

DEVELOPMENT OF A MEASURE OF INGRATIATORY BEHAVIOUR IN ORGANIZATIONS[#]

Arti Shankar

*Old Dominion University
Norfolk-Virginia, USA*

Mahfooz A. Ansari

*International Islamic University
Selangor, Malaysia*

Scema Saxena

*Vasanta College for Women
Varanasi, India*

The paper reports the development of a multidimensional, factorially independent scale to measure ingratiation behaviour in work organizations. The scale was developed and tested on a sample (N=294) of managers working in seven diverse manufacturing organizations located in Northern India. The final scale consisted of 26 items, with five dimensions: Using a third person, enhancement of self, disparagement of self, instrumental dependency, and target gratification. The scale showed a high internal consistency reliability and substantial content, convergent, and discriminant validities. Implications of the findings are discussed, future directions are suggested, and conclusions about the new scale are drawn.

Ingratiation has been described as early as 1936 by popular writers (such as, Carnegie, 1936), empirically investigated over the

[#] This article is based on Arti Shankar's doctoral dissertation, which was completed at the Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, under the guidance of Mahfooz A. Ansari. The authors thank committee members Gary Yukl and Asha Bhandarker for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mahfooz A. Ansari, International Islamic University Malaysia, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia <E-mail: mahfooz@iiu.edu.my>.

past 20 years by social psychologists (Jones, 1964; Jones & Wortman, 1973), and more recently examined by industrial/organizational psychologists (Pandey, 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Wortman & Linsenmier, 1977) as possibly being used by employees in organizational settings. It belongs to a class of influence strategies that aims at satisfying personal and organizational goals (Ansari, 1989, 1990; Ansari & Tandon, 1991; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980). Like all other influence strategies used in organizations (such as rationality, coalition, and exchange), ingratiation involves the exercise of power, which has an impact on the effectiveness of the organization (Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Ralston, 1985). However, it differs from the other strategies by virtue of its illicit and strategic nature. It involves people calculating payoffs, assessing their social contexts, and manipulating the situation to their benefits—quite often at the expense of others.

Ingratiation in organizations lies outside the authority of formal organizations and involves attraction management with a manipulative intent. It has thus been defined as “a class of strategic behaviour illicitly designed to influence a particular other person concerning the attractiveness of one’s personal qualities” (Jones, 1964, p. 11). It occurs when the worker finds it difficult to improve his or her outcomes within the task system itself and when he or she believes that the target has some freedom to develop and modify his or her standards of performance evaluation (Jones, Gergen, Gumpert, & Thibaut, 1965). It is used to get one’s way with the boss as well as to persuade subordinates and coworkers to work in specific ways (Ansari, 1990; Kipinis et al., 1980). Although ingratiation can be used as an upward, downward, or lateral strategy, it is used more frequently to influence one’s superior (Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979; Ansari, 1990; Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Ralston, 1985; Shankar, Ansari, & Saxena, 1994), and therefore, it is generally studied as an upward influence strategy.

Social/organizational psychologists (e.g., Ansari, 1990; Kipnis, et al., 1980; Yukl & Falbe, 1990) working in the area of influence behaviour have generally viewed ingratiation as corresponding to what in native terms has been called “flattery”. They conceptualized ingratiation as a unidimensional concept, and treated it as a soft strategy to gain approbation of superiors. Jones (1964) was probably the first to identify that ingratiation is not one single tactic but it is a strategy that comprises more than one tactic. Ingratiation, according

to him, could take all or any form by which interpersonal attraction may be solicited. Since there are variations in attraction seeking behavior (Byrne, 1971), there are tactical variations in the use of ingratiation (Jones, 1964; Pandey & Bohra, 1984; Wortman & Linsenmier, 1977).

A review of the literature indicates that there are many scales available (Ansari, 1990; Kipnis, et al., 1980; Yuki & Falbe, 1990) that have treated ingratiation as a unidimensional concept. But there have been only two attempts to date to measure it as a multidimensional concept. Pandey and Bohra (1984) developed the first such scale. The items of this scale were worded on the basis of ingratiation tactics defined by Jones (1964), and Pandey and Bohra (1984). The scale consisted of 35 items, with five items to measure each of the seven ingratiation tactics: Other enhancement, self enhancement, opinion conformity, instrumental dependency, changing with the situation, name dropping, and self degradation. While the overall reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the scale had been reported to be .84, the subscale reliabilities were not that strong (mostly in the .50's). In addition, the subscales did not seem to be factorially independent.

The second scale was developed recently by Kumar and Beyerlein (1991). The items of this scale were also worded on the basis of ingratiation tactics defined by Jones (1964). The scale consisted of four subscales: Other enhancement (7 items), opinion conformity (7 items), self-presentation (4 items), and favour rendering (6 items). The overall reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the scale had been found to be .92, with a test-retest reliability coefficient of .73. The individual factor reliability coefficients were, however, not reported. This scale too is not free from limitations. The first is that a factor analysis with oblique rotation was carried out, resulting in the factors being neither clean nor factorially independent (intercorrelations ranged between .22 and .65). The second limitation is that, like Pandey and Bohra's (1984) scale, this scale also has discounted for some other important tactics that could have been ingratiating.

Thus, the present paper is an attempt at developing a psychometrically sound, new multidimensional scale to measure ingratiation as an upward influence strategy which would overcome some of the limitations of the previous scales.

ITEM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Theoretical Construct Definitions

It is probably true that when we are dealing with ingratiation, we are largely concerned with communicative behaviors that reflect the communicator's view of himself or herself, aspects of the surrounding environment, and his or her esteem of the target person. Considering these types of communications seven tactics of ingratiation were identified in the social-organizational literature (Jones, 1964; Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Pandey & Bohra, 1984; Wortman & Linsenmier, 1977). A review of this literature led to the following theoretical definitions of the constructs.

Other Enhancement: It involves communications of directly enhancing evaluative statements (Jones, 1964). The ingratiator may distort and exaggerate the target person's admirable qualities to convey the impression that he or she thinks highly of the target person, and at the same time fails to perceive the negative attributes of the target. The effectiveness of this tactic in the service of attraction seeking seems to derive from the premise that people find it hard not to like those who think highly of them (Heider, 1958).

Self-Enhancement: It involves explicit presentation or description of one's own positive attributes to increase the likelihood of being judged attractive (Jones, 1964). This is generally sought out in two ways. The first involves the modeling of oneself along the lines of the target person's suggested ideals. The second involves oneself as possessing traits that are generally valued in the society or culture.

Opinion Conformity: It involves conforming in various ways to the target person (Jones, 1964). The tactic follows the proposition that people like those whose attitudes and beliefs appear similar to their own (Byrne, 1971).

Instrumental Dependency: It involves trying to induce a sort of social responsibility in the target while showing dependency on him or her (Pandey & Bohra, 1984). This is especially relevant in a culture where the norm of social responsibility states that "help those who are helpless."

Name Dropping: It involves conveying to the target about the important connections of the ingratiator and thus providing cues of how useful he or she can be to the target (Pandey & Bohra, 1984). This is attraction seeking because, in a resource limited

(hierarchical) society, social connections are highly valued (Ansari, 1990; Sinha, 1980).

Self-Degradation: It involves direct manifestation of one's negative attributes to the target (Olzewska-Kondratowicz, 1975; Pandey & Bohra, 1984). This is used to overplay the superiority of the target person and hence reduce the chances of being perceived as a competitive threat to him or her. The tactic draws its effectiveness through an implicit other enhancement.

Third Party Directed: It involves portrayal of the positive qualities of the target to a third person who is known to the target (Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Wortman & Linsenmier, 1977).

Item Generation

A deductive approach was followed for item development (Hinkin, 1992; Schwab, 1980). On the basis of the ingratiation tactics defined above, a pool of 66 items were generated for the ingratiation scale, of which 16 belonged to other enhancement, 9 to opinion conformity, 8 to self enhancement, 9 to self degradation, 11 to instrumental dependency, 8 to third party directed, and 5 to name dropping subscales. The items were worded in the form of statements in such a way that each of these described a tactic of ingratiation. Care was also taken to frame the statement in such a manner as to portray to the respondent that the action (statement) he or she used to influence the superior need not be based on truth, but could have elements of pretence in them.

Item Review and Content Validation

The items were reviewed and judged at this stage for content validity. Content validation was performed in two phases. First, the three authors along with the two other experts served as judges to evaluate each of the 66 items to be identified in the seven dimensions. This exercise was also geared toward recommending modifications—change, drop, or add items—and identifying unclear items. It resulted in identifying 10 confusing, unclear, and inappropriate items, thus reducing the size of the scale to 56 items for further assessment. Secondly, six judges from diverse disciplines (Social Psychology, Economics, Socio-linguistics, and English Literature) were provided the construct definitions. The task of the judges was to sort the various statements, on the basis of item descriptions, as belonging to one of the seven tactics of ingratiation.

The statement on which there was an agreement of 80% or more as belonging to a category was taken as an item of that category. By this way, the total number of items was reduced to 49.

Pilot Study

As a next step, a pilot study was carried out at Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur on a sample ($N= 200$) of engineering majors in role playing situations. The overall strategy used in this study was the measurement of the subject's perception of how frequently they would use each of the 49 tactic-items with their role-set superiors to influence them at work. On the basis of this study, items were refined and reworded-by weeding out the weak items and modifying the ambiguous ones. The scale finally constrained to 35 items, with 5 items in each subscale to avoid influences of item context and the resulting factor structure (Harrison & McLaughlin, 1991; Rummel, 1970).

MAIN STUDY

Sample

Seven diverse manufacturing organizations located in Northern-India participated in the study. Of the seven organizations, three were in the public sector and were involved in the manufacture of chemicals, television sets, and scooters. Four corresponding organizations were taken from the private sector. Data were collected from a total of 350 randomly selected managers, of whom 56 were eliminated because of missing information. The managers represented lower (84.0%), middle (12.8%), and upper (3.20%) hierarchical levels of management. The majority had at least a bachelor's degree. The mean age was 41.8 years, and their average tenure in the organization was 13.6 years. Out of the sampled managers, 60.9% were drawn from the public sector and 39.1% were from the private sector. Bulks of them (69.7%) were doing work of a technical nature. Of all the respondents, 26.7% worked in scooter manufacturing units, 31.5% worked in chemical firms, and 41.8% were involved in the manufacture of television sets.

Instruments

Ingratiation Measure

The ingratiation measure scale used was the revised 35-item scale from the pilot study. The subjects were asked to indicate on a

7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = always) the frequency with which during the past six months they had adopted each of the actions (described by the scale items) to influence their immediate superior at work.

Leadership Style Scale

The self-reported leadership style scale had 24 pretested items that were drawn from Sinha (1987). Each with 8 items, three style dimensions-authoritarian, participative, and nurturant-task were of the interest. The first two styles are widely researched in the field of organizational behaviour and do not merit a detailed description, but the last one does. The nurturant-task style (Sinha, 1980) is a transitional style which is particularly suited within the Indian culture. It has been recommended for those subordinates who are not prepared to participate in decision-making. The emphasis is on target realization with a blend of nurturance orientation. Essentially, nurturance is contingent on task performance. The respondents were asked to judge how frequently the statements were true to them on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = always). The reliabilities, means, and standard deviations of the three subscale, respectively, were found to be .76, 40.25, and 6.31 for the participative subscale; .77, 47.71, and 6.42 for the nurturant-task subscale; and .66, 34.34, and 6.42 for the authoritarian subscale.

Climate

A number of researchers (e.g., Ansari, 1980; Likert, 1967; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Sinha, 1980) have postulated that the climate of the organization is determined, among other factors, by the leadership styles of the management. In view of this, climate in this research was conceptualized in terms of three leadership style dimensions (authoritarian, participative, and nurturant-task) of the managers in general. The leadership style scale was modified to represent the climate of the organization. The scale consisted of 24 items, with 8 items in each subscale. The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which the statements were true for the managers of their organization on a 7-point scale (1 = never; 7 = always). The reliabilities, means, and standard deviations for the three subscales, respectively, were found to be .87, 30.85, and 8.89 for the participative subscale; .89, 35.78, and 9.57 for the nurturant-task subscale; and .54, 37.34, and 6.16 for the authoritarian subscale.

Social Desirability Scale

Ten items were drawn from the widely used social desirability scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960). The subjects were asked to indicate whether the statements (concerning personal attitudes) were true/false for them. The mean and the standard deviation of this scale were found to be 3.10, and 1.79, respectively.

In addition to the above measures, several single-statement items were used to assess the respondent's personal-demographic characteristics such as age, tenure, education, status (hierarchical level), and functionalization.

Procedure

The organizations were requested to grant permission for data collection. Once the permission was obtained, the Personnel Department was asked to supply a list of managers. The criteria for selecting the managers were their hierarchical levels (lower, middle, and upper) and their functionalization (technical and nontechnical). The questionnaires were administered during working hours and were collected at the convenience of the managers. The managers were personally contacted and detailed instructions -written and verbal-regarding how to fill-in the questionnaire were given. Participation in the research was voluntary and a complete anonymity of the individual responses was guaranteed.

RESULTS

Item Review

Three criteria were used for the selection of ingratiating items at this stage. As a first criterion, we calculated the variance on each of the 35 items. The analysis revealed that all the 35 items exceeded unity (i.e., $S^2 > 1.00$). Thus, no items were removed for lack of variability at this stage (see Table 1). The second criterion was the intercorrelations among the items. The correlation matrix (not reported here) revealed that the correlation ranged from .02 to .72. Item-test correlation (see Table 1) disclosed that the items correlated well above .55 with the other items of their domain and, therefore, no item was dropped at this stage. The third criterion was the correlation of the items of ingratiation with the Social Desirability Scale. Table 1 showed that all but two correlation (items 18 and 35)

were nonsignificant, thereby showing the ingratiation responses to be free from social desirability effect.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics, correlation of items with social desirability, and item-test correlations for the 35-items measure of ingratiation

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i> (SOD)	<i>r</i> (IT)
1. I pretended that he/she was the <i>only</i> person who could support me. (ID)	3.6	1.9	.06	.85
2. I made him/her believe that I was a very responsible person. (SE)	4.9	1.8	-.12	.74
3. I pretended that he/she was the <i>only</i> person who helped solve my problems. (ID)	3.6	1.9	-.01	.83
4. I praised him/her in front of his/her friend in the hope that his/her friend would tell him/her about it. (TP)	2.7	1.7	-.02	.85
5. I showed how my connections outside the organization could help him/her. (ND)	2.5	1.6	.02	.80
6. I highlighted his/her achievements to his/her superior in the hope that the superior would mention this to him/her. (TP)	2.7	1.6	.08	.81
7. I made him/her believe that I was a very trustworthy person. (SE)	4.4	1.9	-.06	.81
8. I gave my consent to whatever he/she said, irrespective of my personal opinion. (OC)	3.8	1.8	-.04	.74
9. I told him/her how my connections inside the organization could help him/her. (ND)	2.4	1.7	-.09	.82

Table 1. continued.

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i> (SOD)	<i>r</i> (IT)
10. I showed that I would give my whole-hearted support for all his/her policies. (OC)	4.4	1.8	.01	.68
11. I pretended that he/she was the only person who could decide things for me. (ID)	3.1	1.8	.04	.81
12. I appreciated his/her ideas and opinions in front of his/her friends in the hope that they would tell him/her about it. (TP)	2.6	1.6	.07	.86
13. I told him/her that I knew influential others who could help him/her. (ND)	2.4	1.5	.05	.80
14. I told him/her that his/her presence was necessary for the proper functioning of the organization. (OE)	2.8	1.8	.05	.78
15. I made him/her believe that I was a very competent person. (SE)	4.4	1.9	-.06	.84
16. I showed that I opposed those people who did not agree with him/her. (OC)	3.0	1.7	.09	.68
17. I pretended that I lacked in talent to get his/her help. (SD)	2.2	1.3	.05	.69
18. I showed him/her that I had a high opinion and regard for him/her. (OE)	4.5	1.8	.16	.75
19. I avoided getting into arguments with him/her. (OC)	4.4	1.6	.01	.59
20. I showed him/her that I was impressed by his/her contributions to the organization. (OE)	3.8	1.8	.08	.80
21. I showed him/her that I was always ready to conform to his/her given directions. (OC)	4.5	1.7	.08	.72
22. I pretended that I lacked in experience so that he/she could help me. (SD)	2.5	1.6	.01	.80

Table 1. continued.

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i> (SOD)	<i>r</i> (IT)
23. I pretended that I was only dependent on him/her. (ID)	2.2	1.5	-.04	.75
24. I pretended that I was so handicapped that his/her help was necessary. (SD)	1.9	1.3	.03	.75
25. I told others that he/she was the source of my inspiration in the hope that they would tell him/her about it. (TP)	2.3	1.6	.06	.80
26. I used superlatives to describe him/her while interacting with him/her. (OE)	2.5	1.6	.06	.60
27. I showed that it was <i>only</i> his/her attention that was vital for my survival in the organization. (ID)	2.2	1.5	.08	.68
28. I pretended that I lacked in expertise so that he/she could help me. (SD)	2.3	1.5	.02	.85
29. I told others that I had a high opinion and regard for him/her in the hope that they would tell him/her about it. (TP)	2.5	1.5	.08	.84
30. I showed that I could get support for his/her policies through my contacts. (ND)	2.6	1.6	.04	.85
31. I made him/her believe that I had lots of experience. (SE)	3.8	1.9	.08	.72
32. I showed how my connections with the top men in the organization could be useful to him/her. (ND)	2.3	1.5	.01	.81
33. I highlighted my achievements to him/her. (SE)	3.9	1.8	.07	.67
34. I made him/her feel important. (OE)	4.0	1.8	.01	.59
35. I presented myself in a poor light so that he/she could help me. (SD)	1.9	1.4	.14	.57

Note: $r(292) = .11$ at $p < .05$; $r(292) = .15$ at $p < .01$.

OE= Other Enhancement; SE= Self Enhancement; OC= Opinion Conformity; SD= Self Degradation; ID= Instrumental Dependency; ND= Name Dropping; TP= Third Party Directed; SOD= Social Desirability; IT= Item-Test.

Factor Analysis

The Ingratiation Measure was next subjected to a varimax rotated factor analysis, as a partial test of the construct validity. The items to be retained were selected on the basis of the following criteria. The solution was constrained using the criterion of eigen value greater than or equal to 1.00, and meeting the criterion of factor loading generally not less than .40 on the defining component and no cross-loading greater than .25. The analysis confined to five factors meeting these criteria that explained a total of 53.8% of the variance. The factors loading obtained are reported in Table 2. These factors are operationally described below.

Using a Third Person (UT)

Two factors namely third party directed and names dropping, of the original conceptualization constrained to form this factor and was labeled "Using a Third Person". This factor had ten items and involved respondents ingratiating the target by taking the help of a third person, who was not directly affected by the interaction between the target and the ingratiator.

Enhancement of Self (ES)

This factor had five items and involved ingratiating the target by highlighting one's positive personal qualities.

Disparagement of Self (DS)

This factor had four items (from the originally conceptualized self-degradation subscale). Ingratiation, here, was sought through portrayal of oneself in a bad light.

Instrument Dependency (ID)

Three items of the originally conceived five items were retained in this scale. This factor involved ingratiation through pretenses of dependency on the target person.

Target Gratification (TG)

Two factors namely other enhancement and opinion conformity of the original conceptualization constrained to form this factor. This extracted factor was named "Target Gratification". The factor had four items and dealt with ingratiation through praising and conforming to the opinions of the target.

Table 2

Factor loadings obtained: Ingratiation measure

Items	Factors				
	UT	ES	DS	ID	TG
1.	.21	.15	.38	<u>.69</u>	.11
2.	.14	<u>.64</u>	.23	.28	.00
3.	.17	.29	.21	<u>.68</u>	.15
4.	<u>.64</u>	.09	.23	.24	.16
5.	<u>.70</u>	.14	.09	.16	.06
6.	<u>.69</u>	.11	.11	.24	.20
7.	.12	<u>.76</u>	-.03	.08	.03
9.	<u>.70</u>	.14	.16	.01	.14
11.	.28	.21	.22	<u>.58</u>	.34
12.	<u>.69</u>	.06	.15	.25	.31
13.	<u>.71</u>	.11	.19	.08	.03
15.	.11	<u>.78</u>	.03	.18	.11
16.	.18	.39	.07	.19	<u>.52</u>
19.	.01	-.12	.21	.06	<u>.59</u>
21.	.11	.04	.06	.33	<u>.59</u>
22.	.17	.02	<u>.39</u>	.21	.16
24.	.16	.03	<u>.66</u>	.08	.15
25.	<u>.65</u>	.12	.26	.16	.15
28.	.21	.06	<u>.62</u>	.15	.11
29.	<u>.70</u>	.16	-.27	.15	.06
30.	<u>.74</u>	.22	-.01	.03	.18
31.	.31	<u>.51</u>	-.31	-.05	.06
32.	<u>.71</u>	.19	.07	.02	.07
33.	.13	<u>.57</u>	.23	-.13	.23
34.	.15	.29	.17	.03	<u>.60</u>
35.	.26	-.06	<u>.34</u>	.15	.08
Eigen value	11.9	2.3	1.3	1.2	1.0
Percentage of Variance	34.1	6.8	6.2	3.8	2.9

Note: For item description, see Table 1.

UT= Using a Third Person; ES= Enhancement of Self; DS= Disparagement of Self; ID= Instrumental Dependency; TG= Target Gratification.

Assessment of Scale Independence

Although all the five factors of ingratiation are distinct, they have an implicit motive of attraction management, which leads us to expect some interdependence among them. Table 3 provides the intercorrelations among the five factors. There were only two correlation that were above the .50 level i.e., between instrumental dependency and using a third person and between instrumental dependency and disparagement of self. Such an overlap might be because the three tactics are based on the Indian middle class values of "preference for personalized relationships" (i.e., an obsession for making connections at the personal level) and "dependence proneness" (i.e., a strong tendency to lean on others for help, support, advice, and/or emotional reassurance) in work organizations (Sinha, 1980). Overall, however, the factors were only moderately intercorrelated (average $r = .40$), thereby showing a great deal of independence among the factors.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics, alpha coefficients, intercorrelations of ingratiation factors, and their correlations with social desirability

Tactics	1	2	3	4	5
1. Using third person	.93	-	-	-	-
2. Enhancement of self	.40	.82	-	-	-
3. Disparagement of self	.47	.17	.74	-	-
4. Instrumental dependency	.52	.40	.52	.85	-
5. Target gratification	.38	.36	.35	.46	.72
6. Social desirability	-.03	.11	-.04	.07	.13
<i>M</i>	24.9	21.4	8.6	10.3	17.4
<i>SD</i>	12.4	7.1	4.4	4.9	5.0

Note: $r(292) = .11$ at $p < .05$; $r(292) = .15$ at $p < .01$.

Diagonal entries indicate coefficients alpha.

Social Desirability

The correlation of five ingratiation factor scores with social desirability score (Table 3) revealed that the factors were weakly or completely unrelated to social desirability. This fact may be taken as partial evidence that the subscales are free from social desirability effect.

Reliability

In order to examine the internal consistency of the measures, Cronbach's coefficients alpha were computed. The subscales were found to be fairly reliable (Table 3), the reliability coefficients ranged between .72 and .93.

Convergent Validity

Leadership Styles

Ansari (1990) had found that ingratiation was associated with all leadership styles, namely participative, nurturant-task, and authoritarian. However, authoritarian were found to make the most frequent use of it, probably because an authoritarian manager is more concerned with personal vanity, power, and image management. Zero-order correlations were computed to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and ingratiation. The results (Table 4) revealed that using a third person, enhancement of self, instrumental dependency, and target gratification showed significant positive correlation with authoritarian style. Disparagement of self was negatively associated with nurturant-task style and positively with participative style.

Climate

Ralston (1985) predicted that autocratic managers would encourage subordinate ingratiation behaviour by virtue of suppressing the subordinates' opportunities to use their creative abilities in order to distinguish themselves. Conversely, a democratic leader discourages ingratiation, since he or she perceives the subordinates as being capable of self-control and internally motivated. Ansari and Kapoor (1987) upheld this prediction in an experimental study. The relationship between climate and ingratiation was tested through zero-order correlation (Table 4). As

the results revealed, authoritarian climate positively correlated with instrumental dependency and target gratification tactics of ingratiation. Nurturant-task climate was positively tied with enhancement of self, disparagement of self, and targets gratification tactics of ingratiation. The participative climate negatively correlated with enhancement of self, disparagement of self, and target gratification tactics. Nurturant-task climate appeared to be more highly correlated with ingratiation in comparison to authoritarian climate, but this could be attributed to the higher probability of successful ingratiation in the nurturant-task climate (Shankar, 1992).

Table 4

Correlations of 26-items Ingratiation Measure with Leadership Styles, Climate, and Status

Variables	Ingratiation				
	UT	ES	DS	ID	TG
<i>Leadership Styles</i>					
Participative	-.06	.08	.14	-.07	.01
Nurturant-Task	.08	.07	-.27	-.09	-.09
Authoritarian	.18	.17	-.05	.15	.14
<i>Climate</i>					
Participative	.03	-.12	-.16	.09	-.11
Nurturant-Task	.04	.13	.16	.09	.11
Authoritarian	-.02	.03	.08	.16	.17
<i>Status</i>	-.11	-.11	-.13	-.06	.03

Note: $r(292) = .11$ at $p < .05$; $r(292) = .15$ at $p < .01$

UT= Using a Third Person; ES= Enhancement of Self; DS= Disparagement of Self; ID= Instrumental Dependency; TG= Target Gratification.

Discriminant Validity

Ownership

To examine discriminant validity, the scale was administered to a diverse and multiple sample. The first sample consisted of manager ($n = 170$) in the public sector and the second sample

represented managers ($n = 115$) in the private sector. It has been found that structural variables have strong bearings that affect the legitimacy factor and thus encourage or discourage the tendency to ingratiate (Pandey & Bohra, 1984). There are certain types of organizations that provide a conducive environment for ingratiation. For example, a private sector organization (economic sector that is free from state control) will show frequent use of ingratiatory tactics than will a public sector organization (organization where there is state ownership of means and production, distribution, and exchange). The latter structure is known for fixed rules and procedures set by the authority of a superior body. That is, public sector organizations are subject to a greater range of rules and regulations than are private organizations (Rainey, 1983). In view of this, the decisions and actions of authorities are made less powerful because of organizational rules. Thus, in a privately managed organization, it is important for the subordinates to ingratiate the immediate superior both in acquisitive (i.e., assertive) and protective (i.e., defensive) considerations. This expectation was tested by means of a one-way ANOVA. The results (Table 5) disclosed that the two sample differed significantly in terms of three of the tactics of ingratiation, with members of the private sector making more frequent use of enhancement of self, disparagement of self, and target gratification tactics.

Table 5

Analysis of variance of ingratiation as a function of nature of work and ownership

Tactics	Nature of Work			Ownership		
	Tech	Non-tech	<i>F</i>	Private	Public	<i>F</i>
Using a Third Person	24.90	24.99	0.03	25.25	24.43	0.31
Enhancement of Self	26.47	21.20	0.09	20.64	22.56	5.25
Disparagement of Self	8.20	9.55	6.16	8.17	9.30	4.71
Instrumental dependency	10.00	11.15	3.46	10.01	10.87	2.18
Target Gratification	16.97	18.49	5.79	16.91	18.25	5.05

Note: $F(1,292) = 3.87$ at $p < .05$; $F(1,292) = 6.72$ at $p < .01$.

Tech = Technical; Non-tech = Non-technical.

Functionalization

The samples also differed in terms of the nature of work. The first sample ($n = 205$) consisted of technical workers and the second sample ($n = 89$) consisted of nontechnical workers. The results (Table 5) showed that the workers differed as a function of the nature of work, with the nontechnical workers making more frequent use of disparagement of self and target gratification tactics of ingratiation. These results are comparable to those of Pandey (1981) who has reasoned that the jobs of nontechnical workers are such that they provide a lot of flexibility that leads to immense opportunities for ingratiation. In addition, it could be that, in the case of nontechnical workers, the criteria for excellence by which the workers enhance their attraction in the eyes of their boss are not adequately defined by their jobs.

Status (Hierarchical Level)

Jones (1964) reported low status workers as making more frequent use of ingratiation as compared to high status workers. Perhaps the low status workers because of their low power position feel more concerned about the attraction of the boss towards themselves and are, therefore, more inclined to use ingratiation. The computed zero-order correlation showed a negative relationship of status with using a third person, enhancement of self, and disparagement of self tactics of ingratiation (see Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The main objective of the present study was to develop a psychometrically sound, multidimensional scale of independent factors to measure ingratiation as an upward influence strategy. The final measure that emerged was a 26-item scale, with five independent factors: using third person, enhancement of self, disparagement of self, instrumental dependency, and target gratification. The reliability coefficients of the subscale ranged between .72 and .93, thus showing a high internal consistency among items. The new scale had a built-in content validity and reasonable amount of convergent-discriminant validity. The scale differs from the earlier scales (Pandey & Bohra, 1984; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991) in two major ways: (i) it includes some more

ingratiatory tactics available in the literature, and (ii) tactics of ingratiation are factorially independent.

Since it is not possible to address every issue in a single study, future research should focus on comparing this scale with other influence measures to further the convergent and discriminant validity. In order to assess the temporal stability of the measure, the scale needs to be tested on a larger sample in diverse organizations. Despite the need for additional research to validate the new scale, future researchers may be advised to use the new scale as opposed to the *ad hoc* measures. Furthermore, it may be useful to use this scale in studying downwards and lateral influence in organizations.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. W., Madison, D. L., Porter, L. W., Renwick, P. A., & Mayes, B. T. (1979). Organizational politics: Tactics and personal characteristics of political actors. *California Management Review*, 22, 77-83.
- Ansari, M. A. (1980). Organizational climate: Homogeneity within and heterogeneity between organizations. *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 8, 89-96.
- Ansari, M. A. (1989). Effects of leader sex, subordinate sex, and subordinate performance on the use of influence strategies. *Sex Roles*, 20, 283-293.
- Ansari, M. A. (1990). *Managing people at work*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Ansari, M. A., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 29-39.
- Ansari, M. A., & Tandon, K. (1991). Organizational climate as a moderator of the relationship between leadership styles and influence strategies. *Management and Labor Studies*, 16, 175-187.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic.
- Carnegie, D. (1936). *How to win friends and influence people*. New York: Simon & Shuster.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlow, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24, 349-354.

- Harrison, D. A., & McLaughlin, M. E. (1991, August). *Exploring the cognitive processes underlying responses to self-report instruments: Effect of item content on work attitude measures*. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Miami Beach, Florida.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hinkin, T. (1992, August). *Guidelines for scale development for study of behaviour in organizations*. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Jones, E. E. (1964). *Ingratiation: A social psychological analysis*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Jones, E. E., & Wortman, C. B. (1973). *Ingratiation: An attributional approach*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning.
- Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., Gumpert, P., & Thibaut, J. W. (1965). Some conditions affecting the use of ingratiation to influence performance evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 613-625.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Exploration in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-452.
- Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiation behaviours in organizational settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 619-627.
- Liden, R. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (1988). Ingratiation behaviours in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 572-587.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Olzewska-Kondratowicz, A. (1975). Self-image as a regulator of tactical variation in organizations. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 6, 73-79.
- Pandey, J. (1980). Ingratiation as expected and manipulative behaviour in Indian society. *Social Change*, 10, 15-17.

- Pandey, J. (1981). Effect of Machiavellianism and degree of organizational formalization on ingratiation. *Psychology*, 24, 41-46.
- Pandey, J., & Bohra, K. A. (1984). Ingratiation as a function of organizational characteristics and supervisory styles. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 33, 381-394.
- Rainey, H. G. (1983). Public agencies and private firms: Incentives, goals and individual roles. *Administration and Society*, 15, 207-242.
- Ralston, D. A. (1985). Employee ingratiation: The role of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 477-483.
- Rummel, R. J. (1970). *Applied factor analysis*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behaviour. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour (Vol. 2)*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Shankar, A. (1992). *Ingratiation in organizations: Tactics, measurement, and correlates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kanpur, India: Indian Institute of Technology.
- Shankar, A., Ansari, M. A., & Saxena, S. (1994). Organizational context and ingratiation behaviour in organizations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 641-647.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1980). *The nurturant-task leader*. New Delhi: Concept.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1987). *Leader behaviour scale*. Patna: Assent.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in organizations. In S. B. Bacharach & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), *Research in sociology of organizations (Vol. 3)*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Wortman, C. B., & Linsenmier, L. A. (1977). Interpersonal attraction and techniques of ingratiation in organizational settings. In B. M. Staw & G. A. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behaviour*. Chicago, IL: St. Claire.
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 132-140.