement.
  - o Opinion conformity refers to stating beliefs that one could reasonably assume another person would hold.

  - o Other enhancement is more straightforward flattery, that is, saying something positive about another person.

- In addition, Ellis's study identified a third broad category of impression management tactics: defensive tactics. These include excuses, justifications, and apologies as ways to protect or repair one's reputation.

- Trained assistants in Ellis's study recorded the tactics used by interviewees in structured practice interviews conducted by real employers.
  - All but 3 out of 119 interviewees used at least one of the impression management tactics: self-promotion, ingratiation, and defensive tactics.

  - Both self-promotion and ingratiation tactics had a small positive and statistically significant correlation with higher interview evaluations. Defensive tactics had a much lower correlation that was not statistically significant.

  - Taken as a whole, this study suggests that in formal interview contexts, engaging in both self-promotion and a bit of opinion conformity is likely to create the most positive impression.

Impression Management in Group Efforts
- Researchers Mark Bolino and William Turnley found that different combinations of tactics emerge in situations other than job interviews, such as group projects.

- In their first study, Bolino and Turnley asked 86 college students who had worked on a team project throughout the course of a semester to rate their own use of impression management tactics.
  - The students were asked to note their use of ingratiation, self-promotion, exemplification (giving the impression of dedication by giving extra effort), supplication (giving the impression of neediness by showing weakness or broadcasting limitations), and intimidation. The students tended to cluster into three profiles with regard to their use of impression management tactics.

- o Positives generally made more use of ingratiation, self-promotion, and exemplification, trying to create an overall positive image of themselves. Passives generally made little use of any tactics. Aggressives tended to use all the tactics, both positive and negative.

- Bolino and Turnley also conducted a study in which they asked students to report their use of impression management tactics, rate the desirability of other students as team members, and complete a personality survey.
  - o The results of this second study confirmed the three profiles found earlier: positives, aggressives, and passives. It also found that more women were passives (35 percent) than aggressives (21 percent), but more men were aggressives (35 percent) than passives (11 percent).

  - o High Machiavellian people were more likely to be either passive or aggressive. Low Machiavellians were more likely to be positive. This finding reinforces the idea that Machiavellian types may actually act differently depending on what they need to accomplish their goals, acting more aggressively when that behavior is allowed and more passively when required.

  - o Although the researchers hypothesized that positives would be rated as the best team members, both positives and passives were viewed favorably by other members of their teams. Aggressives were consistently seen as less effective team members.

Impression Management for Executives
- Research offers some insight into both the uses and the effects of ingratiation with CEOs. In one study, Jim Westphal from the University of Michigan and his colleague David Deephouse showed that ingratiation of journalists by CEOs may actually help them get better news coverage.
  - o In this study, the researchers sent surveys to executives at four points in time: prior to an earnings announcement, 3 days after, 7 days after, and 30 days after. They then surveyed journalists

who covered these companies at the same intervals. The surveys revealed that CEOs generally used ingratiation in the week following earnings announcements.

o The researchers also learned that journalists wrote fewer negative statements about a firm's leadership and strategy when the CEOs used ingratiation with them. The journalists were more willing to attribute the poor performance of a firm to something other than the firm itself and its leadership, such as the economy.

- In another study, Westphal studied how CEOs can be the victims of ingratiation. Specifically, Westphal found that CEOs who receive flattery from an immediate team are more likely to sustain a losing strategic direction and keep performance poor over longer periods of time.

- It's important to note that ingratiation works best when it is sincere and not directly connected to a particular request.

Application: Making a Good Impression
- Keep track of the number of compliments you give over the course of a week. As you think back over each day, consider how many of those were honest compliments, genuinely meant to share your positive thoughts about others without immediate hope of anything in return. Write down a percentage next to the total number of compliments for each day.
  o At the end of the week, revisit these numbers and make a plan for the following week. If you aren't giving at least a few compliments each day, make an effort to be more complimentary of others. And if your percentage of genuineness is low, set a goal to raise it.

  o This activity will help you learn to use ingratiation in a way that will build a positive reputation.

- As a second activity, track the number of self-promotional statements you make over the course of a week. As you think back on each day, consider whether you are over- or understating your capabilities. Self-promotion works in many settings, but you can overdo it, which explains why it doesn't always work. If you make more than two or three of self-promoting statements each day, you should begin the next week with the goal of reducing those numbers. Instead of proclaiming your competence, demonstrate it.

Suggested Reading

Bolino and Turnley, "More Than One Way to Make an Impression."

Stewart, Dustin, Barrick, and Darnold, "Exploring the Handshake in Employment Interviews."

Westphal and Deephouse, "Avoiding Bad Press."

Activities to Try

1. Keep track of the number of compliments you give over the course of a week. As you think back over each day, consider how many of those were honest—that is, genuinely meant to share your positive thoughts about others without immediate hope of anything in return. Write down a percentage next to the total number of compliments for each day. At the end of the week, revisit these numbers and make a plan for the next week. If you aren't giving at least a few compliments each day, then make an effort to be more complimentary of others. And if your percentage of genuineness is low, set a goal to raise it.

2. Keep track of the number of self-promotional statements you make over the course of a week. Write down the number of statements, and as you think back on the week, consider whether you are over- or understating your capabilities. Consider ways to demonstrate rather than proclaim your competence.

Selling and Being Sold
Lecture 9

I n this lecture, we will focus specifically on sales and service situations to apply some of what we have learned to these all-too-frequent events in our day-to-day lives. What happens in these situations that makes them either fantastic or terrible? As part of this lecture, we will also talk about ways in which you can apply principles of influence to turn the tables on overly pushy sales agents and how can you get a better deal in your sales encounters by applying the concepts learned in this course.

Successful Salespeople

- Successful salespeople are both competent and caring, two fundamental characteristics that have a significant influence on whether or not we trust someone. A good salesperson also behaves in a way that is consistent with Dale Carnegie's classic work *How to Win Friends and Influence People*.

- The core idea behind Carnegie's work is that by changing your own behavior, you can become more confident, better liked, and more persuasive. Among other pieces of advice, Carnegie offered six simple suggestions for how you can get people to like you.
   o First, be genuinely interested in people. For a salesperson, this advice translates into being attentive without being overbearing and asking questions to get to know customers.

   o Second, remember and use peoples' names.

   o Third, be a good listener.

   o Fourth, talk to people in terms of their own interests. A good salesperson focuses the conversation on the customer and his or her needs.

o Fifth, make people feel important and do it sincerely. One of the best ways to do this is to remember a customer's name and other basic facts and use that information to create a genuine personal interaction.

o Finally, use the simple but powerful tool of smiling.

- How does Carnegie's work hold up when studied by hospitality scholars today? A paper by Michael Lynn from Cornell's School of Hotel Administration reviewed a large number of studies on what servers can do

© iStockphoto/Thinkstock.

Studies on how servers can increase their tips reveal that repeating an order and smiling broadly yield the greatest increases—100 percent and 140 percent, respectively.

to increase their tips. Lynn suggested that the largest increase in restaurant tipping came not from using the customer's name (which yielded a 10 percent increase) but from smiling (which yielded a 140 percent increase).

Emotional Contagion
- Doug Pugh, in a research study published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, suggested two reasons that a positive event, such as a genuine smile, can make people feel better about their encounters with a server or sales agent.
  o First, a smile signifies kindness and builds confidence that you will be helped and get what you seek from the encounter.

- o Second, the smile may operate via emotional contagion to put the customer in a good mood. Emotional contagion is exactly what it sounds like: the idea that moods can be transmitted between people. And when put in a good mood, customers are more likely to evaluate the exchange with a server or salesperson more positively.

- o Pugh's results support these ideas. He tested bank tellers and found that customers were in better moods and rated their exchanges at the bank more positively when they were served by someone with a smile.

- Of course, not everyone reacts to emotional contagion. If you are particularly deep in a mood state, it may be hard for an outside event to alter your mood. And it might not surprise you to know that people who register high on a psychopath scale are less influenced by the mood states of others and more likely to display an opposite reaction. That's a disturbing idea, but it's consistent with what we learned about the dark triad; it also shows the characteristics of the agent and the target working together to determine the outcome of an influence attempt.

Willing Customers
- In previous lectures, we've noted that some people are more suggestible than others. Are some people more likely to buy following an encounter with a sales agent? Let's look at this question in light of two common pieces of wisdom about shopping: "Don't go to the grocery store when you're hungry," and "Don't buy what you don't need."

- The first of these is a warning not to go shopping when you are likely to think everything looks great. When you are strongly motivated to buy, your pursuit of that goal may lead you to be less rational in considering whether (and what) to buy.
  - o When your goal is simply to buy a car, your focus will be on that goal and you may not consider other possibilities, such as walking away and waiting for another day and a better deal.

- o We can extend this piece of wisdom about grocery shopping to other situations. If you can, don't wait until your computer crashes or your car stops working to shop for a new one. Start looking in advance, set a budget, and examine the features of the products based on what you need.

- Following the advice not to buy what you don't need can be surprisingly difficult. When you're in a sales situation, try to slow down and fix in your mind that you will not buy at that moment—then walk away. Afterwards, consider the reasons you should and should not buy. This technique may help to displace the commitment that is biasing your thoughts in support of a purchase.

Selling Contexts
- Certain contexts, such as increased incentives, create an even stronger push than usual for sales agents to sell. Perhaps the most famous example of a sales incentive comes from Mary Kay Cosmetics. Representatives who meet certain sales goals receive a car with no lease payment and only a nominal insurance payment.

- Salespeople seem to be most highly motivated by contests with multiple winners. For those who have worked in sales, the logic here is immediately obvious. Competing with 500 other sales agents for one award is much more difficult than competing in a contest in which half the agents can win as long as they hit a particular sales level.
  - o The fact that people will work harder if they see a reasonable chance of reward is, in fact, the prediction of one of the most well-established economic theories of human motivation: expected utility theory.

  - o Many companies recognize the fact that people will work harder if they believe that the extra effort is likely to yield a meaningful reward; thus, companies offer a range of awards for different levels of sales.

- For customers, the implication here is clear: If you understand the ways in which your sale may help the salesperson, then you may find yourself in a better bargaining position.

Buying a Car
- An article on car buying published in *MSN Money* noted that many of the tips floating around about when and how to bargain for cars are myths. Specifically, you may have read that you should visit a car dealer at the end of the week or the end of the month. But visiting at these times may not be useful if you think about how dealer incentives work.
    - First, there is variability in incentives from dealers; not all of them work on traditional weekly and monthly calendars.

    - Further, a salesperson may already have met a certain threshold; thus, he or she may not really need your sale.

    - Finally, if large numbers of people follow the advice of buying late in the week or month, then sales agents will be busier and feel they have greater leverage to walk away from a reasonable or low-ball offer.

- One of the wisest moves you can make in buying a car is to educate yourself about the incentives that may be in place. Edmunds.com and Kelley Blue Book often have information about incentives from dealers, including when they end. Local dealers may not advertise their incentives, but you can certainly ask.

- Often, the way to get the best deal is simply a matter of economics: Where demand is lowest, companies may establish sales incentives to move inventory. Check for incentives on low-demand cars and find the dealership that has many of these vehicles on the lot.

- Another possibility is to seek out a dealership that does not pay commission on cars. Some dealers put their agents on salary, paying them to be good to customers, not simply to close deals. In his book *To Sell Is Human*, Daniel Pink suggests that the best sales

professionals should, in fact, be paid to provide good service, not just to sell.

Reciprocity

- Another important feature of context is reciprocity. If someone has done you a favor recently, you feel a natural obligation to return the favor. The push in our minds to "pay back" is quite powerful.

- Jerry Burger, the professor who replicated the Milgram compliance studies, also studied the power of reciprocity. In a simple experiment involving 120 undergraduate students, he found that when receiving a small favor, 28 percent of participants returned the favor, even though doing so caused them some inconvenience, compared to 5 percent when no favor had been received.

- Because the effect of reciprocity is so powerful, sales agents frequently give away small gifts. To counteract the influence these gifts can have, some hospitals, companies, and government agencies have policies that limit the value and type of gifts that can be given to someone in the organization who has decision-making authority.

- Counteracting reciprocity is difficult because it is a natural psychological process. At a sales party, such as an Amway or Mary Kay party, bringing a small gift for the host might make you feel less compelled to buy.

Application: Leveraging Knowledge of Sales Situations

- In your next service encounter, learn your server's name and use it, ask something personal about the server and use that information, and smile during your encounter. See if your actions change the type of service you receive. If you want to test the effectiveness of this approach, ask for something special that requires some effort and see if you get it.

- The next time you are making a big purchase, make sure to give yourself time. Do an online search for information about features and costs of the product in which you're interested. This research

will help you avoid buying something that meets your immediate goal to buy but doesn't give you exactly what you need. At the store or dealership, try to find out if the salespeople are working toward special incentives. In the absence of that information, ask the salesperson if he or she will be rewarded for selling a particular product to you. If you get an honest answer, you know how you might be able to influence the agent to lower the price.

Suggested Reading

Burger, Sanchez, Imberi, and Grande, "The Norm of Reciprocity as an Internalized Social Norm."

Carnegie, *Dale Carnegie's Lifetime Plan for Success*.

Pink, *To Sell Is Human*.

Activities to Try

1. In your next service encounter, learn your server's name and use it. Also, ask something personal about the server and use that information. Most importantly, smile. See if these efforts affect the type of service you receive. To test the effectiveness of this approach, ask for something special that requires extra effort and see if you get it.

2. The next time you're in the market to make a big purchase, give yourself plenty of time to do research about product features and costs. If you can, find out if your sales representative is working toward any incentives.

Delivering Effective Speeches
Lecture 10

Robert Kennedy's announcement of the assassination of Martin Luther King on April 4, 1968, is considered to be among the most moving speeches in U.S. history. What made this speech influential, and more broadly, what are the components of an effective speech? In this lecture, we will address these questions by drawing on the insights of both the ancient and the modern world. First, we'll go to the man who is generally considered to be the founder of rhetoric in the West, Aristotle. Then, we will discuss how Aristotle's ideas were elaborated on by the Roman orator Cicero. Finally, we'll end closer in time to the present by reviewing Dale Carnegie's tips for effective speaking.

Ethos

- Aristotle described three tools or techniques available to a speaker trying to persuade an audience: ethos, logos, and pathos. Ethos refers to the audience's perception of a speaker's character. A speaker who generates perceptions of credibility and trust will be more effective in convincing an audience.
  - Note here the focus on the agent characteristics we talked about earlier in this course. Aristotle argued that the agent's character matters and that a speaker can say specific things to convince the audience that he or she is worth listening to.

  - Aristotle suggested that ethos requires a perception of intelligence and good will on the part of the audience, two characteristics that overlap with the qualities of competence and caring that we have discussed.

- Aristotle described a person of intelligence as one who is sensible and sufficiently knowledgeable to address the topic at hand.

- The good will component of ethos requires the audience to perceive that the speaker is motivated not by self-interest, but by a genuine concern for the well-being of others.
  - One tactic for cultivating this perception is to seem reluctant about the issue of concern. For example, you might say that you didn't believe something until you were confronted with overwhelming evidence. In his documentary *An Inconvenient Truth*, Al Gore used this technique to describe the effect that overwhelming evidence of carbon dioxide emissions had on his views about global warming.

  - At times, this approach to creating an impression of good will can be disingenuous and may cross an ethical line. If you feign surprise about information that changed your mind (when the audience knows that your mind was already made up), then you could undermine your credibility and any chance you have of being influential in the future.

Logos
- Logos relates to the argument itself and how it should be shaped to be most convincing. At the heart of every speech is a core argument—a claim with associated evidence that you are making to compel people to believe or act in a certain way.

- Aristotle noted—and it's is still true today—that many arguments are not well constructed and contain logical fallacies.
  - One fallacy that Aristotle pointed out is equivocation, which occurs when a speaker is not clear about his or her intended meaning. In equivocating, a speaker may be trying to "get away with" a weak argument. But this strategy can undermine the speaker's effectiveness, particularly if the audience is listening carefully.

  - Another fallacy is the ad hominem argument, that is, an argument based on a characteristic of a person rather than on sound evidence and logic. We often see this fallacy in action when politicians attempt to disparage their opponents.

Although such attacks are not logical, they sometimes work, particularly if they are connected to valid issues. Ad hominem attacks also take advantage of social proof; if enough people believe that a politician's opponent is a fool or liar, then the idea will take on the color of truth, with the result that the opponent will lose at least some capacity to influence others.

- Even though fallacies are often used successfully in political debates, they are best considered a crutch when good arguments are in short supply. What politicians and other speakers should do is focus on building logos with clear and logically consistent claims.

Pathos
- Pathos refers to the emotions experienced by the audience during a speech. Aristotle's idea here was that speakers should elicit emotions that are germane to the argument being made. The goal is to inspire certain emotions in your listeners so that they will be more likely to understand your perspective, accept your claims, and act on your suggestions.

- Speakers can inspire pathos quite effectively using vivid language and a story, which may help connect abstract arguments with concrete images.

- The type of emotion that should be elicited, and how intense it is, depends on the nature of the speaker's goals. Sometimes a mild emotion, such as slight nervousness about the future, is sufficient. If the speaker is trying to move people to action, then a more intense emotion may be needed.

Robert Kennedy on Martin Luther King
- In his speech announcing the death of Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy's logos was clear and impeccable. He said that King had lived and died for peace and would have wanted to see his vision of a united America come to pass rather than experience more violence.

- Kennedy also effectively employed pathos. The emotions of grief and loss came through in his voice, and he did not try to hide them. The members of his audience were in shock—confused, sad, and angry. Kennedy did not shy away from acknowledging these emotions; in fact, he even showed his own sadness. In this way, Kennedy made a strong connection with the audience.

President Ronald Reagan has been labeled the "great communicator," and his speeches offer wonderful examples of the use of pathos.

- Finally and perhaps most importantly, Kennedy referenced his personal experience to generate ethos. He presented himself as a man who had also lost someone dear to him. He had intelligence drawn from personal experience, and he showed good will toward the crowd by not attempting to hide difficult news and by acknowledging the very real tension between blacks and whites.

The Roman Orator Cicero
- Cicero joined the Roman Senate in 75 B.C. and argued there for many years. He introduced the five canons of persuasion: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery.
  - Under the heading of invention, Cicero argued that a speaker must prepare a speech by seeking out specific information and tools needed to persuade the audience on the specific topic of concern. For our purposes, that means that you should do your research and think about the most compelling reasons for the audience to believe that your ideas are good ones.

- o Arrangement refers to putting together the structure of an argument. Think about the flow of your argument, typically beginning with ethos to win the crowd over, proceeding to logos to establish the argument, and finally, sealing the deal with pathos.

- o Style should be carefully considered to produce the desired emotional reaction in the audience. According to Cicero, a speaker should think about which emotion best serves an argument and use a style that elicits it. Thumping the podium and shouting may be great for pumping up a group of marchers, but it won't work in most business conferences. Match the style of your speech to the event and your goals as a speaker.

- o Memory simply means speaking without having to refer to notes. You should know who you are talking about and focus your entire attention on the audience, not on your PowerPoint slides.

- o Finally, delivery refers to practicing to make sure that you are acting out your speech in a way that best conveys the message.

- Although some of Cicero's canons now seem dated, such as memorizing and acting out a speech, they can be quite impressive if used properly. Consider the impression of intelligence and competence created by giving a speech from memory and matching your gestures and body language to your words.

- In his book *Thank You for Arguing*, Jay Heinrichs provides a helpful summary of Cicero's tips. Heinrichs suggests using language that the audience understands, being clear, being vivid, following local conventions, and having a little ornament but not too much.

- Together, Aristotle and Cicero provide a good overview of classical views of argument and influence. Although these ideas predate the theory and research we've discussed thus far in the course by about 2,000 years, they have stood the test of time. Despite the

monumental changes in how we communicate, the suggestions of Aristotle and Cicero still are useful.

Dale Carnegie
- In the last lecture, we talked about Carnegie's six tips for getting people to like you. In his classic book, Carnegie also offers three fundamental principles for handling people that can be adapted to speech making. His short list is as follows:
  - o Don't criticize, condemn, or complain.

  - o Give honest and sincere appreciation.

  - o Arouse in your audience an "eager want."

- In giving a speech, these three principles complement and add to the ideas of Aristotle and Cicero. They reinforce the concern for ethos by asking the speaker to focus on positives, showing evidence of good will. The act of giving honest appreciation, such as acknowledging listeners for their good work, also allows the audience to recognize the speaker's intelligence.

- Arousing an "eager want" means connecting with people and spurring them to action. For Carnegie, the key here is to choose as your topic something about which you are genuinely passionate. It's nearly impossible to get others to feel passion if you don't feel it yourself, and trying to act it out is best left to the professionals. Instead, you should craft a speech that allows you to discuss what you know and care deeply about. If you do that, the audience will want to listen and will be more likely to be persuaded.

Application: Speaking Effectively
- Watch a political speech and look for signs of ethos, logos, and pathos. A good speech will show signs of each. If the speech falls flat, think about what was missing. Did the speaker forget to connect and establish credibility with the audience via ethos? Were the arguments hard to follow—a sign of poorly developed logos?

Perhaps the emotional tone of the speaker did not match the speech or the desired action. If so, then the failure is with pathos.

- Draft your own speech. Consider a topic of importance to you and identify a time and place when you will be given the floor to speak your mind. To follow the tips here, you need to decide on a goal (what you want your audience to do) and identify what the audience already knows and feels. With that information, you can invent and arrange the argument. Then, take the time to practice your speech and get some feedback.

Suggested Reading

Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People*.

Heinrichs, *Thank You for Arguing*.

Activities to Try

1. Watch a political speech. Look for the signs of ethos, logos, and pathos. A good speech will show signs of each. If the speech falls flat, what was missing?

2. Draft your own speech. Identify a topic of importance to you and imagine a time and place when you will be given the floor to speak your mind. You should have a clear goal in mind, and you should be cognizant of what the audience already knows and feels. With that information, you can invent and arrange your argument. Next, practice your speech and get some feedback.

Real-World Influence Scenario

Imagine that you want to persuade the members of your local church congregation to pitch in to help with a major community project. How can you craft a speech that moves the congregation to action?

To address Aristotle's ethos, you need to inspire in your audience the perception of intelligence. You can do this by mentioning your relevant experience in the congregation and specific accomplishments of church volunteer efforts you've assisted with in the past. You can also speak about how proud you are to have been part of those past efforts. Without bragging about what you can do as a leader, you are convincing the audience that you know what you're talking about when it comes to church volunteer efforts and that you've been an integral part of previous successes.

Now imagine that you have won over your local congregation and are giving your speech in another place, perhaps a church in a Southern city. In that case, sprinkling additional polite terms into your speech and slowing down the pace of your words would allow you to fit in better and make you more likely to be persuasive. You might also refer to the culture and traditions of the city to show the audience members that you understand and appreciate their background.

Developing Negotiation Skills
Lecture 11

Herb Cohen, the author of the bestselling book *You Can Negotiate Anything*, calls the world a "giant negotiating table," and this characterization is correct. Negotiations happen around us all the time. Getting what you deserve out of a negotiation and having all parties walk away satisfied is a specific application of influence. Like all influence situations, negotiating well is a combination of art and science that can have profound implications for you; your coworkers, friends, and family members; and even society. In this lecture, we'll talk about how you can use influence successfully in negotiation settings—to reach an outcome that is considered fair by all parties.

Negotiation Scenario

"You are Dr. Jones, a biological research scientist employed by a pharmaceutical company. You have recently developed a synthetic chemical useful for curing a disease contracted by pregnant women. If not dealt with in the first four weeks of pregnancy, the disease causes serious brain, eye, and ear damage to the unborn child. Unfortunately, the serum is made from a rare fruit. Only about 4,000 were grown in the world this season.

"You have recently been told that a Mr. Cardoza, a South American fruit exporter, has 3,000 of these fruit. If you could obtain all 3,000, you could make enough serum from the juice to both cure all the present victims and inoculate all remaining pregnant women."

You have a budget of $250,000, but you aren't the only one seeking the fruit. Dr. Roland, who is employed by a competing pharmaceutical company, also hopes to get the fruit from Mr. Cardoza. Dr. Roland has been working on biological warfare research for the past several

years. She is trying to create an antidote to a neurological toxin that is leaking from a chemical weapons site and threatening innocent lives.

Each party needs more than half the fruit to achieve his or her purposes. Who gets the fruit?

Position-Based Negotiation
- Influence and negotiation have much in common, but there is an important difference between negotiation settings and the many examples of influence we've seen in this course. In a negotiation, people generally come together with the purpose of reaching an agreement; thus, negotiation is a concentrated time and space within which a variety of influence tactics may be applied. Because the parties are acutely aware that they are being subjected to influence, they are often guarded.

- In their book *Getting to Yes*, Roger Fisher and William Ury identify two broad negotiation strategies: principle-based negotiation and position-based negotiation. Fisher and Ury also describe three criteria that we should use to determine whether a negotiation tactic is successful: (1) It results in a settlement that is agreeable to both parties, (2) it is efficient, and (3) the parties are willing to work together again. When these three criteria are met, the negotiation is considered a win-win.

- Position-based negotiation occurs when each party focuses on a concrete position that must be obtained.
    - In the case of the rare fruit and your role as Dr. Jones, you might make Dr. Roland an offer, asking her to not seek the fruit in exchange for $100,000. That's effectively a cost of $100,000 for all 4,000 fruit produced worldwide.

    - You make this offer knowing that you actually have $250,000 to spend and need only 3,000 fruit. You've left yourself room to be "talked down" or "influenced" into paying a bit more or

buying a bit less. But in the end, you know that you won't settle for any position that costs more than $250,000 and results in fewer than 3,000 fruit in hand. You are focused on the numbers.

- In the real world, a similar approach might be refusing to pay any more than $10,000 for a used car. In the case of home buying, a seller might refuse to pay any settlement costs, focusing the negotiation on making sure that all cash costs of the sale are covered by the buyer.

- In each case, a fixed monetary position is established that leads one party to see any outcome of the negotiation as either a win or a loss. Thus, position-based negotiation has also been called a win-lose approach. Adopting this approach sometimes inadvertently cuts off potentially creative solutions, and one person almost always walks away frustrated.

- The influence tactics used in position-based negotiation can vary, but they easily fall into hard tactics, such as pressure. When you get stuck on a particular number or single issue, then you may find yourself frustrated that the other party won't just "give in," and your frustration comes out in loudly stated demands or ultimatums.

Principle-Based Negotiation
- Principle-based negotiation involves exploring each party's underlying interests and seeking solutions that are mutually beneficial. Rather than pressure, a focus on interests pushes people toward the soft influence tactics of rational argument, inspiration, and exchange.

- In the real world, principle-based negotiations occur frequently. The exchange of power between two providers of electricity on the West Coast, with resulting environmental benefits, serves as a classic example.

- Research by Brandon Sullivan, Kathleen O'Connor, and Ethan Burris indicates that one of the most important agent characteristics

Conflict and lack of trust may play out in divorce proceedings; couples saddled with these issues are usually unwilling to propose win-win solutions.

© Pixland/Thinkstock.

leading to principle-based negotiation is confidence. Those who are confident that they can establish rapport, find trade-offs, and exchange concessions tend to be more likely to begin negotiations with the principle-based, win-win approach.

- The ATTiC model also reminds us that context matters. In the case of negotiations, a turbulent history that creates animosity and reduces trust makes it unlikely that creative solutions will emerge.

Position-Based Negotiation and the ATTiC Model

- In the area of context, research suggests that time pressure can contribute to the use of position-based negotiation. Under pressure, it is more difficult to take the time to exchange information, consider alternatives, and find a mutually beneficial solution. Technology may also play an important contextual role, leading to position-based negotiation. In a study conducted at Tel Aviv University,

researchers found that people negotiating via e-mail used fewer soft and more hard tactics than those working face to face.

- With regard to the agent, a personal characteristic that may lead to a preference for position-based negotiation is competitiveness. In the United States, we often point to lawyers as the quintessential example here. Legal education in this country often socializes law students to be competitive to the point of aggressiveness. The result is a tendency for lawyers to adopt a position-based rather than a principle-based style.

- Another agent characteristic that might lead to choosing a position-based negotiation strategy is culture. As we discussed earlier, those from an individualist culture place their own goals and interests above the interests of the group. Those from a collectivist culture place the goals and interests of the group above their personal interests. Given these definitions, it might seem obvious that individualists would be more prone to position-based negotiation, but reality is a bit more complicated than that.
  - o Researchers Michele Gelfand and Anu Realo conducted a study to see whether culture influenced negotiation process and outcomes. Were individualists more competitive and less willing to exchange information or make concessions? In a study of 102 undergraduate students, the answer was generally no, but that's not the whole story.

  - o In the study, the researchers manipulated whether the negotiators would be accountable for the outcome of the negotiation. In the high-accountability condition, participants were told that they would have to justify their negotiated agreements to a manager. In the no-accountability condition, participants were told that no one would evaluate their negotiations.

  - o When both negotiators were individualists, they were indeed less cooperative but only in the high-accountability condition. In effect, the individualists chose to act less cooperatively when they knew they would be evaluated. In contrast, collectivist

pairs exhibited higher levels of cooperation when they knew they would be evaluated. When people know that others are watching, they are more likely to behave consistently with cultural expectations.

o These results offer an interesting recommendation for increasing collaboration in high-profile negotiations. In the individualistic United States, high-profile negotiations are likely to result in posturing and conflict. But such negotiations might be more collaborative if they are conducted privately and if the results are revealed in a general rather than a detailed fashion. The opposite would be true when the parties are from collectivist countries. In those countries, making the negotiations public and clearly revealing the results should lead to more cooperation.

Game Theory
- The Gelfand and Realo study focused on pairs of negotiators who were similar in their approaches, but obviously, that situation doesn't always hold true. What if a collectivist who relies on soft tactics and an individualist who leans toward hard tactics come together at the negotiating table?

- Early research on game theory in economics offers some insight into what one might do in such situations. Game theory is the study of strategic decision making that analyzes conflict and competition between decision makers. The Prisoner's Dilemma is the most well-known and comprehensively studied example of this type of game.
  o In this game, two players take on the roles of members of a criminal gang that have been arrested and imprisoned; they cannot communicate. Because the police don't have enough evidence to convict both on the principal charge, they realize that they might have to settle for a lesser charge and a prison term of only a year for each. The police offer both prisoners a deal: If one testifies against the partner, he or she will go free, while the partner will get three years in prison on the main

charge. However, if both prisoners testify against each other, both will get two years in prison.

o   When this game is played under most situations, betrayal is a common outcome. Not trusting the unknown party, each prisoner is unwilling to risk getting three years while the other goes free; thus, both people testify and get two years.

- In an iterated version of this classic game, the two players get multiple opportunities to collaborate or betray. In this case, it is more likely that some pairs will collaborate. Based on years of research, the tit-for-tat strategy has emerged as the best approach in this version. Effectively, you start nice and defect only after the other party does, in retaliation. After a defection, you should proceed with a forgiving attitude and return to being nice.

- How can the tit-for-tat strategy be applied in real-life negotiation contexts? Start with an effort to pursue a principle-based strategy. If it becomes clear that you are dealing with someone is focused on positions, alternate between using hard and soft influence tactics depending on what your negotiating partner has done most recently.

Application: Successful Negotiations
- At the beginning of this lecture, we looked at the case of two doctors interested in obtaining rare fruit to save lives. As it turns out, the information provided in this classic business case notes that Dr. Jones needs only the juice of the fruit, while Dr. Roland needs only the rind. In fact, both parties can get what they need from the fruit, and the negotiation can focus on how they can collaborate to implement this win-win solution. The point of this teaching exercise is to encourage participants to explore and discuss the principles that underlie their requests.

- The next time you enter a negotiation in which you hope for a mutually agreeable solution, inquire into the other party's interests. Experiment with using such words as "we" and "us" to see whether doing so creates a difference in the other party's approach.

- The next time you hear an argument, listen carefully. Are the parties being clear about their interests, or are they caught up in defensive posturing and accusations? Don't intervene (unless necessary), but imagine what you might do if you were one of the parties. How could you break the cycle and begin a conversation about principles rather than positions?

Suggested Reading

Cohen, *You Can Negotiate Anything*.

Fisher, Ury, and Patton, *Getting to Yes*.

Activities to Try

1. The next time you enter a negotiation in which you hope for a mutually agreeable solution, inquire into the other party's interests. Experiment with using such words as "we" and "us" to see whether that tactic creates a difference in the other party's approach.

2. The next time you hear an argument between two parties, listen carefully. Are they being clear about their interests, or are they caught up in defensive posturing and accusations? Imagine what you might do if you were one of the parties. How could you break the cycle and begin a conversation about principles rather than positions?

Becoming a Transformational Leader
Lecture 12

In 1994, Ray Anderson, the late CEO of Interface, Inc., a global carpet company, asked his employees to commit to transforming the company into a model of a sustainable, green business. Between 1996 and 2008, Interface reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 82 percent and its fossil fuel use by 60 percent, while dramatically increasing sales and doubling profits. Anderson was a transformational leader. He used his formal position, his passion, and influence to change the way business was done. In this lecture, we'll discuss leadership and influence, specifically what differentiates such leaders as Anderson from more traditional corporate managers. We'll also explore what Anderson's example has to teach us about becoming influential leaders in our own right.

Leadership: Theory and Research

- For many years, leadership research focused on what has been called the great man theory. Scholars posed the question: What traits make some people great leaders and others poor leaders or not leaders at all? They found some key differences between those who emerge as leaders and those who do not. But more recent studies have discovered something that matters even more than individual traits. What matters most, according to the latest research, is the nature of the relationship between the leader and his or her followers.

- In a major synthesis of prior research, a 2011 article in the journal *Personnel Psychology* examined different types of leadership and their relationships with leadership outcomes, such as follower satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, follower job performance, and, ultimately, performance of the group or organization of which followers were a part. The researchers, Tim Judge and Ron Piccolo, found that the best predictor of these outcomes was a particular style of leadership called transformational leadership.

- The concept of transformational leadership comes from a political historian, James MacGregor Burns, who has written a number of books on presidential history. In a book about leadership more generally, Burns argued that different leaders develop different types of relationships with their followers. Specifically, he distinguished between transactional and transformational leaders.
  o Transactional leadership occurs when the relationship between followers and leaders is based on exchange that meets each party's needs. Followers do what the leader wants in exchange for something they want, such as to keep their jobs or to earn bonuses.

  o Transformational leadership occurs when the relationship between followers and leaders is based on influence through values and ideals. Burns cites Franklin Roosevelt as an example of a transformational leader. In his efforts to sell his New Deal programs to Congress, Roosevelt sought to connect them to the U.S. Constitution and the core value of freedom. By offering these connections, Roosevelt was building a relationship with followers based on higher-order principles and ideals.

The Four I's of Transformational Leadership
- Professors Bernie Bass and Bruce Avolio extended Burns's ideas to the study of business leaders. Their research suggests that transformational leadership has four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.
  o Idealized influence occurs when leaders accept that they are role models and behave in admirable ways. Such leaders display passion and conviction and, thus, appeal to followers on an emotional level.

  o Inspirational motivation requires that the leader develop and promote a vision that captures people's hearts and minds. The vision must be positive and provide meaning to the hard work that is being asked of followers.

- o Intellectual stimulation requires that the leader challenge the status quo and involve followers in developing ideas. Leaders who do this well engage their followers in pushing forward their shared cause.

- o Individualized consideration requires that the leader listen to followers, acknowledge their concerns and needs, and support them.

- How did Ray Anderson make use of these four I's of transformational leadership?
    - o Instead of motivating his employees by offering to share profits with them or arguing that their jobs were at stake if they couldn't reduce the company's greenhouse emissions, Anderson used inspirational motivation. He appealed to the lofty goals of saving the planet for the next generation and finding better ways to do business.

    - o Anderson used idealized influence by serving as a role model for his Mission Zero. He personally committed time and money to the efforts to alter his business and spent time outside of business writing and speaking about the environment. His personal behavior was a critical element in his overall attempt to influence his employees.

    - o We can also see how Anderson used intellectual stimulation: He didn't tell his employees how to make the business environmentally friendly but challenged them to figure it out! He had high expectations of his employees and turned over considerable decision-making power to them to test out new ideas.

    - o Finally, Anderson displayed individualized consideration by recognizing people for their ideas and efforts.

- Transformational leaders do exactly what the label suggests: They transform people and, through those people, help build a better

world. But this should not be interpreted to mean that transactional leaders are not useful.

- o In their studies, Judge and Piccolo found a few outcomes that were higher for transactional than for transformational leaders, including followers' job satisfaction and job performance of the leader.

- o These results point to the idea that transactional leaders may be quite effective in helping their employees understand what to do, with the clarity improving satisfaction. These leaders may also be better at doing what is required of them in their core job requirements. Transformational leaders are not necessarily bad at doing these things, but it's easy to picture a transformational leader focusing on a grand vision at the expense of operational details.

Developing Transformational Leaders

- Julian Barling, of Queen's University, and his colleagues conducted a study to explore the question or whether transformational leaders are born or made. These researchers provided transformational leadership training to a group of bank managers and then tested whether their leadership behaviors and the performance of their branches changed.
  - o Employees of trained managers showed increases in commitment to the bank, and they worked harder, generating more sales than they had before their managers were trained. There were no changes in employees of non-trained managers.

  - o These results offer a clear indication that we can all become at least somewhat more transformational in our approaches to leading others.

- John Antonakis and his colleagues at the University of Lausanne conducted research leading to the same conclusion. For their study, researchers videotaped 41 business students giving speeches. They then trained these students in methods to become more transformational in their speaking style, such as using stories,

concrete symbols, and vivid language that elicits emotion. When the same students were taped after training, they were found to much more engaging and convincing by a group of more than 100 independent raters.

- Professor Stefani Yorges and her colleagues tested whether leaders who had shown a willingness to sacrifice for their beliefs would be seen as more influential. Yorges found that people who had sacrificed in the past are more likely to be given the benefit of the doubt with regard to motives. This may explain the success of so many military figures in politics: They sacrificed to serve their country, and as a result, their motives are less open to criticism.

Nelson Mandela
- Among those whose past sacrifice serves as a strong foundation for subsequent efforts to influence and persuade, Nelson Mandela comes immediately to mind. As a leading figure in the African National Congress (ANC), Mandela stood in opposition to the racist apartheid system since its inception in 1948. Initially, he favored nonviolent tactics, but in the face of ongoing repression, he changed his mind. In 1955, he claimed publicly that the ANC had "no alternative to armed and violent resistance."

- This decision and his subsequent actions led to Mandela's arrest in 1962 and the banning of the ANC as a political party. In 1964, Mandela was found guilty of conspiracy to overthrow the government and was sentenced to life in prison. In total, Mandela spent 27 years in prison, where he suffered permanent damage to his eyesight and caught tuberculosis. But he also remained involved in politicking and continued to build his reputation and to learn.

- In 1990, the new white leader of South Africa, Frederik de Klerk, decided that apartheid was unsustainable, and he met with Mandela. After the meeting, de Klerk freed Mandela unconditionally and lifted the ban on the ANC. Much of the ensuing two years was spent in formal negotiation between de Klerk's government and the ANC as they attempted to dismantle apartheid. A free election was

set for April 1994, and Mandela won the presidency; he then began work on what many consider to be his lasting legacy.

- Although Mandela had embraced violence earlier in his life, he came out strongly for national reconciliation. He used inspirational language and set himself up as a role model. He referred to South Africa as the "Rainbow Nation" and brought whites into his governing cabinet, at the same time encouraging blacks to support the national rugby team.

- As Yorges found, sacrifice makes leaders even more influential. In Mandela's case, he sacrificed nearly everything to the advancement of political rights for blacks. Following the collapse of apartheid, there were some who called for war and justice by jailing the oppressors. Mandela, however, had the higher goal of reconciliation in mind and was able to convince his countrymen to join him in pursuit of that higher goal. Were it not for Mandela's transformational leadership, South Africa may well have descended

As president, Nelson Mandela used inspirational motivation by focusing attention on symbols of unity, and he used idealized influence by modeling forgiveness of those who had held him prisoner for so many years.

into civil war, rather than move peacefully forward toward national unity and economic prosperity.

- Not many of us have sacrificed in the way that Nelson Mandela sacrificed, but it's still possible to draw on your own history to convince others that your motives are good.

Application: Using Influence for Transformation
- Consider an issue or cause that is personally important to you. Are you passionate about the need for more public land in your town? Do you think local property taxes are too high? Does the local animal shelter need a new facility? In each case, there is an opportunity for someone like you to be transformative. Choose your cause, reach out to others, build relationships based on common values and interests, establish a shared vision, and mobilize people to bring about change.

- As an alternative to acting as a formal spokesperson for your cause, design and plan an influence campaign. To mobilize people's hearts and minds, help decide on the ideals and symbols, stories and figureheads that will win people over. By mastering the underlying mechanisms of influence, you are now better prepared to be a force for positive change in your home, your business, and your community.

Suggested Reading

Anderson, *Mid-Course Correction*.

Bass and Avolio, *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*.

Burns, *Leadership*.

Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom*.

Activities to Try

1. Consider an issue or cause that is personally important to you. Once you choose your cause, reach out to others, build relationships based on common values and interests, establish a shared vision, and mobilize people to make change happen.

2. Prepare the influence campaign that must accompany your group's efforts. You may not be the one to deliver the speeches, but you can help design the components—the ideals and symbols—that will inspire others.

Bibliography

Allgeier, Sandy. *The Personal Credibility Factor: How to Get It, Keep It, and Get It Back (If You've Lost It)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2009. Practical advice on how to become more credible in your day-to-day interactions.

Anderson, Ray C. *Mid-Course Correction: Toward a Sustainable Enterprise: The Interface Model*. Atlanta: Peregrinzilla Press, 1999. The story of how Ray Anderson became concerned about the environment and the changes he made in the way his company does business to promote sustainability.

Antonakis, John, Marika Fenley, and Sue Liechti. "Can Charisma Be Taught? Tests of Two Interventions." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 10, no. 3 (2011): 374–396. Two studies showing that with training, people can become more charismatic in how they interact with others and give speeches.

Asch, Solomon E. "Effects of Group Pressure on the Modification and Distortion of Judgment." In *Readings in Social Psychology*, edited by E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1958. A summary of Asch's studies on conformity using the line judgment task.

———. "Studies of Independence and Conformity: A Minority of One against a Unanimous Majority." *Psychological Monographs* 70, no. 9 (1956): 1–70. The original publication describing experiments with the line judgment task. Under a variety of conditions, individuals conform and agree with the group opinion.

Attkisson, Sharyl. "Fraud Convictions after CBS News Investigation of 'Storm Chasers.'" CBS News, March 26, 2012. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-31727_162-57404811-10391695/fraud-convictions-after-cbs-news-investigation-of-storm-chasers. Describes the crimes of Dominik Sadowski, a contractor convicted of insurance fraud.

Babiak, Paul, and Robert D. Hare. *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work*. New York: Regan Books, 2006. A look at Hare's work on psychopathy as applied to work settings.

Bacon, John U. *Three and Out: Rich Rodriguez and the Michigan Wolverines in the Crucible of College Football*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011. The story of Rich Rodriguez's three seasons as head coach of the University of Michigan men's football team.

Barling, Julian, Tom Weber, and E. Kevin Kelloway. "Effects of Transformational Leadership Training on Attitudinal and Financial Outcomes: A Field Experiment." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81, no. 6 (1996): 827–832. Field study showing that training in transformational leadership boosted the leadership behaviors of participants and the work outcomes of their employees.

Bass, Bernard M., and Bruce J. Avolio. *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1994. The seminal introduction of Burns's transformational leadership theory into the study of business leadership.

Billig, M., and Henri Tajfel. "Social Categorization and Similarity in Intergroup Behavior." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 3, no. 3 (1973): 27–51. A study demonstrating that even random assignment into groups can result in discrimination.

Bolino, Mark C., and William H. Turnley. "More Than One Way to Make an Impression: Exploring Profiles in Impression Management." *Journal of Management* 29, no. 2 (2003): 141–160. A set of studies showing how students use impression management tactics during group projects.

Bond, Rod, and Peter B. Smith. "Culture and Conformity: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using Asch's (1952b, 1956) Line Judgment Task." *Psychological Bulletin* 119, no. 1 (1996): 111–137. This meta-analysis of Asch's study, discussed in Lecture 1, also investigates the relationship between conformity and individualism/collectivism.

Brüne, Martin, Cumhur Tas, Julia Wischniewski, Anna Welpinghus, Christine Heinisch, and Albert Newen. "Hypnotic Ingroup-Outgroup Suggestion Influences Economic Decision Making in an Ultimatum Game." *Consciousness and Cognition* 21, no. 2 (2012): 939–946. A study examining who accepts unfair offers in the classic ultimatum game.

Burger, Jerry M. "Replicating Milgram: Would People Still Obey Today?" *American Psychologist* 64, no. 1 (2009): 1–11. This paper describes the partial replication of Milgram's classic study. There are a few commentaries, some of them critical, published in the same issue.

Burger, Jerry M., Nicole Messian, Shebani Patel, Alicia del Prado, and Carmen Anderson. "What a Coincidence! The Effects of Incidental Similarity on Compliance." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30, no. 1 (2004): 35–43. A series of studies showing how incidental similarity increases compliance with a request.

Burger, Jerry M., Jackeline Sanchez, Jenny E. Imberi, and Lucia R. Grande. "The Norm of Reciprocity as an Internalized Social Norm: Returning Favors Even When No One Finds Out." *Social Influence* 4, no. 1 (2009): 11–17. An experiment demonstrating that people will pay back a small favor even if the person who provided the favor won't know.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. Reprint ed. New York: Harper Perennial Political Classics, 2010. Ever the political historian, Burns uses historical leaders to propose a new theory of leadership.

Cabane, Olivia Fox. *The Charisma Myth: How Anyone Can Master the Art and Science of Personal Magnetism.* New York: Penguin, 2012. A book with specific guidance on how anyone can learn to appear charismatic to others.

Carnegie, Dale. *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. Reissue ed. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2009. This is the classic, but Dale Carnegie Associates has released updates, and there are volumes that bundle this book with his other works. Also, for a summary of specific public speaking tips, see Carnegie and Associates, "Speak More Effectively by Dale Carnegie,

Part One: Public Speaking a Quick and Easy Way," http://www.dalecarnegie.com.

Cialdini, Robert B. *Influence: Science and Practice*. New York: Pearson, 2008. What many consider to be the most comprehensive book on influence. Cialdini has written related books and has an extensive website with videos (http://www.influenceatwork.com).

Cohen, Herb. *You Can Negotiate Anything*. Secaucus, NJ: Lyle Stuart, 1980. Useful reading to supplement Lecture 11.

Davies, James C. "Toward a Theory of Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 27, no. 1 (1962): 5–19. In this article, Davies advances his J theory of political revolutions.

De Dreu, Carsten K. W. "Time Pressure and the Closing of the Mind in Negotiation." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 91, no. 2 (2003): 280–295. Two studies showing how time pressure influences negotiation processes and outcomes.

Denburg, Natalie L., Catherine A. Cole, Michael Hernandez, Torricia H. Yamada, Daniel Tranel, Antoine Bechara, and Robert B. Wallace. "The Orbitofrontal Cortex, Real-World Decision Making, and Normal Aging. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1121 (2007): 480–498. Presents three studies showing the reasoning deficits that lead older adults to be susceptible to deceptive advertising.

Dutton, Kevin. *Split-Second Persuasion: The Ancient Art and New Science of Changing Minds.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2011. Although Dutton's book overlaps with Cialdini's in some ways, he offers additional insights.

Ellis, Aleksander P. J., Bradley J. West, Ann Marie Ryan, and Richard P. DeShon. "The Use of Impression Management Tactics in Structured Interviews: A Function of Question Type?" *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87, no. 6 (2002): 1200–1208. A study examining impression management tactics used in a structured interview setting.

Ferris, Gerald R., Darren C. Treadway, Robert W. Kolodinsky, Wayne A. Hochwarter, Charles J. Kacmar, Ceasar Douglas, and Dwight D. Frink. "Development and Validation of a Political Skill Inventory." *Journal of Management* 31, no. 1 (2005): 126–152. Studies that describe the rationale behind, and the development of, a survey measure of political skill in organizations.

Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin, 1991. A classic text that distinguishes between position-based and principle-based negotiation and describes how principled negotiation works to satisfy both parties.

French, John R. P., and Bertram Raven. "The Bases of Social Power." In *Studies in Social Power*, edited by Dorwin Cartwright, pp. 259–269. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959. The original chapter that outlines five bases of power.

Gaertner, Lowell, and Chester A. Insko. "Intergroup Discrimination in the Minimal Group Paradigm: Categorization, Reciprocation, or Fear?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79, no. 1 (2000): 77–94. Two studies that replicate and extend the minimal-group paradigm established by Henri Tajfel. They demonstrate that in-group favoritism is more likely when group members were reliant on one another and could return the favor.

Galin, Amira, Miron Gross, and Gavriel Gosalker. "E-negotiation Versus Face-to-Face Negotiation: What Has Changed—If Anything?" *Computers in Human Behavior* 23, no. 1 (2007): 787–797. An experiment comparing face-to-face and e-mail negotiations in terms of both tactics and outcomes.

Greenspan, Stephen. *Annals of Gullibility: Why We Get Duped and How to Avoid It*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2009. A review of gullibility stories that culminates with a theory about why people are sometimes so easily convinced.

Heinrichs, Jay. *Thank You for Arguing: What Aristotle, Lincoln, and Homer Simpson Can Teach Us about the Art of Persuasion*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2007. An engaging tour through the history of rhetoric, with many

practical examples. You can also visit his blog at http://inpraiseofargument. squarespace.com.

Henriques, Diana B. *The Wizard of Lies: Bernie Madoff and the Death of Trust.* New York: Times Books, 2011. A thorough telling of the rise and fall of Bernie Madoff.

Higgins, C. A., Timothy A. Judge, and Gerald R. Ferris. "Influence Tactics and Work Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24 (2003): 89–106. Examines 31 studies to determine the relationship between influence tactics and work outcomes of performance and extrinsic success.

Holoien, Deborah Son, and Susan T. Fiske. "Downplaying Positive Impressions: Compensation between Warmth and Competence in Impression Management." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 49, no. 1 (2013): 33–41. Examines how students asked to write notes trade off between making impressions of warmth and of competence, depending on the instructions given.

Jonason, Peter K., Sarah Slomski, and Jamie Partyka. "The Dark Triad at Work: How Toxic Employees Get Their Way." *Personality and Individual Differences* 52, no. 3 (2012): 449–453. Large survey study examining correlations among dark triad personality characteristics and the use of influence tactics.

Jonason, Peter K., and Gregory D. Webster. "The Dirty Dozen: A Concise Measure of the Dark Triad." *Psychological Assessment* 22, no. 2 (2010): 420–432. Describes the development of a 12-item measure of the three negative personality traits of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy.

Judge, Timothy A., and Robert D. Bretz. "Political Influence Behavior and Career Success." *Journal of Management* 20, no. 1 (1994): 43–65. A field study examining the relationship among supervisor-focused and self-focused influence tactics on career outcomes.

Judge, Timothy A., and Ronald F. Piccolo. "Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, no. 5 (2004): 755–768. A synthesis of studies showing that transformational leadership has strong relationships with work-related outcomes, including satisfaction with the leader, motivation, and perceived leader effectiveness.

Kotov, Roman I., S. B. Bellman, and David B. Watson. *Multidimensional Iowa Suggestibility Scale (MISS) Brief Manual*. medicine. stonybrookmedicine.edu/system/files/MISSBriefManual.pdf. Accessed May 14, 2013. A description of the development and validation of a survey measure of suggestibility.

Langlois, Judith H., Lisa Kalakanis, Adam J. Rubenstein, Andrea Larson, Monica Hallam, and Monica Smoot. "Maxims or Myths of Beauty? A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review." *Psychological Bulletin* 126, no. 3 (2000): 390–423. Reviews 67 studies on judgments of beauty and their correlates.

Latané, Bibb, and John M. Darley. *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970. A description of experiments about bystander intervention, including studies conducted on the streets of New York City.

Leistico, Anne-Marie R., Randall T. Salekin, Jamie DeCoster, and Richard Rogers. "A Large-Scale Meta-Analysis Relating Hare Measures of Psychopathy to Antisocial Conduct." *Law and Human Behavior* 32, no. 1 (2008): 28–45. Examines 95 studies to determine the relationship between the Hare checklist and various types of problematic behavior.

"LouisianREBUILDS.info Contractor Fraud Survey Results." http://www.gnoinfo.com/files/Survey.pdf. Accessed May 14, 2013. Survey results that explain the nature and scope of contractor fraud following the Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans.

Lynn, Michael. "Increasing Servers' Tips: What Managers Can Do and Why They Should Do It." *Journal of Foodservice Business Research* 8, no. 4 (2005): 89–98. A review of literature on how to increase servers' tips.

Mandela, Nelson. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela.* New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1995. One of many books on Mandela, this is his own version of his early life and efforts to lead post-apartheid South Africa.

Milgram, Stanley. *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. This book describes the series of obedience studies Milgram conducted in the 1960s.

Mullaney, Kevin. "Leader Influence Behavior from the Target's Perspective: A Two-Factor Model." Master's thesis, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2011. A thorough study of the relationships among influence tactics and their outcomes.

Padilla, Art, Robert Hogan, and Robert B. Kaiser, "The Toxic Triangle: Destructive Leaders, Susceptible Followers, and Conducive Environments." *The Leadership Quarterly* 18 (2007): 176–194. Argues for three factors that combine to create destructive leadership—characteristics of leaders, characteristics of followers, and context—and illustrates the combination by examining Fidel Castro's leadership in Cuba.

Park, Sun Hyun, James D. Westphal, and Ithai Stern. "Set up for a Fall: The Insidious Effects of Flattery and Opinion Conformity toward Corporate Leaders." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (2011): 257–302. A study of CEOs, showing that they fall victim to flattery and persist in pursuing a losing strategy.

Petty, Richard E., and John T. Cacioppo. *Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1986. A classic book describing a dual-channel theory of attitude change.

Petty, Richard E., John T. Cacioppo, and David Schumann. "Central and Peripheral Routes to Advertising Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of Involvement." *Journal of Consumer Research* 10 (1983): 135–146. The seminal article demonstrating that argument quality had a greater impact on product attitudes when research participants were paying close attention.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. *Power: Why Some People Have It and Others Don't*. New York: HarperCollins, 2010. A business trade book that reviews research on power and offers specific suggestions for how to increase your own power at work.

Pink, Daniel. *To Sell Is Human: The Surprising Truth about Moving Others*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2012. An intriguing look at research and practice on selling, in the broadest sense of the term.

Pugh, S. Doug. "Service with a Smile: Emotional Contagion in the Service Encounter." *Academy of Management Journal* 44, no. 5 (2001): 1018–1027. A field study demonstrating the effect of smiling on service encounters.

Rezlescu, Constantin, Brad Duchaine, Christopher Y. Olivola, and Nick Chater. "Unfakeable Facial Configurations Affect Strategic Choices in Trust Games with or without Information about Past Behavior." *PLOS One* 7, no. 3 (2012): e34293. Three studies that examine features of faces that determine trustworthiness, along with how people react to those faces. The online article is open source and includes free pictures and graphics.

Ronson, Jon. *The Psychopath Test: A Journey through the Madness Industry*. London: Macmillan, 2011. Ronson digs deeper into Hare's psychopathy checklist and interviews Al Dunlap along the way.

Schneider, Andrea Kupfer. "Shattering Negotiation Myths: Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Negotiation Style." *Harvard Negotiation Law Review* 143 (2002): 143–233. Schneider asks lawyers about tactics used in negotiation contexts and challenges the notion that an adversarial approach is more effective than a more cooperative, problem-solving approach.

Sherif, Muzafer, O. J. Harvey, B. Jack White, William R. Hood, and Carolyn W. Sherif. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation.* Norman, OK: The University Book Exchange. 1954. A thorough description of the classic Robbers Cave Experiment, which demonstrates how conflict occurs as a natural result of dividing people into separate groups.

Bibliography

Skeem, Jennifer L., and David J. Cooke. "Is Criminal Behavior a Central Component of Psychopathy? Conceptual Directions for Resolving the Debate." *Psychological Assessment* 22, no. 2 (2010): 433–445. An argument critical of some uses of the Hare checklist, arguing for stronger distinctions between constructs (psychopathy) and imperfect measures of those constructs (the Hare checklist).

Spitzer, Manfred, Urs Fischbacher, Bärbel Herrnberger, Georg Grön, and Ernst Ferh. "The Neural Signature of Social Norm Compliance." *Neuron* 56 (2007): 185–196. Researchers used functional MRI to examine brains of participants playing a game in which they could either be punished or not for violating a norm. Differences in neural activation were found between high- and low-Machiavellian participants.

Stewart, Greg L., Susan L. Dustin, Murray R. Barrick, and Todd C. Darnold. "Exploring the Handshake in Employment Interviews." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93, no. 5 (2008): 1139–1146. A study showing that interviewees with firmer handshakes received higher employability ratings.

Sullivan, Brandon M., Kathleen M. O'Connor, and Ethan R. Burris. "Negotiator Confidence: The Impact of Self-Efficacy on Tactics and Outcomes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 42, no. 5 (2006): 567–581. A study demonstrating that confidence in the various components of principle-based negotiation predicts the adoption of this approach.

Tajfel, Henri. "Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination." *Scientific American* 223, no. 2 (1970): 96–102. Reports a series of studies showing that grouping people results in different behavior toward ingroup and outgroup members.

Tajfel, Henri, M. G. Billig, R. P. Bundy, and Claude Flament. "Social Categorization and Intergroup Behaviour." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 1, no. 2 (1971): 149–177. Two studies showing the power of assignment to groups in determining intergroup discrimination.

Triandis, H. *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995. A monograph that discusses the key attributes and outcomes of these two cultural constructs.

Westphal, James D., and David L. Deephouse. "Avoiding Bad Press: Interpersonal Influence in Relations between CEOs and Journalists and the Consequences for Press Reporting about Firms and Their Leadership." *Organization Science* 22, no. 4 (2011): 1061–1086. A study showing the connection between CEO use of ingratiation and reporters' explanations of why their companies did or did not have earnings that met expectations. Reporters who had been recipients of ingratiation attempts were more likely to attribute failure to meet earnings to the economy rather than to company leadership.

Xie, Guang-Xin, and David M. Boush. "How Susceptible Are Consumers to Deceptive Advertising Claims? A Retrospective Look at the Experimental Research Literature." *The Marketing Review* 11, no. 3 (2011): 293–314. A review of prior literature indicating, among other findings, that older adults are more susceptible to deceptive advertising.

Yukl, Gary, Helen Kim, and Cecilia M. Falbe. "Antecedents of Influence Outcomes." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81, no. 3 (1996): 309–317. Examines the factors that lead to target commitment.

Yukl, Gary, and Rubina Mahsud. "Why Flexible and Adaptive Leadership Is Essential." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* 62, no. 2 (2010): 81–93. The authors argue that effective leaders are flexible in their use of influence tactics and other leadership behaviors, adapting to the immediate situation.

Bibliography