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Although ingratiatory behaviors have been investigated by social psychologists for almost twenty-five years, and have been discussed as being used in organizational settings as an upward influence strategy, few empirical studies have explored the use of ingratiation in organizations. The intent of this study has been to empirically investigate the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings.

In doing so, a theory-based rationale for the occurrence of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings was developed. The framework developed for this study examined ingratiation as both an individually initiated and organizationally induced behavior. Next, a scale was developed to measure the frequency with which employees resort to ingratiatory behaviors in relationships with their superiors. Finally, a series of research propositions about the occurrence of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations were tested across a variety of organizational settings.
Results of this study show that among the person-related variables, need for power, need for achievement, self-monitoring skills, and locus of control are significant determinants of the extent of ingratiatory behaviors shown by employees. Among the task variables, ingratiatory behavior was associated with perceptions of low task autonomy and low task identity. Investigation of leadership dimension revealed that employees whose immediate superiors had high "consideration" behaviors showed less use of ingratiatory behaviors. Organizational factors that were found to be inductive for the use of ingratiation included: extent of structural formalization of the task unit, encouragement for open resolution of conflict, and extent of risk taking encouraged in the organization.

Findings from this study show that ingratiatory behaviors shown by employees in relationships with their superiors are not strictly individually initiated, they are also organizationally induced. Future research on the topic is needed to explore further variables that may affect the propensity to use ingratiatory behaviors in superior-subordinate relationships. The functional and dysfunctional results of the use of such behaviors also need to be examined.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Power, influence, and political behavior are ubiquitous and universal phenomena in formal organizations. Since the ability to influence decision making is not entirely dependent upon formal position in the organization, power and influence have been highlighted as critical variables of study in understanding human behavior in organizations. The concept of power and influence in organizational settings can be broadly referred to as the generalized ability to change the actions of others in some intended fashion (Mowday 1978).

The exercise of influence, in general, involves strategic decisions about who is to be influenced and how this influence is exercised (Michener and Burt 1975). Research on intraorganizational influence has focused on both, downward influence—the ways subordinates can be influenced in supervisory-subordinate relationships—and on upward influence—the ways in which people at work can influence their superiors in organizational decision making situations. The former is customarily called the study of leadership, whereas the latter use of influence is called the study of organizational politics.
Upward influence attempts, the majority of which are
directed at immediate superiors (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wil-
kinson 1980), are ways in which subordinates influence their
superiors in order to obtain personal benefits or satisfy
organizational goals. Research in this area has revealed
that a number of upward influence strategies are used in
organizations, and that researchers have developed taxono-
mies of these strategies that are used in organizations
(Allen et al. 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980;
Mowday, 1975). Included among the upward influence strate-
gies are upward appeal, blocking, coalition, exchange,
persuasion, favor doing/creating obligations, ingratiation,
image building, and support building. One strategy that has
appeared in the taxonomy developed by each of the research-
ers is ingratiation.

As one of a large class of political influence proces-
ses that are ongoing in organizations, ingratiation involves
strategic behaviors designed to enhance one's interpersonal
attractiveness. Ingratiating actions are usually directed
toward objectives that are not made explicit by the parties
involved. Thus, while the ingratiator may behave as though
the issue at hand were his only concern, he may be doing so
to enhance himself in the target person's eyes, or to
achieve other personal goals of which the target person is
unaware (Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977). In an organiza-
tional context ingratiation can be specifically defined as a
set of tactics which are employed by organizational members for the purpose of gaining the approbation of superiors who control significant rewards for them (Tedeschi and Melburg 1984). Implicit in the definition is the ingratiator's attempt to manipulate the attributions made by the target person he or she is trying to impress.

Although ingratiatory behaviors have been defined as being generally manipulative, they need not always be deceitful, nor are they necessarily always driven by attempts to exert undue influence or seek personal gains. An organizational member may use ingratiation because liking and approval from the target person is personally gratifying (Bandura 1977, 1982; Harvey et al. 1980). This approach to ingratiation is somewhat different from the view traditionally adopted by social psychologists, who have defined ingratiation as a class of strategic behaviors that are on the "seamy side of social communication", "illicitly designed," "manipulative," and "deceitful" (Jones 1964; Jones and Wortman 1973; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984). Making this distinction is theoretically justified (Allport 1943; Cooper and Fazio 1984; Epstein 1973; Festinger 1957) and is important for developing a true understanding of why and how ingratiatory behaviors occur in organizations (Liden and Mitchell 1988). This distinction is also important for removing the taboo associated with the topic, and for encouraging more active research.
Statement of the Problem

Ingratiatory behavior is an organizational reality which is driven by the basic desire to be liked and/or by needs or opportunities to gain approbation of others. In organizational situations involving differential power—where resources are scarce or unevenly distributed—a tendency toward such behaviors would be expected as a response to dependence. Although overt ingratiation may be somewhat inhibited in organizational settings by legitimacy considerations, or eschewed because of risks involved, the tendency (or temptation) toward the behavior has nevertheless been found.

Ingratiatory behaviors have been observed as everyday occurrences in organizations, among people at all levels (Allen et al. 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Mowday 1975). One can compile an extensive list of the use of such tactics in organizational settings—from well-acted exclamations of excitement for a boss's new idea to an insincere pat on the back (Ralston 1985). Although ingratiation is just one of the strategies of upward influence used in organizational settings, it is a distinct construct with its own set of causes and consequences (Liden and Mitchell 1988), and therefore, deserves to be studied separately from other upward influence strategies.

In recent years there has been considerable interest in ingratiation—its tactics and consequences, but the topic
has received little empirical attention from organizational researchers. Much of the attention that the topic has received has been from social psychologists (e.g., Bau-
meister 1982; Jones 1964; Jones and Wortman 1973; Riggio and
Friedman 1986; Tedeschi 1981; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984),
who have tried to understand the role and motives of typical
subjects in typical social psychology experiments (Benson
and Hornsby 1988; Cheng 1983; DePaulo, Stone, and Lassiter
1985; Gaes, Kalle, and Tedeschi 1978; Leary et al. 1986;

Study of ingratiation strategies within organizational
settings has been extremely sporadic. It was observed
nearly eight years ago that the subject has long been
regarded as taboo because of its mildly disturbing negative
connotations--clandestine, self-serving, and dysfunctional
(Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981)--and that it was time that
organizations and researchers came forward and tried to
develop a better understanding of this organizational
reality. However, in spite of occasional exhortations of
this nature (Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi
and Melburg 1984), little has been done to improve the
situation. Since the vast majority of empirical work on
ingratiation has been conducted in social psychology, with
no intent to generalize the findings to organizational set-
tings, the understanding of this important upward influence
strategy remains little understood by organizational theorists.

The studies that do exist (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980 and Madison et al. 1980 being the major exceptions) are conceptual and theoretical. The dearth of empirical studies has left the topic open to multiple interpretations and arm-chair speculations. The absence of empirical studies in organizational settings has created other problems as well. Ingratiation is basically purported to be a strategy that is individually initiated, with the organization playing a passive role—an assumption that has been vigorously challenged by organization theorists (Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985). On the other hand, the difficulty with organizational variables is that it is not clear how they should be defined regarding their inductiveness for the use of ingratiations. Indeed, ingratiatory behavior continues to remain both an intriguing and highly under-researched topic in the field of organization behavior.

Purpose of the Study

Although ingratiatory behaviors have been empirically investigated for almost twenty-five years by social psychologists (beginning with the seminal work of Jones in 1964), and have been discussed as being used in organizational setting as an upward influence strategy for more than ten years (e.g., Allen et al. 1979; Wortman and Linsenmeier
1977), few empirical studies have explored the use of ingratiation in organizations. It is interesting to note that as early as 1980, an empirical study by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson had found that ingratiation tactics were among the most commonly used influence strategies in work situations. However, since that time research on ingratiation in organizational settings has been minimal. Most of the studies that have followed (as indicated earlier) are conceptual and theoretical, and although these studies have provided potentially testable propositions regarding the causes of ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings, these propositions remain untested.

The intent of this study was to empirically explore the use of ingratiation in organizational settings. In doing so, a theory-based rationale for the occurrence of ingratiation in organizational setting was been developed. Traditionally ingratiation has been viewed as an individually-initiated behavior. The framework developed for this study examines ingratiation both as an individually initiated and organizationally induced behavior. Figure 1 presents a reduced version of this framework; the full framework is provided in Chapter II.

In the model ingratiationary behavior is viewed as resulting from four sets of variables; the general dispositional characteristics of individuals (personal factors) and tasks, leadership, and organizational characteristics...
(situational factors). With regard to individuals' dispositional characteristics, it is argued that an individual's personality, needs, and personal goals determine how that individual behaves when attempting to exert upward influence in a given work situation. Regarding organizational characteristics, it has been proposed that certain task, leadership, and organizational situations are more conducive to ingratiation than others. It is the combined influence of these two sets of factors that determines the extent of ingratiatory behavior exhibited by individual employees in relationships with their superiors.

Personal factors that were included in the study are: need for power, need for achievement, self-monitoring skill, and locus of control. The importance of these factors in understanding ingratatory behaviors have been confirmed in experimental studies (e.g., Benson and Hornsby 1988; Pandey and Bohra 1984; Pandey and Rastogi 1979). Also, theoretical justifications exist for including these variables (Benson and Hornsby 1988; Cheng 1883; Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977).

Included among the situational factors are task related variables--task identity, task ambiguity, task autonomy; leadership style of the immediate supervisor; and organizational characteristics--structural formalization, perceived fairness of reward system, extent of risk taking encouraged
by the organization, and the organization's attitude toward conflict resolution. There is some consensus about including these situational variables while studying ingratiatory behaviors in organizations (e.g., Cheng 1983; Liden and Mitchell 1988; Pandey and Bohra 1984; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984).

Within this framework an attempt is made to answer two specific questions:

1. What are the personal characteristics of individuals that show greater ingratiatory behavior in organizational settings?

2. What situational factors within the organization influence the prevalence of ingratiatory behavior?

**Significance of the Study**

Ingratiatory behavior as a means of upward influence is as endemic to an organization as planning and organizing. Like any other upward influence strategy, ingratiation is a political process which has the potential of being functional or dysfunctional to organizations and individuals. It has been argued that moderate levels of ingratiatory behavior may also be beneficial to the organization in that it may be a form of social glue that builds cohesive work groups in the absence of true compatibility. However, when its use becomes excessive it may negatively affect the functioning of an organization (Ralston 1985).
Understanding why individuals use ingratiatory tactics in organizations, and the characteristics of individuals who use these tactics frequently, are, therefore, important to understanding this aspect of political behavior in organizations. Only when more is known about the vicissitudes of this phenomenon in the organizational setting can it be related to major issues within organizations.

This study is an attempt to fill this void in the understanding of organizational behavior in three ways. First, a comprehensive framework for understanding the occurrence of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings was created. This theoretical framework synthesizes the views expressed in various conceptual and theoretical studies, and incorporates the experimental findings of social psychologists.

Next, a scale was developed to measure the frequency with which employees resort to ingratiatory behaviors in relationships with their superiors. Creating such a scale brings the topic of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings within the realm of actual empirical research, and should serve as an useful tool for future researchers. It should be mentioned that even though ingratiatory behaviors have received considerable interest and attention from organization theorists in the recent past; there has been no systematic attempt (with the exception of Kipnis, Schmidt,
and Wilkinson 1980) to develop means of measuring such behaviors.

Finally, based on the theoretical framework, a series of research propositions were generated. These research propositions were also tested across a variety of organizational settings. Thus, this study marks the first major empirical research effort directed toward understanding the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings.

As indicated earlier, ingratiatory behavior in organizations is a highly under-researched topic. Much of what is known about the phenomenon is either speculative or has little relevance in organizational settings. The relevance of this study for organizational behavior in general, and organizational politics in particular, is, therefore, self-evident. The study leads to enhanced knowledge of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations which, in turn, it is hoped, would improve the understanding of the political perspective involved in topics such as organizational design, communications, reward and pay systems, equity perceptions, performance evaluations, decision making, motivation, and leader-subordinate interactions.

Limitations of the Study

This study is partly exploratory—an attempt to shed some light on a topic that has long been regarded as taboo or perhaps too complex to be studied empirically (Kipnis
1976; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981). The express intent of this study was not to give definitive answers as to what situational variables can be manipulated to enhance or inhibit ingratiatory behaviors shown by employees in organizational settings. However, the study is an attempt to determine those variables that have direct bearing on the extent of ingratiatory behaviors shown by employees in relationships with their superiors. The variables included in this study, however, are not purported to be the only ones that can be associated with ingratiatory behavior. There may be many other individual and situational characteristics associated with this type of behavior.

The manner in which the term ingratiation has been defined creates another limitation for the study. Implied in this definition is the fact that ingratiatory behaviors are driven by attempts to exert upward influence. This limits the investigation of ingratiatory behavior in this study only to subordinates' ingratiation of superiors. Although research findings from previous studies have indicated that as an influence process ingratiation tends to be used much more as an upward influence strategy than as a downward influence strategy, ingratiation may also be used in an upward or horizontal direction (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980).
Finally, the study is based on data collected from self-report measures. Although this limitation is somewhat overcome by the fact that the study was based on organizational members actively seeking to influence superiors; nonetheless, findings from a study of this nature would require replication using different methodologies.

Variables and Definitions

The dependent variable in this study is ingratulatory behavior shown by employees in relationships with their superiors. The variables that have been examined as possible determinants of ingratiation have been grouped under two categories; general dispositional characteristics of the individual organizational members (called personal factors), and task, leadership, and organizational characteristics (called situational factors). In addition, the study also examines certain demographic characteristics of respondents. The variables included in this study are briefly described below. A more detailed definition of these variables is provided in Chapter III.

Dependent Variable

Ingratiation involves a set of tactics employed by organizational members for making favorable impression on their superior(s) with the intent of securing positive outcomes for themselves.
Independent Variables

General Dispositional Characteristics of Individuals

These consist of various aspects of an individual's personality, needs, values, personal goals, and expectations. The specific variables that have been included in this category are: (1) need for power--the need for control over one's work or the work of others; (2) need for achievement--the need to accomplish and demonstrate competence or mastery; (3) self monitoring skill--the concern with the social appropriateness of one's self-presentation; and (4) locus of control--the generalized expectancy that rewards, reinforcements or outcomes in life are controlled by one's own actions or by other forces.

Situational Variables

The situational variables consist of three sets of variables: task related characteristics, type of leadership, and organizational characteristics.

Task-related variables include: (1) task identity--the extent to which employees do an entire work and can clearly identify its results; (2) task ambiguity--the certainty about duties, authority, allocation of time, and relationships with others; and (3) task autonomy--the extent to which employees have a major say in their work.
Leadership dimensions include: (1) initiating structure—the extent to which the supervisor defines own rules, and lets the follower know what is expected of them; and (2) consideration—the extent to which the supervisor regards the well being, status, and contributions of the followers.

Organization related variables include: (1) structure—the feeling that employees have about the constraints in the group; is there an emphasis on going through channels, or is there a loose and informal atmosphere; (2) reward—the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done; (3) risk—the sense of riskiness and challenge in the job and in the organization; and (4) conflict—the feeling that managers and other workers want to hear different opinions, and the emphasis placed on getting problems out in the open.

Demographic Variables

Demographic variables whose relationships with ingratiatory behavior of employees are explored in this study include age of the employee, sex of the employee, length of work experience, tenure with current employer, type of organization in which currently working, size of the organization in which working, position in organizational hierarchy, sex of immediate supervisor, and tenure under present supervisor.
Hypotheses

Since this study is the first major attempt to empirically research ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings, it is partly exploratory in nature. Accordingly, the causal inferences made in the study about relationships of personal or organizational variables to ingratiatory behaviors need to be interpreted with utmost caution. Keeping this limitation in mind, the following hypotheses have been formulated for this study.

1. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to employees' need for achievement.

2. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to employees' need for power.

3. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to employees' self-monitoring skills.

4. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to employees' internal locus of control.

5. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the initiating structure behaviors of their superior.
6. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the consideration behaviors of their superiors.

7. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated with the extent of task ambiguity perceived by the employees.

8. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated with the extent of task identity perceived by the employees.

9. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated with the extent of task autonomy perceived by the employees.

10. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the structural formalization of their task units.

11. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the employees' perceived fairness of the reward system in their task units.

12. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the extent to which open resolution of conflict is encouraged in their task units.

13. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to
the extent to which risk-taking behaviors are encouraged in their task units.

The relationships of ingratiatory behaviors with a number of demographic variables are also examined. Included among the demographic variables are the employee's age, length of work experience, position in organizational hierarchy, and sex of immediate supervisor. In addition, the possibility of a relationship between ingratiatory behaviors and the primary business activity of the organization in which respondents are working and the size of their organization is examined.

**Research Methodology**

This study used a self-report survey questionnaire (Appendix A). Subjects were asked to indicate their perceptions about variables under investigation keeping in mind their current job. Information about different independent variables of interest was sought using standardized instruments developed by various researchers. The instrument used for measuring each of these variables together with the name, brief description, source of the instrument, and name of the author are given in Table 1. A detailed description of the instruments and their reliability and validities are reported in Chapter III.

A search for a standardized instrument/scale to measure ingratiatory behavior in organizational settings (the
dependent variable in the study) revealed that no such instrument has been developed in the past. Past researchers, notably in social psychology, have relied primarily on experimental designs to measure this behavior, or have used items put together in a rather ad hoc manner (e.g., Pandey and Bohra 1984; Pandey and Rastogi 1979).

Examination of these scales showed very few items that were applicable to ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. The only scale which was scientifically constructed to measure ingratiatory behavior was developed by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980). However, this scale does not specifically measure ingratiatory behaviors shown by a subordinate in superior-subordinate relationships; rather, it attempts to measure upward, as well as downward and horizontal, ingratiation.

In view of this information, the decision was made to construct and validate a new scale that could be used to measure ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. The instrument, "Measurement of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Settings" (MIBOSS) is included as Appendix B. It consists of twenty-four one-line statements describing different ingratiatory behaviors shown by employees in relationships with their superiors. Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they show each of these behaviors to influence their superiors. Response is recorded on a five-point Likert-type scale, in which 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale Used</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Need for Achievement</td>
<td>Manifest Need Questionnaire</td>
<td>Measures the 4 needs using behaviorally based scales</td>
<td>Steers and Braunstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Need for Power</td>
<td>Manifest Need Questionnaire</td>
<td>Measures the 4 needs using behaviorally based scales</td>
<td>Steers and Braunstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Locus of Control</td>
<td>Work Locus of Control Scale</td>
<td>Measure of generalized belief in work setting</td>
<td>Spector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leadership Style</td>
<td>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire</td>
<td>20 item measure of &quot;initiating structure&quot; and &quot;consideration&quot; behaviors.</td>
<td>Stogdill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Task Identity</td>
<td>Job Characteristic Inventory</td>
<td>Measured by 4 item scale.</td>
<td>Sims, Szilagy and Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task Autonomy</td>
<td>Job Characteristic Inventory</td>
<td>Measured by five item scale</td>
<td>Sims, Szilagy and Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Task Ambiguity</td>
<td>Task Ambiguity Scale</td>
<td>Measured by 6 item scale</td>
<td>Rizzo, House and Lirtzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Scale Used</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Structural Formalization</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Employee perception of their organization's questionnaire.</td>
<td>Litwin and Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fairness of Reward System</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Employee perception of their organization's questionnaire</td>
<td>Litwin and Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Encouragement for Conflict</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Employee perception of their organization's questionnaire</td>
<td>Litwin and Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encouragement Risk Taking</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Employee perception of their organization's questionnaire</td>
<td>Litwin and Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
equals "almost always" and 5 equals "never." Since the respondents are asked to report the frequency of actual behavior, a person scoring high on the scale is one who shows ingratiatory behaviors more often than a person scoring low on the scale. The scale construction process, together with details regarding its reliabilities and validities, is reported in Chapter III.

Subjects for the study consisted of working employees and managers enrolled in evening master's of business administration/senior undergraduate courses at the University of North Texas. Participation in the study was voluntary and respondents were assured of absolute confidentiality. Although the sample for the study was somewhat of a "convenience sample," it is extremely representative in terms of demographic characteristics of respondents, and type and size of organizations included in the study. The large cross-section of employees and organizations included in the study should give its results high generalizability.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Introduction

This chapter begins by providing a general review of research literature on the social influence processes in organizations. The focus is then narrowed to literature of upward influence, impression management and ingratiation. The theoretical bases for each of these influence strategies is explained and tactical variations are noted. Thus, a framework for systematic review of social influence processes in organizations is created that distinguishes various similar, but not identical, influence strategies.

The literature review also serves to highlight the limitations of existing research on ingratiiatory behavior in organizations. Finally, a model for studying the occurrence of ingratiiatory behaviors in the organizational settings is suggested. The model serves as the basic framework for this study and directly leads to the research issues that this study investigates.

Social Influence Processes in Organizations

Social influence processes have been acknowledged to be a pervasive aspect of organizational life (Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981). In the past, various researchers have
identified many different types of influence strategies that people use individually and as groups when trying to exert informal influence in their work settings. A number of researchers have also attempted to classify the influence of strategies used in organizational settings (Allen et al. 1979; Cartwright 1965; Gilman 1962; Harsanyi 1962; Jones and Pittman 1982; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Mowday 1975; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981; Rosenberg and Pearlin 1962; Schilit and Locke 1982; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984). Table 2 provides a summary of the classifications of influence strategies suggested by different theorists and researchers.

A quick look at this list of classification schemes, however, reveals that for the most part classification of influence strategies has been done without any consideration to the direction of influence. While it is true that many of the influence strategies can be used in any direction, the frequency of their use varies depending on the direction of use. This is particularly true when these strategies are used in organizational settings that involve differential use of power and dependence for resources, and rewards.

Based on the classification efforts of previous researchers, a modified categorization of influence strategies can be developed that takes into account the direction of influence, and the target of influence acts. The various influence strategies noted in Table 2 can thus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHER/S</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION OF INFLUENCE STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Allen, Madison, Porter Renewick and Mayes 1979 | 1. Attacking or blaming others  
2. Image building  
3. Ingratiation  
4. Associating with influentials  
5. Use of information  
6. Support building for  
7. Power coalition  
8. Creating obligations |
| Cartwright 1965                           | 1. Physical control  
2. Information control  
3. Control over gains  
4. Using same attitudes |
| Gilman 1962                               | 1. Coercion  
2. Manipulation  
3. Persuasion  
4. Authority |
| Harsanyi 1962                             | 1. Distributing punishment  
2. Supply of information  
3. Distributing rewards  
4. Legitimate authority |
| Jones and Pitman 1982                     | 1. Ingratiation  
2. Exemplification  
3. Supplication  
4. Intimidation  
5. Self-promotion |
| Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980       | 1. Assertiveness  
2. Sanctions  
3. Exchange  
4. Blocking  
5. Integration  
6. Rationality  
7. Upward appeal  
8. Coalition |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCHER/S</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION OF INFLUENCE STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tedeschi and Melburg 1984</td>
<td>1. Defensive tactics (e.g., apologies, self-handicapping etc.) 2. Assertive tactics (e.g., self-promotion, ingratiation etc.) 3. Defensive strategies (e.g., helplessness, phobias etc.) 4. Assertive strategies (e.g., attraction, status assertion.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be reclassified into three broad categories: downward influence strategies, lateral influence strategies, and upward influence strategies. This revised classification of various influence strategies is shown in Figure 2.

Downward influence processes include methods used by supervisors and managers to secure compliance from their subordinates, and are studied under the general framework of leadership. Lateral influence processes include the methods which people use, individually or as a group, to influence their colleagues. The use of lateral influence has been traditionally treated in the literature of group dynamics and socialization. Upward influence processes involve ways in which employees influence their supervisors in order to enhance or protect their self interest as individuals or as groups. Since the focus of this study is strictly within the domain of upward influence, further discussions are limited to the review of upward influence strategies.

Strategies of Upward Influence

Upward influence is defined as "attempts to influence someone higher in the formal hierarchy of authority in the organization" (Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981). The major strategies of upward influence are classified by Schilit and Locke (1982) as follows:

1. Logical or rational presentation of ideas (Mechanic 1962; Mowday 1978; Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981)
2. Informal or nonperformance-specific exchange, such as impression management (Mechanic 1962; Kipnis and Vanderveer 1971; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980)

3. Formal exchange, such as rewarding (Skykes 1956; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977; Mowday, 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981)

4. Adherence to rules (Mechanic 1962; Mowday 1978)

5. Upward appeal; bypassing a direct supervisor and appealing to another person in a position of authority (Weinstein 1979; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984)


7. Manipulation; informing or arguing in a way that the recipient is not aware of being influenced (Mowday 1978; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981)


9. Persistence or assertiveness (Mowday 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980)

As shown by the classification, while many of the upward influence strategies involve political behavior, not all upward influence behaviors are political in nature. Thus the acts of upward influence may be placed into one of the two (though not mutually exclusive) categories: non-political influence—carrying out normal, routine expectations of formal rule, and political influence—using means not sanctioned by organizations (Ralston 1985). Also, the source of upward influence attempts (both political as well as non-political) can be classified as individual or group,
Figure 2
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depending on the self-interest of the party involved. Based on these two dimension the upward influence process can be examined in terms of the matrix presented in Figure 3.

The Upward Influence Matrix (UIP matrix) uses two dimensions: acts of influence (political vs non-political), and self-interest (individual vs group), to classify various upward influence strategies noted in the literature review. The non-political dimension of influence involves normal, routine, reporting acts between superiors and subordinates. These acts could be initiated by an individual trying to protect/promote self-interest (examples of which would be persistence, assertiveness, upward appeal and adherence to rules), or a group of individuals acting together to protect/promote some common group interest (for example threat, support building, and formal exchange of favors).

Political acts of influence are primarily distinguishable by the fact that they are outside the behavioral zones prescribed by the formal organization (Mayes and Allen 1977). Also, while these acts are intended to protect/promote self-interests of individuals or groups engaging in the act of influence, the intended consequences of such behaviors may threaten the interests of others. As a result, such behaviors are resisted if they are recognized by others (Frost and Hayes 1977). The intent of the people using these strategies, therefore, is to create the impression that the behavior is legitimate or to make it appear non-
**Figure 3**

UPWARD INFLUENCE PROCESS MATRIX

(U I P Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS OF INFLUENCE</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Political</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Logical Presentation of Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Formal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upward Appeal</td>
<td>Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence to Rules</td>
<td>Sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Impression Management</td>
<td>Coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Performance</td>
<td>Blocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Exchange</td>
<td>Informal Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulative Persuasion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The strategies included in this matrix are not purported to be the only upward influence strategies. There are a number of other strategies that are somewhat similar but not identical to the strategies included here.**
existent. Impression management, self-promotion, and manipulative self-presentation are examples of political behaviors oriented toward seeking individual self-interests. Coalition building, blocking, and intimidation are examples of political acts directed at serving interests of a group.

**Ingratiation: An Impression Management Strategy**

Impression management, as seen from the UIP matrix, is one of the political acts of upward influence designed to protect/promote the self-interest of individuals using the strategy. The term refers to the manner in which individuals plan, adopt, and carry out the process of conveying an image of self and of the interaction context to others (Arkin 1981). Impression management in an organizational context consists of individual behaviors that have the purpose of controlling or manipulating the attribution and impressions formed of that person by others.

Jones and Pittman (1982) classified the different impression management strategies into five groups: ingratiation (gaining approbation of superiors), self-enhancement (presenting oneself as being competent), exemplification (acting as a model of some morally virtuous conduct), supplication (projection of an identity as dependent and weak), and intimidation (conveying oneself as dangerous and potent to secure support).
Ingratiation can be viewed as one of the strategies that people use in organizational settings to protect/promote a favorable impression about themselves. Falling within the realm of the larger influence strategy of impression management, ingratiation can be viewed as manipulative self-presentation; a strategy employed to enhance one's interpersonal attractiveness with the intent of gaining approbation of the superior who controls significant reward for the ingratiator (Tedeschi and Melburg 1984). Although ingratitiatory behaviors by their very definition are manipulative, they need not always be deceitful. Neither are they necessarily always driven by attempts to exert undue influence. An organizational member may use ingratiation for seeking some very basic self-interest—because liking and approval from the target superior is personally gratifying to him.

Ingratiation: A Historical Review

Ingratiateory behaviors have existed since almost the beginning of time. The bite from an apple in the Garden of Eden, it is suggested, may be viewed to have resulted from the snake's effective use of ingratiation for its own self-interest. However, one need not go back to Adam and Eve to find examples of this behavior; they are everywhere today. Furthermore, they are used in organizational settings today
for the same reason they were used aeons ago by the snake in
the Garden of Eden—they get results (Ralston 1985).

In everyday use ingratiation is considered at least
mildly perjorative. The perjorative connotation of the term
comes from the common consensus that ingratiation involves
manipulative intent. Many generations of scholars and
commentators have grappled with the ethics involved in such
strategic behaviors. Both classic and contemporary litera-
tures are replete with epigrams and maxims that offer advice
on conducting interpersonal relations in a skillful manner.
Much of this advice suggests ways of making oneself more
attractive to others (i.e., spells out various tactics of
ingratiation) (Jones and Wortman 1973). The examples that
follow make this point very apparent:

Do not offer a compliment and ask a favor at the same
time. A compliment that is charged for is not valu-
able. [Mark Twain]

Obsequiousness begets friends, truth hatred. [Terence,
from Andria, The Lady of Audros] Speak the truth,
speak pleasant truths, do not speak truths that are
unpleasant. [Ancient Sanskrit proverb]

Praise yourself daringly; something always sticks.
[Francis Bacon, Apothegus]

Actions speak louder than words, and a smile says, "I
like you . . . I am glad to see you," . . . force
yourself to smile . . . Act as if you were already
happy. . . ." [Dale Carnegie, How to Win Friends and
Influence People, 1974].

In the more recent past many organization theorists
have implicitly referred to the importance of enhancing
one's interpersonal attractiveness in organizational
settings. For example, Downs (1967), Schein (1977), and Sofer (1970) point out how a subordinate's chances are heavily dependent on his or her supervisor's subjective, personal judgement. It has also been shown that a supervisor's evaluation of a subordinate's work can be strongly influenced by whether he likes or dislikes the subordinate, and that liking can be managed by the use of ingratiatory behaviors.

**Ingratiation: Social-Psychological Perspective**

In his seminal study Jones (1964) observed that ingratiatement is a form of impression management that departs from normative expectations. He called it the "illegitimate and seamy side of interpersonal communication." It has been argued that ingratiatement is an "illegitimate member of the social exchange family," because the ingratiate presents himself as a party to social exchange with one set of terms and conditions, while in fact he is primarily involved in another kind. Jones adapted the models of Goffman (1955), Homans (1961), and Thibaut and Kelley (1959) to help in specifying the theoretical bases of ingratiatory behavior.

The "dramaturgical approach" of Goffman (1955) suggests that social interactions are governed by the implicit agreement between the persons involved that each will help the other maintain face. The person involved thus has two points of view as he approaches and engages in interaction—
a defensive orientation toward saving his own face and a protective orientation toward saving another's face. This "face-work contract" states that each individual will honor the other's claim to face, and this is accomplished by developing a "common definition of the situation that will support both faces" (Goffman 1955).

Jones argues that ingratiation is a "subversive masquerade" of this contract. The exchange is subversive because, although the ingratiator's own perspective differs from the target person's, he or she gives signals indicating that he or she shares the latter's definition of the situation. The ingratiation performs in the present setting so as to influence the definition of other settings in which he or she expects to be involved, while leading the target person to believe that the current setting is the primary focus. Because the ingratiator is intent upon building a beneficial relationship with the target person, he or she wishes to leave the present interchange with a better face than when he entered in it. As a result of this, the ingratiator can start his subsequent encounter with the target person from a more gratifying level of social interchange (Jones 1964).

The ingratiator, then, is an individual who exploits the facework contract while seeming to validate it. He or she publicly sends out reassuring signals of accepting the contract, while privately working toward another goal; that is, making self attractive (Jones and Wortman 1973). What
is involved in this extension of Goffman's (1955) description of face work is the emergence of non-normative behavior under normative guise.

The relationship between ingratiation and the more legitimate processes of face protection was further clarified by Jones by examining two other explicit treatment of social interaction as an exchange—George Homans' (1961) profit-centered view of interpersonal relations and Thibaut and Kelly's (1959) model of dyadic interaction.

Homans (1961) proposes a general rule of distributive justice in context of interpersonal exchange. A man in exchange relation with another will expect that the rewards of each man be proportional to his cost—the greater the rewards, the greater the costs, and that the net rewards of each man be proportional to his investments. Jones (1964) argues that ingratia tors basically falsify the bargaining process and exploits the distributive justice rule. While they depend for their effectiveness on the responsiveness of the target persons to the norms of distributive justice, they set out to violate this norm. By trying to minimize the "costs" they incur in eliciting reward—that is by falsifying their investments—ingratia tors attempt to stretch their profit margin in the exchange. Their ultimate concern is to create feelings of obligations which will redound to their benefit.
Like Homans, Thibaut and Kelly (1959) assume that in interpersonal dyad each individual will try to maximize the goodness of his or her outcomes. They maintain that a relationship developing between two persons will take the form dictated by the pattern of outcomes or rewards available to each. Using a dyadic matrix they depict variations of power within the relationship. In their formulation, if one person has more to gain or more to lose than other, he has greater dependence on the other, and the other has greater power over him. The person who has greater power in this sense can get the other person to do things for him, because of his superior capacity to reward and punish.

Each person in a dyadic matrix is potentially free to make any response. However, during any given interaction episode there is a certain range of responses that are relevant. Jones (1964) argues that the ingratiaotr tries to expand the boundaries of relevance by introducing responses that are irrelevant to that interaction episode. The ingratiaotr does so to complicate the situation and to bias the responses of the target person in his or her favor, and to neutralize those responses that may deliver negative outcomes.

Based on the reasoning discussed above, Jones (1964) maintains that ingratiaotory behaviors are directed toward objectives not contained in the implicit contract which underlies social interaction. Also, while the ingratiaotor
never violates the contract openly, he publicly sends out reassuring messages that he accepts the contract, while privately working toward another goal. Jones's theoretical perspective has now become the commonly accepted framework for analyzing ingratiation behavior. It has also been supported by numerous subsequent studies (e.g., Baumeister, Cooper, and Skib 1979; Braver et al. 1977; Gaes, Kalle, and Tedeschi 1978; Schlenker 1975; Zanna and Pack 1975).

**Tactical Variations of Ingratiation**

In the context of social-psychological research, ingratiation can take all or any of the forms by which interpersonal attraction may be solicited. In their laboratory experiments Jones (1964) and Jones and Wortman (1973) demonstrated four major classes of ingratiation tactics: other enhancement, opinion conformity, rendering favors, and self-presentation.

**Other Enhancement**

This category of ingratatory behaviors involves communication of directly enhancing, evaluative statements. In using this tactic the ingratiator finds ways to express a positive evaluation of the target person and emphasizes various strengths and virtues. The ingratiator may thus distort and exaggerate the target person's admirable qualities to convey the impression that he or she thinks highly of the target person. Also, while calling attention
to positive attributes, which may in fact characterize the target person, the ingratiator may call little attention or totally ignore the target person's negative attributes.

The effectiveness of this strategy stems from the fact that when a person perceives that another is favorably disposed toward him or her, that person tends to like the other individual (Jones 1964; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977). The premise that liking tends to be reciprocated was put forth by Heider (1946), who maintained that people prefer states of balance in an interpersonal dyad, and that a dyad will be unbalanced if one party likes the other, but is disliked by that person.

Consistent with this reasoning, a number of studies confirm the fact that subjects increase their liking for a stimulus person who expresses approval for them (e.g., Arson and Linder 1965; Jones, Gergen, and Davis 1962; Lowe and Goldstein 1970; Mettee 1971; Tagiuri and Petrullo 1958). Experiments which simulated organizational and industrial settings also confirmed this reasoning (Fodor, 1973, 1974; Kipnis and Vanderveer 1971)

In addition to these direct techniques, there are some indirect techniques that the ingratiators may use for enhancing the target person. One way in which the ingratiator can achieve this is by smiling, maintaining eye contact, listening closely, making brief utterances that indicate attentiveness (such as "really," "um-humm"). Other
subtle techniques include asking the target person for advice or a favor, encouraging the target person to tell more about himself, and talking intimately about himself to the target person (Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977). In doing so, the ingratiator leads the target person into believing that he or she likes that person and considers him or her to be understanding and considerate (Chaiken and Derlega 1975; Cozby 1973).

Opinion Conformity

Another set of techniques used by the ingratiator involves expression of such opinions, or behaving in manners consistent with the opinions, judgments or behaviors of the target person. Where as the tactic of other-enhancement capitalizes on the proposition that persons like those who appear to be like them; the conformity tactic follows the proposition that; persons like those whose values and beliefs appear to be similar to their own (Jones and Wortman 1973). The tactics involved in opinion conformity can range from simple agreement with expressed opinions, through more elaborate attempts to try and articulate the position presumably held by the target, to extremely complex forms of behavior imitation and identification (Jones 1964).

Research has shown overwhelmingly that similarities of values and interests lead to selective association and mutual attraction, and that people prefer others with
similar attitudes (e.g., Byrne, Nelson, and Reeves 1966; Byrne, Griffit, and Stefaniak 1966; Houston 1974; Insko et al. 1973; Johnson and Johnson 1972). Studies that have been conducted in simulated organizational settings also suggest that opinion conformity may be instrumental in attaining rewards (e.g., Baskett 1973). The use of opinion conformity as a successful influence strategy has also been confirmed by organizational researchers (Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Madison et al. 1980; Schein 1977).

Rendering Favors

Favor-doing has been considered to be a logical candidate for the status of ingratiation tactics, because people usually react in a positive manner when someone does something nice for them (Jones and Wortman 1973). This behavior is based on the reciprocity norm between people; by doing a favor for another person, one can induce an obligation to reciprocate (Gouldner 1960). Favor-doing can also help in fostering an identity as a helpful, friendly, and considerate person (Lott and Lott 1974; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984).

Favor-doing can be an effective ingratiation strategy as long as the ingratiator is able to avoid the association of manipulative intentions with his favor-doing acts. In simulated organizational settings, when the circumstances of favor doing were considered to be appropriate, and when manipulative attributions were not made, this tactic was
found to be effective in gaining rewards from supervisors (Kipnis and Vanderveer 1971; Schopler and Thompson 1968).

**Self-Presentation**

This ingratiation tactic consists of making explicit verbal statements of one's attributes to increase the likelihood of being judged attractive by the target person. Self-presentation has two related aspects—providing explicit descriptions about one's characteristics or behaviors, and behaving in such ways as to imply that one possesses certain characteristics (Jones and Wortman 1973). A number of studies have confirmed that people do present themselves positively to others in situations where the liking of other person is important to them (Gergen and Taylor 1969; Hendricks and Brickman 1974; Jones, Gergen, and Jones 1963).

In using self-presentation, however, the ingratiator first needs to know attributes/behavior that are likely to be effective in increasing interpersonal attractiveness. The first effort, therefore, is to try to figure out the target person's idiosyncratic likes and dislikes. Having known this, the ingratiator can convey that he or she possesses those characteristics that the target person is known to like, and avoid sending cues that he or she possesses those that the target person dislikes.

Another tactic related to self-presentation is self-deprecation or humility. Self-deprecation as an
ingratiatory tactic derives its effectiveness from the implicit other-enhancement component—the person depreciating self often implies the superiority of the target person. In doing so he or she also reduces the likelihood of being considered a competitive threat by the target person (Jones and Wortman 1973).

**Ingratiation in Organizational Settings**

Studies on upward influence conducted in organizational settings have found that ingratiatory tactics are among the most commonly used influence strategies in organizations (Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson 1980; Madison et al. 1980; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981). Ingratiation appears to be used in organizational settings basically for the same reasons for which it is known to be used in general social settings—increasing one's attractiveness in the eyes of the more powerful person. The enhanced attractiveness in the superior-subordinate dyad may improve the subordinate's chances of positive rewards such as a raise or a promotion or may reduce his chances of receiving a negative outcome such as adverse assessment or a cut in pay.

The reasoning behind the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations, thus basically follows the same theoretical framework that is used by social-psychologists; that is, viewing ingratiation as a "power-enhancing or dependence-reducing strategy" (Jones and Wortman 1973). Since
organizations abound in relationships that have differential power, the tendency toward strategic behaviors can naturally be expected to be endemic in this type of setting. However, overt manifestations of such behaviors may be partially inhibited by legitimacy considerations, or occasionally eschewed because of risks involved.

Traditionally ingratiation has been viewed by organization theorists as an individually initiated strategy with organization playing a passive role—an assumption that is vigorously challenged by current theorists (Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985). The dynamics of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations is certainly complex, and an understanding of the precise conditions which encourage or inhibit ingratiatory behaviors at work is far from evident. Some of the conditions undoubtedly involve personal dispositional characteristics of individuals. In social settings individual differences such as manifest needs, locus of control, and self-monitoring skills have been found to correlate with individuals' disposition toward ingratiatory behavior. Many of the same personal dispositions appear to be important determinants of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings (Caldwell and O'Reilly 1982; Mowday 1979; Schlenker 1982).

In addition to the personal dispositional factors, however, there appear to be a number of situational factors in organizations that may encourage or inhibit the
occurrence of ingratiation behaviors (Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977). The literature on upward influence identifies a number of such factors that encourage/inhibit the frequency of upward influence attempts in organizations (Cheng 1983; Christie and Geis 1970; Hickson et al. 1971; Hrebiniak 1978; Madison et al. 1980; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1980). While some of these factors are task related (e.g., task interdependence, task autonomy) others are related to management style, and still others are related to the organization itself.

The difficulty with these variables is that it is not clear how they should be defined regarding their conducive-ness for the use of ingratiation. There does appear to be a growing consensus for including some of these variables when studying ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings, however (Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi and Melburg 1984).

**Studying Ingratiation in Organizations**

The framework developed for this study views ingratiation as a result of complex interaction between individuals' dispositional characteristics (personal factors) and task, leadership, and organizational characteristics (situational factors). This framework is presented in form of a model, shown in Figure 4, that looks at various factors in
Figure 4
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organizational settings that may encourage or inhibit ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors.

The personal factors included in the framework are need for power, need for achievement, self-monitoring skill, and locus of control. Included among the situational factors are (1) task related variables—task identity, task ambiguity, task autonomy, (2) leadership style of immediate supervisor—measured on the dimensions of "initiating structure" and "consideration," and (3) organizational variables—structural formalization of work unit, perceived fairness of reward system, extent of risk-taking encouraged by the organization, and organization's altitude toward conflict resolution. These factors are not purported to be the only ones associated with the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations. Instead, they are proposed as being among the factors that may be important determinants of ingratiatory behaviors in organizations.

**General Dispositional Characteristics of Individuals**

The framework developed for this study includes four individual characteristics that may be important in determining an individual's tendency for ingratiatory behavior. These are need for power, need for achievement, locus of control, and self-monitoring skill. Past researchers have identified each of these variables as being

Locus of Control

Rotter's (1966) theory holds that individuals differ in a systematic manner in their beliefs regarding their personal successes and failures. "Internals" tend to believe that their outcomes are the result of the ability and effort that they apply; while "externals" believe that their personal outcomes are the result of factors that are outside their control or luck (Weiner 1974). Individuals with an internal locus of control therefore, show more inclination toward affecting the outcomes they receive. In an upward influence situation like ingratiation they would, therefore, be expected to make greater efforts to secure desired outcomes. Hence, they might show greater use of ingratiatory tactics than persons with an external locus of control.

Manifest Needs

Content theories of motivation are based on the premise that individuals have a relatively stable set of needs which encourage them to take actions for their fulfillment (Campbell et al. 1970). The concept of manifest needs, stemming from Murray's (1938) pioneering work, includes twenty needs. Of these twenty needs two that have been specifically studied in organizational settings are the need for power
People with a high need for power attempt to have control over their work environment and try to influence other people (McClelland and Watson 1973; Winter 1973). Such people can be expected to take an active role in affecting important outcomes by way of increased influence attempts. This being the case, it is quite reasonable to presume that individuals with a high need for power are likely to show greater involvement in upward influence attempts, such as ingratiation, than individuals with a low need for power.

Need for achievement has been generally described in terms of aspiration to achieve goals and greater task orientations (Jackson 1967; McClelland et al. 1953; Steers 1976). High need for achievement is also viewed as being related to self-confidence in influence situations (Tedeschi, Schlenker and Linkskold 1972). Consequently, individuals with a high need for achievement are expected to initiate influence attempts more often than persons with a low need for power. In influence situations, like ingratiation, where an individual attempt at influencing is instrumental to task accomplishment and reward, this relationship may be particularly strong.
Self-Monitoring Skill

A series of studies conducted by Snyder and his colleagues (Snyder 1974; Snyder and Monson 1975; Snyder and Swann 1976) revealed that individuals differ in the extent to which they are attentive and responsive to situational cues as a guide to appropriate behaviors (Caldwell and O'Reilley 1982). This skill is termed as a self-monitoring skill by Snyder.

People who rate high on this skill have been found to seek more information, harbor private images of themselves that are different from their public images, exhibit more accuracy in diagnosing social situations, and be more capable of pragmatically tailoring their behavior to fit situational appropriateness. These persons are also found to be more adept in managing their impression (Schlenker and Leary 1982). Self-monitoring skill, therefore, appears to be an important individual characteristic in determining a person's propensity for political influence strategies such as ingratiation.

Situational Characteristics

Included among the situational factors are (1) task related variables—task ambiguity, task autonomy, and task identity; (2) leadership style of immediate supervisor—measured on the dimensions of "initiating structure" and "considerations"; and (3) organizational variables—
structural formalization of work unit, perceived fairness of reward system, extent of risk taking encouraged by the organization, and attitude prevalent in organization about conflict resolution.

Task Characteristics

Psychological studies of work motivation, both at worker level and at the managerial level, have been shown to be highly related to the characteristics of work itself (Hulin 1971; Schwab and Cummings 1973; Scott 1966). Certain task characteristics, therefore, can combine with individuals' personal characteristics to create situations that foster the use of upward influence strategy such as ingratiating. The three specific task characteristics proposed for investigation in this study are task ambiguity, task autonomy, and task identity.

When management does not clearly identify the authority and responsibilities associated with the job, the incumbent employee is put in an uncertain situation about the job. In such situations the employee is not sure of what he or she is expected to accomplish, how much authority he or she has and how he or she will be judged. Such ambiguous work situations have been found to foster politically based behaviors (Hickson et al. 1971). The reason is that in such situations task accomplishments may not be seen as leading to desired outcomes, thereby opening doors for political
behaviors. High task ambiguity, therefore, encourages ingratiatory behaviors, which are designed to influence the supervisor to secure desired personal outcomes.

Ingratiation is viewed as a "power enhancing, dependence reducing" strategy. In a superior-subordinate dyadic situation, low job autonomy means that individuals have less say in deciding their day-to-day operations (Sims, Szilagy, and Keller 1976). This in turn increases their direct dependence on their immediate superior. Therefore, low task autonomy combined with individual interest in acquiring greater influence and securing more favorable rewards creates a situation that encourages political influence tactics such as ingratiation. If the employee has a higher task autonomy, however, dependency on the supervisor is less, and this, in turn, curtails the necessity to engage in impression management tactics such as ingratiation.

Another task dimension closely related to task autonomy is task identity. It is the extent to which an employee does an entire job, and can clearly identify the results of his efforts (Sims, Szilagy, and Keller 1976). Low task identity, like low task autonomy, has the effect of increasing subordinates' dependence on the supervisor. Also, since the results of the job are not clearly identifiable it causes low cause-effect instrumentality between task performance and achievement of personal goals. This situation, when combined with an individual's personal interest and
disposition encourages the employees to use a political influence strategy such as ingratiation.

**Leadership Characteristics**

Although leadership is typically thought of as an individual variable, it can be viewed as a situational factor when examined from the point of view of influence it has on the behavior of subordinates (Ralston 1985). The amount of direction that subordinates are given, and the way they are treated in situations involving interpersonal relationships, have a significant effect on the behavior of the subordinates. Since the leadership style of the supervisor directly affects the work environment and employees' perceptions regarding the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes, it is proposed that leadership dimensions be included in the factors associated with the use of ingratiatory behaviors of subordinates.

The two dimensions of leadership included in the framework for this study are; "initiating structure," and "consideration" (Stogdill 1963). Initiating structure refers to the degree to which the leaders structure their roles, and the roles of their subordinates toward accomplishing goals. The structuring is done through leaders' active involvement in scheduling work, assigning tasks, and maintaining performance standards. Leaders high on the "consideration" dimension emphasize individuals' needs, respect
subordinates' feelings, and build mutual trust between themselves and their subordinates.

In terms of situations conducive for political activities, supervisors high on "initiating structure" increase their subordinates' dependence on them in terms of superior-subordinate power. Also, by their actions, they control rewards more firmly. The net effect of this leadership style is curtailment of subordinates' opportunities to use their creative abilities in order to distinguish themselves. This situation of over-dependence on the supervisor is in turn, expected to encourage impression management techniques such as ingratiation.

Supervisors who are high on "consideration" are successful in creating relationships of mutual trust with their subordinates, thereby reducing the necessity for manipulative behaviors. Also, the subordinates' views and opinions are given proper audience, which results in decreased feelings of power dependency on the part of subordinates. Together, these situations curtail the necessity for manipulative behaviors such as ingratiation.

Organizational Characteristics

An individual may be able to characterize the organization for which he is working as either conducive or non-conducive to ingratitiory behaviors. There is some evidence that certain organizational situations tend to be
"intrinsically" political and that there are certain organizational characteristics that may play a crucial role in determining when, where, and how much tactical manipulations may occur (e.g., Madison et al. 1980;). Understanding the organizational culture in terms of specific dimensions, therefore, is critical for understanding the process of upward influence in organizational settings.

Structural Formalization

The first such dimension included in this model is the extent of structural formalization of the organization. Previous studies have shown that employees working in highly structured/formalized organizations perceive lesser opportunities for political activities, as compared to employees working in organizations that are less formalized/structured (Pandey 1981; Schilit and Locke 1982). A highly structured organization inhibits its members' opportunities to act unilaterally in their own self-interest because of built-in controls (Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981). Highly structured organizations also sometimes have large numbers of such members who are comfortable in such circumstances and, therefore, are not motivated to react politically (Brehm 1966). In terms of ingratiation, employees working for highly structured organizations find the environment prevalent in these organizations to be less conducive for the use of such behaviors.
Encouragement for Risk Taking

Risk in the organizational context relates to what is at stake, both for individuals and for an entire organization. In a personal context, the existence of highly risky situations in the organization have been found to encourage political behaviors (Madison et al. 1980). Proceeding on the reasoning that follows this finding, it is quite logical to presume that if the employee's job and the organization in general encourage risk taking, then the overall environment is conducive for behaviors such as ingratiation. It is, therefore, hypothesized for this study that employees working in jobs that require risk taking, or organizations that encourage risk taking, are more encouraged to show ingratiationary behaviors than employees working in jobs/organizations that emphasize playing it safe.

Perceived Fairness of Reward System

Among the basic reasons for ingratiationary behavior is the desire to secure favorable rewards. Therefore, the perception of employees about the fairness of the reward system of the organization has a definite impact on their propensity to engage in ingratiationary behaviors. If such rewards as pay and promotion are perceived to be fair and equitable then the need for ingratiation is minimized. Another related motive behind ingratiationary behavior is avoidance of punishment by making a personal impression that
minimizes its chances. If the organization puts greater emphasis on positive rewards than on punishment, then the situation once again discourages ingratiation behaviors.

Conflict Resolution

Choice of ingratiation as an influence strategy is also contingent on the conflict resolution techniques available in the organization. In such organizations where the emphasis is on smoothing over differences of opinion or ignoring them; political activities tend to be more intense. This is because employees try to resolve the job-related conflict through informal means. On the contrary, organizations that place emphasis on getting problems out in the open, create an environment that substantially reduces the need for manipulative behavior. Therefore, those organizations that encourage open resolution of conflict are less conducive to ingratiation behaviors.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design

A self-report survey questionnaire was used for this study (Appendix A). Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions about the variables under investigation, keeping in mind their current job. Information about different variables of interest was sought using standardized scales/instruments developed by previous researchers. Ingratiatory behavior, which is the dependent variable in this study, was measured by an instrument specifically developed and validated for this study. This instrument, "Measurement of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Settings" (MIBOSS), is presented in Appendix B.

Since this study is the first major attempt to empirically research ingratitatory behaviors in organizational settings, it is partly exploratory in nature. The non-experimental nature of the study precludes any strong causal inferences about the variables under study. The purpose of this study was primarily to understand and explain a phenomenon that has long been regarded as taboo. Accordingly, the study investigated a number of individual but related variables, as well as a variety of situational variables.
that are present in different types of organizations, and that may encourage or inhibit ingratatory behaviors among employees.

The variables included in this study are not purported to be the only ones that can be associated with the use of ingratatory behaviors in organizations. There may be many other individual and situational variables that may be significant in determining an employee's propensity to ingratiate.

Variables and Definitions

The theoretical framework adopted for this study conceptualizes ingratiation as both an individually initiated and organizationally-induced behavior. Accordingly, the study explored personal and organizational characteristics that have been theorized to be closely associated with such behaviors.

The dependent variable in this study was ingratatory behavior. Variables that were investigated as its possible determinants (i.e., independent variables) were grouped under two categories: general dispositional characteristics of the organizational members (called personal factors), and task, leadership and organizational characteristics of the individual employees (called situational factors). In addition, certain demographic characteristics of employees
were also examined. The variables that were included in this study for investigation are defined as follows:

**Dependent Variable**

*Ingratiation*

A set of tactics employed by organizational members for the purpose of gaining approbation of superior(s) who control(s) significant rewards for them (i.e., for the ingratiating employees).

**Independent Variables**

*General Dispositional Characteristics of Individuals*

The variables included in this group consist of various aspects of individual personalities, needs, personal goals, values, and expectations. Specific variables that were investigated in the study are (1) *need for power*—need for control over one's work or the work of others (McClelland 1961); (2) *need for achievement*—need to accomplish and demonstrate competence or mastery (McClelland 1961); (3) *self monitoring skill*—the concern with the social appropriateness of one's self-presentation, attention to social comparison information as cues to appropriateness of self-expression, the ability to control and modify one's self-presentation and expressive behaviors, and the use of these abilities in particular situations (Snyder 1974); and
(4) locus of control—generalized expectancy that rewards, reinforcements, or outcomes in life are controlled by one's own actions (internality) or by other forces (externality). In organizational settings, rewards or outcomes include promotions, favorable circumstances, salary increases, and general career advancement (Spector 1988).

Situational Characteristics

The situational characteristics consist of three sets of variables: task related variables, leadership dimensions, and organizational variables. The specific variables that have been included under each of these three subsets are as follows:

Task-Related Variables include: (1) task identity—"the extent to which employees do an entire or whole piece of work and can clearly identify the results of these efforts" (Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller 1976); (2) task ambiguity—"certainty about duties, authority, allocation of time, and relationships with others; the clarity or existence of guides, directives, policies; and the ability to predict outcomes of behaviors" (Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman 1970); and (3) task autonomy—"the extent to which employees have a major say in scheduling their work, selecting the equipment they will use, and deciding on procedures to be followed" (Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller 1976).
Leadership Dimensions include: (1) initiating structure—the extent to which the supervisor defines own rules, and lets the followers know what is expected of them (Stogdill 1963); and (2) consideration—the extent to which the supervisor regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers (Stogdill 1963).

Organization Related Variables include: (1) structure—"the feeling that employees have about the constraints in the group, how many rules, regulations, procedures there are, is there an emphasis on 'red tape,' and going through channels or is there a loose and informal atmosphere" (Litwin and Stringer 1968); (2) reward—"the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done; emphasizing positive rewards rather than punishments; the perceived fairness of pay and promotion policies" (Litwin and Stringer 1968); (3) risk—"the sense of riskiness and challenge in the job and in the organization; is there an emphasis on taking calculated risks, or playing it safe is the best way to operate" (Litwin and Stringer 1968); and (4) conflict—"the feeling that managers and other workers want to hear different opinions; the emphasis placed on getting problems out in the open, rather than smoothing them over" (Litwin and Stringer 1968).

Demographic Variables

Age of the employee—How old the respondent is.
Sex of the employee--Is the respondent male or female.

Length of work experience--Number of years the respondent has worked; reported separately for full-time and part-time work experience.

Tenure with current employer--Number of years for which the respondent has been working with present employer.

Type of organization in which currently working--Primary business activity of the organization for which the respondent is currently working; classified as, service, manufacturing, retailing, government, and both manufacturing and service organizations.

Size of the organization--Number of employees working in the organization in which the respondent is currently employed.

Position in organizational hierarchy--Position held by the respondent in current job; classified as, non-managerial, first level supervisor, middle manager, and top manager.

Sex of immediate supervisor--Whether the immediate supervisor of the respondent is male or female.

Tenure under present supervisor--Period for which the respondent has been working directly under the current supervisor.
Measurement of Independent Variables

All of the independent variables investigated in the study were measured using scales constructed and validated by previous researchers. A brief description of each of these scales, together with the validities and reliabilities of the instruments as reported by their authors and/or other researchers, are provided in the following sections.

Need for Achievement and Need for Power

These variables were measured using Steers and Braunstein's Manifest Needs Questionnaire (1976). Their instrument measures these needs with specific reference to work settings, using behaviorally based scales. Results of both laboratory and field studies indicate that the instrument exhibits acceptable levels of convergent, discriminant, and predictive validities, as well as high test-retest reliability (0.72 and 0.86) and internal consistency (0.66 and 0.83).

Self-Monitoring Scale

The social psychological construct of self-monitoring of expressive behavior and self-presentation was measured through Snyder's Self-Monitoring Scale (1974). The scale was reported to be internally consistent (alpha 0.70), and stable over a one-month period (coefficient 0.83). Laboratory and field experiments demonstrated the convergent and discriminant validities of the scale.
Locus Of Control

The Work Locus of Control Scale developed by Spector (1988) was used for this study. The scale is a measure of generalized control beliefs in work settings. The internal consistency of the scale was reported as 0.85 (Cronbach's Alpha) and the scale was validated by demonstrating significant correlations with other theoretically meaningful variables.

Task Ambiguity

The scale used for measuring this variable was developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970). Internal consistency for the scale was reported as 0.81 (Cronbach's Alpha). The scale was reported to correlate in expected directions with measures of organizational and managerial practices, leader behavior, employee satisfaction, and propensity to leave, thereby demonstrating its convergent validity.

Task Autonomy and Task Identity

These two variables were measured using scales developed by Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller (1976). These scales are two of the six scales that make up the Job Characteristic Inventory. These scales have been tested across a variety of samples and the internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) reported for the two scales were 0.84 and 0.83, respectively. Evidence for convergent and discriminant validities of the scales were also presented.
"Initiating Structure" and "Considerations"

These two dimensions of supervisors' leadership behaviors were measured using items that came from the Form XII version of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) developed by Stogdill (1963). These two leadership dimensions are among the most widely used dimensions in the leadership literature today. Their reliabilities and validities have been reported by numerous researchers over the past twenty-five years.

Structure, Reward, Risk, and Conflict

These variables were measured using scales developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) as a part of their widely known Organizational Climate Questionnaire. All of the scales being used in this study were reported as having "high consistency." Validities for the scales were reported using a series of field studies.

Instrument Development for Measuring Ingratiation

The search for a standardized instrument/scale to measure ingratiaitory behavior in organizational settings (the dependent variable in the study) revealed that no such instrument had been developed. Past researchers, notably in social psychology, relied mostly on experimental designs to measure this behavior, or used items put together in a rather ad hoc manner (e.g., Pandey and Bohra 1984; Pandey and Rastogi 1979). Examination of these scales showed that
they had very few items that were applicable to ingratia-
tory behaviors in organizational settings. The only scale
scientifically constructed to measure ingratia-
tory behaviors in organizations was one developed by Kipnis, Schmidt, and
Wilkinson (1980). However, this scale does not specifically
measure ingratia-
tory behaviors shown by a subordinate in
relationships with a superior; rather, it attempts to
measure upward, as well as downward and horizontal, ingra-
tiation.

In view of this information, the decision was made to
develop and validate a new scale that could be used to
measure ingratia-
tory behaviors specifically in organiza-
tional settings. The scale, Measurement of Ingratia-
tory Behaviors in Organizational Settings (MIBOSS), specifically
measures the ingratia-
tory behaviors shown by subordinates
in relationships with their superiors in organizational
settings.

Questionnaire Development

Based on previous theory (Jones 1964; Jones and Wortman
1973; Liden and Mitchell 1988; Ralston 1985; Tedeschi and
Melburg 1984; Wortman and Linsenmeier 1977), and research
related to upward influence behaviors in organizations
(Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson 1980; Madison et al. 1980;
Mowday 1978; Porter, Allen, and Angle 1981; Schilit and
Locke 1982) an item pool for the ingratia-
tory behaviors was
generated for the purpose of investigation. Discussions with a number of employees and managers from different types of organizations contributed further to the pool of items.

The sixty-five items in this initial pool were analyzed by judges with various areas of expertise—industrial psychology, organization behavior, strategic management, organization theory, and organizational communication. The judges primarily reviewed the items for clarity, appropriateness, and content validity. Those items that were unclear or appeared to be subject to response bias were rewritten or dropped. This process resulted in the elimination of ten items, leaving a pool of fifty-five items in the initial test instrument.

Initial Administration of Instrument

The instrument with fifty-five items was first administered to a sample of management students \(N = 78\), who were employed either full-time or part-time. The subjects were employed in a wide variety of organizations (retail, manufacturing, wholesale, service, government, etc.), and jobs (manual, clerical, first line supervisor, middle level manager, etc.).

The subjects were required to indicate the extent to which they used the ways described by each item to influence their supervisors. Subjects were specifically cautioned not to make any judgement about the desirability/undesirability
of the behaviors described by each item, and to merely report the frequency with which they showed each of these behaviors when dealing with their supervisors. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert-type scale with the following categories: Never do it (1); Seldom do it (2); Occasionally do it (3); Often do it (4); Almost always do it (5). Since the scale asked the subjects to report the frequency of actual behaviors; a person scoring high on the scale would be one who used ingratiatory tactics more often than a person scoring low on the scale.

One of the objectives at this stage of scale construction was to select those items that appeared to provide the best possible description of the behavior under investigation. The primary criterion used in item selection was item-total correlation. Items with higher item-total correlations were retained. In the case of items whose item-total correlations were very similar, the mean and variance of items were taken into account. Items with both larger means (around 3.0) and with larger variance were retained in the item pool. This procedure resulted in the elimination of twenty-eight items, leaving the instrument with twenty-seven items. The item-total correlation of these twenty-seven items ranged from 0.38 to 0.69. The Cronbach Alpha for the twenty-seven item scale was 0.90, and the split-half alphas were 0.83 and 0.85.
Reademption of the Instrument

The scale with the twenty-seven items was further reviewed for clarity, and where necessary minor changes in wording were made. The twenty-seven-item scale was then administered to a different sample of business students (N = 148) who were employed either full-time or part-time. Once again, the sample represented a wide variety of jobs and organizations. Subjects were simultaneously administered a shorter version (ten item) of Crowne and Marlowe's Social Desirability Scale (1964).

Two criteria were used in item selection at this stage: item-total correlation and lack of significant correlation with Social Desirability Scale. The Cronbach Alpha of the twenty-seven item scale was 0.91 and the item-total correlation ranged from 0.41 to 0.66. The scores on ingratiation did not show any significant correlation with scores on the social desirability scale (correlation = 0.0193, p > 0.40). Based on these criteria, three more items were dropped from the scale, leaving a total of twenty-four items on the scale.

These twenty-four items make up the existing MIBOSS scale as presented in Appendix B. The mean score on the scale was 68.75, with a standard deviation of 14.72. The scores were nearly normally distributed. The Cronbach Alpha for this final twenty-four item scale was 0.923. Alpha for two parts of the scale (Split-half alpha) was 0.86 and 0.88.
The item total correlations for the twenty-four items on the scale ranged from 0.42 to 0.67. The mean, standard deviation and item-total correlation, and correlation of each item on the MIBOSS scale with scores on the Social Desirability Scale is presented in Appendix C. The psychometric properties of the MIBOSS scale are presented in Appendix E.

Reliability of MIBOSS Scale

There are three approaches to determining reliability of an instrument. Internal consistency—consistency of individual items of a measure with each other; test-retest reliability—reliability of scores over time; and parallel forms reliability—equality of different forms of the same instrument to each other (Kidder and Jude 1986).

The internal consistency of the MIBOSS scale was measured using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The coefficient alpha for the scale was 0.92, which demonstrates that the internal consistency of the instrument is very high. The split-half reliability, a method that estimates the consistency of the scale by correlating the first half of items with second half, was 0.86 for part one, and 0.88 for part two. Any method of split-half reliability is said to underestimate consistency because reliability is influenced by the total number of items in an instrument. The solution for this is the Spear-Brown Formula. The reliability
coefficient of the scale after Spear-Brown correction was 0.85.

Reliability can also be assessed in terms of the consistency of scores from different administrations of scores over a period of time. If in actuality the variable being measured by the scale has not changed between the times of measurements, then the scores should be relatively similar. Test-retest reliability is also estimated from a correlation—a strong correlation suggests that the instrument is stable over time, and hence reliable. Correlations of 0.69 or better for a one-month period between administrations have been considered as a reasonable degree of stability. The MIBOSS scale was administered twice within a one-month interval to the same sample group (N = 51). The scores from the two administrations showed a correlation of 0.73 (p < .001).

Validity of MIBOSS Scale

The validity of an instrument refers to the effectiveness with which the instrument measures what it was designed to measure. There are three general approaches to validity: content validity, criterion validity, and construct validity (Kidder and Jude 1986).

Content validity assesses whether the substance of the items included in the instrument tap the construct that is being measured. It also indicates whether the scale items
are representative of the content area. The items in the MIBOSS scale were included after an extensive search of both theoretical and empirical research literature. The contents of the scale were also examined by employees and managers from many different types of organizations for appropriateness of behavior descriptions. The individual items on the scale were further examined by experts from the field of industrial psychology, organizational behavior, strategic management, and organizational theory. As such, the scale can be expected to have both face validity and logical content validity.

For determining the construct validity the scale was tested for both convergent validity and discriminant validity (Cronbach and Meehl 1955). Convergent validity asks if a construct, such as ingratiation, correlates with some theoretically relevant construct. Scores on MIBOSS were correlated with the tactics-related items on the Machiavellian Scale (Christie and Geis 1970). Persons who score high on the Machiavellianism Scale are characterized as manipulators of other people. They tend to initiate and control the structure of interpersonal relationships (Shaver 1977). As such, the score on Machiavellian scale (N = 86) was expected to correlate reasonably high with the score on the MIBOSS scale. It was found that the correlation between the two scales was 0.69 (p < .001).
Discriminant validity, on the other hand, refers to the way theoretically non-relevant and dissimilar construct should not be associated with scores on the instrument. To determine discriminant validity, scores from the MIBOSS scale ($N = 51$) were correlated with the Compulsiveness Inventory designed to measure compulsive behaviors that are common in a normal population. The two scales correlated $-0.07$ ($p = > .29$).

Check for Acquiescence Response Set

Since all the items on the MIBOSS scale are worded in the direction of ingratiatory behaviors, the scores on the scale may be affected by the tendency to agree or disagree regardless of the context. Even though numerous researchers have argued that much of the evidence traditionally regarded as acquiescence is better interpreted in terms of subjects' reaction to the content of the items and that content-independent response styles are not a major contaminant of questionnaire responses (Rorer 1965). It was deemed important to determine if the scores on the scale were affected by acquiescence response set. For determining the extent to which, if any, scores on the scale were affected by acquiescence response set, scores on the MIBOSS scale were correlated with scores on the Acquiescence Scale which measures "the general tendency to agree or disagree with questionnaire items, regardless of their context" (Couch and
Keniston 1960). Scores from the two scales (N = 51) correlated 0.11 (p > .21), thereby confirming that the manner in which the items of the scale were worded had no effect on the responses obtained on the scale.

Factor Analysis of MIBOSS Scale

While constructing the items for the scale, fair representation was given to the various ingratiation tactics noted by different researchers. Earlier research indicated that there were strong relationships between the various ingratatory tactics (Jones 1964; Jones and Wortman 1973). In research where subjects were asked to respond to items representing various ingratatory behaviors, it was noted that subjects did not discriminate between various tactics—they either behaved or did not behave an ingratatory manner (e.g., Pandey 1981).

Scores obtained on the MIBOSS scale (N = 146) were factor analyzed using the Maximum Likelihood and Oblimin Rotation Procedure. Factor analysis on the MIBOSS scale showed that all the items loaded between 0.44 and 0.70 on one single factor. Also, no item loaded more strongly on any other factor than on this first factor. This single factor accounted for 37.1 percent of the variation. Further analysis of inter-factor correlation revealed that the factors were highly correlated. Therefore, it was decided to treat ingratatory behavior as a unidimensional
construct. The factor loadings of the twenty-four items that constitute the MIBOSS scale and their communality are presented in Appendix D.

Sample

The sample for this study came from evening master’s of business administration/senior undergraduate students who were also employed either full-time or part-time and who had at least one year of full time work experience. Participation in the study was voluntary. The target sample size for the study was 400. Available information about the sample indicated that a large number of the respondents were employed in non-managerial or first-level supervisory positions, with fewer of them being in middle-level management positions. Since this study specifically focused on the ingratiatory behaviors of subordinates, such a sample was deemed to be specially suited, as fewer respondents had subordinates than bosses.

The setting in which data were obtained gave added advantage to the study in terms of realistic responses. It has been noted that it is difficult to obtain valid data when researching influence in organizations, since individuals exercising influence are likely to be secretive about their practices (Kipnis 1976; Mowday 1978). Given this predicament, it may be likely that a study conducted in a work setting increases the likelihood of people denying the
use of such behaviors. The respondents of this study, however, were away from the work environment, and this, in turn, may have reduced the sensitivity of the topic.

**Data Collection**

Data for the study were collected using a self-report survey questionnaire. Respondents were asked to refer to their current employment experience while reporting their perceptions about variables under investigation. Information was also obtained about sex of the respondents, sex of respondents' immediate supervisors, types of organization for which the respondents worked, number of people employed in the respondents' organization, job levels of the respondents, length of service with the organizations for which the respondents currently worked, and years of full-time and part-time work experience of the respondents.

Participation in the study was voluntary, and respondents were assured of complete confidentiality of their responses. To insure absolute anonymity, respondents were asked not to write anything on the questionnaire, other than checking appropriate responses.

**Data Analysis**

Statistical procedures of the SPSS-X computer package were used for analyzing the data. Preliminary statistical analyses included descriptive statistics and Pearson's Correlation Coefficients. Results of these analyses were
used to examine whether or not the variables correlated in the hypothesized directions. Next, step-wise regression was done to pick up those variables that together were best predictors of the use of ingratiatory behaviors by employees in relation to their superiors. Finally, multiple discriminant analysis was done to determine which of the independent variables were the best discriminators for high and low ingratiating employees. These results are presented in Chapter IV of this study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The results of the data analysis and findings of the study are presented in this chapter. First a description of the sample is provided. Next, demographic characteristics of the respondents and characteristics of the organizations in which they work are given. Results of the data analysis follow next. Data analysis was done using the SPSS-X computer program. Data obtained in this research study were analyzed in three ways: (1) descriptive and correlational statistics, (2) multiple regression analysis, and (3) discriminant analysis.

Description of the Sample

In order to get a heterogeneous sample for this study, the survey was conducted using 400 employees enrolled in graduate and undergraduate courses offered at a major university in the metropolitan area of Dallas-Fort Worth. Since this region is a major industrial and commercial center in the southern United States, a large number of organizations engaged in various business activities are located in and around this area. Employees from these organizations who work in various functional areas and
belong to various job categories take professional courses at the university.

The respondents were informed that participation in the study was voluntary and they were assured of absolute confidentiality of their responses. They were asked not to put their names or any other form of identification on the questionnaire. The questionnaire was completed during class time. Most were enrolled in classes which were held for three hours in the evenings. Class sizes varied from thirty to forty-five students. A total of 346 usable questionnaires were returned.

**Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

The demographic characteristics of the 346 respondents presented in Table 3 show that the sample for the study was quite heterogeneous in composition. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were males and 43 percent were females. More than half of the respondents had over four years of full-time work experience. The employees participating in the study worked in various functional areas, and in many different types of organizations—manufacturing, service, retailing, government etc. Different sizes of organizations (number of employees) were also fairly well represented in the study.

Forty three percent of the respondents worked in non-managerial positions, 32 percent worked as first-line
## TABLE III

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF 346 RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 20 years</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 years and above</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (banks, insurance etc.)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 employees</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-100 employees</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-1,000 employees</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 and more employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time work experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level in organizational hierarchy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-level managers</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-level managers</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-level managers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of immediate supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period worked under present supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to one year</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than a year but less than 2 years</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 3 years</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisors, and 22 percent worked at the middle-management level. Because the study was aimed at studying the factors associated with subordinates' use of ingratiatory behaviors toward superiors, the large percentage of respondents in these organizational hierarchies was desirable. Of the participating employees 63 percent had males as their immediate supervisors and 37 percent had female supervisors. The periods for which employees had worked in their current job and under their current supervisors, was also diverse.

Data Analysis and Results

Data generated by Likert-type scales have been shown to sufficiently approximate interval level data that can be employed with parametric tests (Nunnally, 1978). Therefore, after the initial descriptive and correlational analysis, data obtained for the present research was analyzed using multivariate statistical techniques.

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelation Among Variables

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of all variables measured in the study are shown in Table 4. The reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) of all the scales used in the study are shown on the diagonals in the table. As seen in Table 4, the scales' reliability was generally high.

Results of Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis, presented in Table 4, show that all the
### TABLE IV

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RELIABILITIES, AND CORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>E.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>66.97</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Need for Achievement</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need for Power</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Locus of Control</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initiating Structure</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Consideration Behavior</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Task Ambiguity</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Task Autonomy</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Task Identity</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reward System</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Risk Taking</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Decimal points have been omitted. Correlations of 17 or higher are significant at <.001. Correlations between 16 and 14 are significant at <.005. Correlations of 13 and 12 are significant at <.01. Correlations of 11 and 10 are significant at <.05.
hypotheses formulated in Chapter I of this study are held as true. Each hypothesis and its statistical support are discussed by hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively related to the employees' need for achievement.

Results from the correlation matrix (Table 4) show that employees' ingratational behavior has a significant positive correlation with their need for achievement (.27, p < .001).

**Hypothesis 2.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the employees' need for power.

The correlation statistics show that employees' need for power is strongly related to their ingratational behavior in relationships with their superiors (.39, p < .001).

**Hypothesis 3.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the employees' self-monitoring skills.

Self-monitoring skills of employees is correlated at .46 with their ingratational behavior. This shows that employees who have high self-monitoring skills are also high in using ingratational behaviors in relationships with their superiors. The relationship is significant at less than the .001 level.
Hypothesis 4. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the employees' internal locus of control.

Results of correlation analysis show that employees with a high internal locus of control show high ingratiatory behavior in relationships with their superiors. The correlation of the two variables is .35 and is significant at less than the .001 level.

Hypothesis 5. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the "initiating structure" behaviors of their superiors.

Employees whose immediate superiors have high initiating structure behavior show greater use of ingratiatory behavior in relationships with their superiors. Ingratiatory behavior is correlated (.21) with the initiating structure behavior of the superiors. The relationship is significant at less than the .001 level.

Hypothesis 6. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the consideration behaviors of their superiors.

Employees whose immediate superiors have high consideration behaviors show lesser ingratiatory behavior in relationships with their superiors. These two variables are negatively correlated. Although the correlation is not very
strong (-.14), it is significant at less than the .001 level.

**Hypothesis 7.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated with the extent of task ambiguity perceived by the employee.

Correlation statistics show that employees who perceive higher ambiguity associated with their tasks show greater ingratia tory behavior in relationships with their superior. Task ambiguity is correlated (.22) with ingratia tory behavior, and the relationship is significant at less than the .001.

**Hypothesis 8.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated with the extent of task identity perceived by employee.

The extent of task identity perceived by the employees on their job is negatively correlated with the extent of ingratia tory behaviors shown by them in relationships with their superiors. The correlation of -.26 between the two variables is significant at less than the .001 level.

**Hypothesis 9.** Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated with the extent of task autonomy perceived by the employees.
Task autonomy, as perceived by the employees and the amount of ingratiatory behavior shown by them in relation to their superior, is negatively correlated. The correlation is not very strong (-.17), but is significant at less than the .001 level.

Hypothesis 10. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the structural formalization of their task units.

Structural formalization of the task unit and ingratiatory behavior of the employees in relationships with their superiors were hypothesized as having a negative correlation. The correlation between these two variables is -.15 and is significant at less than the .005 level.

Hypothesis 11. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the employees' perceived fairness of the reward system in their task units.

The extent to which the employees perceived the reward system of their task units to be fair was hypothesized as being negatively correlated with the ingratiatory behavior shown in relationships with superiors. Correlation results show that these two variables are indeed negatively correlated to the extent of -.17. The correlation is significant at less than the .001 level.
Hypothesis 12. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be negatively correlated to the extent to which open resolution of conflict is encouraged in their task units.

The extent to which open conflict resolution was encouraged in a task unit was hypothesized as being negatively correlated with the extent of ingratiatory behavior shown by the employees in that task unit. The two variables were found to be negatively correlated to the extent of -.16, at less than the .005 significance level.

Hypothesis 13. Ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors will be positively correlated to the extent to which risk taking behaviors are encouraged in their task units.

Encouragement for risk-taking by the employees was hypothesized as being positively correlated to the amount of ingratiatory behavior shown by employees in relation to their superiors. The two variables were found to have moderate positive correlation (.14, less than the .005 level).

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

In order to test the multivariate relationship between ingratiatory behavior and individual, leadership, task, and organizational variables, the data were further analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The criterion
(dependent) variable was the use of ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with superiors, as measured by the MIBOSS scale. The predictor (independent) variables were need for achievement, need for power, self-monitoring skill, locus of control, task ambiguity, task identity, task autonomy, organizational structure, conflict resolution, fairness of reward system, and encouragement for risk taking. The step wise (forward estimation) approach was followed for determining the best predictive model using regression analysis. This technique allows the examination of the contribution of each predictor variable to the regression model. Examination of the correlation matrix (Table 4) revealed that none of the independent variables were highly correlated (The highest correlation between any two independent variable was .40). As the predictor variables were reasonably independent of each other there was no threat of multicollinearity and, therefore, the use of step-wise regression was a proper regression procedure. Table 5 presents the results of step wise regression analysis using ingratiatory behavior as the dependent variable.

Results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that variables from all the four variable categories; individual, task, leadership, and organizational, are important for predicting ingratiatory behavior of employees. However, not all variables included in these categories are significant predictors of ingratiatory behavior. Six
TABLE 5
RESULTS OF STEP-WISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS PREDICTING INGRATIATORY BEHAVIORS OF EMPLOYEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Mult. R</th>
<th>Adjs. R^2</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Sign. of t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for power</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent variables—self-monitoring skill, locus of control, need for power, task identity, initiating structure behavior of supervisor, and organizations' attitude toward conflict resolution—predict the extent of ingratiatory behavior shown by the employees fairly well. The multiple correlation for the entire predictor set is .63, and is statistically significant at the .001 level. Together these six variables explain 39 percent (adjusted R^2) of the variance in ingratiatory behavior of employees.

Results of Discriminant Analysis
In order to get into the relationship of variables to the levels/amount of ingratiatory behavior shown by employees,
data were further analyzed using the discriminant analysis procedure. The step-wise method was chosen for deriving the discriminant function. It involves entering the independent variables into the discriminant function one-at-a-time on the basis of their discriminant power. This method has been found to be useful when considering a relatively large number of independent variables for inclusion in the function. The results based on the reduced set of variables identified by this procedure have been found to be as good as, and sometimes better than, the complete set of variables.

In order to emphasize the differences in levels of ingratiation individuals in the top third (ingratiation scores of greater than or equal to 73) and in the lower one third (ingratiation scores of less than or equal to 59) of ingratiation scores were examined.

Variables that significantly discriminated between high and low ingratiators included individual variables—self-monitoring skill, need for power, need for achievement, and locus of control; leadership variable—consideration behavior; task variables—task identity and task autonomy; and organizational variables—structure, risk taking, and conflict resolution. The statistical significance of the discriminant function, as shown by chi-square (64.80), and Wilk's Lambda (.72), were also highly significant (.000,
These statistics confirm that the two groups (high and low ingratiators) are significantly different at the .000 level.

The canonical discriminant function was also noted to be highly significant (.000), and displayed a reasonably good (.54) canonical correlation. A classification matrix was developed for determining the predictive ability of the discriminant function. The results of the classification matrix presented in Table 6 show a classification accuracy of 74.46 percent.

**TABLE 6**

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS OF VARIABLES THAT DISCRIMINATE HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INGRATIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Ingratiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ingratiator</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75 (73.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ingratiator</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26 (24.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of correct classification: 74.46%

In order to determine the direction of variables in predicting ingratiatory behavior of employees, the means of the variables that were found to be significant
discriminators were compared. This comparison of means is shown in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

**MEANS FOR VARIABLES THAT SIGNIFICANTLY DISCRIMINATED BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF INGRATIATORY BEHAVIORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low Ingratiators</th>
<th>High Ingratiators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Achievement</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Power</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Monitoring Skill</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Autonomy</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Demographic Variables**

The relationship of demographic variables with ingratatory behavior was analyzed using ANOVA procedures. Separate ANOVAs were conducted for each of the demographic
variables in order to test their relationship with ingratia-
tory behavior of employees. The results of these ANOVAs are
reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RESULTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>(1,329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>(3,330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>(4,313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in organization</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>(3,324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of organization</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>(4,326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of supervisor</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(1,325)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Period working with present su-
| pervisor                        | 2.60    | .10          | (4,321)|
| Type of organization            | 2.35    | .05*         | (4,323)|

*Significant at the levels shown. These numbers vary
because of missing responses.

The relationship of ingratia-tory behaviors with demo-
graphic characteristics of the employees and their organiza-
tions shows that ingratia-tory behavior of employees is
significantly related to employees' age and position in the
organizational hierarchy. It is also related to the type of organization (manufacturing, retailing, government, etc.) for which the respondent is employed.

**Summary of Results**

It was the intent of this study to empirically explore the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. The framework developed for this study allowed ingratiation to be examined not only as an individually-initiated, but also as an organizationally induced behavior. Accordingly, a number of personal and situational variables were included in the study, and their relationship with the use of ingratiatory behavior by subordinates in relationships with their superiors was examined. Summaries of the results and associated findings are given in the following paragraphs.

The scale, "Measurement of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Settings" (MIBOSS), which was developed and validated for this study showed very high internal consistency. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .93.

Since this study was largely exploratory, the research propositions were directed at examining the direction and strength of relationships between ingratiatory behaviors and a number of personal characteristics and situational variables. Ingratiatory behavior was found to have significant association in the hypothesized direction with every
variable investigated. The variables related to individual characteristics, in general, showed the strongest association. Task related variables also showed high correlations. Variables related to leadership and organizational characteristics, for the most part, showed only moderate association with the use of ingratiatory behaviors of employees.

Results of multiple regression using the step-wise procedure resulted in the selection of six variables as the strongest predictor of ingratiatory behavior. These variables related to individual, task, leadership, and organizational characteristics. The multiple correlation for the predictor set was .63 and was significant at the .000 level. Together, these six variables explained 39 percent of the variance in ingratiatory behavior of employees.

In order to get into the relation of variables to levels of ingratiatory behaviors, step-wise discriminant analysis was done. Ten variables were found to significantly discriminate (significance level less than .001) and the classification accuracy based on them was 74.46 percent.

In addition, the relationship of ingratiatory behavior with a number of demographic variables was also examined. Age, position in organizational hierarchy, and the type of organization were found to be significantly related with the ingratiatory behavior of employees.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study was designed to empirically investigate the use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. Ingratiatory behaviors of employees within organizational settings have received very little empirical attention from organizational researchers. Since the vast majority of empirical work on ingratiation has been conducted in social psychology, with no intent to generalize the findings to organizational settings, the understanding of this important influence strategy remains little understood by organizational theorists.

This study is an attempt to fill the void in the understanding of this important organizational behavior in three ways. First, a comprehensive framework for understanding the occurrence of ingratiatory behaviors in the organizational setting was created (Figures 1 and 4). This theoretical framework synthesized the views expressed in various theoretical and conceptual studies, and incorporated relevant findings from the experimental studies of social psychologists. The framework developed for this study
examined ingratiation, both as an individually initiated and as an organizationally induced behavior.

Next, a scale, "Measurement of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Settings" (MIBOSS) was developed and validated to measure the frequency with which employees resort to ingratatory tactics in relationships with their superiors. Although ingratatory behaviors have received considerable attention from organization theorists in the recent past, there has been no systematic attempt to develop a means of measuring this behavior. The development of the MIBOSS, therefore, brings the topic of ingratiation within the realm of actual empirical research.

Finally, based on the theoretical framework created for this study, thirteen research propositions were generated. These research propositions were directed at developing an understanding of why and how ingratatory behaviors occur in organizations.

Since this study was the first major empirical research effort directed at understanding the use of ingratatory behaviors in organizational settings it was, to some degree, exploratory. However, an attempt was made to determine those variables that have a direct bearing on the extent of ingratatory behaviors used by subordinates in relationships with their superiors. Although the variables identified in this study are by no means purported as the only ones that can be associated with ingratatory behaviors, they
certainly mark an important step forward in improving the understanding of a topic that has long been regarded as taboo, or that has been considered too complex to be studied empirically.

Discussion

It was anticipated at the beginning of this research that the findings would lead to an enhanced understanding of the causes and use of ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. In order to achieve this objective, answers were sought to two specific questions:

1. What are the personal characteristics of individuals that show greater use of ingratiatory behaviors in relationships with their superiors?

2. What situational factors within the organization encourage or inhibit the use of these behaviors?

The following section examines the extent to which the findings of this study provide answers to these two questions. Results reported in Chapter IV are examined and various findings are conceptually integrated.

Personal Characteristics of Employees that Show Greater Use of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Relationships with Their Superiors

The model created for examining ingratiatory behavior in this study divided the variables of interest into two broad categories: general dispositional characteristics of individuals, and situational factors. Included among the
general dispositional characteristics (personal factors) were: need for achievement, need for power, locus of control, and self-monitoring skill. Also related to this category were some demographic characteristics, such as sex, position in organizational hierarchy, and work experience.

Results based on Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Table 4) indicated that each of the individual characteristics related variables had strong positive correlation with ingratiatory behavior. Self-monitoring skills of the employees showed strongest positive association with ingratiatory behaviors (.46, less than .000) followed by need for power (.39, less than .000), locus of control (.35, less than .000), and need for achievement (.27, less than .000). The results merely indicated the strength of the association of these independent variables with ingratiatory behaviors shown by the employees, without offering substantive conclusions.

However, one can make much more substantive interpretations by looking at these results together with the results of discriminant analysis. By identifying the variables that are significant discriminants, and by understanding the manner in which these variables discriminate between high and low ingratiating employees, one can create profiles of employees that show greater use of ingratiatory behaviors in relationships with their superiors.
All four variables that were included in the personal dispositional characteristics were found to have significant association with ingratiatory behaviors of employees (based on Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient Correlation reported in Table 4). The results of discriminant analysis also found these four variables to be significant discriminants. By looking at the means of these variables (Table 7) one can see the direction of these variables. One can see that employees that are high ingratiators have a high need for power and achievement, have a strong internal locus of control, and have high self-monitoring skills.

Taken together, this information can be used to create a profile of employees who show greater use of ingratiatory behaviors in relationships with their superiors. Such employees have typically high aspirations to achieve their goals and are initiators of attempts to control their work environments. They take an active role in affecting important outcomes by way of increased influence attempts, since they tend to believe that their personal successes and failures are results of the ability and effort they apply. Such employees also exhibit more accuracy in diagnosing social situations, and are more able to pragmatically tailor their behaviors to fit situational appropriateness. On the whole, they are more adept in managing their impression.

From the demographic standpoint, highly ingratiating employees may be either male or female. They are likely to be in
the age group of 30 to 35 years, and first level managerial positions.

Situational Factors Within Organizations That Induce/Inhibit Ingratiatory Behaviors Among Employees

The theoretical framework created for this study views ingratiation, as both individually initiated and organizationally induced behavior. The factors within the organization that may encourage or inhibit the use of ingratiatory behavior by employees in relationships with their superiors were classified into three categories: task characteristics, leadership characteristics of immediate superior, and organizational/task unit characteristics.

Results from the correlation matrix (Table 4) indicate that each of the situational factors included in each of these three categories were significantly related with ingratiatory behaviors. While these correlation statistics provide evidence of significant association, they cannot be used for making substantive interpretations. Also, the association was quite weak for some of the variables even though it was statistically significant. Results of discriminant analysis showed that of the nine variables included in the categories, only six were significant discriminants of high and low ingratiatory behaviors. Examination of the means of the six variables found to significantly discriminate could provide a good indication
of the manner in which these variables affected the use of ingratiatory behaviors.

Task Variables

Three variables were included in the task category: task identity, task ambiguity, and task autonomy. Of these, task autonomy, and task identity were found to be significant discriminants. Examination of the means of these variables (Table 7) reveals that high ingratiatory behavior by employees is associated with perceptions of low task autonomy and low task identity.

If ingratiation is viewed as a power-enhancing, dependence-reducing strategy, then in a superior-subordinate dyad low task autonomy and low task identity both have the effect of increasing subordinates' dependence on their superiors. Also, in the case of low task identity the results of a job may not be clearly identifiable. This, in turn, may cause low cause-effect instrumentality between task performance and achievement of personal goals. These task characteristics, therefore, may encourage the use of ingratiatory behaviors, which are primarily designed to influence the superior to secure desired personal outcomes.

Leadership Characteristics

Among the two leadership dimensions examined in the study, consideration was the significant discriminant of ingratiatory behaviors among employees in relationships with
their superiors. Employees whose immediate superiors were high on consideration behavior showed less use of ingratiatory behaviors.

Leadership is typically thought of as an individual variable. However, in this study it was examined from the point of view of the influence it has on the behavior of subordinates. Superiors that are high on the consideration dimension typically emphasize individuals' needs, respect subordinates' feelings, and build mutual trust between themselves and their subordinates. As a whole, they create relationships with their subordinates that reduce the necessity for manipulative behavior, such as ingratiation, on part of the subordinates.

Organizational Characteristics

Previous research has shown that some organizational situations and certain organizational characteristics may play a crucial role in determining when, where, and how much political manipulations may occur. Accordingly, the contributions of four specific dimensions of organizational/ task unit climate; structural formalization, encouragement for risk taking, perceived fairness of reward system, and manner of conflict resolution, to the use of ingratiatory behaviors were examined in the study. Each of these variables were found to be significantly correlated with ingratiation. However the correlation in the majority of cases was not
strong. Results of discriminant analysis showed that only three variables; structural formalization, encouragement for risk taking, and conflict resolution, were significant discriminants of high and low ingratiaitory behaviors among employees.

Highly structured organizations inhibit their employees' opportunities to act unilaterally in their own self interest because of built-in control. Thus, employees working in more structured/formalized organizations/task units may have lesser opportunities for political influence activities, and may find the environment less conducive for the use of behaviors such as ingratiation.

Another dimension of organizational climate related to the use of ingratiaitory behaviors is the extent to which risk-taking is encouraged in the organization/task unit. Past studies have noted that the existence of risky situations in organizations encourages political behaviors. The existence of a climate that encourages risk-taking, therefore, would be conducive for political maneuvers associated with ingratiation. The inclusion of this variable among significant discriminants of high and low ingratiating employees is, therefore, not surprising.

In organizations where emphasis is placed on smoothing over differences of opinion or ignoring them, political activities have been found to be more intense. On the other hand, organizations that encourage settling the problems out
in the open create an environment that reduces the use of behind-the-scene manipulations. Both the correlation statistic and discriminant function confirm that in organizations/task units where open resolution of conflict is encouraged, the environment for using ingratiatory behaviors becomes less conducive.

Conclusions

Using ingratiatory behavior as the criterion variable and all the variables included in the model (Figure 4) as predictor variables, the data obtained in this study were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. For determining the best predictive model the step-wise approach was followed, since this technique allows for examining the contribution of each predictor variable to the regression model. Six independent variables: need for power, self-monitoring skill, locus of control, task identity, initiating structure behavior of superior, and organizations' encouragement for open conflict resolution, were selected in the predictor set. The multiple correlation of the predictor set was high (.63), and together these six variables explained 39 percent (adjusted $r^2$ square) of the variation in ingratiatory behaviors of employees.

Variables that have been included in the predictor set deserve further scrutiny in order to create a better conceptual understanding. Of the six variables selected in the
prediction model, four relate to the general dispositional characteristics (personal factors) of the individuals. This may be indicative of the fact that ingratiaitory behaviors are, indeed, determined by personal characteristics of individual employees—initiated by them depending on their own needs and motives. Such motives may include a relatively stable desire to take an active role in affecting important outcomes by way of increased influence (need for power) coupled with the belief that they can affect their personal outcomes through their ability and efforts (internal locus of control). Given this personal disposition, these employees become more attentive and responsive to situational cues as guides to appropriate behaviors in relationships with their superiors. This results in their seeking more information, diagnosing the information with greater accuracy and pragmatically tailoring the behavior to fit situational appropriateness (self-monitoring skill).

In an organizational context, these factors combined may lead to an influence process by which employees try to gain the approbation of superiors who control significant rewards for them. Since organizational situations almost invariably involve differential power, scarcity and uneven distribution of resources, and competitive pressure for rewards, it provides ample opportunities for the use of political behaviors such as ingratiation, aimed at improving the chances of securing favorable outcomes.
Ingratiation, therefore, appears to be an individually-initiated influence strategy. However, this does not imply that the organization plays a passive role. While the use of some ingratiation can be easily observed as an every day occurrences among all employees at all levels in the organization, there are situations within the organization that are inductive for the use of ingratiation. The net effect of these factors is to determine the extent of ingratiatory behaviors that will be shown by the employees.

Three of the organizational factors that have been included in the predictive model of this study are; task identity, initiating structure behavior of superior, and organizations' encouragement for open resolution of conflict. It is interesting to note that these variables relate to three different aspects of organizational life; task, leadership, and group behavior. Organizational factors that were not found to be significant in determining the use of ingratiatory behaviors also warrant discussion. Included among these factors are perceived fairness of the reward system, encouragement for risk taking, structural formalization, and task ambiguity.

There is a common thread that appears to run through these factors. They are all related to organizational design, and are relevant for employees' performance outcomes in only an indirect manner. Since ingratiation is basically a form of interpersonal behavior, which is directed at
gaining the approbation of superiors with the intent of
gaining approval and/or securing favorable outcomes, factors
that are not directly relevant to the interpersonal influ-
ence process may not be critical in inducing or inhibiting
the use of ingratiatory behaviors.

Overall Conclusions

Although ingratiating is just one of the strategies of
upward influence used in organizational settings, it is a
distinct construct with its own set of causes and conse-
quences. As an interpersonal influence strategy it can be
viewed as an everyday occurrence in organizations. Ingra-
tiatory behaviors shown by employees in relationships with
their superiors are not always individually initiated, they
are also organizationally induced. Factors such as task
characteristics, leadership behavior of superior, and some
aspects of organization design, may induce or inhibit the
use of ingratiating as an influence strategy.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study was partly exploratory in nature. There was
no significant precedence of empirical research, nor a
method of measuring the behavior. This study, therefore,
made significant contributions toward understanding a
behavior that is an everyday occurrence in organizations,
but is little understood. Construction and validation of
the MIBOSS is a long-lasting contribution of this study. It
is hoped that future researchers will find it to be a useful instrument for further research on this topic.

This study basically attempted to address two questions. Although it did provide answers for these questions, it also raised many new questions in the process. Some of the issues which need to be addressed in future studies are:

1. What other personal variables, if any, are among the determinants of the propensity to use ingratiation in superior-subordinate relationships?

2. What effect does an organization's design have on ingratiation behaviors? What factors inhibit its occurrences, and what factors induce its use?

3. What are the functional and dysfunctional results of the use of ingratiation--on the ingratiator, on the superior, on their relationship, on group behavior, and on the organization in general?

4. What is the interactive effect of the variables that have been found to be significant determinants of ingratiationary behaviors in this study?

Some other research questions result directly from the limitations of this study. This study limited the scope of investigation to only the ingratiationary behaviors shown by subordinates in relationships with their superiors. The question now would be: How commonly are ingratiationary behaviors used as a downward influence process? How common is its use in lateral relationships? For a behavior that
has long been regarded as somewhat taboo, there is a long list of questions that need to be answered, and each question is a potential research necessity and opportunity.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Participant:

You have been selected to participate in this study because of your special educational training and/or because of your work experience. Your response to this questionnaire is absolutely confidential. Results from this study will only be presented in form of statistical summaries.

To assure complete confidentiality we ask you not to write anything on the questionnaire, all you have to do is to circle appropriate responses. It is important that you give the responses honestly, frankly and seriously. Read directions given before each section. Answer all questions. Thank you for your time.

PS: For the sake of simplicity the use of pronouns has been limited to he/him/his in the instrument. In doing so no offense is meant to the women participants.
Below are listed 10 statements that describe various things people do or try to do on their jobs. Which of these statements you feel most accurately describes your own behavior when you are at work. **Do not judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable.** Circle the most appropriate category's number following each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I do my best work when my job assignments are fairly difficult.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I try very hard to improve on my past performance at work.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I take moderate risks and stick my neck out to get ahead at work.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try to avoid any added responsibilities on my job.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I try to perform better than my co-workers.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I seek an active role in the leadership of a group.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I avoid trying to influence those around me to see things my way.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I strive to gain more control over the events around me at work.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I strive to be &quot;in command&quot; when I am working in a group.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statements below concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. If a statement is True or Mostly True as applied to you circle T next to the statement, if it is False or Not Usually True circle F. Do not judge the behavior as desirable or undesirable.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes and beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4. I can only argue for ideas that I already believe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6. I guess I can put on a show to impress or entertain people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to behavior of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8. I would probably make a good actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attraction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16. I am not always the person I appear to be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. I would change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.

18. I have considered being an entertainer.

19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting

21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people

22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going

23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.

24. I can look any one in the eye and tell a lie straight face (if for a right end).

25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

Below are described various ways of how people go about influencing their supervisors to make a positive impression about themselves. Refer to your most recent employment experience and describe on the scale given below the extent to which you use each of these ways to influence your supervisor. Do not judge the behavior.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Seldom Occasion- Often Almost
Do It. Do It. ally Do It. Do It. Always Do It.

Read each item as the ending of the phrase: "How often do you"

1. Impress upon your supervisor that only he can help you in a given situation mainly to make him feel good about himself

1 2 3 4 5

2. Show him that you share his enthusiasm about his new idea even when you may not actually like it

1 2 3 4 5
1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasion-
4. Often
5. Almost

Do It. Do It. Do It. Do It. Do It. Always Do It.

3. Try to let him know that you have a reputation for being liked.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Try to make sure that he is aware of your successes
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Highlight the achievements made under his leadership in a meeting not being attended by him
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Give frequent smiles to express enthusiasm/interest about something he is interested in even if you do not like it
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Express work attitudes that are similar to your supervisor as a way of letting him know that two of you are alike
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Tell him that you can learn a lot from his experience
   1 2 3 4 5

9. Exaggerate his admirable qualities to convey the impression that you think highly of him
   1 2 3 4 5

10. Disagree in trivial or unimportant issues but show agreement on those issues in which he expects support
    1 2 3 4 5

11. Try to imitate such work behaviors of your supervisor as working late or occasionally working on weekends.
    1 2 3 4 5

12. Look for opportunities to let the supervisor know your virtues/strengths.
    1 2 3 4 5

13. Ask your supervisor for advice in areas in which he thinks he is smart to let him feel that you admire his talents.
    1 2 3 4 5
14. Try to do things for your supervisor that show your selfless generosity.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Look out for opportunities to admire your supervisor

1 2 3 4 5

16. Let your supervisor know the attitudes you share with him.

1 2 3 4 5

17. Compliment your supervisor on his achievement, however trivial it may actually be to you personally.

1 2 3 4 5

18. Laugh heartily at your supervisor's jokes even when they are not really funny.

1 2 3 4 5

19. Go out of your way to run an errand for your supervisor.

1 2 3 4 5

20. Offer to help your supervisor by using your personal contacts.

1 2 3 4 5

21. Try to persuasively present your own qualities when attempting to convince your supervisor about your abilities.

1 2 3 4 5

22. Volunteer to be of help to your supervisor in matters like locating a good apartment, finding a good insurance agent etc.

1 2 3 4 5

23. Spend time listening to your supervisor's personal problems even if you have no interest in them.

1 2 3 4 5

24. Volunteer to help your supervisor in his work even if it means extra work for you.

1 2 3 4 5
The following statements relate to beliefs people hold in their work setting. Circle the most appropriate category's number following each statement which you feel most accurately describes your own belief about work.

1 2 3 4 5 6
Disagree Disagree Disagree Agree Agree Agree
Very Much Moderately Slightly Slightly Moderately Very Much

1. A job is what you make of it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives that to you.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make efforts.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. In order to get a really good job you need to have family members in high places.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Promotions are usually a matter of good fortune.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

10. When it comes to landing a real good job, who you know is more important than what you know.
    1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.
    1 2 3 4 5 6
12. To make a lot of money you have to know right people.

13. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.

14. People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.

15. Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.

16. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make little money is luck.

Below is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Do not judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. The term "group" as employed in the following items, refers to a department or division that is being supervised by the supervisor being described. The term "members" refers to all the people in that department or division.

Describe how often your supervisor engages in the behavior described by each item below.

Never   Seldom   Occasion- Often   Always

1. He lets group members know what is expected of them

2. He is friendly and approachable

3. He encourages the use of uniform procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>He tries out his ideas in the group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>He makes his attitude clear to the group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>He treats all groups members as his equal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>He gives advance notice of changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>He assigns group members to particular task.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>He keeps to himself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>He looks out for the personal welfare of the group members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>He schedules the work to be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>He is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>He maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. He refuses to explain his actions.

1 2 3 4 5

19. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

1 2 3 4 5

20. He acts without consulting the group.

1 2 3 4 5

The following questions relate to various aspects of your job. Using the scale given below, indicate the extent to which the conditions described by each of the items exist for your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Little Amount</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have.

1 2 3 4 5

2. There are clear goals and objectives for my job

1 2 3 4 5

3. I know that I divide my time properly.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I know what my responsibilities are.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I know exactly what is expected of me.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Explanation is clear for what has to be done on my job

1 2 3 4 5

7. How much are you left on your own to do your own work

1 2 3 4 5

8. To what extent are you able to act independently of your supervisor in performing your job.

1 2 3 4 5
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9. To what extent are you able to do your job independently.
   1  2  3  4  5

10. The freedom to do pretty much what you want on your job
    1  2  3  4  5

11. The opportunity for independent thought and action.
    1  2  3  4  5

12. The control you have over the pace of your work.
    1  2  3  4  5

13. How often do you see projects or jobs through to completion.
    1  2  3  4  5

14. The degree to which the work you are involved with is handled from beginning to end by you.
    1  2  3  4  5

15. The opportunity to complete work you start
    1  2  3  4  5

16. The opportunity to do a job from the beginning to end (i.e. chance to do a whole job)
    1  2  3  4  5

The following section relates to various aspects of an organization. Use the following scale to describe the extent to which the situation described by each of these items is applicable to the organization for which you are currently working.

1  2  3  4

Definitely Inclined Inclined Definitely Agree to agree to disagree Disagree

1. The jobs in this organization are clearly defined and logically structured.
   1  2  3  4
1. Definitely  Inclined  Inclined  Definitely
Agree  to agree  to Disagree  Disagree

2. In this organization it is sometimes unclear who has the
   formal authority to make a decision
   
3. The policies and organization structure of the
   organization have been clearly explained
   
4. Red tape is kept to a minimum in this organization.
   
5. Excessive rules, administrative details, and red tape
   make it difficult for new and original ideas to receive
   consideration.
   
6. Our productivity sometimes suffers from lack of
   organization and planning.
   
7. In some projects I've been on, I haven't been sure
   exactly who was my boss.
   
8. Our management isn't so concerned about formal
   organization and authority, but concentrates instead
   on getting the right people together to do the job
   
9. We have a promotion system here that helps the best man
   to rise to the top
   
10. In this organization the rewards and encouragements you
    get usually outweigh the threats and criticism.
    
11. In this organization people are rewarded in proportion
    to the excellence of their job performance
    
12. There is great deal of criticism in this organization.

1. Definitely
2. Inclined
3. Inclined
4. Definitely

Agree to agree to Disagree Disagree

13. There is not enough reward and recognition given in this organization for doing good work
   1 2 3 4

14. If you make a mistake in this organization you will be punished.
   1 2 3 4

15. The philosophy of our management is that in the long run we get ahead fastest by playing it slow, safe, and sure.
   1 2 3 4

16. Our business has been built up by taking calculated risks at the right time.
   1 2 3 4

17. Decision making in this organization is too cautious for maximum effectiveness.
   1 2 3 4

18. Our management is willing to take a chance on a good idea.
   1 2 3 4

19. We have to take some pretty big risk occasionally to keep ahead of competition.
   1 2 3 4

20. The best way to make a good impression around here is to steer clear of open arguments and disagreements
   1 2 3 4

21. The attitude of our management is that conflict between competing units and individuals can be very healthy.
   1 2 3 4

22. We are encouraged to speak our minds, even if it means disagreeing with our superiors.
   1 2 3 4

23. In management meetings the goal is to arrive at a decision as smoothly and quickly as possible.
   1 2 3 4
The following questions are about you. Please circle the appropriate response for each item.

1. I am a  
   1. Male  
   2. Female

2. My age group is
   1. less than 20 years  
   2. 20 - 24 years  
   3. 25 - 29 years  
   4. 30 - 34 years  
   5. 35 years and above

3. My **full time** work experience is
   1. less than one year  
   2. 1 - 3 years  
   3. 4 - 6 years  
   4. 7 - 9 years  
   5. 10 years or more

4. My **part time** work experience is
   1. less than a year  
   2. 1 - 2 years  
   3. 3 - 4 years  
   4. 5 - 6 years  
   5. 7 years and more

5. I have been working for the employer I am presently employed with for
   1. less than one year  
   2. 1 - 2 years  
   3. 3 - 4 years  
   4. 5 - 6 years  
   5. 7 years or more

6. The organization I am presently working for is a
   1. manufacturing organization  
   2. service organization  
   3. retailing organization  
   4. government organization  
   5. both manufacturing and service organization

7. My position in the company I work for is
   1. non-managerial  
   2. lower level manager  
   3. middle level manager  
   4. upper level manager

8. The organization I work for has
   1. less than 10 employees  
   2. 10 - 100 employees  
   3. 101-1000 employees  
   4. over 1000 people

9. My present immediate supervisor is
   1. Male  
   2. Female
10. I have been working with my present supervisor for

1. 6 months to one year
2. more than 1 but less than 2 years
3. 2 - 3 years
4. more than 3 years
APPENDIX B

THE MIBOSS SCALE:

SCALE CONSTRUCTED AND VALIDATED FOR MEASUREMENT OF INGRATIATORY BEHAVIORS IN ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS
Below are described various ways of how people go about influencing their supervisors to make a positive impression about themselves. Refer to your most recent employment experience and describe on the scale given below the extent to which you use each of these ways to influence your supervisor. Do not judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable.

Circle the most appropriate category's number following each item.

1. Never
2. Seldom
3. Occasion
4. Often
5. Almost

Do It.
Do It.
Do It.
Do It.
Do It.

Read each item as the ending of this phrase: "How often do you...?"

1. Impress upon your supervisor that only he can help you in a given situation mainly to make him feel good about himself

1 2 3 4 5

2. Show him that you share his enthusiasm about his new idea even when you may not actually like it

1 2 3 4 5

3. Try to let him know that you have a reputation for being liked

1 2 3 4 5

4. Try to make sure that he is aware of your successes

1 2 3 4 5

5. Highlight the achievements made under his leadership in a meeting not being attended by him

1 2 3 4 5

6. Give frequent smiles to express enthusiasm/interest about something he is interested in even if you do not like it

1 2 3 4 5

7. Express work attitudes that are similar to your supervisor as a way of letting him know that two of you are alike

1 2 3 4 5

8. Tell him that you can learn a lot from his experience

1 2 3 4 5
Never Seldom Occasion Often Always
Do It. Do It. Do It. Do It. Always
Do It.

9. Exaggerate his admirable qualities to convey the impression that you think highly of him

10. Disagree in trivial or unimportant issues but show agreement on those issues in which he expects support from you

11. Try to imitate such work behaviors of your supervisor as working late or occasionally working on weekends.

12. Look for opportunities to let the supervisor know your virtues/strengths

13. Ask your supervisor for advice in areas in which he thinks he is smart to let him feel that you admire his talent

14. Try to do things for your supervisor that show your selfless generosity

15. Look out for opportunities to admire your supervisor

16. Let your supervisor know the attitudes you share with him

17. Compliment your supervisor on his achievement, however trivial it may actually be to you personally.

18. Laugh heartily at your supervisor's jokes even when they are not really funny

19. Go out of your way to run an errand for your supervisor
20. Offer to help your supervisor by using your personal contacts.
   1  2  3  4  5

21. Try to persuasively present your own qualities when attempting to convince your supervisor about your abilities
   1  2  3  4  5

22. Volunteer to be of help to your supervisor in matters like locating a good apartment, finding a good insurance agent etc.
   1  2  3  4  5

23. Spend time listening to your supervisor's personal problems even if you have no interest in them
   1  2  3  4  5

24. Volunteer to help your supervisor in his work even if it means extra work for you
   1  2  3  4  5
APPENDIX C

MIBOSS SCALE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, ITEM–TOTAL CORRELATION AND CORRELATION WITH SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE
TABLE 9
MIBOSS SCALE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION AND CORRELATION WITH SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN (N=148)</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION</th>
<th>CORRELATION WITH SOCIAL DESIRABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.01 (p &gt; .46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00 (p &gt; .48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.02 (p &gt; .40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.10 (p &gt; .10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.09 (p &gt; .12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.11 (p &gt; .08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.02 (p &gt; .40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00 (p &gt; .48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.02 (p &gt; .40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.02 (p &gt; .38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.01 (p &gt; .45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.03 (p &gt; .34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.07 (p &gt; .34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.00 (p &gt; .49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.07 (p &gt; .18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00 (p &gt; .46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.11 (p &gt; .09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.03 (p &gt; .35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.07 (p &gt; .20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.05 (p &gt; .25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.09 (p &gt; .13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.00 (p &gt; .47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.11 (p &gt; .08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.04 (p &gt; .29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FACTOR LOADING OF MIBOSS ITEMS
### Table 10

Factor Loading of MIBOSS Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX E

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF MIBOSS SCALE: BRIEF SUMMARY

Reliability of Scale

1. Cronbach's Alpha 0.923
2. Split-Half Reliability 0.86 and 0.88
3. After Spearman-Brown correction 0.85
4. Test-Retest Reliability (one month) 0.73

Construct Validity

Correlation with Mach IV 0.69 (P<.001)

Factorial Validity: All 24 items load .44 or better on one factor.

Discriminant Validity

Compulsiveness Inventory -0.07 (p>0.29)

Content Validity

1. Scale items derived from previous researches.
2. Scale items examined and suggested by working employees for accurate and realistic description of behaviors.
3. Scale items examined by experts from organizational behavior, industrial psychology, and organization theory

Other Tests

1. Correlation with Crowne Marlowe's Social Desirability Scale 0.019 (p>.40)
2. Correlation with Acquiescence Scale 0.11 (p>0.21)
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