

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of
Ingratiation-Related Behaviours

by

Neharika Vohra

A thesis
presented to the University of Manitoba
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) Neharika Vohra, 1992



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-77718-4

Canada

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF
INGRATIATORY-RELATED BEHAVIOURS

BY

NEHARIKA VOHRA

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1992

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to
lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm
this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to
publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts
from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have always felt words are inadequate for acknowledging the help and support of those who make the impossible look possible -- but they are the only available mode. My earnest thanks go to my advisor -- Dr. John Adair, for his unabating support, patience, insightful comments and umpteen rereadings to give this thesis its final shape. Thanks to Dr. Jenkinson and Dr. Murray for providing helpful comments and being wonderful committee members.

I would also like to thank my parents, Nimish and Sarika and Laxman who have patiently accepted my absence, and short, sometimes no, letters. They have always encouraged me to do my best.

Abstract

Cross-cultural comparisons of scores on ingratiation, self-monitoring and Machiavellianism were made between Canadians, Indo Canadians (Canadian residents with South Asian-born parents), and South Asian foreign students at the University of Manitoba. On the basis of observation and the research literature, it was hypothesized that ingratiation behavior would be more prevalent among South Asian foreign students than among Canadians, with the Indo-Canadian participants responding intermediate to the two. The predictions for ingratiation, tested by means of a three-factor scale developed in Study 1, were supported for the Indo-Canadian subjects, but significantly in the opposite direction for the other two groups. The ingratiation scale correlated with the Mach IV scale but not with the Revised Self-Monitoring scale. Reasons for the observation of lesser ingratiation by South Asians and more by Canadians were discussed.

Tables of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
Abstract	iii
Theories of Ingratiation	4
Causes of Ingratiatory Behaviour	7
Ingratiation as a dispositional characteristic	7
Ingratiation due to opportunities that arise in one's environment ...	9
Ingratiation due to external stable causes	10
Tactics of Ingratiation	13
Other Enhancement	13
Opinion Conformity	16
Self Presentation	18
Self-degradation	22
Instrumental dependency	23
Name dropping	23
Situation specific tactics	24
Evaluation of Ingratiatory Attempts by Target and Bystander	25
Bystanders' Evaluation of Ingratiation	29
Relation of Social Ingratiation to Some Personality Traits	31
Statement of problem	33
STUDY I	38

Method	38
Subjects	38
Materials	38
Ingratiation Scale	38
Additional questions	39
Procedure	40
Results	42
Factor analysis of the scale	42
STUDY 2	47
Method	47
Subjects	47
Overview of the design	50
Dependent Measures	50
The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSM)	50
Mach IV Scale	51
Ingratiation Scale	52
Procedure	52
Results	56
Hypothesis I	56
Hypothesis 2	60
Secondary analysis on open-ended questions	62
Discussion	67

Conclusions	75
References	78
Appendix A	86
Appendix B	93
Appendix C	98
Appendix D	106
Appendix E (1)	108
Appendix E (2)	109
Appendix E (3)	110

List of Tables

1. Varimax Rotated Principal Factors of the Ingratiation Scale.	43
2. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Cultural Subgroup for Each Subscale of Ingratiation.	57
3. Analysis of Variance for Cultural Subgroups on Each Ingratiation Subscale . .	59
4. Correlation Coefficient of Ingratiation Scores across the Various Situations for all Cultural Groups	61
5. Intercorrelations Between Subscales of Ingratiation, Machiavellianism, and Self Monitoring Test Scores for the Total Sample (N=139)	63
6. Mean Ranks Assigned to Influences on Behaviour in Various Cultural Subgroups	66

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Ingratiatory-Related Behaviours

Coming from a country where resources are scarce, competition is keen, society is hierarchical in nature, and respect is more a function of age than ability, it was intriguing for me to observe that students in this country did not seem to feel a need to impress their teachers. There seemed to be no attempt whatsoever to ingratiate. I soon realised that in this society resources were not as scarce and competition was not as intense. Respect was more a function of ability than of age. Interactions in Western society seemed to be much more straight forward. Fairly limited interactions were common and even those seemed not to leave any lasting impressions.

In India it is very common for students to try to please their teachers by doing some personal favours (which may be both tangible and intangible). These favours obligate the professor to pay back in terms of evaluating them favourably, regardless of their academic capabilities. To obtain a raise, a professor has to ensure that the chairman of the department thinks positively about him/her. At work and in non-academic settings, the scenario is much the same. In the majority of the cases, how successful you are in your career depends on your knowledge of which strings to pull and when. Competence or sincerity is not all that important. Since the society is hierarchical than the Western society and also much more socially restrictive, how you

put yourself across in an interpersonal situation is quite important. It is commonplace for your behavior to be judged in an unrelated situation and then generalized to a more meaningful situation. For example, a student who is seen as behaving inappropriately while watching a game in a stadium may be unfavourably judged in the classroom irrespective of how he/she performs. Therefore, it is always advisable for a student to think carefully about the consequences of a behavior performed in the presence of another person with power to influence decisions regarding important life situations such as career or education. By contrast, persons in the West seem to be judged more on the basis of concrete accomplishments.

In the context of these experiences and observation of differences, it was natural to ask whether ingratiation was a function of society's characteristics and/or child rearing practices? Was ingratiation frowned upon in Western societies, or was it better disguised? Before considering these questions, it would seem necessary first to undertake to understand ingratiation, its manifestation, and its underlying causes.

Ingratiation has been defined as "a class of strategic behaviors illicitly designed to influence a particular other person concerning the attractiveness of one's personal qualities" (Jones, 1964, p.11). The story we may have all read in our childhood of the clever fox and the crow is particularly illustrative. The fox flattered the crow, praised his voice and asked him to sing a song. The piece of bread fell from the crow's beak for the fox to eat; ingratiation worked. In the classical anecdote of Adam and Eve, the

snake's influencing Adam to take the first bite of the apple is a clear demonstration of ingratiation. These stories from literature demonstrate the occurrence and document the age of the phenomenon in Western societies (Ralston, 1987). The vast literature on ingratiation is evidence that ingratiation is found in Western society.

In any society to be successful one has to know the most effective manner in which to behave in different situations. In the West, it may be necessary to disguise ingratiation. For instance, in organizations, the subordinate has to depend on the supervisor for career growth and the supervisor on the subordinate for effective flow of communication. Supervisors want to properly communicate their impressions of and satisfaction with workers' efficiency and progress. All this has to be done in the proper context and in a proper manner. If workers want to impress their supervisor, the worst thing would be to let the supervisor know about their intentions to please him or her. Similarly, if supervisors want to increase the positive evaluation and feelings of self-worth of the workers as a means to increase productivity, they would be wise not to let the workers know about these intentions. The same is true for other social interactions such as those in the family. One child in a family may always appear to escape with the least punishment for wrong doing or to walk away with the most lavish praise for commendable acts, just because his/her knows how to manipulate his/her parents. Although unstated, the rules and norms of ingratiation exist in almost all interactions in our day to day lives.

Theories of Ingratiation

The words "illicitly designed" in the Jones (1964) definition of ingratiation make it obvious that these behaviours have pejorative connotations in the West. Obvious ingratiating words or actions seem to violate the contract underlying social interaction (Jones, 1965). The illicitness of ingratiating behavior is explained in terms of the theories of social interaction (Goffman, 1955; Homans, 1961; Thibaut & Kelly, 1956). None of the theories are complete individually, but in combination are useful in providing a context to understand how people ingratiate (Goffman, 1955) and what motivates them to ingratiate (Homans, 1961).

Goffman (1955) feels that social interactions are permeated by expressive "ritual elements". Interactions are governed by implicit agreement that each person will help the other maintain "face". People have two points of view as they approach and engage in interaction - "a defensive orientation towards saving his own face and a protective orientation toward saving the other's face" (Goffman, as quoted in Jones, 1964 p. 4). Ingratiation seems to involve a contract violation of a special sort. It is not the kind of violation as represented by insults, cutting candour, or challenges thrown to another's face, nor is it a matter of the quantity of deceit in trying to manipulate. Indeed the ingratiator may try to achieve his/her objectives by actually telling the "truth" (possibly only partial truth). It is a situation in which everything seems to be correct, yet is not right. There is exploitation of agreed norms of

interaction while apparently not abusing them. According to Goffman, ingratiators behave in a non-normative fashion disguised as normative.

Homans (1961) presents an economic view of interpersonal relationships. He assumes that people interact in a way that maximizes their profits and minimizes their costs. In some situations, one person may come to expect more profit from an exchange and the other member may perceive the expectations as just. This situation happens when one of the members has more in terms of education, expertise, age, beauty or other forms of social capital. The ingratiator depends on the responsiveness of the target person to the norm of "distributive justice", although he/she is violating the norm. According to Homans, "A man in an exchange relation with another will expect that the rewards of each man be proportional to his costs - the greater the rewards, the greater the costs - and that the net rewards, or profit; of each man be proportional to his investments" (Homans, 1961, p.75). The ingratiator attempts to invest less and gain more. The ingratiator finds ways to obligate the target person committed to the rule of distributive justice. The target person must then provide to the ingratiator benefits appropriate to what the target person believes he or she has received. The target person may choose to pay back either by gratifying the needs of or reinforcing the ingratiator.

Thibaut and Kelley (1959) delineated the structural basis of interpersonal exchange by means of a simplified matrix model. Persons who have more to gain and

less to lose in a relationship with the other have greater power. Persons who generally have power can manipulate the behavior of others. The more powerful can call forth certain responses out of the other person's repertoire because of their capacity to reward or punish. Assuming that the target person has more power than the ingratiator, the ingratiator will try to behave in ways approved by the target person in order to gain maximum rewards. The ingratiator always tries to equalize power by trying to be more attractive in the eyes of the target and thus wield more power on the target person.

Ingratiators try to manipulate a significant other while keeping their maneuvers and motives a secret (Jones, 1964). Although it is non-normative and hence illicit, ingratiation is a sort of necessary evil. Almost no interaction or organization can work effectively without ingratiation (Ralston, 1985). Most research on ingratiation has been designed to assess the effectiveness of various tactics or to identify situations in which it is most appropriate. Characteristics of the target person and responses to attempts at ingratiation, both by the target person and an observer, have been common topics of research. The reasons for ingratiation and the variety of personality traits of ingratiators have also been examined. Our current knowledge of ingratiation will be summarized below under four headings: the causes of ingratiation; tactics of ingratiation; evaluation of ingratiation both by the target and bystander; and finally the relation of attempts to ingratiate to various personality dimensions.

Causes of Ingratiatory Behaviour

The causes of ingratiation behavior are conceptualised at two distinct levels (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). At a general level, there is hardly any empirical evidence to enable arguing that ingratiation is dispositional in nature. At a specific level, needs and opportunities prompting ingratiation are identified, with the cause for ingratiation to be found in different settings.

Ingratiation as a dispositional characteristic. The need to be liked and praised is universal among humans. Steele (1988) argues that people seek out and reconstruct information that reflects positively on them to "maintain(s) the integrity of self" (Steele, 1988, p.291). Steele has demonstrated that a need for positive self-concept is present in all behavioral domains irrespective of the nature of the task. The goal of self-affirmation is to maintain global conceptions of self-adequacy. There are individual differences in attempts to maintain a positive self-concept, and the same individual has considerable flexibility in coping with threats to self-integrity (Steele, 1988). People can try to adapt to the threat by directly diminishing or eliminating the threat or by reducing the perception of threat. In social interactions where there is an unequal distribution of power, the threat to self-image is greater for persons with lesser power. This inequity may lead individuals facing the threat to resort to ways to protect their self-image. One of the ways that an individual can resolve this apprehension is by ingratiating toward the person with greater power. A "carry-over"

effect in self-affirmation (Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas & Skelton, 1981) may occur, for example, when a husband who is henpecked at home tries to regain self-affirmation by ingratiating his boss at work (Liden & Mitchell, 1988).

Steele (1988) argues that self-affirmation can be viewed as a motive. He uses the dissonance and learned helplessness literatures to develop the case that self-affirmation is motivational in nature. Social learning theories of motivation, seeking to explain the complex effects of social environment upon the behavior of an individual (Bandura, Adams & Meyer, 1977; Rotter, 1966), can help explain differences in fulfilment of the self-affirmation motive. An important assumption of this theoretical position is that reinforcement by itself does not motivate behavior. Rather, active processing of information regarding motivational variables is important in determining behavior. The environment in which we live is regarded to be the one main factor in determining our coping strategies.

Assuming that self-affirmation is a basic cause for ingratiation, the basic assumptions of social learning theory can be used to predict differences in ingratiation patterns of individuals belonging to different cultures. How we process information about the environment depends to a considerable extent on our socialization patterns and need structures. The norms sanctioned by different cultures regarding fulfilment of need to be liked and praised may vary, and so may the behavioral patterns commonly observed among people of different cultures.

Ingratiation due to opportunities that arise in one's environment. A more specific way to look at the cause of ingratiation is to examine the needs and opportunities promoting this behavior (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). A student who urgently wants a good recommendation may speak highly about his/her appreciation of the professor and his/her own capabilities in front of a person who is known to exert influence on the professor, with the expectation that the significant other may convey this positive impression about him/her that might be critical for the recommendation. In another case, a student fearing a negative recommendation may imagine that one way to get a better recommendation would be to try to impress the significant other (as above) and emphasize the necessity of a good recommendation. This is done with a view to ingratiate indirectly. The details of various tactics of ingratiation will be dealt with later, but these examples are cited here to illustrate how opportunities of ingratiation may be found from time to time.

The two basic needs causing ingratiation are the need to be defensive and the need to be assertive (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Needs are elicited by environmental cues and give a common direction to related responses (Rotter & Hocheirich, 1975). Defensive needs are aroused by criticism and negative feedback which may arouse the need to protect oneself from attacks on self-image or self-esteem and the need to adopt appropriate tactics to ingratiate, as illustrated in the second example described above. Assertive needs include recognition or status dominance and independence needs. All

these needs are positive in nature, and their fulfilment helps individuals to secure their future. In the example of the student wanting a positive recommendation, ingratiation is more an attempt to make a significant other or oneself seem attractive. Thus, ingratiation may not simply reflect a tendency to be liked but also may appear as a reaction to negative feedback, a method to promote the self. If the needs are strong and difficult to satisfy, the incidence of ingratiation may be more frequent (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984).

Ingratiation due to external stable causes. The nature of society may also have an influence on ingratiation behaviour. Ralston (1985) has suggested that when resources are scarce and roles are ambiguous, individuals will be more likely to use ingratiation tactics in order to feel secure. Cheng (1983) demonstrated that employees who believed that the organizational climate in which they worked was negative tended to select ingratiation tactics as more probable ways of behaving. Liden and Mitchell, (1988) proposed that individuals who are highly dependent on others for completion of a task, that is, for accessing relevant information, resources and support, are more likely to ingratiate to achieve their ends. They also observed, that in organizations where job performance appraisal criteria are highly subjective and personnel policies are not well articulated and enforced, the tendencies to ingratiate are greater. Bohra and Pandey (1984) have shown that the tendency to ingratiate will be greater in less formalized organizations and in those organizations where ingratiation is

encouraged by management.

Sinha (1978), in his proposal of a nurturant task leader in the context of the structure of Indian organizations, has observed that approved "power distance" in a society may make the use of ingratiation the most suitable technique to achieve the desired goal. He observed that, because of the emphasis on nurturant dependency in India, the more a subordinate is dependent, helpless and subservient to his/her superior, the more the latter will tend to mix help and nurturance with power processes. At the same time, indications of autonomy and independence in a subordinate in this kind of environment may make the supervisor use coercive power. Thus, stable environmental causes, such as the approved relationship between supervisor and subordinate, may explain the decision to ingratiate. On the basis of research evidence, it is possible to predict that differing organizational climates, power structures, need patterns, and learned repertory of behavior may be responsible for differences in the incidence and occurrence of ingratiation in different cultures.

Kahn and Young (1973) attempted to show that ingratiation is not merely an artifact of the experimental situation but can also be demonstrated in any social situation. In this experiment, subjects were paired with an opposite-sex partner and were instructed beforehand to get their partner to either like, dislike or be neutral towards them. These conversations were recorded and later compared. It was found that subjects who were attempting to be disliked were more successful than those who

wanted to be liked. People who wished to be liked did so by acting normally, whereas those who wanted to be disliked had to behave rather bizarrely. The authors concluded ingratiation behaviours were part of approved norms of interaction in Western society. In their study, normal behavior had elements of ingratiation, that is, subjects behaved in ways that would make them look attractive to the partner.

This study had various methodological shortcomings and flawed assumptions. For example, there was no attempt to manipulate the motivation of subjects, in spite of the fact that people do not generally ingratiate without a motive (Jones, 1964). In addition, two external raters were employed to rate ingratiation tendencies. Because bystanders not receiving ingratiation remarks are more punitive and less likely to detect ingratiation behaviours (Bohra & Pandey, 1984), this procedure may not be valid. It may have been more appropriate to have the partner provide a rating of the ingratiation behavior of subjects to make the observations about ingratiation more valid.

In another study by Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson (1980), it was shown that ingratiation is used in organizational settings. Kipnis et al. (1980) showed that, among the various tactics used by people at work to influence their superiors, co-workers and subordinates, ingratiation emerged as a specific tactic at all levels of target status, especially when the goal of the interaction was to seek assistance from the target person.

Tactics of Ingratiation

Researchers have outlined ways in which ingratiation is manifest in different situations. Jones (1964), in his pioneering work, suggested three main tactics that an ingratiator uses: other enhancement, opinion conformity, and self-presentation.

Pandey (1981) added four more tactics of ingratiation which he said may be more characteristic of persons in developing countries: self-degradation, name dropping, instrumental dependency, and situation-specific tactics. The occurrence of each tactic has been widely documented and researched to demonstrate the subtleties involved in the practical application of each.

Other Enhancement. Jones (1964) proposed that ingratiators may make themselves more attractive by "expressing positive evaluation of the target person". The ingratiator may make the target person feel his/her is admired or liked by emphasizing the positive qualities of the target person and ignoring there negative qualities or weaknesses. His/her may exaggerate favourability ratings of the target person. This behavior of the ingratiator seems to fit Heider's formulation of peoples' preference for balanced dyads. If one of the pairs in a dyad shows liking for the other, the target person may reciprocate by evaluating the first person more positively (Heider, 1958).

Jones, Gergen, and Jones (1963), in their search for tactics of ingratiation among leaders and subordinates in a status hierarchy, found that low status subjects

were more positive in their public appraisal of high status subjects than were high status subjects in their appraisal of low status subjects. The researchers manipulated conditions so that subjects thought that they were communicating either as a subordinate with a superior or as a superior with a subordinate whom they liked. Subjects ostensibly had to exchange opinions on 24 items; twelve initiated by them and the rest by their partner. Subjects were made to believe that they exchanged with a partner self-presentation ratings such as strength of character, attractiveness, popularity, competence, integrity, control and adjustment. Participants also rated their partners based on their impression about the partner during the exchange of opinions. Subjects never interacted but were led to believe that whatever they said was relayed to their partner in the next booth. The experimenters actually intercepted their messages and substituted bogus replies. The study was conducted over a two year period. In the first year, subjects were instructed that the interaction was to see if the pairs could work together and like each other. During the second year, it was stressed that it was important to be truthful and not mislead the partner. Among other things, the results made clear that other enhancement was mainly used as a strategy by low-status persons to appear attractive to high-status persons.

It has also been shown that regardless of the level of skilluse of other-enhancement can bring in some tangible rewards, such as higher pay, quicker promotion and better letters of recommendation. Kipnis and Vanderveer (1971) and

Tsui and Barry (1986) have shown that individuals in an organizational setting who ingratiate are generally the ones who get significantly more pay raises than others, even if they have similar capabilities as those who do not ingratiate. The tactic of other-enhancement, however, may not be as simple as is perceived. If a target person perceives the intent of the ingratiator, there is a risk that the attempt to ingratiate may backfire (Wortman & Linsenmeir, 1977). Thus, it is important to delineate ways by which the ingratiator can manipulate the attributions the target makes for the other-enhancement acts. It is in the best interest of the ingratiator for the target to believe that the cause for praise is internal rather than external.

Wortman and Linsenmeir (1977) have suggested that ingratiators may time their compliments so that desire of benefit does not seem salient. Another effective way is to arrange to have compliments delivered by a third person so as to increase the credibility of the compliments. These authors also suggest that an ideal situation is one in which the ingratiator praises the target person behind his/her back, but in front of an important, credible person (in the eyes of the target person) who will convey the information to the target person. Another suggested tactic is to combine both positive and negative evaluations so as to portray oneself as an honest and diligent evaluator. This tactic would also make the compliment look sincere. The ingratiator should highlight positive traits that are important to the target person and criticize negative ones that he/she knows are not important to the target person.

Certain non-verbal behaviors, such as eye-contact and smiling, are also useful ways to appear attractive (Wortman & Linsenmeier, 1977).

Opinion Conformity. Jones (1964) proposed another set of behaviours generally used by ingratiators: Opinion conformity involves expression of agreement with the opinions of the target person. Byrne (1971) has shown that most people like other people who have attitudes similar to themselves. On the basis of the attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971) and balance theory (Heider, 1958), it can be said that similarity causes liking, and liking another makes us think that the other probably likes us too. This belief itself may increase our positive evaluations of the person. There is empirical evidence to show that, if you perceive a person to be similar to yourself, you tend to like the person more.

In an experiment, Jones and Jones (1964) manipulated the variations in opinion expression as a function of two experimental treatments. Subjects engaged in an exchange of opinions with a target person. In all cases, the target person expressed his/her opinions first. In one treatment variation, the target person expressed opinions identical to those the real subject had expressed in a pretest; in the other condition, the target person expressed opinions opposite to those expressed by the subject in a previously administered questionnaire. Subjects were instructed either to behave in a manner that would enhance their evaluation by the target or in a fashion that would give an accurate picture of themselves. Thus data were collected from four groups of

subjects: one group where the subjects tried to be liked and the target expressed similar opinions; another where subjects tried to be liked, but the target expressed opposite opinions; a third group where subjects behaved indifferently but the target expressed similar opinions; a fourth group where subjects acted in a neutral manner, but the target expressed opposite opinions. As predicted, subjects who wanted to be evaluated positively and had a target who expressed similar opinions liked the target the most.

In a study previously described (Jones, Gergen & Jones, 1963), high and low status subjects tended to show approximately similar degrees of conformity to each other on issues not especially relevant to status hierarchy. However, the high status people conformed significantly less than the low status ones on more relevant issues. Griffit and Veitch (1974) have shown, in an experiment where subjects (initially strangers to each other) were forced to live with each other, that the preference pattern of subjects followed attitudinal similarity towards issues in general.

It is valid to ask the question, how can anyone who does nothing but agree to our opinions be likable? It is difficult to perceive how a person lacking creativity and intelligence, could be liked more. However, on reflection, there are situations where unconditional agreement may be more normative and rewarding. For example, an autocratic leader may like a worker better who agrees unconditionally to whatever he/she says. Wortman and Linsenmeir (1977) argue that, if an ingratiation can

manipulate the conditions to make it appear that nothing is to be gained by agreement with the target, yet agree with the target, greater liking will follow. Sometimes adding meaningless qualifiers to essentially the same opinion may be another way of manipulating liking. A study by Baskett (1973) suggested that co-workers who express attitudes similar to their superiors may be rated as more competent and given higher salaries than workers who do not. Bohra and Pandey (1984) showed that when people ingratiated towards strangers, friends and bosses, they generally used opinion conformity as a means to appear attractive.

Self Presentation. One common source of information about others is how they describe themselves (Holtgraves & Srull, 1989). Consequently, ingratiation may be achieved by presenting an image similar to an ideal of the target person. For example, if a superior appreciates creativity and modesty, the ingratiator can try to come up with seemingly new ideas and never over-exhibit his/her capabilities. However, the ubiquitous double standards in our society make self-presentation a difficult technique. While it may be unpopular among colleagues to boast about one's capabilities, being too modest may cause one to run the risk of being overlooked by superiors. At the same time, being too enthusiastic (giving new ideas or working too hard) may antagonize colleagues. Godfrey, Jones and Lord (1986) encouraged subjects to use positive self-descriptions and to talk about their accomplishments. Only some subjects were more effective self-promoters than others, although the

reason for these differences were not clear in the study. It was concluded that "successful self-presentation attempts are subtle, patterned and contingent on the response of the target person" (Godfrey et al., 1986, p.112).

Two different types of self-presentational strategies used to ingratiate a powerful target person when a mistake reflecting on lack of ability has been committed are - accounts and apology (Wood & Mitchell, 1981). Self accounts include the use of excuses and justifications (Scott & Lyman, 1968). Wood and Mitchell (1981) propose that the ingratiator impresses on the target person that the mistake was not under voluntary control. While giving justification, the ingratiator conveys to the target that, although he or she understands that the act was wrong, this behavior was the best possible option in that particular situation. The other mode of presenting oneself following poor performance is to ask pardon for failure rather than attribute the cause of the failure to a situation (Wood and Mitchell, 1981). Self-presentational strategy thus falls under two broad categories -- providing justifications as an assertive self-presentational strategy; asking for an apology or giving an excuse as a modest self-presentational strategy.

Stires and Jones (1969) manipulated dependence of subjects upon a particular supervisor. Subjects were led to believe that the supervisor was either the sole person who decided or had a limited role to play in deciding whether they were chosen for the job. In a control condition, subjects were led to believe that the supervisor had

no role at all to play in choosing the subject for the job. It was found that subjects in the supervisor responsible condition were more modest on personal traits and were more self-enhancing on traits related to job abilities as compared to supervisor not solely responsible and supervisor not at all responsible condition. The results demonstrated that, as a rule, people know where to draw the line between modesty and self-enhancement.

It should also be pointed out that self-presentation is a more difficult and more direct tactic than other-enhancement and opinion conformity. Because self-presentation does not involve the target, that person may wonder why the ingratiation is presenting information about him/herself. It is likely that the target will be very critical of the information presented since it does not affect the emotionality and cognitions of the target person as did the tactics of flattering or agreeing with the target. The target may go to great lengths to test the truthfulness of self as presented by the ingratiation (Gurevitch, 1984).

Gurevitch (1984) studied the kind of impressions that were formed when an individual engaged in presenting him/herself in a favourable manner. The manipulated variables were positivity of information conveyed and degree of similarity with the target. Subjects heard a two-minute presentation over an intercom from a person who was portrayed as having either high, low or equal status, as either of high or normal ability, and as either similar or dissimilar to them. The results indicated that, if an

ingratiator wants to promote self-enhancement, it would be useful to make the target perceive similarities with self, but, if the target is going to compare the ingratiator with another person, it is useful to emphasize dissimilarities between the self and the other person.

Rhodewalt and Agustsdottir (1986) have examined the effects of self presentation on phenomenal self. Phenomenal self is defined as "a person's awareness arising out of his (or her) interactions with the environment, of his (or her) beliefs, values, attitudes, the links between them and their implications for his (or her) behaviour" (Jones & Gerrard, 1981, quoted in Rhodewalt & Augustdottir, 1986, p. 47). They found that positive self-presentation can help subjects have higher self-esteem, especially if they were initially depressed.

The context in which self-presentation statements are made is also important. Holtgraves & Snull (1989) have shown that positive self-descriptions produced different impressions among observers when the conversation context was manipulated. In one taped conversation, the target made positive self-descriptions to which the speaker, ingratiator, responded with positive self-statements. In another taped conversation, the target asked questions that provided an appropriate context for the speaker to make self-statements identical to those in the first condition. In the third condition, the statements were again identical, but the questions posed by the target person were different and did not demand positive self-statements. As

predicted, subjects evaluated the speakers in the first two conditions positively but gave negative evaluations to the speaker in the third condition. Making positive self-statements out of context may reflect negatively on a person's mental abilities. The use of positive self comments will result in perceptions of the speaker as inconsiderate, egoistical, and as having a poor relationship with the other, because the speaker tends to threaten the balance of power so important in our social interactions. On the other hand, if the speaker is obligated to provide self-description, he/she is perceived as less responsible for his/her behaviour.

Pandey (1986) notes that the specific nature of competition and minimal resources in underdeveloped countries leads to use of alternative tactics of ingratiation. The four tactics named by him are: self-degradation, instrumental dependency, name-dropping and situation specific tactics. Although Pandey (1981) observes that these may be more characteristic of Third-World countries, research evidence shows that some of the indirect tactics of impression management are quite similar to those described by Pandey.

Self-degradation. Although self-degradation is related to self-enhancement, Pandey (1981) identifies it as a separate tactic. Pandey emphasizes that this technique is more prevalent in Third World countries where resources are scarce and competition is greater. The ingratiator, by demeaning the self before the target, may make the target feel sympathetic and perceive a need to help the ingratiator. Neither this nor

the other tactics discussed by Pandey have been widely researched.

Olszewska-Kondratowicz (1975) has shown an interdependency between self-esteem and use of self-deprecation. He found that female subjects high in self-esteem tended to use self-deprecation more as a tactic to ingratiate, whereas, among male subjects, only those low in self-esteem tended to use self-deprecation as a means to ingratiate.

Instrumental dependency. The ingratiator may emphasize the extent to which he/she is dependent upon the target person. For example, before a personnel decision is made, the ingratiator may point out to the supervisor that the welfare of his/her spouse and children depends upon the supervisor. Bohra and Pandey (1984) compared the occurrence and frequency of each technique of ingratiation by measuring the imagined responses of the subjects on an ingratiation scale. It was found that this technique was used more often in interactions with the supervisor than with friends or strangers. This tactic may be more characteristic of Third-World countries because of vast populations and pervasive poverty. The less affluent class may try to get something out of the more affluent by impressing on them that they are so powerful that they could control the lives of the less affluent.

Name dropping. Another tactic described Pandey (1986) is the strategic use of the name of a more powerful person. For example, to effectively stall a transfer order in an industry, the employee may use the name of a powerful minister to impress the

management. Bohra and Pandey (1984) reported that this tactic was most often used while interacting with a boss or a stranger and appears quite similar to the indirect tactic of impression management designed to cleverly enhance one's public image. These tactics are designed to impress others by providing information about other significant people and things rather than by providing information about oneself. Cialdini and Richardson (1980) have argued that mentioning one's associations can be an effective device for managing public self-image (Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1976). Finch and Cialdini (1989) have shown that even personal connections with another person may be used to promote aspects of the ingratiators' character even if the connection with the other person is negative. These results can be explained in terms of Heider's (1958) balance theory. Simple, even meaningless and accidental connections between things can lead observers to infer similarity. Mentioning an important person's name may promote the perception of similarities and would be a case of impression by association.

Situation specific tactics. The individual may take care of the personal likings of the boss, give gifts, change behavior according to the situation, and seem attractive in all ways possible (Pandey, 1986). Bohra and Pandey (1984) reported that this tactic was principally used while interacting with the boss. However, to this last category Pandey does not seem to add anything new, and it may share much common variance with other tactics described above.

Ingratiation involves an ingratiator and a target. The above discussion has concentrated on how the ingratiator manifests ingratiation behaviour. It is also important to consider ingratiation from the perspective of the target person. The complexities and subtleties of various ingratiation tactics effect how a target evaluates attempts to ingratiate. Moreover, ingratiation occurs in social contexts in which others not directly related to the interaction also evaluate the behavior of the ingratiator. An important issue that has been a concern among researchers is whether the target and the bystander evaluate ingratiation similarly. If there are differences, how could they be explained?

Evaluation of Ingratiation Attempts by Target and Bystander

Reagan, Straus, and Fazio (1974) provided important evidence that, if ingratiators can make themselves look more attractive, then, even with a lower level of competence, they can expect more favours than they may actually deserve. In their studies, subjects were encouraged to interact with confederates who either acted in a friendly or unfriendly manner in an attempt to be either liked or disliked by the subject. The subjects later scaled their liking toward the confederate. The confederates then played a game requiring skill while the subjects watched. Half of the confederates played well and half played poorly. Subjects in the liked condition evaluated the confederate as more skilful than in the disliked condition regardless of their objective level of skill. Attractiveness of a person effects evaluation of their

performance on a skill task.

In a study to see how "ingratiation induced positive affective states"(p. 479) in the target, Pandey and Kakkar (1982) gave instructions to make subjects imagine themselves as either high-level or low-level supervisors. They were then evaluated by the workers on a set of instructions they had prepared for the worker. It was found that subjects who received ingratiating evaluations liked the workers more, expressed desire to later work together and evaluated them more favourably on intelligence, morality, adjustment, and personal feelings.

Jones (1964) proposed that internal reactions of the target may range from "attraction-centred attitude changes to distrust-centred changes" (p. 164). He identified five clusters of internal response along an affective dimension.

Category 1 is a symbiotic mixture of "affection, affiliation and attraction" (p. 164). The target will tend to like the ingratiator and will try to give her/him the best possible in terms of material and social rewards.

Category 2 involves "subjective feelings of restitution" (Jones, 1964, p. 165). As a result of the ingratiators' trying to flatter or giving gifts, the target may feel obliged and thus feel under some kind of pressure to do something for the ingratiator. This is different from the first case, because the target both feels attracted and also experiences some sense of discomfort. If the discomfort of feeling obliged can be overcome by doing a favour in return, the situation is quite straight forward. On the

other hand, if the situation is such that the target always feels obligated, then Jones (1964) proposes that target's behavior may be predicted along the lines of dissonance theory. If the relationship was voluntary, then the target may reduce dissonance by liking the ingratiation. If the relationship was involuntary, the target may begin to hate the ingratiation.

Category 3 is described as "feelings of tolerance and forbearance" (Jones, 1964, p. 165). The target has sympathy or pity rather than any liking for the ingratiation whatsoever. If the target feels the need to protect the ingratiation from harm, it is more likely that the target will have feelings of nurturance, superiority, and tolerance. The ingratiation, however, does not expect this as an outcome when engaging in ingratiation behaviour.

Category 4 is characterised by "feelings of embarrassment or annoyance and disposition to avoid further interaction" (Jones, 1964, p. 165) with the ingratiation. These feelings may arise from the fact that the target person may feel undue pressure to do things for the ingratiation, even though unable to account for the necessity to do anything for the ingratiation. This situation is not pleasant for the target person, and the affect aroused may not be clear. The target will definitely not feel good complying to the external demands of the ingratiation.

Although it is difficult to react with hostility toward a person who says good things about you or does favours, still one may logically speculate that the target can

react (Category 5) with feelings of "disgust and more indignation" (Jones, 1964, p. 156). The target may actually harm the ingratiator. This reaction is more likely to happen when the ingratiator is highly dependent on the target.

Several experiments have found the personality of the target to interact with his/her reaction to the ingratiator. In an experiment, self-esteem of subjects was measured and subjects were then interviewed. Either flattering or neutral assessments of their interviews were presented via a closed-circuit television. It was found that subjects who had high self-esteem responded favourably to flattering assessments (Colman & Olver, 1978). As a result, it can be concluded that personality traits of the target, such as level of self-esteem, interact with the reactions shown toward ingratiators attempts.

Pandey and Rastogi (1979) found that subjects who were high on Machiavellianism responded more favourably to ingratiation. They also found that Machiavellianism interacted with the kind of tactics preferred. Other-enhancement and self-presentation techniques were favoured by subjects high on Machiavellianism.

Successful use of ingratiation may lead to reciprocal behavior on the part of the target. Verbal behavior of leaders was observed in an experimental setting, and it was found that subjects who were led to believe they were leaders tended to incorporate into their repertoire the behaviours of successful subordinates (Sims & Manz, 1984). Miller and Kenny (1986) also demonstrated that the target was also more prone to

engage in self-disclosure after the ingratiator had self-disclosed. Liking towards a subordinate has also been found to cause the target to be less severe, to remember the positive qualities of the subordinate for a longer time, to find less faults and, as a result, to recommend the subordinate positively (Tsui & Barry, 1986).

Bystanders Evaluation of Ingratiation

A number of researchers have also looked at the observers' evaluation of ingratiation. What attributions does an observer make about the outcome of an ingratiator? Research has also looked into personality differences of bystanders and their evaluation of ingratiation behaviour.

For example, high self-monitors, i.e., persons who are more likely to engage in ingratiation behaviours, are more severe when they judge similar behavior in others (Jones & Jones, 1964; Jones, Jones, & Gergen, 1963). Jones and Baumeister (1976) attempted to determine if high self-monitoring individuals perceived the ingratiator differently than low self-monitoring individuals. Subjects were characterized as high self-monitors or low-self monitors on the basis of their responses to Snyder's Self-Monitoring scale (1974). Both groups of subjects watched video-taped interactions. In one of these, two discussants were characterised as agreeing unconditionally and, in another, as not agreeing at all. Later subjects were informed that one discussant had been instructed to gain affection or respect from the other, i.e., to engage in ingratiation. The high self-monitoring subjects liked the non-ingratiator, who did not

unconditionally agree, better. The low self-monitoring individuals better liked the discussant who agreed. The reasons for the difference in evaluation may be twofold. Firstly, the high self-monitor is more likely to be aware of the context and the behavioral demands of the situation, he/she may be in a better position to perceive ingratiatory tendencies in the other person's behaviour. Secondly, the high self-monitors may also be aware of the pejorative connotations so they prefer to take a negative stand towards ingratiatory behavior when it is manifested by another person.

Pandey and Singh (1988) have shown that subjects evaluated manipulative behaviours negatively and showed dislike for the person who engaged in them. Non-manipulative behaviours were evaluated more positively. Subjects were asked to read given transcripts of interviews for a job. The transcripts began by describing the target (interviewee) and the subject (applicant) followed by their actual conversation. Either the applicant ingratiated by appearing clever and cunning, or acted as a straight-forward person. In the third part, the applicant was described to be either successful or a failure. Attributions toward the applicants' outcome (success /failure) were tested in addition to measuring the extent to which the subject liked the applicant and approved of his/her behavior in the interview situation. It was found that subjects expressed dislike for ingratiatory behavior and failure, though they liked the former better than the latter. Subjects also liked the successful ingratiator more than the unsuccessful non-ingratiator but attributed failure of the ingratiator more to an internal

cause more than in the case of the non-ingratiator. Pandey and Bohra (1986) similarly reported that ingratiating behavior was less positively evaluated than non-ingratiating behavior by people who did not actually benefit from the ingratiator's compliments.

On the basis of these studies, it can be concluded that bystanders who are not receiving compliments will vary in their evaluations of an ingratiator's behaviour. Differences in evaluations have been found to covary with self-monitoring skills of individuals. This covariation can be conceived as a function of the mediating affective states of the target person and the bystander. When complimented, a target person's affective state may be changed and (s)he may tend to perceive the ingratiator differently. When a third person evaluates similar behavior, no such affective reactions take place and (s)he may be more severe in judging the ingratiating behavior (Pandey & Bohra, 1986).

Relation of Social Ingratiation to Some Personality Traits

Pandey and Rastogi (1979) demonstrated the role of Machiavellianism and situational variables on the adoption of ingratiation tactics. Subjects with pretested high and low scores on the Mach IV scale were assigned to experimentally manipulated competitive or non-competitive interview situations. Subjects in both groups were instructed to imagine themselves as participating and handling themselves intelligently in the interview situation. Subjects who were high on Machiavellianism scores showed greater tendencies to imagine themselves as likely to engage in

ingratiating behaviours. However, the instruction that subjects were required to handle themselves intelligently during interview situations may have enabled them to guess the purpose of the study and thus co-operate with the experimenter. Also the subjects were responding to a hypothetical situation. It may be more meaningful to manipulate conditions in the laboratory to see if traits like Machiavellianism and ingratiation covary. High scorers on the Mach Scale are more zealous and original when it comes to using manipulations in social situations (Christie & Geis, 1970).

It has been shown that self image can either promote or reduce ingratiating behavior (Olszewska-Kendratowicz, 1975). When the probability of being successful is determined by an individual's efforts, it is more likely that the self-image will serve as motivation to reach for a higher position. It has been experimentally demonstrated that participants with high self-esteem and awareness of ingratiation tactics generally ingratiate more (Olszewska-Kendratowicz, 1975). High school students were led to believe that a special interview with a school psychologist was a new method to choose students for admission to colleges. Subjects were measured on self-esteem and balanced with respect to sex and age. Half of the subjects were made aware of ingratiation tactics by giving them an hour-long lecture on various ingratiatory techniques. Females who were high in self-esteem and males who were low or intermediate on self-esteem tended to ingratiate more. Validity of the results may be questioned because the lecture on ingratiation may have primed these subjects to the

purpose of the study and they may have behaved accordingly. An increase in self-esteem following positive self-presentation as opposed to a decrease in self-esteem following self-deprecating presentation has been found with both normal (Jones, Rhodewalt, Berglas & Skelton, 1981) and depressed subjects (Rhodewalt, & Augustsdottir 1986).

That Self-Monitors are better aware of ingratiation techniques and are more apt at detecting opportunities to ingratiate has been repeatedly demonstrated (Caldwell & Riley, 1982; Jones & Baumeister, 1976; Jones, Jones & Gergen, 1963; Mowday, 1978; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Some of these studies are inadequate with respect to methodology. One major flaw is that ingratiation is not measured directly and the positive correlation between self-monitoring and ingratiation may be spurious. A direct measure of ingratiation and its correlation with self-monitoring indices would be the most straightforward test of the covariance of ingratiation and self-monitoring.

Statement of problem

Ingratiation is a means to gain rewards in interactions in situations characterized by unequal balance of power. Assuming that the "ingratiated" neither perceives the slight deviation as an aberration nor an exploitation of the norms of interaction, the ingratiator gains by subtly exploiting the norms of interaction. Research over the past twenty-five years has indicated the use of tactics such as other-enhancement, positive self-presentation, and conformity as means to ingratiate

effectively. It has also been shown that the "ingratiated person" is attracted to the "ingratiator" and tends, compared to a bystander, to judge ingratiators more favourably.

The author's observation of marked absence in classroom situations in Western society of student attempts to ingratiate toward teachers compared to similar situations in her native culture is further reinforced by substantial ingratiation research literature by Indian authors. Pandey (1981) has noted that, because of the prevalent economic conditions in India, it is likely that ingratiation will be more common in India than in Western society (Khosla, 1967; Nandy, 1977; Nayar, 1977, cited in Pandey & Singh, 1988). On the basis of both available research (Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Pandey & Bohra, 1986; Ralston, 1985; Sinha, 1978), and personal observations, it is expected that individuals belonging to Eastern and Western cultures will have different ingratiation patterns.

Ingratiation is regulated by sanctions of the society or culture in which it occurs, and cross-cultural research may reveal meaningfully important variations in ingratiatory behaviour (Jones, 1965; Pandey, 1986; Pandey & Rastogi, 1979; Ralston, 1985; Wortman & Linsenmeir, 1977). There are few cross-cultural comparisons on the topic, and certainly none that have examined ingratiation patterns in substantially different cultures from the East and West. This study compared the responses of Canadian subjects, to Indo-Canadian subjects and to South Asian subjects who have

come to study in Canada, on a direct measure of ingratiation developed and validated in this study. It was hypothesised that there would be differences in ingratiation patterns of the three groups with South-Asian subjects exhibiting the greatest tendency to ingratiate followed in order by Indo-Canadians and Canadians.

A second general concern is the lack of a direct measure of ingratiation. Tendencies to ingratiate have been observed as a function of the manipulated variables in laboratory experiments rather than being measured directly. For example, some experiments provide subjects with ingratiating or non-ingratiating evaluations and measure affective responses towards the evaluator with the responses then used as a measure of ingratiation (Jones, 1965; Jones, Jones, & Gergen, 1963; Kahn & Young, 1973). In other studies, subjects observe episodes in which ingratiation is employed as a means to impress a target person, and later rate their degree of preference for the observed behaviours. These ratings are then used as a measure of how much a subject would ingratiate, with ratings of greater preference indicating higher tendencies to ingratiate (Pandey & Rastogi, 1979; Pandey & Singh, 1988). Such preferences are unlikely to be valid measures because of unequivocal evidence showing that observers tend to act and judge differently than persons directly involved in the setting (Jones & Baumeister, 1976; Pandey & Bohra, 1986; Pandey & Singh, 1988).

A paper and pencil test (Bohra & Pandey, 1984) attempted to measure ingratiation towards strangers, friends and employer to show "that ingratiation is

dependent on the target's characteristics" (Bohra & Pandey, 1984, p.218) by asking subjects to speculate how they would behave towards the targets with the six different ingratiation tactics: opinion conformity; self-presentation, other enhancement, situation-specific tactics, instrumental dependency, name dropping. This test was found to be inadequate for measuring cross-cultural differences in amount of ingratiation to a given situation, because of its focus on dependence of ingratiation on target characteristics. Also, the assumption that the six tactics of ingratiation are independent is questionable. Other enhancement, name-dropping and instrumental dependency may all be a part of situation-specific tactics and may be considered as a limitation of the scale. Based on the weaknesses of the paper and pencil test and the experimental measures described above, it was concluded that the research literature lacks a satisfactory direct measure of ingratiation.

One of the goals of the present study was to develop items that measure ingratiation tendencies within subjects repeatedly across various situations and then to test this general measure across cultures to examine if ingratiation is habitual or situation-specific. This aspect of the study was exploratory, yet it was hoped that it would shed light on aspects of ingratiatory behaviour.

Empirical evidence suggests that self-monitors recognize opportunities for ingratiation and ingratiate more than individuals who score low on a self-monitoring scale (Caldwell & Rilley, 1982; Mowday, 1978; Schlenker & Leary, 1982). Similar

findings have been reported for persons scoring high on Machiavellianism (Pandey & Rastogi, 1979). Because these results have been obtained only with indirect measures of ingratiation, the present research provides a test of the correlation of Self-Monitoring and Machiavellianism with a direct measure of ingratiation.

The aims of the present research were a) to develop a direct paper-pencil measure of ingratiation; b) to test differences in responses of subjects of different cultures and c) to test the correlations of ingratiation with Machiavellianism and Self-monitoring.

The two studies reported below were undertaken to meet these objectives. Study I reports the development and validation of the ingratiation scale. The final scale was decided upon after subsequent tests and modifications in the wording of some items. Reliability coefficients, factor analyses, and the correlations of the items and sub-scales with other self-report measures of ingratiation, as evidence of the psychometric properties and construct validity of the scale, are reported in this study. The ingratiation scale was tested only on Western subjects because this was the only group with a sufficient number of subjects available. It was assumed that validation of the scale with Western subjects would generalize to scales for use with Indo-Canadian and South Asian subjects, these scales deviated only slightly in the context and wording of certain items .

STUDY 1

Method

Subjects

Three hundred and ten male and female students enrolled in the Introductory Psychology course, 17.120 at the University of Manitoba were recruited as subjects for pilot testing of an Interpersonal Behaviour Scale. The test booklet consisted of an Ingratiation scale and a set of phenomenological questions. Subjects received experimental credit for participating in the experiment.

Materials

Ingratiation Scale. The version of the ingratiation scale initially prepared for this study can be found in Appendix A. Eight Likert-type items gathered information from participants regarding their behaviour in various interpersonal situations—from formal interviews to informal encounters with a salesperson in a grocery store. These situations also differed in their goals and difficulty of goal-attainment. Subjects were requested to respond to each item on seven-point scales.

Two of the situations were job interviews, varying in terms of how difficult it was to get the job. Another involved an interview for admission to a coveted school. Other situations were interviews for a student loan award, an encounter with a sales representative in a mall, and an encounter in an unconventional setting with a future instructor. A final item enquired about curriculum-vitae writing styles. Subjects could

receive a maximum of seven or a minimum of one point for each item. One item (item 2) was reverse-coded so that greater agreement meant lower ingratiation. Total Ingratiation scores could range from a maximum of 238 to a minimum of 34. The responses to each item were subjected to factor analysis to assess the underlying structure of the scale.

Additional questions. In addition to the closed-ended questions that comprised the Ingratiation Scale, open-ended questions that allowed subjects to express their thoughts and experiences with ingratiation were also asked. The questions inquired directly about tendencies and tactics a subject might use to ingratiate. These questions served as a comparison for responses on the Ingratiation Scale and provided insight into subjects' personal experiences.

The first two open-ended questions inquired if subjects were sensitive to differences in the social and interpersonal behaviour of people from different countries. In the opening question, subjects were asked if they had observed behavioral variations in several interpersonal settings among people of different cultural backgrounds. The second question asked them to describe differences in their ingratiatory behaviour in different settings, such as the classroom, job situation, or with friends. In the third question, subjects were asked to rate whether their group, in comparison to other groups was, equal or more aggressive. Subsequent questions asked subjects to rank the influence of parents, friends, and early childhood experience

on their behaviour in general.

The last two questions inquired directly about subjects' ingratiation behaviours. One question required subjects to choose from among four options ranging from the least to the most tendency to ingratiate to get a raise at work. Another question asked subjects to describe if they could get a better grade in a course than they deserved. If they answered 'yes', then they were requested to describe their strategies. The scores on the two direct questions inquiring about subjects' ingratiation behaviors were used to cross-validate the responses of subjects to the Likert-type items in the ingratiation scale using multi-trait multi-method discrimination method (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Answers to the open-ended questions were analyzed separately. The additional questions along with the orienting instructions are listed in Appendix B.

Procedure

Data were collected in groups of 20-25 subjects each. Subjects were given a single test booklet consisting of the Ingratiation Scale and additional questions.

Preliminary instructions provided a brief description of how to respond to the Likert-type items and the additional questions. Subjects were instructed that their responses would be anonymous, that they should be honest in responding, and that they should bring to the attention of the researcher any problems they had in interpreting items.

The following detailed oral instructions were given:

"This study is conducted to pilot test a questionnaire to be used

as part of a study of cross-cultural comparison of interpersonal behaviours. In the questionnaire I will give, different kinds of situations are described followed by a set of likely behaviours. As you read the situations, please imagine yourself being in that situation and then read the following likely behaviours followed by seven point scales. Please indicate the degree to which you think the statement describes your likely behaviour on the seven-point scale. On the scale, a response of seven indicates 'exactly like me' and a response of one indicates 'not at all like me'. There are no right or wrong answers. Whatever you think best describes the most likely behaviour is the answer in your case. Please, be very honest in your response and also remember that you do not have to write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. You can always choose to respond or not respond. If at any point you feel that you do not want to answer a particular item, please feel free not to answer. If you feel you have something more to say than that asked by a particular item, you can write it down nearby the item.

In the end are some questions where I require detailed answers. If you need more space than that provided, please write on the back of the page. The preliminary analysis of the study will be given to your 17.120 instructor and also posted in front of the lecture theatre, when

they are ready. If you have any concerns, please raise your hand and I will try to address them. Thank-you for your cooperation and help."

At the end of the study, subjects were thanked individually for their participation and given credit.

Results

Factor analysis of the scale. Each item of the scale was treated as a variable. Principal components analyses on the thirty-three variables resulted in seven factors retained by the criteria of minimum eigen values of 1.0. Examination of the Scree plot showed that there were one main and two minor factors. Twenty-four of the variables had loadings of .50 or more on the first unrotated factor. Only seven items had loadings of .50 or more on the second unrotated factor. Only five variables reached the criterion loading on the third unrotated factor.

Following varimax rotation, it was found that some of the items did not load on any factor consistently or loaded on two or more factors with similar loadings. Items with ambiguous loadings were modified to more directly measure ingratiation. Items 1c, 1e, 3c, 3f, 8c and 8d were reworded to force subjects to make a more precise choice about their behaviour in each situation.

Items 5a, 5b, 5c, 6c, 6d, 7b, and 7c were more radically changed. Item 5a was subdivided because some subjects remarked that they would work for their supervisor but not express any pleasure. Item 5d was deleted because, on reexamination, it was

Table 1

Varimax Rotated Principal Factors of the Ingratiation Scale

Variables	I Situation- specific tactics	II Other- enhancement	III Self- presentation	IV Grocery store encounter
1a	.12	.24	.70*	.09
1b	-.01	.12	.77*	-.09
1c	.67*	.13	.26	.03
1d	.61*	.39	.05	.08
1e	.75*	.11	.07	.02
2a	.21	-.19	-.01	.61*
2b	-.06	-.08	-.05	.78*
2c	-.19	.05	-.06	.66*
2d	-.17	.14	.02	.56*
2e	.14	.08	.16	.51*
3a	.43	.02	.50*	.05
3b	.24	.10	.72*	-.01
3c	.79*	.16	.18	-.04
3d	.71*	.37	.07	.01
3e	.76*	.15	.12	.01
3f	.69*	.14	.17	.01
4a	.15	.62*	.27	.14
4b	.30	.57*	.15	.09
4c	.18	.66*	.01	.04
5a	.13	.64*	.10	.01

5b	.51*	.11	.00	-.16
5c	.20	.52*	.07	.02
6a	.09	.66*	.25	.08
6b	.14	.66*	.37	.05
6c	.52*	.41	.06	.04
6d	.78*	.16	.02	.04
7a	.66*	.37	.11	-.03
7b	.51*	-.17	.21	.22
7c	.32	.49*	.04	.05
8a	.29	.29	.68*	.07
8b	.16	.17	.81*	.00
8c	.72*	.28	.01	.01
8d	.66*	.31	.07	.02
8e	.75*	.14	.11	.01

Note. Items loading to the criterion level on each factor are asterisked.

obvious that it did not measure ingratiation. Item 6c, which asked subjects if they would try to be humorous, was changed because subjects reported that being humorous was not anything they would do to get a loan, or that they were humorous in almost all situations. Items 7b and 7c were not relevant, did not measure ingratiation, and were changed to more directly measure ingratiation. Items 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d and 2e loaded separately on one factor, social ingratiation, and were retained with the intention of analyzing that factor separately.

The revised scale (see Appendix C) was administered to two hundred and sixty undergraduates enrolled in the Introductory Psychology course, 17.120 at the University of Manitoba. The procedure was identical to that described earlier. The ingratiation scale was factor analyzed with responses subjected to principal components analysis. Varimax rotation was used on the first four factors with eigenvalues of 1.0 or more.

The factor loadings on each item are presented in Table 1. Factor 1, consisting of items 1c, 1d, 1e, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 5b, 6c, 6d, 7a, 7b, 8d and 8e, measures situation-specific tactics. These items measured the ability of subjects to gain some desired end by changing their behaviour according to the demands of the situation. For example, some of the questions involved mentioning the name of an important person who would wield power over members of a selection committee by saying that they were friends and acquaintances, or by trying to impress a future instructor in an unusual situation by choosing to pick a magazine that shows intellectual superiority rather than

frivolousness. The first factor accounted for 61 percent of the total variance. Factor 2, comprised of items 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5c, 6a, 6b, 6c, 7c, was labelled "Other-Enhancement". The items loaded on this factor seemed to reflect use of the ingratiation tactic of making the other person feel good about him/herself, such as by making the other person feel powerful. Items 1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4b, 8a, 8b loaded on Factor 3. This factor was labelled "Self-presentation" because all of these items seemed to measure the extent to which positive self-presentation techniques were used to ingratiate. Factors two and three each accounted equally for about 15 percent each of the variance. Items 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, all of which loaded on Factor 4, showed non-significant loadings on any other items and they were not included in the final analyses because they were apparently measuring something other than ingratiation. Factor 4 accounted for only nine percent of the total variance. Because all subitems loading on Factor 4 measured reactions to an encounter with a salesperson in a grocery store, they were not named as one of the factors of ingratiation and were used only to measure correlation with other traits such as Machiavellianism and self-monitoring because they did explain nine percent of the variance.

As a check for multi-trait, multi-method validity, the overall score for ingratiation, arrived at by summing over the three factors, situation-specific tactics, other-enhancement and self-presentation tactics, was correlated with responses to additional direct questions on ingratiation. Significant correlations were found

between overall ingratiation score and two items directly asking about ingratiation: if subjects could be promoted at work ($r=.45$ $p >.0001$) and if they could get a better grade than they actually deserved by ingratiating ($r=.46$, $p >.0001$).

STUDY 2

In the second study, the responses to the revised Ingratiation Scale of Canadians, Indo-Canadian subjects having Indian parents but who were brought up in West, and South Asians students who have come to Canada for their higher education, were compared. The relationships of self-monitoring and Machiavellianism to revised Ingratiation Scale scores were also tested.

Several specific hypotheses were tested. It was predicted that:

1. Foreign students from India, Sri-Lanka and Bangladesh would exhibit the greatest tendency to ingratiate, whereas subjects belonging to the Canadian culture would have the lowest ingratiation tendencies. Subjects who have East-Indian parents but who have been brought up in the Canadian culture were expected to have intermediate tendencies to ingratiate.

2. Subjects who reported high ingratiation tendencies were also expected to have high scores on Machiavellianism and Self-monitoring.

Method

Subjects

Two hundred and five students at the University of Manitoba and University of

Winnipeg were recruited by various means and tested as subjects. In accordance with predetermined criteria for responses to certain biographical questions (Appendix E), the data for only one hundred and thirty-nine of these subjects were included in subsequent analyses.

The Canadian subject population consisted of undergraduate students enrolled in the Introductory Psychology course (17.120) at the University of Manitoba. They participated in return for one credit hour toward an experimentation requirement. On the basis of the rigorous criteria i.e., subjects who were born in Canada and who had parents born and raised in Canada, only forty-nine of the original one hundred participants were included in final analyses. The mean age of Canadian subjects was 20.2 years with a standard deviation of 3.92.

Fifty-five Indo-Canadian students enrolled in the graduate and undergraduate programs at the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg were contacted primarily via the Forum of Indo-Canadian Students. This organization, recognized by the University of Manitoba Students Union, is comprised of students who were born and raised in the Western culture, but whose parents were of South-Asian descent. Because it was not possible to test these students at the Forum meeting, members who expressed willingness to participate were contacted by telephone to schedule data collection sessions. In addition, four Indo-Canadian students who happened to sign up for experimental sessions in 17.120, were identified

by name and contacted by telephone. These subjects were then rescheduled to participate in the study with the other Indo-Canadian subjects. They received credit for participation as did the other 17.120 students. All other subjects participated for no tangible reward. All Indo-Canadians were tested in culturally homogeneous groups. One group of ten subjects was tested at the University of Winnipeg. Six sessions were run at the University of Manitoba with groups ranging in size from four to ten. Of the fifty-five subjects, only forty-three were found to have at least one parent born in one of the South Asian countries and to have both parents who had lived for a minimum of 15 years in a Western country. The mean age of subjects in this sample was 20.97 years with a standard deviation of 2.56.

Students from South Asia pursuing their higher education as foreign students at the University of Manitoba comprised the third sample. These students were identified by contacting the University of Manitoba India Students Association, the Bangladesh Students Association, and the Sri Lanka Students Association. Each organization is recognized by the University of Manitoba Students Union and is comprised of students from their countries who are registered in graduate or undergraduate programs at the University of Manitoba. Through requests for participants made at scheduled general meetings of these groups, a total of 50 students were obtained from these sources. Interested persons were contacted by phone to schedule data collection sessions. Subjects were tested in groups of 6 to 10 at the University of Manitoba. Only forty-

five of the fifty subjects who completed the questionnaires met the criterion of less than a five-year stay in a foreign country. The mean age of subjects in this group was 27.76 years with a standard deviation of 4.03.

Overview of the design

The study consisted of a simple, one-way multivariate design with one independent variable (group membership) and three dependent variables (three factors of ingratiation) and additional measures of self-monitoring and Machiavellianism. Scores on self-monitoring and Machiavellianism were correlated with the scores on Ingratiation subscales. Answers to the additional questions gave additional descriptive information about the perceptions and occurrence of ingratiation among different groups.

Dependent Measures

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSM). The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale measures individual differences in the concern people have for behaving appropriately in social contexts. The high self-monitoring person is one who correctly uses the cues given by others to monitor his/her own behaviour (Snyder, 1979). The Self-Monitoring Scale, originally developed by Snyder (1974) to measure individual differences in self-management, consists of principally describing (a) the ability to modify self-presentation and (b) sensitivity to expressive behaviour of others. As a result of several studies and analyses of the internal structure of the self-monitoring

scale, Snyder and Gangstead (1986) revised the original twenty-five item scale to the new 18-item Revised Self-Monitoring scale that was used in the study.

Test-retest reliability was found to be 0.83 and an internal consistency of the revised Self-Monitoring scale was reported to be 0.70 (Snyder & Gangstead, 1986). Studies bearing on construct validity have been cited (Snyder & Gangstead, 1986). Discriminant validity was demonstrated by showing that self-monitoring scores were not meaningfully correlated with public self-consciousness and social anxiety. Construct validity was demonstrated by factor analysis of the scale to demonstrate that it was more homogeneous than the original scale (Snyder & Gangstead, 1986).

Mach IV Scale. The Mach IV scale consists of twenty items designed to assess the tendency of an individual to manipulate others. Half the items are worded so that agreement is scored in a pro-Machiavellian direction and the other half so that disagreement is scored as pro-Machiavellian. Subjects were required to rate their agreement or disagreement with these items on seven-point scales. The actual range of possible scores is 20 to 140. A constant of 20 is added to obtained scores, making the range from 40 to 160, this was done to make it easier to think and calculate with a score of one hundred as the neutral point (Christie & Geis, 1970). A score of 160 on Mach IV means that there is strong agreement with every item keyed for Machiavellianism. Internal consistency ranging from 0.70 to 0.80 and a six-week test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.76 have been reported (Christie & Geis, 1970).

Validity studies have been reported by the authors of the test (Christie & Geis, 1970).

Ingratiation Scale. The ingratiation scale, developed in Study 1, consisted of eight items designed to elicit information from participants regarding their behaviour in different interpersonal situations. The scale consisted of questions relating to three different tactics of ingratiation: situation-specific tactics; other-enhancement; and self-presentation. Although not part of the Ingratiation Scale, several additional questions about an encounter with a grocery salesperson were examined separately in the analyses. The three tactics of ingratiation were highly correlated (Table 4). Specific items measuring the various tactics were described in Study I. The maximum and minimum scores for situation specific tactics, other-enhancement and self-presentation were: (15, 105), (8, 56), and (6, 42). The detailed scoring procedure is described in Appendix D.

Procedure

Subjects were tested in groups within each sample source. There were five data collection sessions for the Canadian group, seven sessions for the Indo-Canadian group, and five sessions for the foreign student group. For all three groups, the instructions and the procedure of administration of the paper-pencil measures were similar.

Subjects were welcomed to the study and asked to complete several questionnaires. To ensure anonymity, participants were given a questionnaire with a

unique identification number and told not to put their name on the booklet. The booklet contained the ingratiation scale and open-ended questions. Subjects were asked to respond in the booklet and told that they could write on the back of the pages if needed. After they finished the questionnaire, the Self-Monitoring, Mach IV scale and biographical questions asked were given together in a concluding booklet. The detailed oral instructions given to subjects were as follows:

"Welcome to experiment 'Brandon'. This is a study to examine the interpersonal behaviour of individuals from different cultures in various situations. What I want you to do today is to complete three questionnaires. I will give you a booklet on which there is an ID number. You can choose any one of the questionnaire booklets. Please do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaires. I am not interested in how you respond as an individual. I am interested in the norm for your group. Please do not try to answer to please me or so as to appear good, but answer in a way that you think is characteristic of you.

In the first booklet, there are two parts. In general, you have a few questions to answer about your ideas and opinions with respect to certain social behaviours. For these questions, you should imagine yourself being in the described situation, such as applying for a job

where there were other applicants and only one opening. You must try to imagine yourself in the situation and then think what you would do before providing your answer. There are several situations described which you are likely to face in day to day life. You are requested to imagine your most likely behaviour in each situation and to answer spontaneously. Your answers are anonymous. Please give me your honest reactions.

In Part B of the questionnaire, I have asked questions about what you may have observed in daily life situations. Space is provided in which to write your answers. If you think the space is insufficient, you can write on the back of the page with the appropriate question number.

Please raise your hand after you finish this questionnaire. I will come and give you the other questionnaire and copy the ID number on the second questionnaire. This will be done to match your responses on the two questionnaires.

In the second questionnaire are descriptive statements. You are to indicate in response to each statement whether the action described in the statement is the likely way in which you will behave. You are then to indicate the degree to which you think the statement describes your behaviour on a seven-point scale. On the scale, a response of seven

indicates "exactly like me" and a response of one indicates "not at all like me". There are no right or wrong answers to these statements.

The correct answer is the one that best reflects you.

In the last page are some personal questions such as where you were born and where your parents were born. I have asked them so as to know your cultural background.

I would like to point out to you that you are free to respond as you see appropriate. If you feel anxious or stressed by an item, you need not respond to it. Also, if you have any questions, please raise your hand and I will try to clarify them.

I also want to thank you for your help and cooperation. As soon as the data collection is completed, I will mail you a detailed explanation of the purpose of the study and of the hypotheses tested through your 17.120 instructor. Thank-you again for your help."

After the task was completed, subjects were individually thanked and told that they would be informed about the results and purpose of the study through their Introductory Psychology course instructor.

As soon as results were analyzed, students from the Introductory subject pool were debriefed by a written detailed description of the study given to their instructor. Other subjects were told to leave their name and university address on an address

label. The address labels were used to mail the feedback on the purpose and general hypotheses. Detailed results were not promised because the number of potential subjects for subsequent research of this sort was limited. Precise knowledge of the results might make future subjects sophisticated and unsuitable for subsequent research.

Results

Hypothesis I. It was expected that cultural groups would differ in their tendency to ingratiate. The ingratiation scale was not unidimensional so it was decided that each factor—situation-specific tactics, other-enhancement, and self-presentation be considered as separate dependent variables. The mean and standard deviations for each of the factors for the three groups of subjects are presented in Table 2.

To assess if the differences between groups were statistically significant, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed. High intercorrelations among the three factors warranted the use of multivariate analysis of variance, rather than a simple one way ANOVA on each of the factors. An SPSSx MANOVA was employed for the analyses with sequential adjustment for nonorthogonality. There were no univariate or multivariate within-cell outliers at $\alpha = .001$. Tests of assumptions of

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Each Cultural Subgroup for Each Subscale
of Ingratiation

Factors of ingratiation	Canadians		Indo-Canadians		South Asians	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Situation- Specific tactics	46.30	13.47	40.70	16.30	37.42	17.07
Other Enhancement	28.69	7.08	25.26	7.96	27.77	8.68
Self- Presentation	26.63	6.72	27.28	7.67	27.74	9.30

normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

A one-way, between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance with three levels of group membership was performed on each of the three dependent variables: situation-specific tactics, self-presentation and other enhancement. According to the three criteria (Wilks, Pillai's and Hotelling-Lawley Trace), the combined dependent variables significantly affected group membership, $F(6,268) = 3.91$, $p < .0009$. The results reflected a moderate association between the combined dependent variables and group membership, $r = .18$.

Multivariate contrasts revealed significant overall differences between Canadians and the South Asians studying abroad by all four criteria (Wilk's, Pillai's, Hotelling-Lawley Trace, Roy's maximum root criterion), $F(3, 134) = 5.17$, $p < .0021$. Canadians showed a greater tendency to ingratiate ($M = 106.14$) than Indians ($M = 96.98$) or Indo-Canadians ($M = 97.6$) and the differences between the groups were found to be significant by all four criteria $F(3, 134) = 3.47$, $p < .02$.

To test the contribution of each of the three dependent variables to predict group differences, a simple one-way analysis of variance was computed with group membership as the independent variable and one of the factors of ingratiation as the dependent variable. The results of the ANOVA for each dependent variable are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Cultural Subgroups on Each Ingratiation Subscale

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Situation Specific Tactics</u>				
Between	1939.13	2	969.57	3.96**
Within	33298.97	136	244.85	
<u>Other Enhancement</u>				
Between	285.05	2	142.53	2.27
Within	8529.02	136	62.71	
<u>Self-Presentation</u>				
Between	29.97	2	14.98	0.24
Within	8610.98	136	63.32	

** $p < .01$

Significant group differences were found for situation-specific tactics, univariate $F(2, 136) = 3.96$ $p < .02$. Univariate contrasts revealed significant differences in the employment of situation-specific tactics between Canadians ($M = 46.30$) and the South Asians coming to study abroad ($X = 37.42$), $F(1, 136) = 7.73$ $p < .006$ with Indo-Canadians ($X = 40.70$) being intermediate to Canadians and South-Asian subjects.

Analysis of variance on the mean scores of Canadians, Indo-Canadians and South Asians coming to study abroad on other enhancement (26.63, 27.28 and 27.74) or self-presentation (28.69, 25.26 and 27.77) did not yield significant group differences, $F(2, 136) = 0.29$ and 1.21 , respectively, $p > .05$.

The means on the grocery store encounter item for Canadians, Indo-Canadians and South Asians were 21.26, 21.74 and 19.44 respectively. The differences between groups were not significant. Table 4 reveals high positive correlation for the three factors with each situation. A possible interpretation of these correlational results is that those who were highly ingratiating in one situation were found to be highly ingratiating in the other situations except with behaviour in the grocery store encounter. Similarly, those who were less ingratiating in one situation were also less ingratiating in other situations.

Hypothesis 2. It was hypothesized that subjects who reported high ingratiation tendencies would have higher mean scores on the Mach IV and

Table 4

Correlation Coefficient of Ingratiation Scores across the Various
Situations for all Cultural Groups.

Situations	Situation- Specific tactics	Other- enhancement	Self- presentation
Job interview less competition	.78	.75	.74
Grocery store	-.03	-.04	-.13
Admission interview	.86	.74	.66
Curriculum Vitae	.63	.49	.60
Supervisor	.49	.71	.54
Student loan	.75	.48	.74
Emergency	.62	.50	.41
Job interview tough competition	.81	.70	.78

Note. Except for correlations of grocery store encounter with the scores on ingratiation scale, all correlations were significant at $p < .01$.

Revised Self-Monitoring scales. Correlations among the three ingratiation subscales, and the Mach IV and Self-Monitoring scores are presented in Table 5. There were no significant correlations between self-monitoring and either situation-specific tactics, self-presentation, or other-enhancement. Self-monitoring was significantly correlated ($r=.20$ $p > .02$) with the scores on the grocery store encounter scenario. By contrast, Machiavellianism showed significant positive correlations with situation-specific tactics ($r=.31$ $p > .0001$), other-enhancement ($r=.25$ $p > .003$), self-presentation ($r=.17$ $p > .02$) and the grocery store encounter item ($r=.29$ $p > .01$).

Secondary analysis on open-ended questions. The first open-ended question sought to find if Canadians, Indo-Canadians and South Asians perceived differences in the way people from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds reacted. Sensitivity to dissimilarity of reactions to a given situation varied, $X^2 (2, N = 137) = 12.193$, $p < .002$, significantly across groups with 55.1 percent of Canadian subjects, 70.2% of Indian subjects, and 88.4% of Indo-Canadians expressing sensitivity towards cultural difference. Another open-ended question asked subjects to rate their group in comparison to people from other ethnic backgrounds on social aggressiveness. The overall perception of own group in comparison to other group was significantly different among the three groups, $X^2 (4, N = 137) = 36.97$, $p < .001$. The majority of the Canadian subjects (95.9%) reported that their cultural group was equal or more aggressive than other groups.

Table 5

Intercorrelations Between Subscales of Ingratiation,
Machiavellianism, and Self Monitoring Test Scores for the Total
Sample (N=139).

Subscales	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Situation Specific tactics	—					
2. Other Enhancement	.70*	-				
3. Self Presentation	.49*	.56*	-			
4. Grocery store encounter	-.03	-.05	-.19	-		
5. Machiavellianism	.31*	.25*	.17*	.28*	-	
6. Self Monitoring	.07	.01	.03	.18*	.18*	-

*p < .05

Indo-Canadian subjects were evenly divided in their assessment of aggressiveness among the three categories of less (34.9%), equal (27.9%), and more (30.2%) aggressive and showed no definite pattern. The majority of the South Asian subjects, however, felt that they were less aggressive than other groups (53.2%), whereas only 27.7% felt that they were about the same and 19.1% thought that they were more aggressive.

Subjects were also asked to rank the determinants or influences on their behaviour. The mean ranks assigned to each influence are presented in Table 6. Desire to be part of a group had the highest mean rank (4.83) for predicting behavior among Canadian subjects. Societal influences had the highest mean rank (4.76) among Indo-Canadian subjects, whereas peer pressure (4.74) seems to have the greatest influence on South Asian participants in this study. The ranks were subjected to Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA to examine whether influences on behaviour differed according to groups. There were significant differences in ranks assigned to role of friends, $F(2, 136) = 22.63, p < .0001$ and desire to be part of a group $F(2, 136) = 6.69, p < .0352$.

On the open-ended question relating to possible strategies adopted to get a raise, 22% of the Canadian subjects and 21% of the Indo-Canadian subjects said that they would employ ingratiation tactics to get a raise. On the other hand 31% of the South Asian subjects opted to use ingratiation tactics in order to get a raise. A z test

of differences in proportions revealed South Asians subjects were significantly more willing to use ingratiation tactics to get a raise, $z = 11.25$ $p < .05$ in comparison to Canadians and Indo-Canadians. This difference in use of tactics to get a raise was in the hypothesized direction. South Asians seemed to ingratiate more than the Canadians and Indo-Canadians, but there was no difference among the Canadians and Indo-Canadians. On the item asking subjects if they could get a higher grade at school by ingratiating the instructor, 43% of the Canadians, 39% of the Indo-Canadians, and 32% of the South Asians responded in the affirmative and described ways in which they could make an impression on the instructor to get a better grade. A z test of differences in proportions revealed significant differences among Canadians and South Asians $z = 11.00$ $p < .05$. The differences in proportions were not significant for Canadians and Indo-Canadians nor for Indo-Canadians and South Asians.

One of the difficulties with the Ingratiation Scale items was that they were heavily school oriented. It was conceivable that the South Asian subjects would show differences on work-related items in contrast to those that were school related. To consider this possibility work- and school-related items (regardless of the factor on which they loaded), were examined separately. The means for school- and work-related items for Canadians, Indo-Canadians and South Asians were 39.74 and 44.69, 42.21 and 48.11 and 39.79 and 49.35 respectively. The differences for work and

Table 6

Mean Ranks Assigned to Influences on Behaviour in Various Cultural Subgroups

Influences	Canadians	Indo-Canadians	South Asians
	<u>M</u> (n=49)	<u>M</u> (n=43)	<u>M</u> (n=47)
Parents	2.57	2.35	2.02
School	3.12	2.56	3.04
Friends ^a	3.30	3.74	4.74
Group membership ^a	4.83	4.76	4.25
Society	4.18	4.09	3.74
Situational	3.02	3.51	2.78

a Significant differences in mean ranks across cultural groups.

items were significant $F(2, 136) = 3.48$ $p < .03$ and were in the hypothesized direction, with means for work-related items being larger among South Asians and means for school-related items being larger among Canadians.

Discussion

It was hypothesized that South Asian subjects would have the greatest tendency to ingratiate, followed by Indo-Canadians, with Canadians having the least tendency to ingratiate. The results showed the reverse: Canadians showed the highest overall tendency whereas South-Asians showed the least tendency to ingratiate. This finding was contradictory to speculations by Pandey (1981), Khosla (1976), and Nayar (1977) who proposed that scarce resources and intense competition accounts for greater manifestation of ingratiation behaviors among people from Third World countries. Sinha and Verma (1983) also contended that traditional, hierarchical societies such as India demand ingratiation behavior in many social situations.

There may be several reasons for Canadians exhibiting the greatest tendency to ingratiate. A principal reason may be that the items are ecologically valid only for undergraduates who relate more to the situations described in the scale and not so for South Asian graduate students who have already achieved the goals and do not feel the need to ingratiate in the situations described in the scale. The items on the scale may be more suited to tapping ingratiation among Western subjects on whom it was validated but not the right questions to ask South Asian subjects to elicit ingratiation.

responses from them. Items related to admission to a coveted school, or applying for a job may be more important to younger Canadian undergraduates rather than older foreign graduate students.

Pandey and Bohra's (1986) finding that the ingratiating person was judged as more adjusted may suggest another possible reason for greater manifestation of ingratiation among Canadians. Though no formal measure of adjustment was obtained, ratings of social aggressiveness of own group in comparison to other groups may be treated as an indirect measure of adjustment. On the basis of those ratings, it is possible to argue that Canadians living within their own culture would feel more at home, are more adjusted, and feel freer to aggress as they rated themselves and also ingratiate the most. The Indo-Canadians who may find different behavior patterns at home and outside were mixed in their responses to social aggressiveness, and are probably intermediate to the two groups in their adjustment levels and also on scores on ingratiation scale. The South Asian students who may be are unsure and timid in the foreign culture are least adjusted, and also lowest in manifestation of any tactics of ingratiation.

The study also may lack external validity. The South-Asians, who come to study abroad, may be different from their counterparts who remain in their country. Thus, subjects in this study may not be a true representative of their own culture. In the process of adjustment to the new culture, foreign students also may substantially

change their normal behavior patterns. Because the South Asian subjects were away from their traditional hierarchical society (Sinha & Verma, 1983) and living in a situation where resources were not scarce and competition not so keen, they may have been less inclined to ingratiate. Moreover, South Asians abroad are likely to have been successful in previous cutthroat competitions within their respective countries, and may no longer feel the need to ingratiate.

The South Asian subjects were older (mean age of 28 years) and also higher in their education level than either the Canadian or Indo-Canadian subjects. With the exception of three subjects, all South Asian subjects were in graduate programs. These older subjects may have found it less necessary to ingratiate in some of the situations described in the Ingratiation Scale and thus produced lower scores. Being older, already admitted to graduate school and possessing secured funding, may have allowed them to avoid the real competition in their new society. For example, in an answer to the open-ended question regarding how can you get a higher grade than you really deserve, one South Asian subject replied, "I don't think it is important for me to get a higher grade anymore (because I am already in my Ph.D.) than I really deserve, so I will not try (to ingratiate)".

Apart from not being representative of the native culture, there could also have been problems of an enhanced desire on the part of the South-Asian students to appear conscientious to the experimenter who was, someone they each personally knew. This

situation may have caused the subjects to reply in a socially-desirable rather than in an honest manner.

Younger subjects may have found it important to ingratiate in some of the situations that were appropriate to their context. Situations included in the questionnaire were admission to a coveted school, getting a loan for higher studies, applying for a job, working for a supervisor, trying to impress an instructor who is going to teach a future course, or ways and means to get a higher grade. Because of the importance attached to being independent in Canadian society, Canadian students may be financially hard-pressed, and find it important to procure loans and jobs to support themselves for higher studies. Though some Indo-Canadians also pay their own way through school, they are not likely as hard pressed because their Indian parents might be more than willing to pay for their higher education. (In saying that Indo-Canadian parents are willing to pay for their childrens' higher education, the author is making an assumption solely on interactions with Indo-Canadian families in Winnipeg. Moreover, because it is normal in India for parents to pay for higher education, Indian parents are likely to carry the same values even in a foreign culture).

Situational variables seem to play an important role in the manifestation of ingratiation (Cheng, 1983; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Ralston, 1985; Wortman & Linsenmier, 1977). In light of little evidence of individuals' dispositional characteristics in manifestation of ingratiation, it is easier to

see how the nature of questions may have been responsible for the direction of results. The Canadians and Indo-Canadians had higher scores on ingratiation than South-Asians because the situations described in the questionnaire were such that they were more important to them.

This argument is reinforced by secondary analyses of the open-ended questions and the internal analyses of scale items. In both closed and open-ended items, it was found that South Asians, in comparison to Canadians and Indo-Canadians exhibited a greater tendency to ingratiate in situations relating to work and very significantly lesser tendency to ingratiate in situations relating to school. It also may be argued that some of the situations portrayed in the scale may be dissimilar, not only in importance but also in the amount of control that could be exerted to achieve the desired outcome. For example, Item 6 in the Ingratiation Scale was different for Canadians and South Asians (an interview for student loan vs an interview for visa extension) but similar for Indo-Canadians and Canadians. In the case of student visa extension, the subject may exert very little control because the basis for extension is not arbitrary. On the other hand, a student can get a loan if he/she personally impresses the need on the loan officer.

Another place to look for reasons for differences in responses to the Ingratiation Scale may be perception of influences on behavior. Subjects were asked to rank order the importance of different influences on their behavior. Being part of a

group, peer pressure, and demands of society were consistently ranked highly by all three groups; however, the influence of parents on behavior ranked as the least important among both Canadians and Indo-Canadians and may explain the similarity of their responses. It is very difficult to say that the findings will generalize to a truly equivalent cross-cultural group. To test such differences would require the administration of the same questionnaire to a group of undergraduates in India, Bangladesh or Sri Lanka at the same age and status as the Canadian student sample. Such students would identify more with the situations presented in this scale and present a fairer test of the hypothesis.

Independent of group differences, Machiavellianism, the ability of an individual to manipulate others, was found to be significantly correlated with ingratiation. This result has been found in previous studies (Pandey & Rastogi, 1979). The three-factor ingratiation scale seems to relate closely with the ability to influence others to gain more than deserved in a given interaction. Previous research (Pandey & Rastogi, 1979) has shown that people who scored high on Machiavellianism were also high in their evaluations of ingratiatory behavior manifested by others. In the present study, it was additionally shown that people who score high on Machiavellianism report that they would ingratiate more in various situations. Both Machiavellianism and ingratiation seem to measure the manipulative intent of the individual (Pandey & Singh, 1988). If you have the ability to manipulate others, you may praise insincerely

or agree with someone who is in a position to influence major events, even if you do not like or agree with that person.

On the other hand, it was found, as shown in previous studies (Caldwell & Riley, 1982; Mowday, 1978; Schlenker & Leary, 1982), that ingratiation does not correlate with self-monitoring. High self-monitoring individuals are acknowledged to be solicitous with self-presentation and to possess "an acute sensitivity to the cues in the situation which indicate what expression or self-presentation is appropriate and what is not" (Snyder, 1974, p.527). It has been argued (Jones & Baumeister, 1976) that ingratiation is a function of the reinforcement to attract self-attention, the probability of success, and estimation of how ingratiation is viewed by the target person. The perception of legitimacy of ingratiation is determined by individual differences in the target person, with high self-monitors having been found to be more critical of attempts to ingratiate than low self-monitors (Gerstein, Ginter & Graziano, 1987; Jones & Baumeister, 1976). This study, unlike the studies by Schlenker and Leary (1982) and Jones and Baumeister (1976), attempted to measure ingratiation rather than measure how ingratiation is evaluated by an onlooker. The results suggest that, whereas self-monitoring has an important role to play in the evaluation of ingratiation behavior (Jones & Baumeister, 1976), it has a minimal role to play in the actual manifestation of ingratiation.

Self-monitoring, however, correlated positively with responses to the items

concerning the grocery store encounter. People who seemed to present themselves as likable to a salesperson in a grocery store were also high self-monitors. It was also found that the groups were very similar on the factor named self-presentation in the ingratiation scale. The similarity of scores across groups on both self-presentation and encounter with salesperson implies that self-monitors, who are so aware of the consequences of violating norms of interaction (Goffman, 1971), would not ingratiate in situations where there might be chances of being evaluated negatively because of being insincere. For example, in the scenario of trying to get admitted to a coveted school, high self-monitors would not dare to praise members of the committee in case the interviewers might see through the high self-monitors' attempts to manipulate the accepted norms of the interview situation and thus evaluate the ingratiator more negatively.

An alternative interpretation is that high self-monitors because of heightened sensitivity to social cues in general may have been more aware of the purpose of the study and therefore responded in a socially desirable rather than in an honest manner. The above mentioned fact would have led to the effect of reducing correlation between ingratiation and self-monitoring. In the grocery store scenario, seeing no harm to acting in an ingratiating manner, they scored highly, and a positive correlation was found between self-monitoring and the grocery store scenario.

To determine the valid interpretation, a study designed to allow high and low

self-monitors to choose either to ingratiate or not in situations where there were positive and negative evaluation conditions would provide insights into the relationship between ingratiation and self-monitoring. If the high self-monitor ingratiated under positive rather than negative evaluation conditions, it could be deduced that self-monitoring is not directly correlated with the tendency to ingratiate but is mediated by evaluation possibilities.

Examination of social-desirability scale scores in a replication of the present study would provide further tests of the hypothesis that self-monitors disguise their responses. Because high self-monitors may respond in a more socially-desirable manner, deleting from final analysis the responses of subjects who scored high on a social desirability scale would provide empirical evidence of whether self-monitors were playing the role of a "good subject" in the experiment.

The failure of the Ingratiation Scale to differentiate between groups, and the evidence of positive correlations of ingratiation scores with Machiavellianism and no correlation with self-monitoring, raise concerns about the construct validity of the Ingratiation Scale. The results of this study were not sufficient to demonstrate whether the scale was measuring the construct it was designed to measure. Research to demonstrate its effect and additional studies to separate the effects of mediating variables such as social desirability and evaluation apprehension, would be necessary to demonstrate construct validity of the Ingratiation Scale.

Differences in sample characteristics and the unique relationship between the South Asian subjects and the experimenter may deem it inappropriate to generalize the findings of this study beyond the sample used in the study. However, the interesting patterns of relationship found between ingratiation and Machiavellianism and self-monitoring suggests further investigation may advance ingratiation theory and its more contemporary form of impression management theory.

Conclusions

There was a difference in the manifestation of ingratiation among the three groups compared in this study. The Ingratiation Scale was effective in discriminating high ingratiators versus low ingratiators among all the groups. However, the items in the Ingratiation Scale were situation specific and valid only for undergraduates who want to gain admissions for further studies and are insecure about future financial status and jobs.

The author's observation as a newcomer to the society may not have been accurate. Westerners are willing to use ingratiation to gain rewards in various situations. The means for the subscale Situation-Specific tactics were the highest for Canadians which may imply that Westerners are more adept at changing the manifestation of ingratiation so that it is not possible to observe by a foreigner. This finding is consistent with Kahn and Youngs' (1973) study who showed that ingratiation tactics are part of daily life tactics.

An important conclusion that can be drawn from this study is the importance of situational variables in the manifestation of ingratiation. Ingratiation is not habitual. People do not ingratiate irrespective of the demands of the situation and personal needs. Only if it is perceived by an individual that it may be worth his/her while to ingratiate in a given situation does he/she ingratiate. A study on undergraduates across cultures having similar needs would be a more appropriate cross-cultural comparison and would provide stronger evidence to the contention that ingratiation is situation-specific. Also, in a true cross-cultural comparison, it would be possible to determine the magnitude of ingratiation in various cultures.

References

- Bandura, A., Adams, E., & Meyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 125-139.
- Baskett, G. D. (1973). Interview decisions as determined by competence and implied similarity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 343-345.
- Bohra, K. A., & Pandey, J. (1984). Ingratiation towards strangers, friends and bosses. Journal of Social Psychology, 122, 217-222.
- Byrne, D. (1971). Attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O' Rille, C. A. (1982). Responses to failure: The effects of choice and responsibility on impression management. Academy of Management Review, 25, 121-136.
- Campbell, D. P., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validity in the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.
- Cheng, J. L. C. (1983). Organizational context and upward influence: An experimental study of the use of power tactics. Group and Organization Studies, 8, 337-355.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press.

- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 366-375.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of impression management: Basking and blasting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 406-415.
- Colman, A., & Olver, K. R. (1978). Reactions to flattery as a function of self-esteem: Self enhancement and cognitive consistency theories. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17, 25-29.
- Finch, J. F., & Cialdini, R. B. (1989). Another indirect tactic of (self-) image management: Boosting. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 222-232.
- Gerstein, L. H., Ginter, E. J., Graziano, W. G. (1987). Self-monitoring, impression management, and interpersonal evaluations. The Journal of Social Psychology, 125, 379-389.
- Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 50, 106-115.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face work. Psychiatry, 18, 213-231.
- Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public. New York: Doubleday.

- Griffit, W. B., & Veitch, R. (1974). Preacquaintance attitude similarity and attraction revisited: Ten days in fall-out shelter. Sociometry, 37, 163-173.
- Gurevitch, Z. D. (1984). Impression formation during tactical self-presentation. Social Psychology Quarterly, 47, 262-270.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Holtgraves, T., & Srull, T. K. (1989). The effects of positive self-descriptions on impression: General principles and individual differences. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 452-462.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). Social behavior in its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt.
- Jones, E. E. (1964). Ingratiation. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Jones, E. E. (1965). Conformity as a tactic of ingratiation. Science, 149, 144-150.
- Jones, E. E., & Baumeister, R. F. (1976). The self-monitor looks at the ingratiator. Journal of Personality, 44, 654-674.
- Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., & Jones, R. G. (1963). Tactics of ingratiation among leaders and subordinated in the status hierarchy. Psychological Monographs, 77, Whole No. 566.

- Jones, E. E., Jones, R. G., & Gergen, K. J. (1963). Some conditions affecting the evaluation of the conformist. Journal of Personality, 31, 270-288.
- Jones, E. E., Rhodewalt, F., Berglas, S., & Skelton, J. A. (1981). Effects of strategic self-presentation on subsequent self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 407-421.
- Jones, R. G., & Jones, E. E. (1964). Optimum conformity as an ingratiation tactic. Journal of Personality, 32, 436-458.
- Kahn, A., & Young, D. L. (1973). Ingratiation in a free social situation. Sociometry, 36, 579-589.
- Khosla, G. D. (1976, December). A Chamcha is a chamcha. Surya India, pp. 41-44.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 440-452.
- Kipnis, D., & Vanderveer, R. (1971). Ingratiation and the use of power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 80-86.
- Liden, R. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (1988). Ingratiation behaviours in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 13, 572-587.
- Miller, L. C., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). Reciprocity of self disclosure at the individual and dyadic levels: A Social relations analysis. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 713-719.

Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upwards influence in organizations.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 137-156.

Nayar, K. (1977). The judgement: Inside story of the emergency in India.

New Delhi: Vikas

Olszewska-Kendratowicz, A. (1975). Self-image as a regulator of tactical variations in ingratiation. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 16, 73-79.

Pandey, J. (1981). Ingratiation tactics in India. Journal of Social Psychology, 113, 147-148.

Pandey, J. (1986). Socio-cultural perspectives on ingratiation. In B. Maher & W. Maher (Eds.), Progress in experimental research in personality (Vol. 14, pp.205-229). New York: Academic Press.

Pandey, J., & Bohra, K. A. (1986). Attraction and evaluation as a function of the ingratiating style of a person. Social Behavior and Personality, 14, 23-28.

Pandey, J., & Kakkar, S. (1982). Supervisors affect: Attraction and positive evaluation as a function of the enhancement of others. Psychological Reports, 50, 479-486.

Pandey, J., & Rastogi, R. (1979). Machiavellianism and ingratiation. Journal of Social Psychology, 108, 221-225.

- Pandey, J., & Singh, A. K. (1988). Attribution and evaluation of manipulative social behaviour. Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 735-744.
- Ralston, D. A. (1985). Employee ingratiation: The role of management. Journal of Management Review, 10, 477-487.
- Reagan, D. T., Straus, E., & Fazio, R. (1974). Liking and the attribution process. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10, 385-397.
- Rhodewalt, F., & Agustsdottir, S. (1986). Effects of self-presentation on the phenomenal self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 47-55.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-28.
- Rotter, J. B., & Hocheirich, D. J. (1975). Personality. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self presentation: A Conceptualization and model. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 641-669.
- Scott, M. B., & Lyman, S. M. (1968). Accounts. American Sociological Review, 33, 46-62.
- Sims, H. P., & Manz, C. C. (1984). Observing leader verbal behaviour: towards reciprocal determinism in leadership theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 222-232.

- Sinha, J. B. P. (1978). Power in superior - subordinate relationship: The Indian case. Journal of Social and Economic Studies, 6, 205-218.
- Sinha, J. B. P., & Verma, S. (1983). Perceptual structure of dyadic interactions. Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 14, 187-199.
- Snyder, C. M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.
- Snyder, C. M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol.12, pp. 85-128). New York: Academic Press.
- Snyder, C. M., & Gangstead, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 125-139.
- Steele, C. M. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation: Sustaining the integrity of the self. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 21, pp.261-302). New York: Academic Press.
- Stires, L. K., & Jones, E. E. (1969). Modesty versus self-enhancement as alternative forms of ingratiation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5, 172-188.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Verbal tactics of impression management. In C. Antak (Ed.), Ordinary explanation of social

behavior (Pp. 271-326). London: Academic press.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The social psychology of groups.

New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tsui, A. S., & Barry, B. (1986). Interpersonal affect and rating errors.

Academy of Management Journal, 29, 586-599.

Wood, R. F., & Mitchell, T. R. (1981). Manager behavior in a social context:

The Impact Of Impression Management on Attributions and

Disciplinary Actions. Organizational Behavior and Human

Performance, 28, 356-378.

Wortman, C. B., & Linsenmeir, J. A. W. (1977). Interpersonal attraction and

techniques of ingratiation in organizational settings. In B. M. Staw, &

G. R. Salanick (Eds.), New directions in organizational behaviour (pp.

133-178). Illinois: St.Clair Press.

Appendix A

Ingratiation Scale

(Before revisions)

1. There are four vacancies and five job applicants and you are one of the job applicants. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) During the interview, I will express values, opinions and attitudes closer to what I guess to be those of members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) In the interview, I will try to present myself as an applicant that I perceive the selection committee would regard as an ideal applicant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) If given the opportunity, I would not hesitate to praise members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of persons who I knew were friends of one/more members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(e) I would look for an opportunity to suggest to the members of selection

committee how important it was for me to get this job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

2. Suppose you are in a grocery store and someone comes up to you, requests you to taste a new product and then offers you a coupon for buying it at a discount. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation)

(a) I would taste the product and listen patiently to what the person has to say.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) I would praise the product and enter into a small conversation with the person about it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) I will taste the product, take the coupon and buy the product from the person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(d) In case I do not plan to buy the product, I will give the person a good enough reason to explain my choice.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(e) I may taste the product and then just go on to my routine shopping without paying any attention to the persons' sales talk.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

3. In an interview for admission to the best school in your field of interest, which behavior best describes you. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) Before the interview, I will read extensively to discover the popular areas of research among faculty, and, during the interview, I will express my deep interest in those areas (even if I was not as much interested).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) In the interview, I will try to portray myself as closely as possible to what I perceive the selection committee regards to be an ideal student.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) I will look for an opportunity to praise the members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of some students who I knew the department valued and would say that they were my friends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(e) I would indicate to the members of selection committee how excited I was to get a chance to prove myself in this school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Would not likely (Would most likely
behave this way) behave this way)

4. While preparing a curriculum vitae or resume for a job or application for funding, what do you think is closest to your behaviour? (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) I will try to make my curriculum vitae seem impressive by "puffing" the information.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Would not likely (Would most likely
behave this way) behave this way)

(b) I will exaggerate information in my curriculum vitae that I imagine will reflect positively about my abilities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Would not likely (Would most likely
behave this way) behave this way)

(c) I will include with my list of publications papers with impressive titles that, are still in the preparation stage that I expect to publish one day.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Would not likely (Would most likely
behave this way) behave this way)

(d) I will include on my curriculum vitae information that, although not important, makes my resume look more extensive or impressive.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
(Would not likely (Would most likely
behave this way) behave this way)

5. If your advisor or boss at work asks you to do something you personally feel you should not do, what would be your most likely reaction (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) Contrary to my feelings I will express my pleasure in doing the work and will also try to do it to the best of my ability.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) I would tell my superior that I would do the work if he/she made some modifications to the request.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) I would state immediately and directly to his/her face that I would prefer not doing it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

6. You have gone to the student loan office to get your loan application sanctioned (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) I will write the application to convey that it was extremely important for me to get an extension.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) When called for an interview with the student loan officer, I will try to act in a way so to impress him/her.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) I will try to be humorous so that he/she will like me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(d) I will try to make some personally flattering remarks to the officer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

7. You are accompanying a friend to the emergency room of a hospital and you meet an instructor in the waiting room who will be teaching you a course next term. The instructor is accompanying his child who has some minor ailment. What do you think your behavior is most likely to be. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) I would introduce myself, remind him of the upcoming course and enquire and express my concern about the child.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) I would take the opportunity to try to get to know him better.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) I would just read a magazine because I do not yet know the instructor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

8. There is one vacancy and four job applicants, and you are one of the applicants. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) During the interview, I will express values, opinions and attitudes which I guess are those of members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(b) In the interview, I will try to present myself as an applicant that I perceive the selection committee would regard as an ideal applicant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(c) If given the opportunity, I would not hesitate to praise members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of persons who I knew were friends of one/more members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

(e) I would look for an opportunity to suggest to the members of selection committee how important it was for me to get this job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)				(Would most likely behave this way)		

Appendix B

Additional Questions

(Question two to seven were similar for all the three groups. The orienting paragraph and first question were different for each subgroup. Below is the questionnaire as presented to the Canadian subjects. Questions which were not similar are presented separately as they were for Indo-Canadian and South-Asian subjects.)

Winnipeg is a cosmopolitan city. Many people have come here from different countries. People from different cultural backgrounds other than your own have special characteristics and typical ways of reacting to social situations.

1. In general, do you think people from different cultural backgrounds react differently to most social situations. (Please circle your opinions).

Yes / No

2. Please describe situations where you have observed different behaviours by people of different cultural backgrounds.

_____ As a student in the classroom.

_____ Teacher-student relationship.

_____ Communication with a superior at work.

_____ Interactions with friends.

_____ Interaction with others.

_____.

_____ Other (please specify).

_____.

3. In general, do you feel that your own cultural group is less, or about the same, or more aggressive in social dealings than other groups?

_____.

4. In general, how would you rank the determinants or influences on your behaviours. (Please rank order the causes below in the order of importance to you, with one indicating the most important and six the least important.)

_____ What my parents did since I was a child.

_____ What I learned at school.

_____ What my friends generally do.

_____ My desire to be part of a group.

_____ My desire to do what society permits.

_____ The demands of each new situation.

5. Which of the following strategies would you prefer to follow in order to get a raise. (Please check only one):

- _____ Work diligently.
- _____ Try to bring my work to the attention of my superior.
- _____ Use all possible means to impress my supervisor.
- _____ Behave in a way that will cause my supervisor to like me.

6. Do you think you can get a better grade than you actually deserve if you could make your course instructor think that you are a deserving student?

Yes/No

7. What would you do to impress your instructor?

Orienting instructions and the first question for Indo-Canadians

Your parents have been brought up in a different culture than the one in which you live. To some extent you may have been exposed to the norms followed by their culture as well as to the norms followed in this culture in which you now live. You may have noticed differences in the norms of the two cultures. I am interested in the norms you use in deciding your behavior in social situations.

1. Do you feel that you would have to behave differently if you were to live in the society where your parents were brought up.

Yes/No.

Orienting instructions and the first question for South Asian subjects

When you came from your home country to study abroad, you probably had adjustments to make in the new society. Among those, I am most interested in knowing are those in which you had to tailor your behavior to the normative behavior manifested in common social situations in the new culture into which you moved.

1a. Have you had to change to an extent your usual way of reacting to common social situations in the new culture. (Please circle your opinion)

Yes/No

1 b. If yes please describe some of the problems in social situations, communication styles, assumptions etc., that come to your mind as soon as you think about the very first days in the new culture.

Appendix C

THE INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIOUR SCALE

(Revised Version)

(Identical forms of the scale were presented to Canadians and Indo-Canadians. The scale presented to the South Asian subjects was identical except for the asterisked item.)

1. There are four vacancies and five job applicants and you are one of the job applicants. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

a) During the interview, I will express values, opinions and attitudes closer to what I guess to be those of members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

b) In the interview, I will try to present myself as an applicant that I perceive the selection committee would regard as an ideal applicant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will try to find an opportunity to praise members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of persons who I know could wield power over members of selection committee and also say that they were friends and acquaintances.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(e) I will make a deliberate attempt to suggest to the members of the selection committee that I would be obliged to them if I get the job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

2. Suppose you are in a grocery store and someone comes up to you, requests you to taste a new product and then offers you a coupon for buying it at a discount. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation)

(a) I would like to taste the product and listen patiently to what the person has to say.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) I would praise the product and enter into a small conversation with the person about it.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will taste the product, take the coupon and buy the product from the person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(d) In case I do not plan to buy the product, I will give the person a good enough reason to explain my choice.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

behave this way)

behave this way)

(e) I may taste the product and then just go on to do my routine shopping without paying any attention to the persons sales talk.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

3. In an interview for admission to the best school in your field of interest, which behavior best describes you. (Please indicate to what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) Before the interview, I will read extensively to discover the popular areas of research among faculty, and, during the interview, I will express my deep interest in those areas (even if I was not as much interested).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) In the interview, I will try to portray myself as closely as possible to what I perceive the selection committee regards to be an ideal student.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will look for an opportunity to praise the members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of some students who I knew the department valued and would say that they were my friends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(e) I would indicate to the members of selection committee how excited I was to get a chance to prove myself in this school.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

4. While preparing a curriculum vitae or resume for a job or application for funding, to what degree do the statements describe how you would respond in the situation.

(a) I will exaggerate positive information in curriculum vitae that I imagine will impress the selection/funding agency.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) I will include with my list of publications impressive titles of papers that are still in the preparation stage but I do expect to publish some day so that my curriculum vitae looks great.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) To make my resume look impressive or extensive, I will include information that is really not important.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

5. If your advisor or boss at work asks you to do something you personally feel you should not do, what would be your most likely reaction. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) Contrary to my feelings I will do the work and also try to do it to the best of my ability.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) I would express my pleasure even though I did not feel as good in doing the work.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I would do the work but subtly make him/her feel obliged towards myself for doing the work.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

*6. You have gone to the student loan office to get your loan application sanctioned.
(To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) I will write the application to convey that it was extremely important for me to get the loan.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) When called for an interview with the student loan officer, I will behave so as to impress him/her.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will make efforts to make my interviewer feel that he/she exerted power upon me and I respected him/her for that.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely					(Would most likely	

behave this way)

behave this way)

(d) I will lead the conversation in a way that I can make some flattering remarks to the officer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

7. You are accompanying a friend to the emergency room of a hospital and you meet an instructor in the waiting room who will be teaching you a course next term. The instructor is accompanying his child who has some minor ailment. What do you think your behavior is most likely to be. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

(a) I would introduce myself, remind him of the upcoming course and enquire and express my concern about the child.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) I would take the opportunity to try to impress him by striking a conversation on a topic in which I think I have some stimulating and bright ideas.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) Instead of picking up a magazine that is of real interest to me I will pick up and read a more intellectual kind of magazine so as to impress the instructor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

8. There is one vacancy and four job applicants, and you are one of the applicants. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in the situation).

a) During the interview, I will express values, opinions and attitudes closer to what I guess to be those of members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

b) In the interview I will try to present myself as an applicant that I perceive the selection committee would regard as an ideal applicant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will try to find an opportunity to praise members of the selection committee.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(d) If there was a chance to do so, I would mention names of persons who I know could wield power over members of selection committee and also say that they were friends and acquaintances.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(e) I will make a deliberate attempt to suggest to the members of the selection committee that I would be obliged to them if I get the job.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

Item 6 for South Asians

6. You have gone to the immigration office to get your visa extended and to get a work permit. (To what degree does the statement describe how you would respond in

the situation).

(a) I will fill the application to convey that it was extremely important for me to get an extension.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(b) When called for an interview with the immigration officer, I will pull up an act and behave so as to impress him/her.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(c) I will make efforts to make my interviewer feel that he/she exerted power upon me and I respected him/her for that.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

(d) I will lead the conversation in a way that I can make some flattering remarks to the officer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Would not likely behave this way)					(Would most likely behave this way)	

Appendix D

Coding Manual

Ingratiation Scale

There were eight items in the scale. Each item was followed by three to six specific questions related to the stem of the item. The subject was required to circle on a scale of 1 to 7 a number that seemed to describe his/her most likely behaviour in the situation described in the item. With the exception of Item 2, a score of one indicated a low tendency to ingratiate and a score of 7 a high tendency to ingratiate. The number circled for each item was the score for ingratiation. Item 2 was reverse coded, i.e., a score of seven indicated a tendency low tendency to ingratiate and a score of one a high tendency to ingratiate.

On the basis of factor analysis, the scale was divided into three subscales. The subscale "Situation-Specific Tactics" was measured by items 1c, 1d, 1e, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 5b, 6c, 6d, 7a, 7b, 8c, 8d, 8e. It was possible to obtain a minimum score of 15 and a maximum score of 105 on this subscale. The range of scores on the factor "Other-Enhancement" subscale was 8 to 56. The items measuring other-enhancement were 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5c, 6a, 6b, and 7c. The factor "Self-presentation" had fewer items (1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 8a and 8b). It was possible to obtain a maximum score of 42 and a minimum score of 6 on

this subscale. Item 2, which dealt with an encounter with a sales person, did not load on any of the above factors and was thus analyzed separately.

Treating this item as the other subscales, i.e., summing the scores obtained in each sub-item, resulted in a possible minimum of 5 and a maximum of 35.

Additional questions

In addition to the Ingratiation Scale, several other questions were asked to obtain relevant information about the subjects and their perceptions of differences in various cultural groups. Specifically, questions were asked to assess participants' cultural sensitivity, their perception of social aggressiveness in their own group in comparison to other cultural groups, and their perception of the influence of friends, society, school, family, and situational of their behaviour. A final set of two questions were included to measure ingratiation directly.

Appendix E (1)

Biographical questions asked of Indo-Canadian participants.

Please fill out the following questions to the best of your knowledge.

- (1) I am _____ years old.
- (2) I was born in _____. (please specify the country)
- (3) Starting at birth, please list in order the countries you have lived in, along with the number of years for each:

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years.

- (5) My mother was born in _____, but has lived in Canada for _____ years.

- (6) My father was born in _____, but has lived in Canada for _____ years.

Appendix E (2)

Biographical questions asked of South Asian participants.

Please fill out these questions to give some information about your cultural background.

(1) I was born in _____ (Please specify the country).

(2) I have lived in Canada for _____ years.

(3) Starting at birth, please list in order the countries you have lived in, along with the number of years for each:

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years.

Appendix E (3)

Biographical questions asked of Canadian participants.

Please fill out the following questions to the best of your knowledge.

(1) I am _____ years old.

(2) I was born in _____.

(3) Starting at birth, please list in order the countries you have lived in, along with the number of years for each:

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years

_____ for _____ years.

(5) My mother was born in _____, but has lived in Canada for _____ years.

(6) My father was born in _____, but has lived in Canada for _____ years.