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"I could have saved a life that day, but I chose to look the other way."

--- Don Merrill

"I have come to believe over and over again that what is most important to me must be spoken, made verbal and shared, even at the risk of having it bruised or misunderstood."

--- Audre Lorde

It is reported that some of the staff members involved in the Challenger Space Shuttle project were aware of the flawed design of the O-rings and the Solid Rocket Booster, but they did not speak up and report the issue to higher authorities in order to have it corrected. Instead, they acknowledged the flawed design as an acceptable flight risk. The Rogers Commission which was in charge of investigating the disaster characterized this as a contributing factor causing the accident (Rogers et al., 1986).

In the case of the Tenerife airport disaster, there is evidence to suggest that the co-pilot and the flight engineer on board of one of the airplanes were aware that their plane had not been cleared for takeoff, but they were hesitant to speak up to the captain because they did not wish to challenge one of the most senior, highly respected captains in the fleet. The official investigation suggested that this might have been one of the explanations for why human errors occurred (Roitsch, Babcock, & Edmunds, 1977).
It is reported in a research article published in Organization Science (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005) that a nurse caring for a 27-week old baby had her own suspicion about the accuracy of the physician's diagnosis. She saw that the baby's conditions worsened. She spoke up repeatedly to different senior nurses and doctors until the attending physician realized the seriousness of the situation and called for the surgeons. Had she not done that, the life of the young patient might have been lost.

These three anecdotes may be extreme, but they illustrate to a great extent the topic of this dissertation and its importance -- exerting influence upwards in the workplace. In a series of empirical studies, we will investigate why and how employees engage in upward influence using voice and different tactics. Specifically, we examine what motivates employees to speak up and use various upward influence behaviors. We propose that employees' pursuit of achievement goals (e.g., DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Dweck, 1999; Elliot, 1999; Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007; VandeWalle, 1997; Yeo, Loft, Xiao, & Kiewitz, 2009) serve as internal, motivational forces that drive employees to engage in upward influence. This is because we believe the motivations associated with mastery goals -- the desire to develop competence -- and performance goals -- the desire to demonstrate competence -- best speak to the motivational and cognitive requirement to invest time, energy, and expertise in order to engage in upward influence.

In this introduction section, we will first clarify what upward influence is and its importance to organizations, supervisors, and employees. We then describe the complexity of the underlying motivational forces that drive employees to engage in upward influence by discussing the risky, delicate nature of upward influence behaviors. After that, we explicate our rationale for using achievement goal theory as the fundamental theoretical framework to examine motivational antecedents of upward
influence. Finally, we present an overview which outlines the main focal research questions of the three empirical chapters.

**Upward influence behavior -- definitions and importance**

Interpersonal influence behaviors refer to what individuals do in order to alter the attitudes and behaviors of others (Cialdini, 2006). When such behaviors are used by employees and directed upwards in order to influence their supervisors, they are upward influence behaviors by definition (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990). As such, numerous types of employee behaviors may fall under this general definition. For instance, employees may engage in whistleblowing, issue-selling, complaints, and expression of dissent to, directly or indirectly, consciously or subconsciously, influence the supervisor. In this dissertation, we focus on two specific types of upward influence behaviors which are used directly on the supervisor with a clear, conscious intention to influence: upward challenging-promotive voice behavior and upward influence tactics.

Challenging-promotive voice behavior refers to discretionary, extra-role communication by an employee of suggestions, concerns, and information about potential problems, or opinions and ideas about work-related issues to the supervisor with the intent to change things for the better (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison, 2011; 2014). One can direct this form of voice at subordinates, coworkers, and superiors. Obviously, we examine employees' upward challenging-promotive voice in this dissertation. We have two main reasons for this. First, the supervisor is the power-holder in a work unit, controls valuable organizational resources, and holds much decision making authority. Consequently, employees who intend to change certain aspects within that work environment would very likely
require the approval and support of the supervisor. Therefore, upward voice is essential for the employee who intends to effect change and bring about improvements. Second, as this form of voice behavior challenges the status-quo by promoting and proposing some form of a change, supervisors may be offended or even threatened by it. This unique nature of upward voice makes it risky as the employees who choose to engage in it would need to balance their desire to change and improve things with the risk of challenging their supervisors. As a result, upward voice is worthy of careful scholarly examination in order for us to understand why some individuals would engage in voice while others would not.

The delicate, risky nature is not exclusive to upward voice behavior, it is shared by upward influence tactics -- the other main upward influence behavior construct we focus on in this dissertation. Employees may use specific tactics to influence the behaviors and attitudes of their supervisors. Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980) and Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) identified six upward influence tactics: assertiveness, or using a forceful approach to gain compliance; upward appeal, or asking the superiors of the influence target to help gain the influence target's compliance; coalition, or gaining support from knowledgeable others in order to influence the target; ingratiation, or being friendly and trying to increase liking in order to influence the target; bargaining, or offering to do something in return in order to gain compliance; rationality, or using information, facts, and figures to make logical arguments in order to persuade the target. These six tactics were further categorized into hard, soft, and rational tactics (Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003). Hard tactics use more power and put more pressure on the target to comply. Soft tactics rely less on the direct use of forceful power but more on power-sharing and do not force the target to comply. Assertiveness, upward appeal, and
coalition are considered hard tactics as they rely directly on power and leave little room for the target to decide whether to comply or not (Higgins et al., 2003; Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993). Bargaining and ingratiation are considered soft tactics as they rely on power-sharing and the target is not pushed to comply as much as by the hard tactics (Higgins et al., 2003; Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993). Rationality stands on its own as a rational tactic as it is primarily rooted in logic and information (Higgins et al., 2003; Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003).

Research has shown that upward influence behaviors are important both for the influence target -- the supervisor, and for the influence agent -- the employee. From a supervisor's point of view, employees' upward influence behavior represents opportunities to improve the functioning of the work unit and increase its overall work performance. For example, upward voice has positive effects on group problem-solving (Nemeth, Connell, Rogers, & Brown, 2001), work-group task performance (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011), and work-unit effectiveness (Detert, Burris, Harrison, & Martin, 2013). Consequently, managers and supervisors have come to rely on their employees' voice input to effectively manage the work units for which they are responsible.

From an employee's perspective, successfully engaging in upward influence offers the chance to acquire valuable organizational resources which may greatly aid their job performance and career development. Studies have shown that employees use upward influence tactics to gain supervisors' approval and liking (Su, 2010), increase supervisors' rating of employee promotability (Thacker & Wayne, 1995), obtain valued resources, information, and equipment (Yukl & Falbe, 1990), negotiate performance ratings, salary, and benefits (Wayne et al., 1997), as well as resolve
conflicts and deal with stress (Nonis, Sager, & Kumar, 1996). As such, engaging in upward influence is critical for employees to be successful at work.

**Upward influence behavior -- the underlying motivational complexity**

Upward influence behaviors are not only important, they are also complex because the engagement in such behaviors relies on a complexity of substantive, communicative, persuasive, and risk considerations. In other words, to influence the supervisor, employees need to identify and formulate the substance that forms the influence objective, they need to take actions to communicate such substance to the supervisor, and they need to do so in a manner that is persuasive and convincing in order to achieve their influence objectives. Even then, there is still no guarantee that their effort will successfully influence the supervisor and they may end up upsetting and offending the supervisor through failed or improper upward influence attempts. Due to this behavioral and cognitive complexity, the motivational antecedents that underlie employees' engagement in upward influence behaviors are also complex. That is, an employee needs to be driven to address all the substantive, communicative, persuasive, and risk considerations in order to be sufficiently motivated to engage in upward influence.

However, few studies have fully taken into account this underlying motivational complexity when examining the antecedents of upward influence behaviors. Most research has, explicitly or implicitly, focused on a distinct aspect of voice to associate it with specific cognitive and motivational considerations. Taking the substantive aspect as an example, studies have found that those employees with innovative cognitive preferences (Janssen, De Vries, & Cozijnsen, 1998), those highly conscientious (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001) and those central in workplace networks
(Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010) are more motivated and better able to develop substance for upward influence attempts. In terms of overcoming the potential risks of upward influence, studies have found that employees who receive much organizational support (Tucker, Chmiel, Turner, Hershcovis, & Stride, 2008) and who are supervised by ethical leaders (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) and transformational leaders (Cable & Judge, 2003) are more motivated to speak their mind and try to influence the supervisor. While these studies have greatly advanced scholarly understanding of what promotes and motivates employees to engage in upward influence, what is lacking is an investigative approach that incorporates the multiple underlying motivational aspects in the examination of upward influence antecedents.

We address this key issue in this research project by examining employees' engagement in upward influence behaviors from a multiple motivational approach in order to take into account the above mentioned underlying motivational complexity. Put differently, we aim to utilize a theoretical framework that can speak to how employees fulfill different motivational requirements to not only formulate substance but also communicate it persuasively to overcome the potential risks associated with upward influence attempts, in order to exert influence on the supervisor. Through reviewing the literatures and prior research on achievement motivation, we have identified the achievement goal theory, a predominant motivational framework used by researchers to examine individuals' professional and academic motivations, to be of value for this research project. Below we outline the central tenets of this theory and elaborate on why it serves as a fundamental theoretical framework that elucidates the motivational antecedents of upward influence behaviors.
Achievement goal theory

Generally speaking, we all love to win and hate to lose. This is because humans have a fundamental desire for achievement and success (Dweck, 1986; Elliot, 1999). Scholars in psychology and management use achievement goal theory to better describe and investigate how these fundamental desires for achievement and success shape individual behavior. According to the achievement goal theory, an individual's achievement motivation is rooted in their desire to develop competence, known as a mastery goal, and to demonstrate competence, known as a performance goal (e.g., Dweck, 1986; Dweck, 1999; DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Elliot, 1999; Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009). In other words, a mastery goal reflects an individual's desire to develop their competence and to improve their performance relative to their own past performance. A performance goal reflects the desire to demonstrate superior competence on performance indicators relative to socially relevant others (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009). Both mastery and performance goals are fueled by the fundamental human need for competence (Deci & Ryan, 2002), though they refer to different standards for competence evaluations. Mastery goal individuals feel more competent when they improve their performance relative to their own previous performance -- they focus on intrapersonal standards. In contrast, individuals pursuing a performance goal feel more competent when their performance is superior than others' -- they focus on interpersonal standards.

Early research using a dichotomous mastery vs. performance conceptualization found that a mastery goal was more beneficial than a performance goal in inducing positive behavioral outcomes (e.g., Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996; Farr, Hofmann, & Ringenbach, 1993; Ford, Weissbein, Smith, & Gully, 1998; Phillips & Gully, 1997;
VanderWalle, Brown, Cron, & Slocum, 1999). However, subsequent research found that a performance goal was also sometimes related to positive behaviors and performances (e.g., Elliot & Church, 1997; Skaalvik, 1997). This led scholars to bifurcate a performance goal into a performance-approach goal, or the motivation to outperform others in order to demonstrate competence, and a performance-avoidance goal, or the motivation to avoid being outperformed by others in order to prevent being viewed as incompetent (VandeWalle, 1997). Of the two, a performance-approach goal has been found to elicit increased effort whereas a performance-avoidance goal was found to relate to the reduction of efforts in achievement situations (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Duda, 2001; Dweck, 1999).

Following the bifurcation of the performance goal, a mastery goal was also further categorized into approach and avoidance versions where a mastery-approach goal motivates individuals to focus on the development of competence and a mastery-avoidance goal motivates individuals to avoid deterioration or the loss of competence and skills (Elliot & McGregor, 2001), resulting in a four-goal conceptualization of achievement motivation. Recently, researchers also proposed and used a five-goal conceptualization (mastery intrinsic, mastery extrinsic, performance approach, performance avoidance, and work avoidance [Pulkka & Niemivirta, 2013]) and a six-goal conceptualization (task approach, task avoidance, self-approach, self-avoidance, other approach, and other avoidance [Elliot, Murayama, & Pekrun, 2011]). The majority of studies on achievement goals have used either the four-factor model (i.e., mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, performance avoidance) or the two approach versions of mastery and performance goals (Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011). We also adopt this latter approach and focus on mastery-approach and performance-approach goals throughout this dissertation.
We have three main reasons for focusing on the approach versions of mastery and performance goals. First, theoretical parsimony considerations: the models we conceptualize and test in the three empirical chapters are already sufficiently complex. To incorporate all four or six goals would likely be impractical and antithetical to our goal of writing coherent and interesting papers that potential readers can comprehend and use. Second, close alignment between approach focus and upward influence behavior: the approach nature of employee upward influence behaviors such as voice and influence tactics are closely aligned with approach-oriented achievement motivation (Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003), and therefore, focusing on the two approach goals is theoretically sound. Third, the two-approach-factor conceptualization of mastery and performance goals has a rich theoretical and empirical foundation (e.g., Anseel et al., 2011; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Poortvliet, 2012; Poortvliet et al., 2009; Poortvliet et al., 2011; Porter, Gogus, & Race, 2010; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011; Van Hooft & Noordzij, 2009) that we can use for conceptualizing our research models.

**Dispositional versus situational goals**

DeShon and Gillespie (2005) reviewed the widespread study of achievement goals and identified five distinct categories of definitions: as dispositional traits, quasi-trait, mental frameworks, beliefs, or situation-specific goals. Essentially, these categories represent a spectrum in which goals are treated as stable personality traits to changeable achievement motivation depending on the particular situation. In empirical research, some studies use mastery and performance goals to reflect individuals' dispositional traits that do not significantly change over time or across situations (e.g., Dweck, 1999; Nicholls, 1984; Vandewalle, 2003), whereas others implicate these
goals as achievement cognitions that individuals can choose to adopt depending on the situation and the specific tasks involved (e.g., Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996; Farr et al., 1993; Pintrich, 2000).

There are merits in both approaches. One may argue that because dispositional goals are relatively more stable and unchanging, this conceptualization is especially important to research. On the other hand, as situational goals are more specific to the situation and task, they may more directly and reliably predict an individual's behavior, thereby making this conceptualization more research worthy. In this project, we take into account both conceptualizations and examine how dispositional and situational goals are related to employees' upward influence behaviors. Specifically, in the study reported in Chapter 2, we define and conceptualize achievement goals as domain-specific traits (i.e., goal orientations in a work environment) that include dispositional goal propensities (e.g., VandeWalle et al., 2011). In the studies reported in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, we define and conceptualize achievement goals as situational goal states induced and adopted in a specific work context (Elliot et al., 2011; Van Yperen & Orehek, 2013). In this way, we incorporate both dispositional and situational conceptualizations of achievement goals in this dissertation.

**Multiple goal perspective**

When using the achievement goal theory in the examination of employees' motivation to engage in upward influence behaviors, we apply the multiple goal perspective (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Senko et al., 2011) because this perspective best speaks to the complexity of employees' motives to engage in such behaviors. According to the multiple goal perspective, mastery and performance goals are not mutually exclusive but may combine to achieve the greatest motivational
effects. Three types of combinations are possible to enhance outcomes. The two goals may: (1) have a positive interactive effect to optimize an outcome (interactive model); (2) each have a positive main effect on an outcome (additive model); or (3) have unique effects on different outcomes (specialized model) (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Senko et al., 2011). The reason that the multiple goal perspective is valuable for the examination of motivation for upward influence is that the combination of mastery and performance goals can best address the substantive and persuasive aspects of upward influence behaviors in the cognitions of the focal individual employee.

Research shows that many employees are concerned about the potential repercussions of speaking up, such as being labeled as a rebel or trouble-maker by socially relevant others and being given poor performance ratings by the supervisor (Morrison, 2014). The choice and use of improper upward influence tactics could also lead to negative outcomes such as lowered assessment of promotability (Thacker & Wayne, 1995) or increased dislike by the supervisor (Su, 2010). As a result, employees' engagement in upward influence involves delicate balancing between the desire to develop one’s competence by uncovering issues and identifying opportunities for improvement on the one hand, and the desire to impress and persuade the supervisor of the value of one’s input, thereby demonstrating one’s competence and reducing the risk of negative repercussions. We propose that this duality in motives can be best addressed through the multiple goal perspective. Below, we present our main arguments on why the achievement goal theory and the multiple goal perspective serve as the fundamental theoretical frameworks that elucidates the complex underlying motivational antecedents of upward influence behaviors.
Achievement motivation and upward influence

The achievement goal theory represents a predominant theoretical framework for understanding employees' motivation and achievement striving in management and psychological studies (Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009). Both mastery-oriented and performance-oriented motivations have been found to guide an array of work-related cognitions and behaviors (e.g., Chiaburu, Marinova, & Lim, 2007; Darnon, Muller, Schrager, Pannuzzo, & Butera, 2006; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Porter, 2005). Consequently, there is adequate research and theoretical support to suggest that this theoretical framework is indeed relevant and valuable for researching employees' upward influence behaviors.

More specifically, we believe that employees' mastery-oriented achievement motivation enables and drives them to develop and formulate the substance which they may communicate to the supervisor in order to exert influence upwards. Mastery goals have been found to induce high levels of intrinsic motivation (Elliot & Harachiewicz, 1996; Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999), the use of deep information processing strategy (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Elliot, 1999; Pintrich, 2000), and the adoption of epistemic regulation for problem solving (Darnon & Butera, 2007). We argue that these motivational strategies may facilitate employees to identify work-related issues, uncover improvement areas, and formulate ideas with which they can influence the supervisor, all of which increase the likelihood for such employees to engage in upward influence behaviors.

Performance goals, on the other hand, are related to a win-focused, competitive mindset driven to demonstrate superior competence to socially relevant others (Dweck, 1986; Gehlbach, 2006; Poortvliet & Darnon, 2010). As such, employees pursuing a strong performance goal are motivated to frame their concerns, opinions, and ideas in
the best possible light in order to impress and persuade the supervisor of the value of their input. Consequently, performance goals may motivate employees to approach upward influence attempts as opportunities to demonstrate superior competence to their supervisor, thereby giving little attention to the potential risks associated with upward influence. Taken together, mastery and performance goals in combination motivate employees to address both the substantive and persuasive aspects that are inherently involved in upward influence.

To conclude, the central theme of investigation in this dissertation is the relationship between achievement motivation and upward influence. Relying on the achievement goal theory and the multiple goal perspective, we will focus on how mastery-oriented and performance-oriented achievement motivation in combination may promote employees' engagement in upward influence behaviors. We will also identify and examine moderating and mediating roles that other work-related constructs play in regulating and clarifying the relationship between achievement motivation and upward influence, which we will introduce in more detail below in the chapter overview.

**Overview of the dissertation**

Using the multiple goal perspective to guide our design of a series of field studies, we investigate in chapters 2 and 3 how trait-like achievement goal orientations and achievement goal states serve as the underlying motivational force that drives employees to engage in upward, challenging-promotive voice behavior. We conceptualize and empirically test our proposition that the combined effects of both mastery and performance goals are most conducive to employee voice. In chapter 4, we apply the multiple goal perspective in the examination of employees' use of
expertise power to engage in various upward influence tactics. We argue that mastery and performance goals serve as joint moderators in determining how employees utilize their expertise to influence the supervisor. We present the main focus of each chapter below before describing how the three empirical chapters integrate to investigate the central research theme.

Chapter 2 -- Goal orientations, upward voice, and influence

In this chapter, we will examine how achievement goals as domain-specific traits (i.e., mastery and performance orientations in the work environment) motivate employees to use upward voice in order to influence the supervisor. We expect that a mastery goal orientation would motivate employees to engage in voice towards the supervisor. This is because we believe that employees driven by this orientation are more likely and better able to identify work-related issues, develop improvement suggestions, and articulate them to the supervisor.

Furthermore, we argue that as employee voice behavior has substantial value for supervisors, employees who can consistently provide voice behavior will be most likely to be perceived by the supervisors as important and influential members of the work unit. Accordingly, we will investigate to what extent voice serves as an explanatory mechanism for why employees with a high mastery orientation are influential to the supervisor.

Finally, based on the multiple goal perspective (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Senko, Hulmean, & Harackiewicz, 2011), we propose that a high performance goal orientation enhances the influence of employee voice on the supervisor. The reason for this proposed moderation is that a high performance orientation increases employees' motivation to leverage voice behavior into influence on their supervisor by
persuading the supervisor of their valuable input and superior competence. In this chapter, we empirically test these hypothesized relationships using survey data collected from employee-supervisor dyads working in a four-star Dutch hotel.

**Chapter 3 -- Motivational antecedents of voice: A multiple goal - status interaction perspective**

In chapter 3, we continue our examination of the motivational antecedents of employee upward voice and propose that mastery goals and performance goals would interact with employee status in predicting voice. This chapter includes two empirical studies. Study 1 conceptualizes the three-way interaction among mastery goals, performance goals, and status in predicting employee voice. In line with the previous chapter, we argue that the desire to improve (i.e., mastery goals) and the desire to demonstrate improvements (i.e., performance goals) are both relevant motivators for voice. However, as voice is associated with socio-political risks, higher status employees are better positioned to act upon their mastery and performance motivation to engage in voice. Thereby, the two achievement goals and status would form a three-way interaction in predicting voice such that the relationship between mastery goals and voice is positive only when performance goals are higher rather than lower and status is higher rather than lower.

In Study 2 of this chapter, we seek to identify the proximal mediating mechanisms that clarify why mastery and performance goals motivate employees to engage in voice. We argue that mastery and performance goals each lead to different interests in voice. Specifically, we expect that employees motivated by mastery goals would have a high level of intrinsic interest in voice behaviors because mastery goals
drive employees to seek improvement and development (e.g., Elliot, 2005; Poortvliet, 2013; Van Yperen & Orehek, 2013) and to adopt deep information processing strategies (Darnon & Butera, 2007; Elliot, 1999; Pintrich, 2000). These employees are motivated to detect issues and shortcomings in work processes, products, and procedures in order to construct opportunities for improvement and development. Thus, due to the intrinsic value of voice for improvement and development, strong mastery goals would increase employees' intrinsic interest in voice behaviors. In contrast, performance goals focus on demonstrating superior performance-related competence relative to others (Dweck, 1986; Elliot, 2005; Gehlbach, 2006; Poortvliet & Darnon, 2010). Consequently, performance goals would encourage employees to view voice behaviors as an opportunity to display superior skill, expertise, and performance to socially relevant others (i.e., supervisors and coworkers). Due to the instrumental value of voice for performance enhancement, strong performance goals would increase employees' extrinsic interest in voice behavior.

As such, intrinsic interest and extrinsic interest in voice are conceptualized to function as mediators that explain why mastery and performance goals motivate employees to engage in voice and these two mediating variables would form a three-way interaction with status in predicting voice. In sum, Study 2 tests a moderated mediating model in which status operates as a second-stage moderator in the indirect relationships of mastery and performance goals with voice that are mediated by the two-way interaction between intrinsic and extrinsic interest in voice. Specifically, the indirect relationship between mastery goals and voice through intrinsic interest in voice is more pronounced when extrinsic interest in voice is higher rather than lower and status is higher rather than lower.
To test our propositions, we utilize two samples, one for each study. Study 1 relies on data collected from 1,100 South Korean R&D employees nested in 111 work teams and Study 2 makes use of data collected from 150 Dutch hotel employees nested in 95 teams.

Chapter 4 -- Achievement goals, power, and upward influence

In chapter 4, we examine how employees pursuing different achievement goals would exercise their expertise power differently when engaging in upward influence. In other words, we examine the three-way interaction effects among mastery goal, performance goal, and expert power base on upward influence tactics. We integrate the approach-inhibition theory of power (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003) with achievement goal theory (Elliot, 2005; Van Yperen & Orehek, 2013) to propose that achievement goals capture the specific motivations that regulate whether employees exercise their expert power in an aggressive and forceful manner to influence their supervisor. As expertise represents a key power base in the employee-supervisor relationship (French & Raven, 1959; Sturm & Antonakis, 2015), employees who possess a high level of expert power may develop an increased capacity to engage in hard influence behaviors (i.e., assertiveness and coalition building) towards the supervisor in order to approach desired outcomes. However, whether individuals with high levels of expert power would choose to engage in these hard influence tactics may depend on their achievement goals.

We expect that employees have the strongest motivation to engage in forceful influence behavior when they pursue a strong performance goal and weak mastery goal mainly because of their competitive desire to ensure influence success in order to express dominance and demonstrate competence. When employees pursue a strong
mastery goal, either singly, or in combination with a performance goal, the mastery-oriented cognitions neutralize the potential tendency of the employees to exercise expertise in hard influence behaviors. When employees are not motivated by either goal, this total lack of achievement striving would lead employees to experience little approach-oriented motivation. Consequently, these employees would also not use their expert power to engage in hard influence.

In other words, we believe that only those employees who are driven by a strong performance goal and a weak mastery goal would actively exercise their expert power in the form of hard upward influence tactics. Consistent with the methodology used in the other two chapters, we rely on survey data collected from employee-supervisor dyads working in a Dutch hotel to test our hypotheses.

Taken together, the three empirical chapters, when viewed as a whole, will indicate quite clearly that both dispositional and situational achievement goals serve as important internal motivational forces that promote employees' upward influence behaviors. Mastery-oriented and performance-oriented achievement motivation plays differential roles in facilitating employees' effort to influence the supervisor. Mastery goals can enable and motivate employees to formulate influence substance and objectives because they trigger employees' focus on the intrinsic value of upward influence behaviors in improving the self and the organization. Performance goals trigger employees to persuade the supervisor in order to achieve influence because these goals focus employees' attention on the extrinsic value of upward influence in demonstrating competence and expertise to socially relevant others. The two types of achievement motivation jointly clarify the motivational complexity of employees' upward influence behaviors.
Chapter 5 — General discussion

Finally, we summarize and integrate the key findings of the three empirical chapters in Chapter 5. We will discuss the theoretical implications of our findings for the current body of literature on upward influence and achievement motivation. We will comment on a few potential limitations that exist in our research and give recommendations for future research. We will also highlight a number of key practical implications for employees and managers in organizations. Lastly, we will end the dissertation with a few concluding remarks.