

**FACTORS AFFECTING THE USE OF UPWARD & DOWNWARD
IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS FOR POSITIVE
APPRAISALS**

PRIYANKA JAISWAL



**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

MAY 2015

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2015

**FACTORS AFFECTING THE USE OF UPWARD & DOWNWARD
IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS FOR POSITIVE
APPRAISALS**

By

PRIYANKA JAISWAL

Department of Management Studies

Submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

MAY 2015

This Thesis is Dedicated to My Parents

Mrs. Meena Jaiswal

&

Mr. Nagwant Prasad Jaiswal

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**Factors Affecting the Use of Upward & Downward Impression Management Tactics for Positive Appraisals**”, being submitted by **Ms. Priyanka Jaiswal** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)**, is a record of bonafide research work carried out by her. She has worked under my supervision and has fulfilled the requirements for the submission of this thesis, which has attained the standard required for Ph.D. degree of the Institute. The results presented in this thesis have not been submitted elsewhere for award of any degree or diploma.

Date:

(Kanika T. Bhal)

Research Supervisor

Professor

Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi, India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my most sincere gratitude to my research supervisor Prof. Kanika T. Bhal, whose valuable guidance and help has enabled me to carry out this research work. I found a mentor in her, who guided, encouraged, and supported me during my entire journey of the doctoral program. Her patience, high standards, and willingness to help me, provided me with the confidence and direction, which I most needed, and which I appreciate. I have been very fortunate to have worked with her. My deepest love and gratitude towards her.

I am extremely indebted to the research committee, all other distinguish faculty members of the department for their encouragement, help and timely advice for keeping my spirit high throughout the study to enable its successful completion.

I would like to thank my seniors, friends and colleagues, Tuheena, Parul, Gaurav, Abhishek, Amit, Sumant, Krishnendu, and Megha whose critical observations and great source of support helped me refine my work.

Last but not the least I would like to express my gratitude to my parents Mr. Nagwant Prasad Jaiswal and Mrs. Meena Jaiswal for their endearing support and blessing throughout my PhD. My sisters Ranjana, Namrata and Amrita, my brother Abhishek, and my brothers in-law Rishi and Kuldeep for their constant encouragement and motivation. My husband Omveer deserves a special mention here for his loving support, cooperation, adjustment, and patience in trying times.

Date:

Priyanka Jaiswal

ABSTRACT

This research is designed to study the use of IM tactics in the workplace. Besides assessing the impact of actor characteristics (Machiavellianism, self-efficacy, need for achievement, power, and affiliation) and organizational values (Machiavellian culture), it also studies the use of target Mach and target power and the use of IM tactics. It uniquely studies the use of impression management, both by the subordinates (upward) and the leader (downward) to impress each other. In this context, LMX is seen as an important factor. IM tactics have been classified as self and other on one dimension and positive and negative, on the other, thus leading to focus generic types of IM tactics.

The study objectives are addressed through three studies. Two experimental and one survey. After reporting the methodological details and establishing the psychometric properties of the scale, key results of each study are reported in three chapters. Overall, our results reveal a higher use of IM by the subordinates to impress the leaders (upward) than vice versa. Results reveal that in general high Mach on the part of actors and organization leads to a higher use of IM tactics in general. However, high Mach on the part of targets is not so significant. High perceived power of the target, usually restraints the actors from using intimidation. People high on self-efficacy need for achievement, affiliation use positive IM tactics, through the reasons may be uniquely different for the factors. Practical implementations are provided and limitations of the research are discussed for future directions of research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
AKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Classification of Impression Management Tactics.....	2
1.1.2 Studying Downward Impression Management Tactics	5
1.1.3 Importance of Target Characteristics in Impression Management	6
1.1.4 Actor's Characteristics	7
1.1.5 Importance of Culture Context in Impression Management.....	7
1.2 Broad Research Questions.....	8
1.3 Research Overview.....	8
1.4 Implication & Relevance of the Study	9
1.5 Chapter Plan	10
CHAPTER 2 : REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
2.1 Impression Management	13
2.2 Impression Management in Organizations.....	16
2.2.1 Upward and Downward Impression Management.....	17
2.3 Motives of Impression Management.....	18
2.3.1 Impression Management and Performance Rating	19
2.4 Classification of Impression Management Tactics.....	20
2.4.1 Self-Focused IM Tactics	22
2.4.1.1 Positive Self-Focused IM Tactics.....	23
2.4.1.2 Negative Self-Focused IM Tactics	26
2.4.2 Other Focused IM Tactics	27

2.4.2.1 Positive Other Focused IM Tactics	27
2.4.2.2 Negative Other Focused IM Tactics	28
2.5 Factors Affecting Impression Management Tactics.....	30
2.5.1 Target Characteristics (Target's Individual Factors)	31
2.5.1.1 Machiavellianism :(Target's Mach)	31
2.5.1.2 Power: (Target's Power).....	32
2.5.2 Contextual Factors.....	34
2.5.2.1 Organizational Machiavellianism (Organizational Mach)	34
2.5.2.2 Leader Member Exchange (LMX)	36
2.5.3 Actor Characteristics (Actor's Individual Factors).....	39
2.5.3.1 Machiavellian Characteristics of the Actor (Actor's Mach)	39
2.5.3.2 Self -efficacy:	39
2.5.3.3 Need for Achievement.....	40
2.5.3.4 Need for Power	40
2.5.3.5 Need for Affiliation:	41
2.6 Research Gaps	42
2.7 Overall Objectives	44
CHAPTER 3: IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS, TARGET, AND ORGANIZATIONAL MACHIAVELLIANISM EXPERIMENTAL STUDY 1	45
3.1 Introduction	45
3.1.1 Objectives.....	45
3.1.2 Background	47
3.1.3 Research Design.....	47
3.1.3.1 Control Variables.....	48
3.2 Study 1A: Upward Impression Management	48
3.2.1 Methodology	48
3.2.1.1 Sample Details.....	48
3.2.1.1 Procedure of Data Collection	49
3.2.1.2 Experimental Design	50
3.2.1.3 Measures	50
3.2.2 Data Analysis	54
3.2.2.1 Psychometric Properties of Dependent Variables	54

3.2.2.2 Check on Experimental Manipulations	58
3.2.3 Results and Analysis: Study 1A	59
3.3 Study 1B: Downward Impression Management.....	66
3.3.1 Methodology	66
3.3.1.1 Sample Details.....	66
3.3.1.2 Procedure of Data Collection	67
3.3.1.3 Experimental Design	67
3.3.1.4 Measures.....	68
3.3.2 Data Analysis	68
3.3.2.1 Psychometric Properties Study 1B	68
3.3.2.2 Check on Experimental Manipulations	71
3.3.3 Results and Analysis: Study 1B	73
3.4 Key Findings	81
CHAPTER 4: IMPACT OF TARGET POWER AND LMX ON UPWARD AND DOWNWARD IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS EXPERIMENTAL STUDY 2.....	83
4.1 Introduction	83
4.1.1 Objectives.....	83
4.1.2 Background	85
4.1.3 Research Design.....	86
4.2 Study 2A: Upward Impression Management	87
4.2.1 Methodology	87
4.2.1.1 Sample Details.....	87
4.2.1.1 Procedure of Data Collection	87
4.2.1.2 Experimental Design	87
4.2.1.3 Measures.....	88
4.2.2 Data Analysis	91
4.2.2.1 Psychometric Properties of Dependent Variables	97
4.2.2.2 Check on Experimental Manipulations	94
4.3 Study 2B: Downward Impression Management.....	105
4.3.1 Methodology	105
4.3.1.1 Sample Details.....	105
4.3.1.2 Procedure of Data Collection	105

4.3.1.3 Experimental Design	106
4.2.1.4 Measure	106
4.3.2 Data Analysis	107
4.3.2.1 Psychometric Properties Study 2B	107
4.3.2.2 Check on Experimental Manipulations	110
4.3.3 Results and Findings	111
3.4 Summary of the Results.....	119
CHAPTER 5: IMPACT OF ACTOR & SITUATION RELATED FACTORS ON THE USE OF IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT TACTICS:SURVEY STUDY	121
5.1 Introduction	121
5.2 Background	121
5.3 Study Objectives.....	122
5.4 Instruments Used.....	123
5.4.1 Actor's Machiavellianism Characteristics	123
5.4.2 Self Efficacy Scale	123
5.4.3 Need	123
5.4.5 Organizational Machiavellianism	124
5.4.6 Impression Management Tactics.....	124
5.5 Methodology	124
5.5.1 Participants	125
5.6.2 Testing the Psychometric Properties of the Scale: Measurement Model	125
5.6 Analysis and Results	142
5.7 Key Results.....	148
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	151
6.1 Introduction	151
6.2 Summary of Key Results.....	151
6.3 Discussion	153
6.3.1 Machiavellianism and Use of IM Tactics	153
6.3.3 LMX and the Use of IM Tactics	158
6.3.4 Actor's Self-Efficacy and Use of IM Tactics.....	160
6.3.5 Actor's Need for Achievement and the Use of IM Tactics.....	161
6.4 Implications of the Research	162

6.4.1 Impression Management: A Practical Outlook	162
6.4.2.1 Selection Interviews	163
6.4.2.2 Performance Appraisal / Reward.....	164
6.3.2.3 Balancing Power.....	167
6.5 Limitations and Directions for Future Research	167
REFERENCES	169
ANNEXURE I.....	191
ANNEXURE II	197
ANNEXURE III	201
ANNEXURE IV	206
ANNEXURE V	210
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	215

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Classification of Impression Management.....	22
Figure 2.2:	Research Model	43
Figure 3.1:	Study 1 Research Model	46
Figure 3.2:	Research Design: 2x2 Matrix for Study 1A.....	50
Figure 3.3:	The Estimated marginal mean for Entitlements tactic (Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach as Independent variables).....	61
Figure 3.4:	Mean of Entitlement in Different Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach Situation.....	62
Figure 3.5:	The Estimated marginal mean for Supplication tactic (Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach as Independent variables).....	63
Figure 3.6:	Mean of Supplication Tactic in Different Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach Situation.....	63
Figure 3.7:	The Estimated marginal mean for Blasting (Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach as Independent variable)	64
Figure 3.8:	Mean of Blasting in different Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach Situations.....	65
Figure 3.9:	Research Design: 2x2 Matrix for Study 1B.....	67
Figure 3.10:	The Estimated marginal mean for Self-Enhancement Tactic (Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach as Independent variable)	75
Figure 3.11:	Mean of Self-Enhancement Tactic in Different Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach Situation.....	75
Figure 3.12:	The Estimated Marginal Mean for Supplication Tactic (Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach as Independent Variable)	77
Figure 3.13:	Mean of Supplication Tactic in different Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach Situations	77
Figure 3.14:	The Estimated Marginal Mean for Intimidation Tactic (Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach as Independent Variable	79
Figure 3.15:	Mean of Intimidation Tactic in Different Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach Situations	79

Figure 4.1:	Study 2 Research Model	85
Figure 4.2:	Research Design: 2x2 Matrix for Study 2A.....	88
Figure 4.3:	Estimated Marginal Mean for Exemplification Tactic (Leader's Power and LMX as Independent Variables).....	101
Figure 4.4:	Mean of Exemplification Tactic in Different Leader's Power and LMX Situations.....	102
Figure 4.5:	Estimated Marginal Mean for Intimidation (Leader's Power and LMX as Independent Variables)	103
Figure 4.6:	Mean of Intimidation Tactic in Different Leader's Power and LMX Situations.	103
Figure 4.7:	Research Design: 2x2 Matrix for Study 2B.....	106
Figure 4.8:	Estimated Marginal Mean for Intimidation (Subordinate's Power and LMX as Independent Variables)	115
Figure 4.9:	Mean of Intimidation Tactic in Different (Subordinate's Power and LMX Situations.....	115
Figure 4.10:	Estimated Marginal Mean for Blasting Tactics (Subordinate's Power and LMX as Independent Variables).....	117
Figure 4.11:	Mean of Blasting Tactic in Different Subordinate's Power and LMX Situations.....	117
Figure 5.1:	Study 3 Model.....	122
Figure 5.2:	CFA 5 factor model for Individual Level Factors	127
Figure 5.3:	One factor CFA model for Individual Level Antecedent Variables	128
Figure 5.4:	CFA Model for Contextual Variable Organizational Mach	131
Figure 5.5:	CFA 4 Factor model for the Self Focused Depersonalized IM Tactics	133
Figure 5.6:	One factor CFA model for the Self Focused Depersonalized IM Tactics	134
Figure 5.7:	CFA 3 Factor Model for Other-Focused IM Tactics	136
Figure 5.8:	One Factor CFA Model for Other-Focused IM Tactics.....	137
Figure 5.9:	Moderating Effect of Organizational Mach on Actor's Mach and IM Tactics Relationship	145
Figure 5.10:	Graphical representation of Moderation by Organizational Machiavellianism on Actor's Mach and Exemplification IM Tactic.....	145
Figure 5.11:	Moderating Effect of Organizational Mach on Need for Power and IM Tactics .. Relationship	146
Figure 5.12:	Graphical representation of Moderation by Organizational Machiavellianism on Need for Power and Ingratiation IM Tactic	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1:	Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Each Impression Management Tactics	56
Table 3.2:	Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Dependent Variables	57
Table 3.3:	Correlation and Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variable (IM Tactics)	58
Table 3.4:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Leader's (Target) Mach on Self-Enhancement as Upward IM Tactic.....	60
Table 3.5:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach on Entitlements Tactic	61
Table 3.6:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach on Supplication Tactic	62
Table 3.7:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach on Blasting Tactic	64
Table 3.8:	ANOVA Significance Results Summary: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Leader's Mach on Upward IM Tactics	65
Table 3.9:	Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Each Impression Management Tactics	69
Table 3.10:	Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Dependent Variables Study 1B	70
Table 3.11:	Correlation and Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variables (IM Tactics) Study 1B.....	71
Table 3.12:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Subordinate's (Target) Mach on Exemplification as Downward IM Tactic.....	73
Table 3.13:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach (Target) on Self-Enhancement as Downward IM Tactic	74
Table 3.14:	ANOVA Result: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Subordinate's (Target) Mach on Supplication as Downward IM Tactic	76
Table 3.15:	ANOVA result: Effect of Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach (Target) on Intimidation as Downward IM Tactic.....	78

Table 3.16:	ANOVA Significance Results Summary: The Effect of Organizational Mach and Subordinate's Mach on IM Tactics.....	80
Table 3.17:	Combined Result Studies 1A & 1B	80
Table 4.1:	Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Each Impression Management Tactics for Study 2A	92
Table 4.2:	Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Dependent Variables (IM Tactics) for Study 2A	93
Table 4.3:	Correlation and Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variables (IM Tactics) for . Study 2A	94
Table 4.4:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's (Target) Power and LMX on Self-Promotion as Upward IM Tactic.....	97
Table 4.5:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's (Target) Power and LMX on Entitlement as Upward IM Tactic.....	98
Table 4.6:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's Power (Target) and LMX on Self-Enhancement as Upward IM Tactic.....	98
Table 4.7:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's (Target) Power and LMX on Supplication as Upward IM Tactic.....	99
Table 4.8:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's Power and LMX on Ingratiation Tactic.....	99
Table 4.9:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's (Target) Power and LMX on Blasting as Upward IM Tactic.....	100
Table 4.10:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's (Target) Power and LMX Exemplification as Upward IM Tactic	100
Table 4.11:	ANOVA Result: Effect of Leader's Power and LMX Intimidation as Upward IM Tactic.....	102
Table 4.12:	ANOVA significance Results Summary: Effect of Leader's Power and LMX Upward IM Tactics	104
Table 4.13:	Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Each Impression Management Tactics for Study 2B	108
Table 4.14:	Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Dependent Variables for Study 2B.....	109
Table 4.15:	Correlation and Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variables (IM Tactics) for .	

Study 2B.....	110
Table 4.16: ANOVA Result: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Self-promotion Tactic.....	112
Table 4.17: ANOVA Result: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Entitlements Tactic.....	113
Table 4.18: ANOVA Result: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Ingratiation Tactic.....	113
Table 4.19: ANOVA Result: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Intimidation Tactic.....	114
Table 4.20: ANOVA Result: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Blasting Tactic.	116
Table 4.21: ANOVA Results Summary: Effect of Subordinate's Power and LMX on Different Downward IM Tactics.....	118
Table 4.22: Combined Result Studies 2A & 2B	118
Table 5.1: Descriptive Statistics of the Demographic Factors of the Respondents	125
Table 5.2: Multiple Fit indices of Measurement model Compared with the Nested Model (One factor) and the Null Model for Actor's Characteristics Variables	129
Table 5.3: Fit Statistics of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for One Factor Model of Actor's Characteristics	129
Table 5.4: Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of The Actor's Characteristics Variables	130
Table 5.5: Fit Statistics of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Organizational Factor..	131
Table 5.6: Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted and Cronbach Alpha of Organization Factor.....	132
Table 5.7: Multiple Fit indices of Measurement model Compared with the Nested Model (One factor) and the Null model for Self Focused Depersonalized IM Tactics.	134
Table 5.8: Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of Self Focused Depersonalized IM Tactics..	135
Table 5.9: Multiple Fit indices of Measurement model Compared with the Nested Model (One factor) and the Null model for Other-Focused IM Tactics	137
Table 5.10: Descriptive Statistics: Factor Loading, Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted, and Cronbach Alpha of the Target focused IM Tactics.....	138
Table 5.1: Summary of the Fit Indices of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Study 3	139

Table 5.12: Discriminant Validity of Actor's Characteristics	139
Table 5.13: Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variables (Self Focused IM Tactics).....	140
Table 5.14: Discriminant Validity of Dependent Variables (Other Focused IM Tactics) ...	140
Table 5.15: Inter-correlation Table for All Study Variables.....	141
Table 5.16: Regression Results: Effect individual Factors on Different IM Tactics	142
Table 5.17: Regression Results: Effect of Contextual Factors on Different IM Tactics	144
Table 5.18: Moderating Effect of organizational Machiavellianism on Actor's Mach and Impression Management Tactics Relationship.....	145
Table 5.19: Moderating Effect of organizational Machiavellianism on Need for Power and Impression Management Tactics Relationship	147
Table 6.1: Summary of Key Results	152

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BLS	Blasting
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
CR	Composite Reliability
ENT	Entitlements
EXE	Exemplification
GFI	Goodness of Fit Index
IFI	Incremental Fit Index
IM	Impression Management
ING	Ingratiation
INT	Intimidation
LMX	Leader Member Exchange
Mach	Machiavellianism
N-Achi	Need For Achievement
N-Affi	Need For Affiliation
NFI	Normed Fit Index
N-Pow	Need for Power
O Mach	Organizational Machiavellianism
Pow	Power
RMSEA	Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation
S.ENH	Self-Enhancement
SD	Slandered Deviation
SEff	Self-Efficacy
SP	Self Promotion
SUP	Supplication