DEMOGRAPHIC ANTECEDENTS OF UPWARD INFLUENCE STRATEGY IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN NIGERIA.

ARUOREN, Emmanuel Ejiroghene
Department of Business Administration, Faculty of the Social Sciences,
Delta State University, Abraka.
aruorenemmanuel@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the strategies used by employees to sway their superiors in public organizations in Nigeria, and to examine if demographic attributes sway the adoption of such strategies. The upward influence strategies examined were showing expertise, manipulation, blocking, defiance, ingratiation, rational persuasion, exchanging benefits, personalized help, showing dependency, and diplomacy. Three hundred and fifty-seven questionnaires were given to Local Government Council workers in Delta State, Nigeria. Results indicated that the popularly used strategy was rational persuasion, while the least used strategy was defiance. Gender difference was found in all ten strategies examined. However, age showed differences in ingratiation, manipulation, personalized help, blocking, and rational persuasion. Furthermore, married employees showed differences in manipulation, and showing expertise. Overall, the study supported the notion that adoption of upward influence strategies may be influenced by demographic characteristics. It was therefore recommended that managers, supervisors and subordinates should understand that demographic factors influence the adoption of upward influence strategies among employees.

Keywords: Upward influence strategies, gender, age, marital status, demographic factors

INTRODUCTION

Employees' ability to sway their peers, supervisors or managers and even top management has been linked to their success or failure in the workplace (Castrol, Douglas, Hochwarter, Ferris, and Frink, 2003). Hence, Yulk (2010) notes that knowing the strategy that will have the highest likelihood of success regarding

influencing your peers, and supervisors can lead to improvements in managerial effectiveness. This knowledge also helps promote individual employee career advancement (Barrick, Shaffer, and DeGrassi, 2009). Organization designs in recent times have tended towards horizontal designs, thus leading to downsizing, right-sizing and the flattening of organizational structures. This have led to lower level employees being more involved in decision-making (Steizel and Rimbau-Gilabert, 2013).

Upward influence strategy research is nascent, thus there are a limited number of theories available to help understand them, as well as limited number of empirical studies (Smith, Watkins, Burke, Christian, Smith, Hall, and Simms, 2013). Lee, Han, Cheong, Kim, and Yun (2017) performed a meta-analytic review of papers on influence strategy between 2003 – 2017, and found only few articles on upward influence. Although most studies are from the North America and Asian countries, studies in Africa have been relatively absent, especially in Nigeria. This calls for more research on upward influence strategy. Therefore, this study examined the least or most adopted strategy which employees use to sway their supervisors and determine if demographic attributes sway the adoption of such strategies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Upward Influence

The behavior of an individual to sway the behavior of another person is called influence tactics (Yukl, Seifert, and Chavez, 2008). According to Chaturvedi and Srivastava (2014) influence strategy can be understood as an effort by a person to change the attitude or thinking of another person to achieve a particular goal. Influence strategy within organizations may be classified as downward influence (i.e. when a superior influences the attitude or behavior of subordinates), or upward influence (i.e. when a subordinate influences the attitude or behavior of superiors), or horizontal influence (i.e. when peers within organizations influence each other's attitude or behavior). Upward influence strategy may therefore be described as tactics which a subordinate uses to sway or change the attitude or behavior of superiors higher in the organizational hierarchy to achieve an objective.

Types of Upward Influence Strategies

Over the last few decades, several influence strategies have been identified. The first detailed empirical study on influence tactics used in organizational settings

was conducted by Kipnis, Schmidt and Williams (1980). These researchers used the Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS) Questionnaire and identified eight influence tactics: blocking, assertiveness, sanctions, rationality, upward appeal, ingratiation, exchange, assertiveness and coalitions. Yukl et. al. (2008) used the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ) and identified eleven influence strategies, which they grouped into soft, rational and hard tactics (Table 1).

Table 1: Influence tactics, Explanation and Classification

Influence Tactics	Explanation	Classification
Rational Persuasion	The agent use's logical arguments and factual evidence to show that a request or proposal is feasible and relevant for important task objectives.	Rational
Consultation	The agent asks the target person to suggest improvements or help plan a proposed activity or change for which the target person's support is desired.	Soft
Inspirational Appeal	The agent appeals to the target's values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person's emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal.	Soft
Collaboration	The agent offers to provide assistance or necessary resources if the target will carry out a request or approves a proposed change.	Soft
Appraising	The agent explai ns how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or help to advance the target's career.	Soft
Ingratiation	The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an attempt to influence the target person to carry out a request or support a proposal.	Soft
Personal Appeal	The agent asks the target to carry out a request or support a proposal out of friendship, or asks for a personal favour before saying what it is.	Soft
Exchange	The agent offer something the target person wants, or offers to reciprocate at a later time, if the target will do what the agent requests.	Soft
Legitimacy	The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify that he/she has the authority to make it.	Hard
Pressure	The agent us es demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent remainders to influence the target to do something.	Hard
Coalition	The agent enlists the aid of others, or uses the support of others, as a way to influence the target to do something.	Hard

Source: Yukl, Seifert, and Chavez (2008)

Bhal and Ansari (2000) identified three new strategies in India: instrumental

dependency, showing expertise, and personalized help. More recently after reviewing the literature, Lam, Raja, Finstrad-Milion and Desilus (2017) identified 12 influence strategies: rational persuasion, exchange, inspirational appeals, legitimating tactics, apprising, pressure, collaboration, ingratiation, consultation, personal appeal, coalition tactics and organizational appeal. Furthermore, using a cross-cultural perspective, Ralston, Hallinger, Egri, and Naothinsuhk (2005) regrouped the strategies identified in previous research into the following: organizational sanctioned behavior, destructive/legal behaviors, destructive/illegal behaviors, and non-destructive/legal behaviors. Organizationally sanctioned behavior describes upward influence strategies which are beneficial to organizations, such as rational persuasion, showing expertise, and exchanging benefits. Non-destructive/legal behaviors consist of the 'me first' approach, sees self-interest as above others' interests, but are still tend not to be harmful. These include impression management, ingratiation, upward appeal, personalized help, showing dependency and diplomacy. Destructive/legal behaviors show the 'get-out-of-my-way-or-get-tramped' approach, which are legal but often tend to hurt other. These strategies include: blocking, and being manipulative. Finally, destructive/illegal behaviors are illegal and can harm others. These include coercive tactics, blackmailing and harassment.

Demographic variables and upward influence strategies

The consequence of demographic attributes (such as marital status, age, educational qualification, gender) on upward influence strategies was reviewed in this section. Although gender can influence several organizational variables, the effect of gender on the adoption of upward influence strategy has shown conflicting results (Akhtar & Mahmood, 2009). Studies by Ansari, Aafaqi, & Zainal (2007) and Sara, Manouchehr, Majid, Hossein & Elham (2009) found differences between men and women, in their choice of upward influence strategy. While men used manipulation, showing expertise, promising rewards, logical reasoning and threat of punishment, women used ingratiation, exchange, and upward appeal more frequently. Kaul, Ansari & Rai (2006) examined gender differences in choosing upward influence tactics in India and concluded that males and females exhibited differences in their use of upward influence strategy. More recently, Tyrovola, Papanikolaou & Adamis (2012) studied influence strategies in Greek organizations. Results revealed significant gender differences in inspirational appeals and apprising tactics.

Other researchers have reported no gender differences in the use of upward influence strategy. Akhtar & Mahmood (2009) studied upward influence tactics in Asia and reported that gender does not affect the choice of upward influence. Nag, Nongmaithem & Tripathi (2008) investigated whether gender affected power bases, influence outcomes and strategies in India. Their results revealed no gender differences in the choice of upward influence tactics. Earlier researchers (Yulk & Falbe, 1990; Yulk & Tracey, 1992) also found no differences in how men and women use upward influence within organizations.

Relatively few researches have considered upward influence strategies and its effect on age, level of educational attainment and marital status. Akhtar & Mahmood (2009) study in Asia reported that age was negatively related to ingratiation and exchange tactics, but found no correlation between age and rational persuasion. Tyrovola, et al, (2012) also found that age had significant correlations with ingratiation and consultation. Ralston, Hallinger, Egri & Naothinsuhk (2005) found age differences in the use of upward influence tactics. In terms of marital status, while no relationship was found with any influence tactics they studied (Tyrovola, et al, 2012), Wafa, Kharina, & Hassan (2012) reported that there was a significant difference in pressure strategy between singles and married individuals. Furthermore, in terms of highest educational qualification obtained, Tyrovola, et al, (2012) found that only the tactics of pressure showed significant difference with the three levels of education they studied (secondary school, university degree and postgraduate degree). Earlier studies (Sear, 1986; Ansari & Kapoor, 1987) reported that education could predict the choice of upward influence tactics. From the above discussion, this study will answer these questions:

Question One: To what extent do subordinates use each upward influence strategy in public organizations in Nigeria?

Question Two: To what extent do demographic variables influence the choice of upward influence strategy?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Sample/Participants: The sample for this study consisted of Local Government Council Employees in Delta State, Nigeria. Four hundred questionnaires were administered to the employees in their places of work and three hundred and fifty-seven useful questionnaires were retrieved, given a response rate of 89.25%.

The respondents were asked to rate the upward influence strategies used by them to influence their superiors at work. Demographic data were also collected.

Measures: Upward Influence Strategies was measured using a questionnaire adopted from Ansari, Aafaqi and Zainal (2007). These researchers identified ten upward influence strategies (using 39 items), used by subordinates. These strategies are: Ingratiation (6 items); Manipulation (5 items); Personalized Help (4 items); Defiance (4 items); Blocking (4 items); Showing Expertise (4 items); Exchange of Benefits (3 items); Rational persuasion (3 items); Showing Dependence (3 items); and Diplomacy (3 items). Participants were required to rate the extent to which they used certain behaviors in influencing their supervisors, using a 7 point likert scale ranging from 1 (Never true) to 7 (Always true). Demographic factor was collected on gender (male, female); age (21-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years, 51-60 years), marital status (single, married, divorced), and educational level attained (primary school, secondary school, diploma, degree, postgraduate, others).

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1 captures the results of respondent's bio-data analysis. The result revealed that 168(47.06%) and 189(52.94%) of the respondents are male and female respectively. Also, it was found that 114(31.93%) and 130(36.41%) are within the age brackets of 21-30years and 31-40years, while 93(26.05%) and 20(5.60%) are within the age bracket of 41-50years and 51-60years respectively. On the marital status of the respondents, it shows that 136(38.10%) and 217(60.78%) are single and married respectively, while only 4(1.12%) are divorced. Moreover, the educational level result shows that 10(2.80%), 44(12.32%) and 67(18.77%) are primary, secondary and diploma holders while 177(49.58%), 43(12.04%) and 16(4.48%) are degree, postgraduate and other degree holders.

Table 1: Respondents Bio-Data

S/N	Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Gender	Male	168	47.06%
		Female	189	52.94%
		Total	357	100.0%
2.	Age	21-30years	114	31.93%
		31-40years	130	36.41%
		41-50years	93	26.05%
		51-60years	20	5.60%
		Total	357	100.0%
3.	Marital Status	Single	136	38.10%
		Married	217	60.78%
		Divorced	4	1.12%
		Total	357	100.0%
4.	Educational Level	Primary School	10	2.80%
		Secondary School	44	12.32%
		Diploma	67	18.77%
		Degree	177	49.58%
		Postgraduate	43	12.04%
		Others	16	4.48%
			357	100.0%

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Question One: To what extent do subordinates use each upward influence strategy in public organizations in Nigeria?

Presented in Table 2 are the mean and standard deviation of each of the upward influence strategies of employees in rank order. The result implies that rational persuasion (mean = 4.6545) was the most frequently used strategy among employees in public organizations. This was followed by diplomacy (mean = 4.4818), ingratiation (mean = 4.3487), personalized help (mean = 4.0861), showing expertise (mean = 4.0833), exchange of benefits (mean = 3.7292), manipulation (mean = 3.3782), showing dependency (mean = 3.3604), blocking (mean = 2.8165), and defiance (mean = 2.8151) respectively. The least upward influence strategy used was defiance.

Table 2: Mean, and Standard Deviation Ratings of Influence Upward Strategies

Influence Strategy	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
Rational Persuasion	4.6545	1.2210	1st
Diplomacy	4.4818	1.2217	2nd
Ingratiation	4.3487	1.1769	3rd
Personalized Help	4.0861	1.2255	4th
Showing Expertise	4.0833	1.2459	5th
Exchange of Benefits	3.7292	1.3860	6th
Manipulation	3.3782	1.1092	7th
Showing Dependency	3.3604	1.5699	8th
Blocking	2.8165	1.2013	9th
Defiance	2.8151	1.2090	10th

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Question Two:		To what extent do demographic variables influence the choice of upward influence strategy?

In order to examine the relationship between each upward influence strategies and demographic variables of gender, age, marital status, and highest educational levels, t-tests (for those variables with two categories: gender) and one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni correction (for those variables with 3 or more categories: age, marital status and highest educational qualification) was performed. The upward influence strategies employed in this study encompassed ingratiation, manipulation, personalized help, defiance, blocking, showing expertise, exchange of benefits, rational persuasion, showing dependence and diplomacy.

The t-test result as presented in table 3 showed a significant gender variation in all ten (10) upward influence strategies. However, the female respondents are

significantly different in the upward influence strategies compared to the male; as the female category had a lower t-value in all respects.

Table 3: Predictive Model of the Upward Influence Strategies and Gender

Dependent Variable	Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Level	
						Lower Boundary	Upper Boundary
Integration	*Intercept*	2.44	.062			4.23	4.47
	Gender (Male)	.079	.027	6.47	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	5.54	.000	.958	.999
Manipulation	*Intercept*	1.95	.059			3.26	3.49
	Gender (Male)	.062	.027	8.45	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	4.93	.000	.958	.999
Personalized Help	*Intercept*	2.31	.065			3.96	4.21
	Gender (Male)	.529	.027	8.45	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	6.01	.000	.958	.999
Defiance	*Intercept*	1.67	.064			2.69	2.94
	Gender (Male)	.529	.026	9.19	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	5.85	.000	.958	.999
Blocking	*Intercept*	1.62	.064			2.69	2.93
	Gender (Male)	.59	.026	5.77	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	4.48	.000	.958	.999
Showing Expertise	*Intercept*	2.31	.061			3.95	4.21
	Gender (Male)	.47	.031	6.22	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	4.00	.000	.959	.999
Exchange of Benefits	*Intercept*	2.13	.073			3.58	3.87
	Gender (Male)	.509	.027	7.68	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	7.46	.000	.958	.999
Rational persuasion	*Intercept*	2.59	.064			4.53	4..78
	Gender (Male)	.488	.026	7.34	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	5.96	.000	.958	.999
Showing dependence	*Intercept*	1.94	.083			3.19	3.52
	Gender (Male)	.529	.027	13.45	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	9.86	.000	.958	.999
Diplomacy	*Intercept*	2.51	.065			4.36	4.61
	Gender (Male)	.529	.027	5.97	.000	.477	.581
	(Female)	.979	.011	4.90	.000	.958	.999

Source: Field Survey, 2019

The results of the one-way ANOVA, showed a significant difference in only seven of the ten upward strategies. In terms of age, significant differences were found for ingratiation (21-30 years with $F=8.62$, $p=0.0040<0.05$), manipulation (31-40 years with $F=3.60$, $p=0.0302<0.05$), personalized help (41-50 years with $F=2.26$, $p=0.0310<0.05$), blocking (31-40 years with $F=2.98$, $p=0.050<0.05$),

and rational persuasion(51-60 years with F=4.47, p=0.0487<0.05) (Table 4, 7, 8, 9, 11).In terms of marital status, only married employees showed significant differences in defiance (F=2.37, p=0.050<0.05), manipulation (F=2.50, p=0.0433<0.05) and showing expertise (F=3.96, p=0.0040<0.05) (Table 5, 7, 10). Furthermore, in terms of highest educational level attained, only employees with degrees showed significant difference in personalized help (F=3.25, p=0.0231<0.05). Overall, demographic antecedents affect upward influence strategies in public organizations.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study determined the most frequently used upward influence strategy by subordinates in public organizations in Nigeria. It also examined whether demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status and level of education have implication for the choice of upward influence strategy. The results identified rational persuasion as the most frequently used strategy by subordinates. This was followed by diplomacy, ingratiation, personalized help, showing expertise, exchange of benefit, manipulation, showing dependency, blocking, and defiance as the least used strategy. Gender difference was revealed in all ten strategies studied. This finding is consistent with Kaul et al, (2006), Sara et al, (2009) and Tyrovola et al, (2012), however it did not support Nag et al, (2008) and Akhtar & Mahmood (2009), who found no gender difference in choice of upward influence tactics.

Although, relatively few studies have considered age, marital status and level of education, some interesting facts emerged from the study. Age difference was found in five upward influence tactics (ingratiation, manipulation, personalized help, blocking and rational persuasion). This finding is consistent with Ralston et al, (2005). Married employees showed significant difference in defiance, manipulation and showing expertise. This finding supports Wafa et al, (2012). Finally, employees with degrees showed significant difference in the use of personalized help as an upward influence tactics.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDY

The intent of this study was to explore the most/ and least frequently used upward influence strategy and whether demographic variables impact on the choice of such strategies among public sector employees in Nigeria. The study concludes that whereas the most frequently used strategy was rational

persuasion, the least used strategy was defiance. Furthermore, employees' demographic characteristic, which includes gender, age, marital status and educational level, tends to affect the choice of upward influence strategies. Managers, supervisors and subordinates should therefore focus on the strategy that will probably lead to a positive outcome for themselves and the organization in general. The limitation of this study was that it focused only on employees' upward influence strategies in the public sector. Future research should include private sector organizations. Also, moderators such as quality of leader member exchanges (LMX) may influence the choice of adopting certain strategies. This should be studied in the future.

REFERENCES

Akhtar, S., & Mahmood, Z. (2009). A tri-prong variable analysis of influence strategies. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 7*(9), 1080-1089.

Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 40*, 39-49.

Ansari, M. A., Aafaqi, R., & Zainal, S. (2007). *Supervisory behavoiur, gender and upward influence.* Paper presented at the twenty second annual meeting of the Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology (SIOP), The Marriott Marquis, New York, April 27-29, 2007.

Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 6*, 1394-1411.

Bhal, K. L., & Ansari, M. A. (2000). *Managing Dyadic Interactions in Organizational Leadership.* New Delhi: Sage.

Castro, S., Douglas, C., Hochwarter, W., Ferris, G. & Frink, D. (2003). The effects of positive affect and gender on the influence tactics - job performance relationship. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(1), 1-18.

Chaturvedi, S., & Srivastava, A.K. (2014). An overview of upward influence tactics. *Global Journal of Finance and Management, 6*(3), 265-274.

Kaul, A., Ansari, M. A., & Rai, H. (2006). Gender, affect and upward influence: An India study. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability, 2*(2), 1-31.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 65(4), 440-452.

Lam, M., Raja, M., Finstad-Milion, K., & Desilus, B. (2017). Getting things done: Proactive influence tactics in Mexico and the United States. *Global Journal of Management and Marketing, 1*(2), 46-62.

Lee, S., Han, S., Cheong, M., Kim, S., & Yun, S. (2017). How do I get my way? A meta-analytic review of research on influence tactics. *The Leadership Quarterly, 28*(1), 210-228.

Nag, S., Nongmaithem, S., & Tripathi, N. (2008). Gender and influence strategies in work settings: Diminishing differences. *National Academy of Psychology, 53*(1), 41-53.

Ralston, D.A., Hallinger, P., Egri, C.P. & Naothinsuhk, S. (2005). The effects of culture and life stage on workplace strategies of upward influence: A comparison of Thailand and the United States. *Journal of World Business, 40*(3), 321-337.

Sara, Z., Manouchehr, N., Majid, M. M., Hossein, F. S., & Elham, F. (2009). Gender analysis of citizens willingness to participate in executive and managerial activities in Tehran Forest Parks. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 6*(8), 1107-1112.

Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow database on Social Psychology's view of human. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 515-530.

Smith, A. N., Watkins, M.B., Burke, M. J., Christian, M. S., Smith, C. E., Hall, A., & Simms, S. (2013). Gendered influence: A gender role perspective in the use and effectiveness of influence tactics. *Journal of Management, 39*(5), 1156-1183.

Steizel, S., & Rimbau-Gilabert, E. (2013). Upward influence tactics through technology-mediated communication tools. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 29*(2), 462-472.

Tyrovola, M. A., Papanikolaou, V., & Adamis, D. (2012). Predictive model for influence strategies in Greek organizations. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 3*(10), 32-42.

Wafa, S.A., Kharina, U., & Hassan, R.A. (2012). Influence strategies of Malaysian managers. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 1*(12), 137-142.

Yulk, G. A., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence strategies and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(2), 132-140.

Yulk, G. A., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence strategies used

with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 525-535.

Yulk, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C. (2008). Validation of the extended influence behavior questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 609-621.

Yulk, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J: Harlow.

APPENDIX 1

Table 4:   Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Ingratiation [a]	Age	(21-30years)	112	1.59	8.62	.004	12.8756	167.2316
		(31-40years)	127	1.3246	1.18	.3098	3.1333	168.2173
		(41-50years)	84	1.1661	1.70	.1105	14.9443	92.3407
		(51-60years)	18	1.3813	.90	.3549	1.2519	24.9926
	MS	(Single)	132	1.5034	.21	.8915	.9498	202.0101
		(Married)	212	1.3222	1.26	.2876	6.6234	279.0072
		(Divorced)	2	.4537	.10	.9091	.2361	1.125
	HEL	(Primary)	9	1.7793	.60	.5742	2.3472	13.6666
		(Secondary)	41	1.1989	.37	.6912	.8937	49.1543
		(Diploma)	64	1.4166	1.71	.1886	4.8509	90.6606
		(Degree)	173	1.5220	.88	.4536	4.0098	263.3087
		(Postgraduate)	38	.8314	1.11	.3670	3.6471	31.2741
		(Others)	11	1.2995	.81	.54566	4.4174	15.0756

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 5:   Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Defiance

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Defiance [d]	Age	(21-30years)	112	1.5898	1.15	.2866	1.8204	177.8271
		(31-40years)	127	1.5824	1.20	.3059	3.7722	200.3605
		(41-50years)	84	1.0659	.48	.8687	4.2682	93.7963
		(51-60years)	18	1.4571	2.93	.1041	3.8760	23.0883
	MS	(Single)	132	1.6873	.33	.8040	1.6932	226.0917
		(Married)	212	1.3364	2.37	.0500	12.3369	276.3180
		(Divorced)	2	1.125	.17	.8660	.84375	2.5313
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.5451	3.22	.1019	2.3516	25.5470
		(Secondary)	41	1.992	1.39	.2613	3.3262	49.1667
		(Diploma)	64	1.7359	.21	.8151	.7137	111.3311
		(Degree)	173	1.4921	.09	.9632	.4213	258.1408
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.3946	.32	.8639	1.8989	56.6737
		(Others)	11	1.7185	1.85	.1894	10.3712	15.4063

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 6: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Exchange of Benefits

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Exchange of Benefits[g]	*Age*	(21-30years)	112	2.0162	0.13	.7199	.2626	227.5668
		(31-40years)	127	1.7000	1.23	.2968	4.1566	215.2109
		(41-50years)	84	2.1827	.65	.7298	11.7805	189.0248
		(51-60years)	18	1.3929	2.02	.1720	2.6741	23.7926
	MS	(Single)	132	1.9587	.46	.7075	2.7627	261.6612
		(Married)	212	1.9134	1.43	.2256	10.8485	402.4592
		(Divorced)	2	1.6667	.75	.6325	2.9999	1.9999
	HEL	(Primary)	9	1.2810	2.74	.1320	4.7178	5.3333
		(Secondary)	41	2.1692	.09	.9131	.3955	88.9379
		(Diploma)	64	1.5759	1.81	.1718	5.7072	100.8600
		(Degree)	174	2.1678	.63	.5955	4.1087	375.0337
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.0399	.85	.5042	3.5764	40.0980
		(Others)	11	2.4741	.59	.6760	6.5679	30.5432

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 7: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Manipulation

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Manipulation [b]	*Age*	(21-30years)	112	.911	0.30	.5865	.2728	102.6774
		(31-40years)	127	1.4252	3.60	.0302	9.8569	173.9879
		(41-50years)	84	1.1489	.62	.7594	5.8864	99.8167
		(51-60years)	18	1.3654	.52	.4808	.72559	25.2159
	MS	(Single)	132	1.0766	1.01	.3906	3.2613	142.0842
		(Married)	212	1.3166	2.50	.0433	12.8342	271.5591
		(Divorced)	2	1.8499	1.21	.5403	3.9399	1.6199
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.4711	.63	.5613	.6450	3.5950
		(Secondary)	41	1.3741	.76	.4743	2.0878	56.3376
		(Diploma)	64	1.2717	1.73	.1858	4.3952	81.3898
		(Degree)	173	1.2689	.51	.6755	1.9423	219.4031
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.4476	1.70	.1699	7.3024	40.7777
		(Others)	11	.7438	3.04	.0648	5.5875	5.3000

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 8: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Personalized Help

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Personalized Help[c]	Age	(21-30years)	112	1.5669	1.43	.2338	2.2367	174.8225
		(31-40years)	127	1.5441	1.58	.2095	4.8433	194.3437
		(41-50years)	84	1.2929	2.26	.0310	21.0343	97.9187
		(51-60years)	18	1.5796	2.03	.1716	3.0375	26.9750
	MS	(Single)	132	1.5674	1.70	.1710	7.8531	203.7479
		(Married)	212	1.4588	1.80	.1294	10.3681	304.7425
		(Divorced)	2	1.3079	62.25	.0893	3.8906	.0313
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.4729	.42	.6753	.4516	3.8047
		(Secondary)	41	1.4325	.93	.4021	2.6693	58.7326
		(Diploma)	64	1.3705	.61	.5490	1.6594	87.7119
		(Degree)	173	1.4927	3.25	.0231	14.5737	258.2299
		(Postgraduate)	38	2.1177	0.12	.9738	1.1275	87.8143
		(Others)	11	.9622	1.52	.2625	5.1419	9.2917

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 9: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Blocking

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Source Within Group
Blocking [e]	Age	(21-30years)	112	1.1779	.14	.7139	.16034	132.9515
		(31-40years)	127	1.3836	2.98	.0500	8.0064	170.4762
		(41-50years)	84	1.7493	.43	.9002	6.3246	154.6122
		(51-60years)	18	1.8941	.36	.5564	.7041	35.2833
	MS	(Single)	132	1.1509	.47	.7027	1.6469	153.7262
		(Married)	212	1.5983	2.06	.0874	12.9072	332.3243
		(Divorced)	2	2.6406	.25	.8165	2.6406	5.2813
	HEL	(Primary)	9	1.0563	.33	.7273	.8266	8.6797
		(Secondary)	41	1.8569	.78	.4635	2.9100	76.1354
		(Diploma)	64	1.2596	.27	.7679	.6682	80.6172
		(Degree)	173	1.4659	2.39	.0704	10.5116	253.6119
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.1643	.44	.7767	2.1787	46.7224
		(Others)	11	1.3059	2.38	.1152	9.0864	10.5034

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 10: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Showing Expertise

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Within Group
Showing Expertise[f]	Age	(21-30years)	112	1.2384	0.68	.4101	1.2384	202.9157
		(31-40years)	127	1.4782	.77	.4673	2.2709	188.4213
		(41-50years)	84	1.4306	.61	.7673	7.2242	124.3901
		(51-60years)	18	1.1044	.01	.9295	.0094	20.975
	MS	(Single)	132	1.6323	.78	.5052	3.8552	216.5051
		(Married)	212	1.5081	3.96	.0040	22.6468	303.1107
		(Divorced)	2	1.6041	.14	.8864	1.0313	3.7813
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.4174	2.69	.1362	1.6313	2.1250
		(Secondary)	41	1.4269	1.36	.2668	3.8953	58.5064
		(Diploma)	64	1.6631	.75	.4751	2.5047	106.4355
		(Degree)	173	1.4844	2.09	.1035	9.2996	256.7979
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.7600	1.41	.2479	9.5777	64.3437
		(Others)	11	1.8156	.91	.4913	6.7726	20.4618

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 11: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Rational Persuasion

Dependent Variable		Parameter	DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Within Group
Rational persuasion[h]	Age	(21-30years)	112	.1821	0.10	.7473	.1821	195.4368
		(31-40years)	127	1.4487	0.83	.4378	2.4149	184.4602
		(41-50years)	84	1.3729	1.36	.2269	14.4675	111.8360
		(51-60years)	18	.0961	4.47	.0487	3.4241	13.7926
	MS	(Single)	132	1.7748	.33	.8025	1.7923	237.8016
		(Married)	212	1.3149	1.23	.3008	6.4208	277.5966
		(Divorced)	2	.4074	.19	.8528	.3333	.8889
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.6716	.56	.5939	.8361	5.2083
		(Secondary)	41	2.0135	.30	.7415	1.2131	82.5521
		(Diploma)	64	1.5691	.28	.7557	.8827	155.2517
		(Degree)	173	1.3942	1.02	.3849	4.2687	241.1901
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.5787	2.48	.0598	13.7461	52.5588
		(Others)	11	.8426	.99	.4509	3.3549	9.2839

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 12: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Showing Dependence

Dependent Variable	Parameter		DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Within Group
Showing dependence[i]	*Age*	(21-30years)	112	2.1906	1.04	.3092	2.2851	245.2471
		(31-40years)	127	2.8101	2.74	.0682	15.0112	347.4854
		(41-50years)	84	2.3586	.81	.5969	15.5144	201.4774
		(51-60years)	18	1.9237	.16	.6980	.3129	36.2370
	MS	(Single)	132	1.7747	.33	.8025	1.7923	237.8016
		(Married)	312	2.5762	1.28	.2797	13.1016	543.3459
		(Divorced)	2	1.2963	1.69	.4781	3.0000	.88889
	HEL	(Primary)	9	1.2709	4.58	.0500	6.5249	4.9861
		(Secondary)	41	1.8422	1.30	.2827	4.8015	75.5293
		(Diploma)	64	2.4251	1.15	.3232	5.5776	155.2517
		(Degree)	173	2.5916	1.61	.1891	12.5073	448.3401
		(Postgraduate)	38	2.3194	1.19	.3308	10.8458	86.5703
		(Others)	11	3.5032	3.10	.0615	27.8573	24.6914

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 13: Predictive Model of Age, Marital Status, Highest Educational Level and Diplomacy

Dependent Variable	Parameter		DF(1)	MS	F	Prob.	Source Between Group	Within Group
Diplomacy[j]	*Age*	(21-30years)	112	1.4816	0.16	.6885	.2411	167.1789
		(31-40years)	127	1.5557	1.44	.2403	4.4563	196.2316
		(41-50years)	84	1.3742	.41	.9115	4.7587	121.6667
		(51-60years)	18	1.6944	.154	.2308	2.5352	29.6593
	MS	(Single)	132	1.6374	.125	.2935	6.1184	214.9633
		(Married)	212	1.3787	1.76	.1388	9.5545	288.2499
		(Divorced)	2	2.1018	5.81	.2816	5.8056	.5000
	HEL	(Primary)	9	.7704	2.59	.1441	2.9472	3.9861
		(Secondary)	41	1.1478	.01	.9917	.0191	47.0617
		(Diploma)	64	1.6643	1.10	.3386	3.6664	106.5160
		(Degree)	173	1.4967	.61	.6114	27248	258.9374
		(Postgraduate)	38	1.5276	.80	.5340	4.9723	59.1879
		(Others)	11	1.3185	.78	.5610	4.3703	15.4074

Source: Field Survey, 2020