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Abstract
Organizational newcomers are unfamiliar with many aspects of their workplace, and look for information to help them reduce uncertainty and better understand their new environment. One aspect critical to newcomers is the disposition of their supervisor—the person who arguably can impact the newcomer’s career the most. To form an impression of their new supervisor, newcomers will look to social cues from coworkers who have interpersonal contact with the supervisor. In the present research, we investigate the ways newcomers will use observed ingratiation—a common impression management strategy whereby coworkers try to appear likeable (Schlenker, 1980)—to form impressions of a supervisor’s warmth. Research on social influence cannot easily account for how third parties will interpret ingratiation, as the behaviors linked to ingratiation suggest something positive about the target, yet the unsavory aspects of the behavior imply it may not have the same effects as other positive behaviors. Our findings suggest that newcomers are unique in that they are motivated to learn about their new supervisor, and are prone to ignore those unsavory aspects and infer something positive about a supervisor targeted with ingratiation. Our findings also suggest that this effect can be weakened based on the supervisor’s response. In other words, newcomers rely less on evidence from a coworker’s ingratiation in the presence of direct behaviors from the supervisor.
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Being a newcomer can be an exciting time for an employee, as it is often marked by optimism and hope for the opportunity ahead (Louis, 1980). However, it is also a time of uncertainty, as newcomers are unfamiliar with many aspects of their new environment (Bauer & Green, 1998; Miller & Jablin, 1991). Newcomers look to manage this uncertainty by gaining familiarity with aspects of the environment most critical to their success (Bauer & Green, 1998; Louis, 1980; Morrison, 1993). These include their organization, job, coworkers, and new supervisor—the person likely to impact their career the most through job assignments, responsibilities, pay, and promotions (Yukl, 2002).

Because newcomers are determined to gain insights about their supervisor, they will use whatever information they can to quickly determine if this is someone they can like and trust (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007; van den Bos, 2001). Some of this information may come directly from the supervisor via encounters, meetings, training sessions, feedback, or other face-to-face interactions (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Watkins, 2003). However, newcomers report that they often have “scant contact… and low frequency of interaction with managers” (Korte, 2009, p. 296), and even when opportunities for direct contact do arise, newcomers are often reluctant to interact directly with supervisors (Brooks, Gino, & Schweitzer, 2015; Louis, 1980; Morrison, 1993). Indeed, Morrison (2002) noted that “newcomers exhibit a preference for indirect modes of information seeking” (p. 233). Therefore, newcomers are likely to base much of their initial impressions of their supervisor on indirect observations—including interactions the supervisor has with others.

When observing their supervisor interact with others, one type of interaction newcomers are likely to encounter regularly is ingratiation from a coworker (Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, &
Gilstrap, 2008; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). Ingratiation—defined as the use of certain positive behaviors such as flattery, favor-doing, or opinion conformity employed to elicit the attribution of likeability (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009; Bolino & Turnley, 1999)—is pervasive in organizations (Bolino, Long, & Turnley, 2016). Supervisors are often the targets of ingratiation because of their status and control over important work resources (Barrick et al., 2009; Leary, 1995; Long, Baer, Colquitt, Outlaw, & Dhensa-Kahlon, 2015), and employees often ingratiate themselves to supervisors to try and make a positive impression (Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995). Thus, when newcomers observe coworkers interacting with their supervisor, they are likely to see some form of ingratiation. A question then becomes if and how newcomers will use this information to form impressions of the supervisor.

Research on social influence paints a complicated picture of how a newcomer might use observed ingratiation to form impressions of the supervisor. On the one hand, because ingratiating behaviors seem positive, observers might use this information to form a positive impression of the supervisor (Cialdini, 2009). According to this perspective, the information from ingratiation could be interpreted as “proof” or evidence that the supervisor has good qualities (Sundie, Cialdini, Griskevicius, & Kenrick, 2012). Indeed, observing behaviors similar to ingratiation has been shown to result in positive attributions for the recipient (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Cialdini, 1989; Richardson & Cialdini, 1981), and research suggests that observers who see supervisors being complimented and offered favors by coworkers are thought of more positively by those observers (Wayne, Kacmar, & Ferris, 1995). However, there is also evidence that suggests ingratiating behaviors would not influence the impressions of observers. For example, people are less likely to be influenced by others they perceive as dissimilar to themselves (Cialdini, 2009; Platow et al., 2005). Because observers view coworkers who
knowingly ingratiate supervisors unfavorably (Fein, 1996; Vonk, 1998; 1999), they might consider these coworkers as dissimilar to them and part of their “out-group,” and therefore be less willing to accept ingratiation as positive evidence about the supervisor. Additionally, social influence is less effective when observers assume that information is fake or inauthentic (Lawson, Downing, & Cetola, 1998; Platow et al., 2005). Thus, in situations where newcomers recognize that the behaviors associated with ingratiation are being performed for impression management purposes, this information is likely to be discounted. In this way, ingratiation represents a challenging phenomenon for social influence research in that the information cues are technically “positive” (e.g., compliments, favors, agreement), but there are aspects of the behavior (e.g., manipulation, ulterior motives, feigning) that suggest it may not operate the way other positive behaviors do.

While these unique qualities of ingratiation set it apart from other positive behaviors in the domain of social influence, examining this phenomenon through the lens of newcomers may shed light on how these individuals will interpret ingratiation behavior. Building on theories of uncertainty management (van den Bos, 2001) and social perception (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), we suggest that newcomers are motivated to evaluate their new supervisor and will be inclined to ignore the features of ingratiation that suggest it should be discounted and use it to make positive inferences about the supervisor. The present test of this prediction makes several important theoretical contributions. First, it adds to the literature on social influence and newcomer socialization by showing that newcomers may attend to types of social information that other employees tend to discount. Second, it adds to the literature on ingratiation by showing that ingratiation is not just a tool used by actors for managing how others perceive them, but can also be used as a tool to manage how
others perceive others, an idea rarely considered by impression management scholars (Andrews & Kacmar, 2001; Bolino et al., 2008; Cialdini, 1989). Finally, it contributes to social information processing theory by proposing that the effects of social information will be strongest in the absence of direct information. When more useful or direct information is present, it appears as though the value of social information may be diminished.

**Theory and Hypotheses**

Newcomers must rely on their supervisors for many important job- and career-related decisions, and thus will be concerned with forming an impression of how their supervisor will manage these decisions to avoid potential exploitation, rejection, or harm (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Berger, 1979; Blader & Tyler, 2005). According to theory on uncertainty management, newcomers can manage their uncertainty by determining if their new supervisor is someone they can trust (van den Bos, 2001)—defined as having positive expectations about the supervisor’s actions (De Jong & Elfring, 2010; Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998). Trust is something newcomers will want to evaluate quickly in their new supervisor, and will use any available information to do so (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011). If newcomers can initially determine if a supervisor can be trusted, this lessens their urgency to seek additional information about the supervisor’s intentions (van den Bos, 2001).

According to research on trust formation, newcomers can base their trust in their supervisor either as a function of their relationship (the relationship-based perspective) with the supervisor, or as a function of specific qualities or characteristics (the character-based perspective) of the supervisor (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). The former perspective is potentially less relevant to the newcomer situation, as relationship-based trust takes time to develop (Dirks &
Ferrin, 2002; McAllister, 1995), something newcomers may be too impatient for (Cuddy et al., 2011). The latter perspective is arguably more relevant, as character-based trust forms more quickly and is thus ideal for newcomers who are motivated to evaluate their supervisor. Integrating this research with theories on early impression formation (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2008; Fiske et al., 2007) points to certain aspects of the supervisor’s character that will be particularly important to newcomers when evaluating trust. Specifically, warmth represents a universal dimension upon which individuals are likely to evaluate others—and scholars have indicated that warmth is highly linked to trust (Cuddy et al., 2008). Moreover, research suggests that warmth is the primary trait individuals evaluate in others (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007, 2014; Cuddy et al., 2008; Wojciszke, Bazinska, & Jaworski, 1998) and can be judged very quickly (Cuddy et al., 2008; Willis & Todorov, 2006; Ybarra, Chan, & Park, 2001). Because warmth is both highly linked to trust and is the primary trait newcomers are likely to evaluate, in this paper we focus on the effect of observed ingratiation on newcomers’ evaluations of a supervisors’ warmth.

Supervisor warmth can play a significant role in the performance and well-being of a newcomer (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Tjosvold, 1984), and is therefore a trait akin to an empty bucket that needs to be filled by newcomers, who will rely on any readily available sources of information to fill it. We suggest that one such source of information is the supervisor’s interactions with others, as observing social interactions is a strategy that has been shown to influence perceptions of targets (Burt & Knez, 1995). When supervisors are observed interacting with others, it is likely that these interactions involve ingratiation, particularly when supervisors are interacting with other employees (Rosenfeld et al., 1995; Wayne & Ferris, 1990).

Social information processing theory suggests that newcomers will use the observed ingratiation behavior as social information—in other words, beyond the words that are spoken in
the interaction, they will interpret meaning based on the existence of the interaction and the clues it provides (Chen, Takeuchi, & Shum, 2013; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). We suggest that in the absence of more certain information (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955), the newcomer is likely to interpret this interaction as signaling something positive about the supervisor. Specifically, this information is likely to suggest that the supervisor is someone who is well-liked and worth trying to influence (Cialdini, 2009; Tu & Fishbach, 2015). While this information is positive on the surface, there are aspects specific to the ingratiatory motive that may cause observers to discount its positivity. Specifically, ingratiators are viewed unfavorably by observers (Fein, 1996; Vonk, 1998; 1999) and ingratiation is often characterized as feigned behavior (Barrick et al., 2009; Bolino & Turnley, 1999; Jones & Pittman, 1982), both of which are qualities of social information that have been shown to hamper its influence on others (Cialdini, 2001; 2009; Lawson et al., 1998; Platow et al., 2005). However, because newcomers are starved for information about supervisors and motivated to evaluate their warmth and trust (Cuddy et al., 2011; Miller & Jablin, 1991; van den Bos, 2001), we suggest that newcomers will ignore the features of ingratiation that suggest it should be discounted, and use ingratiation as a positive signal about the supervisor. Thus, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 1:** Observing ingratiation from a coworker toward a supervisor is positively related to newcomer impressions of the supervisor’s warmth.

**Study 1**

In order to test our central hypothesis that newcomers’ observations of ingratiation result in impressions of supervisors’ warmth, we ran a series of five experimental studies (Study 1a-e). In these studies, participants were assigned to an ingratiation condition or a control condition, and were told they would watch a recorded interaction between a supervisor and a subordinate
(i.e., a coworker of the participant). Unless otherwise noted, participants were further instructed to imagine that this interaction was occurring in their own workplace. This manipulation has external validity for the newcomer situation, as the participants were not familiar with the supervisor nor the subordinate. Participants then watched the interaction in which the supervisor and subordinate discussed an upcoming project. After observing this interaction, participants were asked to complete several measures about the interaction, as well as questions about their personality and background.

The interaction the participants watched served as our manipulation of ingratiation. In order to minimize any potential cross-gender effects (Guadagno & Cialdini, 2007), both the supervisor and the subordinate in the interaction were male. In the ingratiation condition, the subordinate engaged in ingratiation toward the supervisor over the course of their interaction. To manipulate ingratiation, we drew upon the scale developed by Bolino and Turnley (1999). According to this scale, there are four aspects of ingratiation — giving compliments to be seen as likeable, taking an interest in someone’s personal life to show that you are friendly, praising someone for their accomplishments so you will be seen as a nice person, and doing personal favors for someone to show that you are friendly. Appendix A includes the specific statements the subordinate said in the ingratiation condition. Each of these elements was carefully manipulated such that in the ingratiation condition the subordinate engaged in each of these behaviors, but the behaviors did not alter the structure of the interaction in any other way. In other words, the interaction was the same in both conditions, including what was being discussed and concluded, and the only difference was the ingratulatory actions.

**Measure of Supervisor Warmth.** Participants were asked to give their opinion about the warmth of the supervisor using four adjectives identified by Turnley and Bolino (2001).
Participants were asked “How much do you perceive (the supervisor) as…” and responded on a five-point scale where 1 = \textit{Not at all} and 5 = \textit{Extremely}. These four items were \textit{likeable}, \textit{cooperative}, \textit{nice}, and \textit{pleasant}. These four items were aggregated to form a single measure of supervisor warmth.\footnote{1}

\textbf{Controls.} In order to partial out the variance in our dependent variables from constructs that are not part of our model, we included several control variables. We controlled for \textit{age} because prior research in organizational settings suggests that age can influence judgments along a variety of dimensions (e.g., Collins, Hair, & Rocco, 2009; Perry, Kulik, & Zhou, 1999; Shore, Cleveland, & Goldberg, 2003; Vecchio, 1993). Furthermore, we controlled for \textit{work experience} (measured in years), as we believed that participants with more work experience were likely to have different perceptions of supervisors in general, which could influence their interpretations of the supervisor. Finally, we controlled for \textit{political skill} because prior research suggests that an individual’s political skill can shape how one understands and utilizes ingratiation at work (Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska, & Shaw, 2007)\footnote{2}. Political skill was measured using a 6-item scale developed by Ahearn, Ferris, Hochwarter, Douglas, and Ammeter (2004). Items included, “I am good at getting others to respond positively to me,” and “I usually try to find common ground with others.” These items were aggregated to form a single measure of political skill.

To test our hypotheses for all sub studies contained in Study 1, we estimated hierarchical regression models for supervisor warmth where in step 1 we included the control variables, and in step 2 we added the focal predictor of ingratiation. Prior to our analysis of each sub study we conducted a manipulation check to ensure that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect. Participants responded to the four items contained in the Bolino and Turnley (1999) ingratiation measure on a 5-item scale where 1 = \textit{Strongly disagree} and 5 = \textit{Strongly agree}. Items included,
"Complimented (the supervisor) so that (the supervisor) would see him as likeable," and "Took an interest in (the supervisor)’s personal life so that (the supervisor) would see him as friendly."

**Study 1a**

Participants were students enrolled in a management course at a large southeastern university. The results of the manipulation check confirmed that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect ($\alpha = .90$; $M_{\text{neutral}} = 3.48$, $SD_{\text{neutral}} = .72$; $M_{\text{ingratiation}} = 4.61$, $SD_{\text{ingratiation}} = .48$; $F(1, 95) = 74.29$, $p < .05$). Sample information as well as means, standard deviations, and correlations of Study 1a variables are reported in Table 1. As shown in Table 2, ingratiation had a significant positive effect on ratings of supervisor warmth ($r = .76$, $p < .05$), offering support for Hypothesis 1. The results of Study 1a provide evidence that employees form positive impressions of supervisors’ warmth when observing them receive ingratiatory behaviors from coworkers. Specifically, this study shows these effects when participants have no pre-existing knowledge of the supervisor or the coworker, which makes this very relevant to newcomer situations. One of the key strengths of this study is that due to its experimental design, we are able to rule out alternative explanations for the observed results. The only difference between the two conditions was the behavior of the coworker—the supervisor’s actions remained constant, and participants had no prior information about the supervisor that could have influenced their impressions. One notable limitation of this study is that the participants were students. Even though most students have some work experience and often interact with professors and other authority figures, it is possible that the effect observed was unique to the population based on their lack of employment. Thus, we conducted Study 1b to replicate the results of Study 1a in a sample of full-time working adults.

**Study 1b**
Participants were working adults recruited using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Participants received financial remuneration for participating in this study. The results of the manipulation check confirmed that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect ($\alpha = .91$; $M_{\text{neutral}} = 3.02$, $SD_{\text{neutral}} = .76$; $M_{\text{ingratiation}} = 4.59$, $SD_{\text{ingratiation}} = .48$; $F_{(1,101)} = 158.20^*$, $p < .05$).

Sample information as well as means, standard deviations, and correlations of study variables are presented in Table 3. As shown in Table 2, ingratiation had a significant positive effect on participant ratings of supervisor warmth (.48, $p < .05$). Thus, Study 1b also found support for Hypothesis 1.

**Studies 1c and 1d**

While newcomers are often unfamiliar with their new supervisor, there may be circumstances where they do have some pre-existing knowledge of what this person is like. Thus to better explore the ecological validity of our findings, we ran two additional studies where participants were given small pieces of information about the supervisor before observing the ingratiatory episode. In Study 1c prior to observing the interaction, participants were instructed to imagine that this scenario was taking place in their workplace, and that they had the impression that the supervisor in the video seemed “like a generally nice guy” and “like he’s pretty good at his job.” In Study 1d, the procedure was similar except participants were told the supervisor in the video seemed “like a generally unpleasant guy” and “like he’s pretty bad at his job.” These statements were designed to give the participants pre-existing positive or negative information about the supervisor to determine if the effects of observed ingratiatation still influenced ratings of supervisor warmth in these situations.

Participants were working adults recruited using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk who received financial remuneration for participating in this study. The results of the manipulation
check confirmed that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect for study 1c ($\alpha = .89$; $M_{neutral} = 2.85$, $SD_{neutral} = .81$; $M_{ingratiation} = 4.26$, $SD_{ingratiation} = .67$; $F_{(1,67)} = 61.45^*$, $p < .05$), and study 1d ($\alpha = .93$; $M_{neutral} = 3.05$, $SD_{neutral} = .72$; $M_{ingratiation} = 4.40$, $SD_{ingratiation} = .57$; $F_{(1,75)} = 82.97^*$, $p < .05$). Sample information as well as means, standard deviations and correlations for variables used in Study 1c and Study 1d are presented in Table 4 and Table 5, respectively. As shown in Table 2, ingratiation had a significant influence on ratings of supervisor warmth in Study 1c (.55, $p < .05$) and Study 1d (.63, $p < .05$). Together, the results provide evidence that the effects of ingratiation on newcomer impressions of supervisor warmth are significant even when the newcomer has some pre-existing information about the supervisor. Thus, these studies not only support the findings of Studies 1a-1b, but also provide added support for the ecological validity of these findings.

**Study 1e**

Our theoretical development suggests that while ingratiation represents a challenging situation within the social influence literature, viewing this phenomenon through the lens of newcomers offers insight because newcomers are in a unique position relative to their new supervisor. Drawing from uncertainty management theory (van den Bos, 2001), we suggest that newcomers are motivated to evaluate their new supervisor and will likely ignore the features of ingratiation that suggest it should be discounted and focus on the positive social cues it sends about the supervisor. Studies 1a-1d offer support for our hypothesis that newcomers who observe a supervisor being ingratiated will develop positive impressions of the supervisor’s warmth, but in order to establish discriminant validity and explore whether this phenomenon is unique to newcomers we ran an additional study. In Study 1e, instead of being told to imagine that the observed ingratiation scenario was taking place at their own workplace, participants were
instructed to imagine that the observed ingratiation scenario was taking place at an office at which they were consultants and their contract was about to end. In this way, this scenario removes the newcomer dimension, as the parties involved are neither a supervisor nor a coworker. The results of the manipulation check confirmed that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect ($\alpha = .90; M_{neutral} = 3.27, SD_{neutral} = .82; M_{ingratiation} = 4.31, SD_{ingratiation} = .60; F_{(1,65)} = 36.08^*, p < .05$). Sample information as well as means, standard deviations, and correlations for variables used in Study 1e are reported in Table 6. As shown in Table 2, ingratiation had no significant influence on perceptions of supervisor warmth in Study 1e (.$04, ns$). These results suggest that, as predicted, the effect of observed ingratiation on perceptions of supervisor warmth is limited to the newcomer situation.

**Discussion**

The combined results of Study 1 suggest that observing ingratiation toward a supervisor sends newcomers positive signals about the supervisor’s warmth. This effect held across multiple samples, and persisted even in situations where observers had some pre-existing positive or negative information about the supervisor. However, in non-newcomer situations we found no evidence for this effect. Thus the results converge to support our hypothesis that newcomers who observe ingratiation have increased perceptions of their supervisors’ warmth.

For their part, supervisors—who are often oblivious to the ingratiator’s motives and appreciate the ingratiation attempts—are inclined to show liking toward the coworker (Baumeister, 1982; 1989; Leary, 1995; 2007; Wayne & Ferris, 1990) by displaying approval, kindness, politeness, or affection—precisely what the ingratiating coworker is seeking (Bolino & Turnley, 1999, Jones & Pittman, 1982). Therefore, newcomers may also be able to obtain first-hand information about the supervisors’ warmth directly from their behavior (Fiske et al., 2007),
and prior evidence suggests that observers consider the actions of the target when observing a
target interact with a third party (Burt & Knez, 1995). The behavior of the supervisor is likely to
lessen the impact of the social information obtained from the coworker’s ingratiationary behaviors,
as direct information is often weighted more heavily than indirect information when forming
impressions (Herr, Kardes, & Kim, 1991). Social information, which is somewhat ambiguous in
nature (Bruner, 1958), is likely to be discounted or overridden in the presence of this more
concrete information (Herr et al., 1991). Therefore, there is likely a substitution effect, whereby
ingratiation on the part of the coworker or liking behaviors on the part of the supervisor should
result in attributions of the supervisor’s warmth. Furthermore, these effects are likely not
additive—the information obtained directly from the supervisor should override or at least
diminish any social information from ingratiation. Therefore, we predict:

_Hypothesis 2:_ Supervisor liking toward the coworker will moderate the relationship
between observed ingratiation and attributions of warmth, such that the relationship is
weaker when the supervisor shows liking behaviors.

**Study 2**

Participants were working adults recruited from an upper-level management course at a
large southeastern university and were offered extra credit for participating in this study.
Participants were randomly assigned into one of four conditions in a 2 x 2 factorial design, which
included two conditions for a subordinate ingratiation condition and two conditions for a
supervisor reaction condition. The procedure and measures for Study 2 were identical to Study 1
except in Study 2 half of the participants watched a video where the supervisor expressed liking
toward the subordinate.\(^3\)
We developed a manipulation of supervisor liking behavior toward subordinates based on the scale developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990). According to this scale, supervisors can show liking toward subordinates through four behaviors: expressing that they like the subordinate, that they get along well with the subordinate, that supervising the subordinate is a pleasure, and that the subordinate is a good friend. Similar to our manipulation of subordinate ingratiation, we developed a manipulation of supervisor liking behavior in which the supervisor expressed all four of these behaviors during their conversation with the subordinate (see Appendix A). Also similar to our manipulation of ingratiation, we were careful to make sure that the flow of the conversation and the conclusions drawn from the conversation were identical across conditions.

Results

Prior to testing Hypothesis 2, we again conducted manipulation checks to ensure that our experimental conditions had the intended effects. For the ingratiation manipulation we used the same procedure as in Study 1, and the results of the manipulation check confirmed that our ingratiation condition had the intended effect ($\alpha = .91; M_{\text{neutral}} = 3.16, SD_{\text{neutral}} = .83; M_{\text{ingratiation}} = 4.38, SD_{\text{ingratiation}} = .67; F_{(1, 185)} = 123.31^*, p < .05$). To test the supervisor liking manipulation we used the 4-item supervisor liking scale developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990). Participants were asked to respond to each of the four items on a scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. These items were aggregated to form a single variable. Results of the manipulation check also confirmed that our liking condition had the intended effect ($\alpha = .92; M_{\text{neutral}} = 3.51, SD_{\text{neutral}} = .63; M_{\text{liking}} = 4.49, SD_{\text{liking}} = .55; F_{(1, 185)} = 126.29^*, p < .05$). Sample information as well as means, standard deviations, and correlations of study variables are reported in Table 7. To test our hypothesis that the supervisor liking response would interact with coworker ingratiation to influence perceptions of warmth, we estimated a two-way analysis of
variance (ANOVA) model. In this model the independent variables were the ingratiation condition and the liking condition, and again we controlled for age, work experience, and political skill. Results of this ANOVA suggested that the interaction between ingratiation and liking was significant ($F(1,186) = 10.28, p < .05$), lending support for Hypothesis 2. To examine this relationship further, in Table 8 we present the means of the ratings of supervisor warmth in each of the four conditions, and in Figure 1 we plot the interaction between ingratiation and liking on participants’ ratings of supervisor warmth. As both Table 8 and Figure 1 illustrate, the warmth means were similar to each other when either the subordinate engaged in ingratiation or the supervisor engaged in liking behavior, and these effects were not additive. Table 8 also presents 95% confidence intervals for ratings of supervisor warmth in each condition, and superscripts indicating which cells are significantly different from each other. As shown in the table, three conditions had no significant differences from each other; only the no ingratiation/no liking condition was significantly different from the other three conditions.

**Discussion**

The results of Study 2 offer support for Hypothesis 2 by showing that the effects of observed ingratiation on impressions of supervisor warmth are weakened in the presence of direct information from the supervisor. In this study, there seemed to be an either/or effect in relation to impressions of the supervisor. If employees either observed the supervisor receiving ingratatory behaviors or observed the supervisor engaging in liking behaviors, they formed positive impressions of the supervisor’s warmth. This suggests that observers use ingratiation behaviors from a coworker in the same way as they use the liking behaviors from the supervisor when they form impressions. Notably, the behaviors were non-additive, as there were no differences between observers who saw both ingratiation and liking, observers who saw only
ingratiation, and observers who saw only liking. This is in line with our theorizing around social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), suggesting that directly observable information weakens, or even overrides, the indirect social information obtained by observing the ingratiation. This finding offers important insights into how newcomers may form impressions of their supervisor, and when combined with the Study 1 findings suggests that newcomers will use whatever information possible to form impressions of their new supervisor. However, ultimately the supervisor still has the ability to control these impressions.

**General Discussion**

Ingratiation is pervasive in organizations, but the literature on social influence is unclear about how observers who recognize it will decipher the information being communicated when one party ingratiates another. On the one hand, the behaviors associated with ingratiation are positive and offer positive cues, yet on the other the motives behind ingratiation are unsavory and should dampen those cues (Cialdini, 1989; 2009; Vonk, 1998). Building on theories of uncertainty management, we speculated that newcomers, who are motivated to gather information about the supervisor (Cuddy et al., 2011), would discount those dampening cues and make positive inferences about the targeted supervisor. Indeed, our Study 1 results suggested that newcomers form positive impressions of their supervisor’s warmth, a trait akin to trust. Notably, the effect disappeared for contractors who observed ingratiation, suggesting that the finding is unique to newcomers.

However, newcomers do not have to rely solely on ingratiation from coworkers when making early impressions of their supervisor. Instead, newcomers can also rely on supervisors to provide information directly to them. The results of Study 2 suggest that coworkers use observed ingratiation in the same way as supervisor liking behaviors when forming impressions of the new
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supervisor. Notably, when ingratiation from coworkers and liking from supervisors were both present, the effects were non-additive. This finding is important, as it suggests that direct information from supervisor liking weakens the effect of the indirect information from coworker ingratiation. In other words, regardless of how others behave toward them, supervisors can still control how they are perceived by new employees.

Contributions to Theory and Practice

This paper contributes to the literature on ingratiation by showing that newcomers will use ingratiation as a source of positive information about targeted supervisors when forming initial impressions. This finding is both novel and important, as it adds clarity to social influence theory for making predictions about how certain types of observers may use ingratiation when forming initial impressions. This paper makes an additional contribution to the ingratiation literature by showing that ingratiators can actually manage the impressions of others. The leading assumption is that ingratiation behaviors exist to manage the impression of the actor performing them. This paper suggests that these behaviors may also be useful for managing the impression of the target, something rarely considered by impression management scholars. This implies that the old adage of “known by the company you keep” could be modified to “known by what the company you keep does”—a finding important to anyone concerned with their own and others’ workplace reputation (Westphal, Park, McDonald, & Hayward, 2012; Westphal & Stern, 2007).

This paper also makes a contribution to research on newcomer impression formation. Research in this area has assumed that newcomers base impressions on what they observe supervisors doing in the early stages of their socialization (e.g., Jones, 1986; McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). We found that newcomers may also use indirect information when forming impressions, illustrating the value in expanding newcomer impression formation
research to include indirect strategies of information seeking (Cialdini, 1989). Finally, the moderating effect of directly observable information contributes to social information processing theory by showing that the predictions made by the theory are strongest in the absence of other more direct sources of information. When more direct information is available, actors may be less reliant on social information. This could have a dramatic impact on the way researchers understand social information processing theory in organizations. For example, employees may use social information to learn that it is okay to steal at work, but that may only be the case if the organization does not address stealing directly.

Our findings have important practical implications for managers. For instance, our results suggest that managers can leverage ingratiating employees to enhance their own reputations with newcomers. However, this tactic should be used with caution due to the known harm these behaviors can have on the reputation of the ingratiator (e.g., Eastman, 1994; Fein, 1996; Vonk, 1998; 1999). In this way, it seems that there is a tradeoff between the reputation of the ingratiator and the supervisor—the supervisor reaps rewards while the ingratiator suffers consequences. Furthermore, supervisors who hope to control their reputation with newcomers should do so deliberately and early on—before impressions can be formed via social cues that the supervisor does not control. This is particularly important for supervisors who choose to be passive or less assertive early in their relationships with new employees.

**Limitations and Conclusion**

As is the case with all research of this type, our study is not without limitations. Because our series of studies was experimental in nature we cannot fully evaluate the ecological validity to actual newcomer situations. In spite of this weakness, the benefit of this design was that it allowed us to evaluate the specific effects of observed ingratiation in a way that would be
difficult to accomplish in a field study. Furthermore, we tested our hypotheses in a variety of situations, including where participants had no information about the supervisor as well as when they had either pre-existing positive or negative information about the supervisor, potentially reducing the ecological validity concern.

Also, our experimental design included interactions between only a male coworker and supervisor. Scholars have long noted the stereotypes men and women face in the workplace (e.g., Eagly & Mladinic, 1989) including how stereotypes impact judgments on warmth (Cuddy et al., 2011). For example, female professionals are often seen as less warm than male professionals (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004). Thus future research should consider the potential moderating effect gender may have on the results reported in this study.

Our theoretical development led us to focus on supervisor warmth, however it is possible that observed ingratiation could result in other impressions of the supervisor. For example, a newcomer may infer that the supervisor is powerful or in control of scarce resources, and this power and control is the motivation behind the ingratiation. Exploring all potential inferences about the supervisor goes beyond the scope of this research, but future research could consider other impressions newcomers may form as a result of observed ingratiation.

Finally, the social information from ingratiation and supervisor reaction were both in the same direction (i.e., positively valenced) suggesting that the supervisor had warmth (Cuddy et al., 2008). We focused on liking behaviors on the part of the supervisor as the focal supervisor reaction because this is typically the reaction that ingratigators seek (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Leary, 1995), thus in the context of our study it was a natural reaction for the supervisor to have. However, it is possible for supervisors to respond in ways that suggest they are not warm. Further research should investigate what happens when the supervisor reacts with disliking or
other negative reactions. If the social information and the direct information were in opposite directions, it could be that the direct information would again override the social information, leading to a more negative impression of the supervisor. Additionally, supervisors often behave inconsistently or in ways that send mixed messages to subordinates (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), and future research could consider the effects of observed ingratiation when supervisors engage in behaviors that communicate contradictory information to newcomers.

The results of our study suggest that newcomers will use coworker ingratiation to form positive impressions of targeted supervisors’ warmth. In multiple studies, we found consistent evidence for our hypothesized relationship between observing ingratiation and supervisor warmth—a phenomenon that occurred only when the observers were newcomers. Moreover, being the target of ingratiation was as important as demonstrating positive behaviors, the strategy long considered a best practice for enhancing one’s reputation. Our results complement important ideas for how newcomers form impressions, for supervisors on how to make good first impressions, and for understanding how ingratiation is interpreted by observers in the workplace.
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Footnotes

1The literature on warmth recognizes that this is a broad category that can be measured in many ways (Cuddy et al., 2008). We chose a measure of warmth that was relevant to the literature on ingratiation, but in order to ensure that this measure maps closely onto scales that have previously been used to measure warmth we conducted two validation studies. In the first study we recruited 65 full time working adults from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (Mage=35.71, SDage=12.24; 71% male; 76.9% Caucasian, 9.2% African American, 6.2% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.1% Hispanic, 4.6% “other”). Participants were asked to view one of the videos depicting a supervisor/subordinate interaction used as our manipulation in this study. Half of the participants viewed a scenario where the subordinate did not ingratiate and the supervisor did not show liking, and half viewed a scenario where the subordinate did not ingratiate and the supervisor did show liking. Afterwards, participants were asked to rate the supervisor using the 4-item measure of warmth developed by Fiske et al. (2002) (sincere, good natured, warm, tolerant) and also the 4-item measure developed by Turnley and Bolino (2001) used in this paper (likeable, cooperative, nice, pleasant). Coefficient alpha for the items in the Fiske et al. (2002) scale (.90) and Turnley and Bolino (2001) scale (.93) were acceptable, so both were aggregated to form single measures. Correlation analysis suggested that these two measures of warmth were highly correlated and thus similar to each other (r = .94, p < .01).

We also conducted a second analysis to assess the content validity of our measure (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999) where we recruited 73 students from a Mid-Atlantic university (Mage=20.85, SDage=2.75; 78% female; 59% Caucasian, 29% Asian, 3% African American, 4% Hispanic, 5% other). Participants were asked to read a statement that defined warmth as “displaying affection, kindness, and/or enthusiasm” (Simpson, 2016), and then asked to rate how closely each adjective in both the Fiske et al. (2002) measure of warmth (warm1) and the Turnley and Bolino (2001) measure of warmth (warm2) matched the concept and definition of warmth on a scale ranging from 1 = Extremely Bad match to the concept and its definition to 7 = Extremely Good match to the concept and its definition. The alpha coefficients for warm1 (.68) and warm2 (.91) were acceptable, so each were aggregated to form single variables. We conducted a repeated measures ANOVA to determine if there were any differences in the way participants judged each scale relative to the concept and definition of warmth provided, and results of this analysis suggested that there was no difference between the measures (Mwarm1=5.58, SDwarm1=.81, Mwarm2=5.74, SDwarm2=1.18; F(1,72)=1.66, ns). This further suggested that the two measures of warmth were highly related to each other.

2Because prior research has included political skill as a moderator in models exploring ingratiation in supervisor/subordinate relationships (Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams, & Thatcher, 2007), in post hoc analyses as a robustness check in all studies we explored political skill as a moderator of the hypothesized relationships in this paper. We found that the inclusion of this moderator parameter did not have any significant effect on the interpretation of our results, and thus in the interest of parsimony we did not include it in the reported models.
To assess the realism of our videos, we asked a sample of 41 newcomers who had been with their current organization fewer than 90 days to watch the videos of the coworker ingratiating the supervisor (n = 16), or the supervisor showing liking to the employee (n = 25). We then asked the participants to answer two questions about the scenario. For the first question ("In 1-2 sentences, describe why you think someone would act the way the supervisor/coworker acted in this scenario"), 100% of the participants reported why someone would act the way depicted. In other words, none of the participants indicated that someone would not act the way depicted. For the second question ("In 1-2 sentences, describe a scenario where you have seen a supervisor/coworker act the way depicted"), 93% of the participants described someone they had seen act this way. For example, one participant wrote, "I have seen my friend Jim act this way at our company. He likes to give lots of compliments and make a lot of small talk," and another wrote, "A lot of my supervisors have acted like him." These results support the realism of the behaviors seen in the videos.
Table 1
Study 1a Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Ingratiation</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Political Skill</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Age</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Experience</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 97. Sample was 69% female and 64% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal * p < .05. † p < .10.
Table 2

Unstandardized Results of Study 1 Warmth Regression Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study 1a Model 1</th>
<th>Study 1a Model 2</th>
<th>Study 1b Model 1</th>
<th>Study 1b Model 2</th>
<th>Study 1c Model 1</th>
<th>Study 1c Model 2</th>
<th>Study 1d Model 1</th>
<th>Study 1d Model 2</th>
<th>Study 1e Model 1</th>
<th>Study 1e Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.36* [.85]</td>
<td>2.92* [.81]</td>
<td>2.72* [.81]</td>
<td>2.08* [.92]</td>
<td>1.86* [.92]</td>
<td>2.76* [.82]</td>
<td>2.70* [.79]</td>
<td>2.01* [.98]</td>
<td>1.99* [1.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.00 [.02]</td>
<td>.00 [.02]</td>
<td>.04 [.03]</td>
<td>.05† [.03]</td>
<td>.00 [.02]</td>
<td>.00 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>-.37* [.16]</td>
<td>-.39* [.15]</td>
<td>-.03 [.03]</td>
<td>-.04 [.03]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>.02 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>.01 [.02]</td>
<td>-.01 [.02]</td>
<td>-.01 [.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.37†</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.47†</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ F</td>
<td>13.47*</td>
<td>6.73*</td>
<td>6.55*</td>
<td>7.37*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05. † p < .10. Standard Errors reported below parameter estimates in [ ].
Table 3

*Study 1b Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political Skill</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>37.35</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Experience</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 103. Sample was 52% female and 69% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal * p < .05. † p < .10.*
Table 4

*Study 1c Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political Skill</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>32.62</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Experience</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 69. Sample was 40% female and 84% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal. * p < .05. † p < .10.*
Table 5

*Study 1* Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political Skill</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>36.06</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Experience</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 77. Sample was 33% female and 73% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal. *p < .05. †p < .10.
Table 6

*Study 1e Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political Skill</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.24†</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Experience</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 67. Sample was 36% female and 81% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal. * $p < .05$. † $p < .10.$*
Table 7
Study 2 Sample Information, Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ingratiation</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liking</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor Warmth</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Skill</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Experience</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 186. Sample was 55% female and 71% caucasian. Coefficient Alpha reported along the diagonal. * p < .05. † p < .10.
Table 8

*Study 2 Results of Two-Way ANOVA on Supervisor Warmth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liking Condition</th>
<th>Ingratiation Condition</th>
<th>No Liking</th>
<th>Liking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91 (1.07) (^{2,3,4})</td>
<td>3.95 (.90) (^{1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.76, 3.06]</td>
<td>[3.82, 4.08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85 (.97) (^{1})</td>
<td>4.07 (.81) (^{1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3.71, 3.99]</td>
<td>[3.95, 4.19]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 186. Standard Deviations are reported in () 95% confidence interval reported in[]. Superscript indicates which cells are significantly different from each other based on overlapping 95% confidence intervals.*
Figure Caption

*Figure 1.* Interaction of Ingratiation Behavior and Liking Behavior on Impressions of Supervisor Warmth in Study 2
Appendix A

Subordinate Ingratiation Scenario

*Compliment:* I’d take your advice any day because you’re a really sharp dresser. It may sound funny but when I’m getting ready for a client meeting, I always ask myself, “What would (supervisor) wear?”

*Interest in Personal Life:* I remember someone saying your daughter plays soccer. Does she still play?

*Praise:* But I’d be crazy not to go with your instinct. You had an absolutely amazing quarter; I really was just in awe. So whatever you think, I’m good with.

*Personal Favor:* I brought you this coffee from the cafeteria. You didn’t ask, but I figured since I was down there I’d bring you one too. I know how you like your coffee – 2 creams, 1 sugar.

Supervisor Liking Scenario (Study 2 only)

*Liking:* You know, you’re a good guy, (subordinate), I like you. I wish the company had more guys like you. It sure would make my job a lot easier.

*Get along well:* This meeting should be a good one. You and I get along really well, so it might actually be fun.

*Pleasure supervising:* It really is a pleasure being your manager; you make things so easy on me. Maybe too easy….

*Friend:* By the way, Brian, over the holiday weekend my wife and I are having a few friends over for a BBQ. Would you and your wife like to come over?