ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Indirect Ingratiation: Pleasing People by Associating Them with Successful Others and by Praising Their Associates

Nurit Tal-Or

Department of Communication, University of Haifa, Mount Carmel, Haifa 31905, Israel

Most of the literature on impression management considers direct tactics such as self-promoting by mentioning personal achievements and ingratiating by complimenting others. These direct tactics can backfire if the target recognizes the hidden motive behind them. Therefore, people often use indirect impression management tactics. Previous research has shown that people promote themselves indirectly by associating themselves with successful others or by magnifying the characteristics of others to whom they are connected. The current research suggests that when the motive is ingratiation, the impression manager highlights the success of a person who is close to the target of ingratiation. The four experiments of the current research documented this tactic and examined its consequences for the impression manager and for the target.

Since Goffman's (1959) and Jones's (1964) seminal works, researchers have acknowledged people's tendency to engage in impression management in order to influence the way they are perceived by others. People attempt to appear capable, likable, and, on occasion, even threatening or incompetent. In recent years, communication scholars have documented the role of impression management motives in many aspects of interaction including its planning (Berger & Bell, 1988), the narratives the interactants tell (Markham Shaw, 1997), the choices of channels of communication (O'Sullivan, 2000), and the impression formed of the conversational partner (Monahan, 1995).

In order to be liked, people use a class of tactics that is commonly called ingratiation (Jones, 1990). These tactics include opinion conformity, the doing of favors, and enhancing the other through flattery and compliments (Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1995). On the other hand, in order to appear competent, individuals engage in self-promotion by mentioning their personal accomplishments and unique characteristics (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1986). Although there are situations in which it is possible to both ingratiate and self-promote successfully, in most cases these tactics counter each other. It is common for a person who manages to be perceived

Corresponding author: Nurit Tal-Or; e-mail: ntalor@com.hevra.haifa.ac.il

as competent to also make others feel jealous and resentful (Rosenfeld et al., 1995). Furthermore, using the tactics of self-promotion does not always result even in the person being perceived as capable. As people become aware of the hidden motive behind an individual's self-enhancement, they may perceive him or her as manipulative instead of capable (Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986). Therefore, in many cases people prefer to promote themselves indirectly.

Indirect self-promotion

Cialdini and his colleagues were the first researchers who documented the usage of indirect impression management tactics (Cialdini et al., 1976). They claimed that people manage their impression by associating themselves with other people, groups, or things (Cialdini, 1989). These researchers have demonstrated people's tendency to associate themselves with successful others in order to win prestige, a process they called basking in reflected glory (hereafter, basking). For example, they found that football fans use the first-person pronoun ''we'' much more often in their description of their team's success compared with their description of the team's failure. Cialdini and his colleagues have also shown that people do not only try to connect themselves to successful others but also attempt to improve the prestige of those with whom they are already connected by mentioning their accomplishments or by describing their attributes favorably, a process called burnishing (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980).

The perception of indirect self-promotion

The rationale for this association with successful others is explained by the balance theory (Heider, 1958). According to this theory, the desire for cognitive balance leads to associated things being perceived as similar to one another. Thus, associating oneself with successful others may result in being perceived by other people as more capable. Previous research indeed showed that people benefit from even a slight association with successful others. For example, Gilovich (1981) found that a football player who shared an irrelevant attribute, such as the same hometown, with another successful football player was evaluated as a better player.

However, in previous research the association with successful others was generally made by a third party, not by the impression manager (e.g., Gilovich, 1981; Kernis & Wheeler, 1981). Similarly, in a study in which the association was made by the impression manager, it was done so in response to a question (Carter & Sanna, 2006). Under such conditions, there is no reason to suspect the motives of the individual (e.g., Holtgraves & Srull, 1989). In the only two studies to date that examined the perception of indirect self-promotion, which was initiated by the impression manager, the impression formed of the self-promoter was not so positive. The person who depicted a close other positively or associated himself or herself with a successful other was perceived as less likable or manipulative (Lebherz, Jonas, & Tomljenovic, 2009; Tal-Or, 2008).

Indirect ingratiation

As mentioned earlier, associating oneself with successful others serves mainly self-promotion purposes. Yet, self-promotion is not the only motive for impression management. Ingratiation is another major motive. Although previous research has focused on direct tactics of ingratiation, to date there has been no mention of the possibility of indirect ingratiation.[1]

According to Jones (1990), ingratiation is probably the most common type of impression management. People attempt to be perceived as likable by doing various kinds of favors, by expressing opinions similar to those held by others, and by complimenting their interactants (Rosenfeld et al., 1995). Complimenting the targets of impression management shows the speakers' fondness for them (Vonk, 2002) and raises the targets' self-esteem (Leary, Haupt, Strausser, & Chokel, 1998). Because people tend to like those who like them (Backman & Secord, 1959; Singh, Yeo, Lin, & Tan, 2007) and those who reward them (Byrne, 1997), the targets of ingratiation are assumed to like the ingratiators. Previous research has indeed documented the effectiveness of the ingratiation tactics in making others like us and treat us nicely (e.g., Seiter, 2007). According to this research, it is much easier to succeed in ingratiation than in self-promotion (Godfrey et al., 1986). Even if an outside observer sees through the manipulative attempt, the target of the ingratiation usually likes the flatterer (Vonk, 2002).

However, as suggested by the "ingratiation dilemma" (Jones, 1990), the more important it is to the impression manager to succeed in his or her ingratiation attempts and be perceived as likable by a specific person, the more sensitive this person will be to any signals hinting at a lack of authenticity and the presence of manipulation. In order to avoid being perceived as unauthentic and manipulative, impression managers use various approaches that increase the likelihood of successful ingratiation (Rosenfeld et al., 1995). These approaches include the usage of a third party to deliver the compliment (Liden & Mitchell, 1988) and making the compliments credible by mixing praise over important issues with criticism of minor issues (Rosenfeld et al., 1995). The current research suggests that just as people use indirect self-promotion in order to self-promote without being perceived as manipulative, they also use indirect ingratiation in order to ingratiate without risking negative consequences. While the concept of indirect impression management that was introduced by Cialdini (1989) focused on the success of a person associated with the impression manager, the current research focused on the success of a person associated with the target of the impression management attempt (hereafter, the target).

This study proposes that a person with the motive of being liked can enhance the target indirectly by praising people associated with that target, rather than praising the target directly. For example, a student who wants to be liked by her lecturer can express her admiration for the beauty of the lecturer's children. As mentioned earlier, people promote themselves indirectly by associating themselves with successful others (basking) or by improving the prestige of those with whom they are

already connected by mentioning their accomplishments (burnishing) (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). It is claimed here that people use the same tactics in order to ingratiate: They praise a person who is associated with the target of their ingratiation (ingratiation through burnishing) or attempt to associate the target with successful people (ingratiation through basking).

To conclude, the suggested process of indirect ingratiation moves as follows: In order to ingratiate in a subtle way, ingratiators mention the success of a person close to the target or associate the target with a successful other. As being associated with a successful other enhances the self (Cialdini, 1989), it is perceived as a compliment by the target of the ingratiation. Receiving a compliment makes the targets believe that the ingratiator likes them (Vonk, 2002). Given that we like those who like us (Singh et al., 2007), and those who reward us (Byrne, 1997), the process ends with the target's increased liking for the ingratiator.

The aim of the current research was to document the existence of these two tactics of indirect ingratiation and to examine the perceptions formed by the target of these indirect tactics. Study 1 examined the occurrence of ingratiation through burnishing and Study 2 tested its effectiveness. Study 3 examined the occurrence of ingratiation through basking and Study 4 tested its effectiveness. In all of these experiments, there are three main people who play a role: (a) the impression manager who attempts to impress the target, (b) the target whose role is to form an impression of the impression manager, and (c) the successful third person whom the impression manager mentions in order to manage his or her impression indirectly. In Studies 1 and 3, the naive participant played the role of the impression manager and in Studies 2 and 4 the participant was the target of the ingratiation.

Experiment 1: Ingratiation through burnishing

According to Cialdini and Richardson (1980), people will tend to praise the success of someone with whom they are already connected in order to be perceived as competent. It is hypothesized here that in order to ingratiate people will tend to praise the success of someone with whom the target of their ingratiation is connected. Given that being associated with successful others enhances the self (Cialdini, Finch, & De Nicholas, 1990), the impression managers, as naive scientists, should be aware that praising their target's associate flatters their target. Thus, impression managers will tend to praise a person who is connected to their target, especially when their motive is to ingratiate. Similarly, it is assumed here that in a case in which the third person is mentioned by the target, the impression manager will respond positively to the raising of the issue and will be willing to discuss it if this person is close to their target, especially when the motive is to ingratiate. This reasoning leads to the following four research hypotheses:

> H1: Impression managers will praise other people when these individuals are connected to their target more than when they are not connected to him or her.

H2: When the successful other has already been mentioned, the impression managers' responses will be more positive when this person is connected to their target than when he or she is not.

H3: Impression managers will tend to praise individuals who are connected to their target and respond positively to the mentioning of these individuals by the target when their motive is to ingratiate more than when their motive is to self-promote.

H4: Impression managers are more likely to calculate that mentioning the success of other people will make their target proud when these people are connected to the target than when they are not connected to him or her.

As previous research has demonstrated, gaining prestige by being associated with successful others is most effective when the successful other is not connected to the target of the impression management as well (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). From the literature on the illusion of out-group homogeneity, we learn that the members of an out-group are perceived as similar to each other, whereas the members of an in-group are perceived as distinct (Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989). The impression manager and the successful other might be perceived by the target as out-group members who are similar to each other. However, if the target is associated with that successful other as well, he or she might perceive the impression manager and the successful person as distinct.

Thus, a person aiming at self-promotion will tend to praise other people the more they are associated with him or her and the less they are associated with the target. Using the same logic, when the impression management motive is ingratiation, people who are expected to be praised are those who are connected to the target, but not to the impression manager. This praise should make the targets feel especially proud and complimented because the connection to the successful others is distinctively their own. Furthermore, they should assume that they will be perceived as similar to the successful others in the eyes of the impression manager. Thus, it is hypothesized that the ingratiation attempts outlined above will be less pronounced when the successful other is close to the impression manager.

H5: Impression managers will tend to praise individuals, respond positively to the mentioning of these individuals by their target, and assume that mentioning the success of these individuals will make their target proud when these individuals are not connected to the impression managers more than when they are connected to them.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and fourteen participants volunteered to participate in the experiment in exchange for 40 shekels (the equivalent of US$11.50 at that time). These participants were students at an Israeli university who responded to announcements that were posted on the university's bulletin boards. They were invited to the communication laboratory after the research assistant (RA) had made sure in a telephone conversation that they had not participated in similar experiments in the past.

Of these participants, 169 passed the manipulation check and the rest were excluded from the analysis. Of the remaining participants, 112 were females and 57 were males, and their mean age was 24.07 ($SD = 2.58$). The remaining participants were distributed in a fairly even manner among the various conditions and the conditions of all the independent variables did not differ significantly one from the other in terms of gender, age of participants, and mother tongue. All the participants were fluent in Hebrew, which was the language in which the experiment was conducted.

Research assistants and confederates
In each experimental running, there were two RAs and one to two confederates. One of the RAs who led the experiment was a graduate student and the rest were B.A. students. Each of them knew only his or her role in the experiment and was not exposed to or informed about the occurrences in the other parts of the experiment. The researcher trained the assistants and confederates by rehearsing the research procedure several times on mock participants.

Experimental design
The current study used a 2 (motive: ingratiation vs. self-promotion) × 2 (connection to impression manager: connected or not) × 2 (connection to target: connected or not) between-subjects factorial design.

Procedure
To test the hypotheses, it was necessary to: (a) create triads of people—an impression manager, a target, and a successful other; (b) manipulate the makeup of the triads: The successful other will be either a friend or a stranger to each of the remaining two people; (c) manipulate the goal of the interaction to be either ingratiation or self-promotion; and (d) measure the content of the interaction.

The creation and manipulation of the makeup of the triads were accomplished by the following procedure. Participants were asked to come to the laboratory with a friend. In a random way, half of them were separated from their friend and were teamed with two other research confederates, who in half of the cases were presented as friends and in the other half as strangers. The other half of the participants stayed with their friend.[2] This pair was joined by another research confederate, who, in a random way, in half of the cases was a stranger to both of them and in the other half pretended to be a good friend of one of them (that participant was instructed to behave accordingly[3]). Thus, following this procedure a triad of people was formed made up of the participant in the role of the impression manager, a confederate in the role of the target of ingratiation, and a third person who was either associated or not associated with the impression manager and/or with the target (see Table 1 for a schematic representation of the triad types).

In order to create an interaction between an impression manager and a target in which the impression manager's goal was manipulated, the following procedure was devised. The participants were told that the study was concerned with syntax in conversations and required two of them to engage in a "getting acquainted" conversation.

Table 1 Types of Triads Used in Study 1

Role in the Experiment	Type of Triads			
Naive participant	P[a]	P[a]	P[a]	P[a]
Successful other	RA[b]	RA[b]	P[a]	P[ab]
Target	RA[c]	RA[b]	RA[b]	RA[b]

In each triad, people with the same superscripts were friends (or pretended to be friends) and the others were strangers. P = participant; RA = research assistant.

One participant (in the role of the impression manager) and one confederate (in the role of the target) were asked to remain in the room, whereas the third person (a participant or a confederate, according to the condition) was asked to move with an experimenter to another room and participate in another study examining social perception. Then, the target was asked to accompany another experimenter in order to ''adjust the angle of the video cameras.'' The participant (in the role of the impression manager) who remained alone was told by another experimenter that the true purpose of the experiment was to study the differences in syntax that people use when they like or dislike another person. Thus, he or she would have to try to make the person they interacted with like them as much as possible (randomly, in half of the cases the instruction was to be perceived as competent as possible; this motive manipulation is based on that of Godfrey et al., 1986). Immediately following the giving of those instructions, in order to create a situation in which the success of the third person was salient for the impression manager, the experimenter who seemingly tested the third person in social perception entered the room excitedly and told the experimenter about the outstanding achievement of that person, who scored the highest possible grade.

At that stage, the impression manager was accompanied with video cameras to a room in which the target (who was unaware of the research hypotheses and the motivation condition) was already sitting. They were asked to converse for 8 minutes. If the impression manager did not mention the success of the third person in the test, the target, after an interval of 6 minutes, speculated on what was happening with the third person. The first dependent variable that was measured was whether the impression manager mentioned the success of the third person (which was a dichotomous measure: yes or no). Taking into account the possibility that only a minority of the impression managers would mention the success of the third person, an additional variable was measured to document the reaction of the impression managers to the mentioning of the third person by the target. Two independent judges were asked to evaluate the degree to which the impression manager was interested in talking about the third person following the raising of the issue by the target. The judges were asked to form their evaluation on a 1–5-point scale ranging from ''very interested'' to ''not interested at all.''

In order to check the motive manipulation, the following behaviors were measured: The degree to which the impression manager showed interest in the statements

of the target and agreed with the target (these behaviors were expected to be more intense in the ingratiation condition) as well as the degree to which the impression manager tried to impress the target, was self-assured, and mentioned his or her success during the interaction (these behaviors were expected to be more intense in the self-promotion condition). The choice of these behaviors was based on Godfrey et al. (1986). These variables were encoded by two independent judges, who reviewed the filmed interactions and were asked to rate their evaluation on a 1–5-point scale. Pearson correlations were computed for all judgments and they were all significant ($p < .001$). Interjudge reliability was calculated using Cronbach's α. The reliability estimates ranged from .64 to .77 (Krippendorff's α ranged from .37 to .62). The dependent variables were the mean of the judges' estimations.

Lastly, following the interaction, a questionnaire devised specifically for the current research was handed out to the impression managers in which they had to answer a few questions measuring the effect they assumed the mentioning of the success of the third person had on their target. If they mentioned the success by themselves, they had to speculate on the degree to which it impressed their target, and the degree to which it made their target proud. If they did not mention the success, they had to speculate on the degree to which it would have made their target impressed and proud if they had mentioned it. All these four questions were on a 1–7-point scale ranging from "not at all" to "very much."

Results

Manipulation check

Participants in the role of impression managers were asked about the type of relationship between their target and the third person. If they did not answer this question correctly or did not know the third person's score on the computerized test, they were excluded from the analysis. Out of 214 participants, 45 failed this manipulation check. As the level of association between the third person and the target and the awareness of the success of the third person are the core of the current study's manipulation, these participants were excluded from the analysis. Moreover, a series of examinations were conducted in order to validate the motivation manipulation (to self-promote or to ingratiate). As expected, the impression managers showed more interest in their target's statements in the ingratiation condition ($M = 4.34, SD = 0.71$) than in the self-promotion condition ($M = 3.95, SD = 0.81$), $F(1, 167) = 10.87$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$. They also agreed more with their target's statements in the ingratiation condition ($M = 4.18, SD = 0.73$) than in the self-promotion condition ($M = 3.91, SD = 0.97$), $F(1, 167) = 4.45, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$.

On the other hand, the impression managers mentioned their own successes more in the self-promotion condition ($M = 3.98, SD = 0.81$) than in the ingratiation condition ($M = 3.19, SD = 0.78$), $F(1, 167) = 41.35, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$. They also tried harder to impress their target in the self-promotion condition ($M = 2.46, SD = 1.26$) than in the ingratiation condition ($M = 1.39, SD = 0.48$), $F(1, 167) = 53.90, p < .001, \eta^2 = .24$. Similarly, they showed more self-confidence

in the self-promotion condition ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 0.79$) than in the ingratiation condition ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.75$), $F(1, 167) = 7.87$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Together, these results confirm the success of the motive manipulation.

Conversation analysis
Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted with the impression management tactic (indirect ingratiation or indirect self-promotion), closeness to the target, and closeness to the impression manager as the independent variables, and the various responses of the impression manager as the dependent variables. Unfortunately, only 13% of the impression managers raised the issue of the third person's success. Therefore, their distribution across conditions was not informative and did not show any systematic pattern. The small N prevented an examination of H1. However, in line with H2, a main effect was found for closeness to the target on willingness to discuss the third person following the target's mentioning of that person (tested only on the participants who did not raise the issue of the third person's success by themselves), $F(1, 141) = 4.53$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. The impression manager showed more interest in discussing the third person when this person was close to the target ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 0.91$) than when this person was distant from the target ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.03$). In order to control for the general level of interest the impression manager showed in the target's statements, this variable was entered as a covariate. In that analysis, a main effect was still found for closeness to the target on willingness to discuss the third person following the target's mentioning of that person, $F(1, 140) = 3.85$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. The interaction between closeness to the target and motive did not reach significance, $F(1, 141) = 3.81$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. Thus, H3 was not supported.

Questionnaire analysis
The impression managers thought that their target would have been more impressed if they had mentioned the success of the third person when this person was close to the target ($M = 5.40$, $SD = 1.44$) than when this person was not close to the target ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.62$), $F(1, 144) = 14.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .09$.

Similarly, in line with H4, the impression managers thought that their target would have been prouder if they had mentioned the success of the third person when this person was close to him or her ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.55$) than when he or she was not ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.57$), $F(1, 144) = 18.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$. However, with regard to this dependent variable, closeness to the impression manager also had a significant effect. Partially supporting H5, the impression managers thought that their target would have been prouder if they had mentioned the success of the third person when this person was not close to them ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.65$) than when he or she was close to them ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.54$), $F(1, 144) = 9.89$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$.

Discussion
Overall, the results showed that people are aware of the potential benefits of the indirect ingratiation tactic. When the successful person is mentioned by their target,

they respond more positively when this person is close to the target than in the case where this person is not associated with the target. Although this is not a direct test of indirect ingratiation, it hints in that direction, as a common, polite response would be to respond positively to whatever issue the target raised (Godfrey et al., 1986). The fact that they responded more positively when the target mentioned a person close to him or her hints that they realized that a positive response in that case would be more positively evaluated. This idea is strengthened by the finding that the participants acknowledged that mentioning the success of another person would make their target impressed and proud when he or she was close to their target.

While it is quite obvious that the targets would be prouder of the success of a close other than the success of a distant other, this result is complicated by an additional finding: The participants estimated that the targets would be prouder of the success of a third person if this person were distant from the participants themselves. This last result is in line with the findings of Cialdini and Richardson (1980), who showed that burnishing is most effective when the successful person is close to the impression manager but distant from the target. Just as self-promotion through burnishing is most effective when the target is not connected to the successful person, so is ingratiation through burnishing most effective when the impression manager is not connected to the successful person. In that case, the glory of the successful other is reflected only on the target, and the target and the successful person are perceived as similar to one another. However, this expected effect was evident only in the assumed impact on the target, not in the actual ingratiation attempts of the impression managers.

These findings demonstrate that, as intuitive scientists, people have a rather good sense about the existence of burnishing as a self-promotion mechanism, and know that it is possible to apply that mechanism in order to compliment others. However, the awareness of the benefit of ingratiation through burnishing only partially manifested itself in actual behavior. While the impression managers responded positively to the mentioning of the third person by the target when this person was close to the target, this behavior did not differ between the motive conditions and only a minority of the impression managers independently mentioned the success of the third person. The reason for this omission might be the multiple options available to the impression managers in their attempt to ingratiate. As the manipulation check showed, they attempted to ingratiate by showing interest in their target's statements and by agreeing with their target's statements. It might be that the use of indirect ingratiation is limited to situations in which there are no other, more direct ways to ingratiate, or to situations in which using the direct approach may raise suspicions about ulterior motives.

Experiment 2: Perceptions formed of ingratiation through burnishing

Study 1 showed that impression managers are aware of the benefits of ingratiation through burnishing, believing that mentioning the success of people who are connected to their target may help them ingratiate. The current study examined the correctness of this belief. In other words, it examined the perception formed of an

impression manager who ingratiated indirectly by mentioning the success of a person related to his or her target compared with an impression manager who self-promoted indirectly by mentioning the success of a person related to himself or herself and compared with a person who did not mention anyone's success.[4]

Previous research has revealed the tendency of people to like speakers who describe others positively. Arguably, the perceivers assume that the positive description of others stems from the speaker's likability (e.g., Wyer, Budesheim, & Lambert, 1990). On the other hand, when the described other is close to the speaker, the speaker is perceived rather negatively in terms of manipulability and sociability (e.g., Tal-Or, 2008, in press). These two conflicting perceptions should cancel each other out. Thus, the perception formed of an indirect self-promoter in terms of sociability and general likability is not expected to differ from that of a person who does not use impression management tactics at all.

However, in indirect ingratiation the described person is close to the target. As people tend to like those who promote them (Jones, 1964), and because being associated with successful others enhances the self (Cialdini et al., 1990), the targets are expected to like impression managers who mention the success of people who are connected with them. This reasoning leads to the following hypothesis:

> H1: A target of ingratiation will perceive an impression manager as likable and sociable when he or she praises the success of other people who are connected to the target more than when he or she praises people who are connected to the impression manager and more than when he or she does not mention anyone's success. These last two conditions will not differ one from the other.

While mentioning the success of one's associates is not expected to result in more favorable attitudes toward the impression manager, one could argue that it should make the self-promoter appear more capable. As claimed earlier, people's perceived ability benefits from their association with successful others (e.g., Gilovich, 1981). However, this is not the case when people initiate the delivery of the information regarding this association. Previous research has shown that people suspect the ulterior motives of those who use indirect self-promotion (Tal-Or, 2008) and that using these tactics usually does not pay off in terms of perceived ability (Lebherz et al., 2009; Tal-Or, in press). While indirect self-promotion is not expected to result in enhanced perceptions of the impression manager's ability, indirect ingratiation in which there is no connection between the successful other and the impression manager is even less likely to improve perceptions about the latter's ability. Thus, no hypothesis regarding the effects on ability was formulated, although this variable was measured to enable the revealing of effects that were not envisioned.

Method

Participants

One hundred and seventy-two participants volunteered to participate in the experiment in exchange for 40 shekels (the equivalent of US$11.50 at that time). These

participants were students at an Israeli university who responded to announcements that were posted on the university's bulletin boards. They were invited to the communication laboratory after the RA had made sure in a telephone conversation that they had not participated in similar experiments in the past.

Of these 172 participants, 142 did not encounter any problems during the experiment (which will be outlined below) and the rest of them were excluded from the analysis. Of the remaining participants, 101 were females and 41 were males, and their mean age was 23.16 ($SD = 2.99$). The remaining participants were distributed in a fairly even manner among the various conditions, which did not differ significantly one from the other in terms of gender, age of participants, and mother tongue. All the participants were fluent in Hebrew, which was the language in which the experiment was conducted.

Research assistants and confederates

In each experimental running, there were one RA and two confederates. The RA who led the experiment was a graduate student and the rest were B.A. students. Each of them knew only his or her role in the experiment and was not exposed to or informed about the occurrences in the other parts of the experiment. The researcher trained the assistants and confederates by rehearsing the research procedure several times on mock participants.

Experimental design

The current study used a three (impression management tactic: ingratiation, self-promotion, or none) between-subjects design.

Procedure

Pairs of friends were invited to the laboratory, where they met two confederates pretending to be another pair of friends who were taking part in the experiment. The experimenter told the four people that they were going to participate in two short, unrelated experiments, the first examining the similarity in levels of knowledge among friends, and the second examining syntax in "getting acquainted" conversations.

Each of the participants was asked to enter a cubicle with a computer inside. The participants then took a difficult knowledge quiz, and the computer announced that they received an average grade. At that stage, the computers of the two confederates appeared to freeze, and they complained to the RA. The RA said that this problem had happened before and it was unfair to them not to see their scores. Therefore, she would retrieve their grades from the database that had the grades of all the participants. The RA opened a file and told each of the confederates to look at his or her grade. Next, the RA asked each of the real participants to move to the following screen to see who they are going to be paired with in the next experiment.

At that stage, each participant was paired with one of the confederates and the pairs were asked to sit and wait in two separate rooms. Each pair was left alone for a few minutes. During that time each of the confederates randomly shared one of the

following statements with the participant: (a) "When she showed me their database, I saw your friend's score; he or she scored 10 out of 10" (ingratiation through burnishing condition); (b) "When she showed me their database, I saw my friend's score; he or she scored 10 out of 10" (self-promotion through burnishing condition); or (c) "When she showed me their database, I saw that there were many participants in this experiment" (control condition). Then, the RA arrived and asked the participants to fill out a questionnaire measuring their perception of the confederate. Thus, in the current research the confederate played the role of the impression manager who tries to self-promote or ingratiate indirectly, and the participant was the target of ingratiation who was asked to form an impression of the impression manager.

The questionnaire that was handed out to the participants first asked a question to assess the participants' gut-feeling toward the confederate in the role of the impression manager on a 1–7-point scale ranging from negative to positive ($M = 5.51$, $SD = 0.98$). This question aimed at measuring the spontaneous reaction of the participants toward the confederate without the need to think about behavioral indications for the existence of specific traits in the confederate's personality. (Aronson & Linder, 1965). Following that question, the participants were asked on a scale of 1–7 to provide an evaluation of 13 semantic differential traits that were related to the confederate's sociability and ability (following previous studies such as those by Gurevitch (1984) and Tal-Or (2010) on the perception formed of impression managers). Based on an exploratory factor analysis, two indexes were created from those traits. The ability index was based on the mean of the traits: successful, calculated, and smart ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.92$, Cronbachs' $\alpha = .62$), and the sociability index was based on the traits: friendly, warm, sincere, considerate, good, nice, and kind ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 0.75$, Cronbachs' $\alpha = .83$).

Results
Exclusion of participants from the analysis
Given the complicated nature of the experiment, some problems were encountered that resulted in the exclusion of some participants from the analysis. Participants were excluded for several reasons: the participant suspected the manipulation (four participants were excluded on that basis), the participant already knew the confederate (1), the participant did not understand the manipulation (3), the confederate did not get a chance to say his or her sentence (2), the participants told each other their real grades on the test (4), the participant asked the confederate what her grade was on the test (13), and various technical problems (3).

Main analysis
An ANOVA was conducted with the impression management tactic (indirect ingratiation, indirect self-promotion, and control) as the independent variable and the gut-feeling as the dependent variable. This analysis revealed a significant difference, $F(2, 138) = 3.72$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$. The targets reported the most positive feelings toward the impression managers who used an indirect ingratiation tactic ($M = 5.81$,

$SD = 0.88$), less positive feelings toward those who used indirect self-promotion ($M = 5.44$, $SD = 0.99$), and the least positive feelings toward those who did not use any tactic at all (control condition) ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 1.00$). As expected by H1, a planned contrasts analysis revealed that the indirect ingratiation condition differed in a marginally significant way from the indirect self-promotion condition, $t(138) = 1.89$, $p = .06$, and differed significantly from the control condition, $t(138) = -2.65$, $p < .01$. Also as expected, the indirect self-promotion condition did not differ from the control condition, $t(138) = -.78$, $p > .1$. There was no significant effect with regard to the ability index, $F(2, 139) = .23$, $p > .1$, $\eta^2 = .003$, or the sociability index, $F(2, 139) = .84$, $p > .1$, $\eta^2 = .01$.[5]

Discussion

As hypothesized, indirect ingratiation pays off. Impression managers were perceived more positively by their targets when they mentioned the success of people who were connected to these targets, in comparison with those who mentioned their associate's success and with those who did not use impression management tactics. Interestingly, however, this effect was significant only with regard to the dependent variable measuring the participants' gut-feelings, not with regard to the other two dependent variables that measured the actual traits ascribed to the impression managers. As demonstrated previously by Aronson and Linder (1965), the gut-feeling measure was more sensitive to manipulation than the measurement of the traits. Moreover, the lack of difference in the ability measure between the indirect self-promotion condition and the control group is in line with previous research, which showed that indirect self-promotion does pay off in terms of perceived ability (e.g., Tal-Or, in press). The targets might not believe people's bragging about their close others' success because they acknowledge the benefit these people reap from such an association. Alternatively, the low reliability obtained in the ability measure might account for the lack of effect for this variable.[6]

Note that although indirect ingratiators were perceived more positively than those who did not use impression management tactics, indirect self-promoters did not differ from the control group. It might have been expected that mentioning the success of a close other would be perceived as manipulative, making the indirect self-promoters less likeable than those in the control group. However, this perception stands in contrast to the generally favorable impression formed of people who describe others positively (e.g., Wyer et al., 1990). These two contradictory perceptions might have cancelled one another, resulting in a perception similar to that of the control group.

Experiment 3: Ingratiation through basking

People can promote themselves indirectly not only by praising those with whom they are already connected (burnishing) but also by associating themselves with successful others (basking in reflected glory) (Cialdini, 1989). As was shown by Cialdini and his colleagues in their famous football studies, football fans tend to

use the pronoun ''we'' in describing their team's success more frequently than in describing their team's failure (Cialdini et al., 1976). Here, the successful other is a group, not an individual. However, as the impression manager does not belong to the group, Cialdini (1989) views it as the same process in which an individual connects himself or herself to a successful entity. The current research hypothesized that a phenomenon similar to indirect self-promotion occurs when the impression management motive is ingratiation, and the impression manager is trying to make a connection between the successful people or objects and the target, using the pronoun ''you.'' This reasoning leads to the following research hypothesis:

> H1: When sports fans describe the success of their team, they will use the first-person pronoun more when they attempt to self-promote than when they attempt to ingratiate. However, when sports fans describe the success of their target's team, they will use the second-person pronoun more when they attempt to ingratiate than when they attempt to self-promote.

Method

Participants

Fifty-three participants volunteered to participate in the experiment in exchange for 40 shekels (the equivalent of US$11.50 at the time). These participants were students at an Israeli university who responded to announcements that were posted on the university's bulletin boards. They were invited to the communication laboratory after the RA had made sure in a telephone conversation that they had not participated in similar experiments in the past.

Of these participants, 40 were able to perform the experimental task (outlined below) and the rest were excluded from the analysis. Of the remaining participants, 39 were males and 1 was female, and their mean age was 24.88 ($SD = 3.13$). Thirty-three of the participants were football fans and seven were basketball fans. The remaining participants were distributed in a fairly even manner among the various conditions, which did not differ significantly one from the other in terms of gender, age of participants, and mother tongue. All the participants were fluent in Hebrew, which was the language in which the experiment was conducted.

Research assistants and confederates

In each experimental running, there were one RA and one confederate. The RA who led the experiment was a graduate student and the confederate was a B.A. student. Each of them knew only his or her role in the experiment and was not exposed to or informed about the occurrences in the other parts of the experiment. The researcher trained the assistants and confederates by rehearsing the research procedure several times on mock participants.

Experimental design

The current study used a 2 (motive: ingratiation vs. self-promotion) × 2 (team described: the impression manager's team or the target's team) mixed factorial design.

Procedure

Football or basketball fans were recruited, and each was asked to describe the details of two football or basketball games to an interviewer (a research confederate pretending to be a participant), who was also a football/basketball fan, in front of video cameras. The interviewer asked the interviewee the following set of questions: (a) What is your name? (and gave his or her name too); (b) What is your favorite team? (and gave his or her favorite team too, which was different from that of the interviewee[7]); (c) Please describe a game in which X (the team the interviewee admired) won; and (d) Please describe a game in which Y (the team the interviewer admired) won.

The participants were also told by the RA that the aim of the research was to examine the syntax of football/basketball fans when they express their feelings of like or dislike of others and when they express their appreciation or disapproval of others. They were told that following their interview, the interviewer would be asked about his perception of them, and his syntax would be examined. Thus, as in the motive manipulation of Experiment 1, the participants were asked in a random way either to try to make their interviewer like them as much as possible (ingratiate) or to be perceived as competent as possible (self-promote). The 13 participants who could not describe both games were excluded from the analysis. Thus, in this experiment the participant played the role of the impression manager whose goal was to make his or her target (who was a confederate) perceive him or her as competent or likable.

Two independent judges encoded the pronoun usage in the description of the games. Only pronouns that were part of the narration of the activities of the team/players were encoded. Pearson correlations were computed for all judgments and they were all significant ($p < .001$). Interjudge reliability was calculated using Cronbach's α. The reliability estimates ranged from .90 to .94. (Krippendorff's α ranged from .81 to .89). The dependent variables were the mean of the judges' estimations.

Results

A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted. The within-subjects variable was the game the impression managers described: Their team or the target's team. The between-subjects variable was the impression management motive: Ingratiation or self-promotion. The dependent variable was the number of times the impression managers used pronouns other than third-person pronouns when describing the games (the first-person pronoun when describing their own team and the second-person pronoun when describing the target's team). This analysis revealed a main effect for the team described. The impression managers used the first-person pronoun more when describing the team they admired ($M = 1.42$, $SD = 2.43$) than they used the second-person pronoun when describing the team the target admired ($M = 0.38$, $SD = 1.15$), $F(1, 36) = 8.37$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = 0.19$. As hypothesized in H1, there was also a significant interaction between the team described and the motive, $F(1, 36) = 5.32$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .13$. In order to understand the interaction, two simple ANOVAs were conducted for each of the teams described. As expected,

when describing the target's team, impression managers used the second-person pronoun more when they attempted to ingratiate ($M = 0.76$, $SD = 1.55$) than when they attempted to self-promote ($M = 0.00$, $SD = 0.00$), $F(1, 36) = 4.61$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .11$. The opposite was true for their description of their own team, that is, they used the first-person pronoun more when they attempted to self-promote ($M = 1.87$, $SD = 2.99$) than when they attempted to ingratiate ($M = 0.97$, $SD = 1.69$), but this effect did not reach significance, $F(1, 36) = 1.29$, $p > .1$, $\eta^2 = .04$.

The nature of the dependent variable in the current research made it essential to control for extraneous variables such as usage of third-person pronouns and total talk time. Thus, the above analysis was repeated twice, after which the original dependent variable was divided by total talk time and total pronouns used in describing the teams. When the dependent variable was divided by total talk time, the same pattern of results were obtained: The impression managers used the first-person pronoun more when describing the team they admired ($M = 0.17$, $SD = 0.29$) than they used the second-person pronoun when describing the team the target admired ($M = 0.05$, $SD = 0.16$), $F(1, 36) = 7.02$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .16$; there was also a significant interaction between the team described and the motive, $F(1, 36) = 5.97$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .14$. The simple effects also showed the same pattern as the original analysis. Similarly, when the dependent variable was divided by the total number of pronouns used, the same pattern of results was obtained: The impression managers used the first-person pronoun more when describing the team they admired ($M = 0.19$, $SD = 0.27$) than they used the second-person pronoun when describing the team the target admired ($M = 0.06$, $SD = 0.17$), $F(1, 36) = 10.85$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .23$; and there was also a marginally significant interaction between the team described and the motive, $F(1, 36) = 4.09$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .10$. The simple effects also showed the same pattern as the original analysis.

Discussion

The current study succeeded in documenting indirect ingratiation using the tactic of associating the target with successful others. When the participants discussed the success of a team, that their target admired, they used the second-person pronoun more when they wanted him to like them than when they wanted him to think they were competent. Using the second-person pronoun associated the target with the success of his admired team. Given that items that are related with one another, even in an insignificant way, are perceived as similar (Finch & Cialdini, 1989), this association should be perceived as a compliment by the target of ingratiation. As people like those who compliment them (Vonk, 2002), it is reasonable to assume that using this tactic would help individuals ingratiate themselves with their targets.

Interestingly, no difference was found between the ingratiation and self-promotion condition in the frequency of using the first-person pronoun in describing the success of one's own team. Usage of the first-person pronoun in describing the game of the team one admired might be more common than using the second-person pronoun when describing the game of another's team. This assumption is strengthened by

the significant main effect of the team described. The impression managers used the first-person pronouns more when describing the team they admired than they used the second-person pronoun when describing the team the target admired. As impression managers used the first-person pronoun in that case so habitually, they did not differentiate between the motive conditions. However, they did use the second-person pronoun tactically, according to their impression management motives.

Experiment 4: Perceptions formed of ingratiation through basking

Study 3 documented the tendency of people with an ingratiation motive to associate their targets with successful others. The current study aimed at examining the extent to which they achieved their goal. Does indirect ingratiation through basking indeed result in a positive perception of the impression manager? Previous research has shown that being associated with successful others fosters one's self-concept (Cialdini et al., 1990). Thus, a person who associates us with successful others actually compliments us indirectly. The literature on compliments provides evidence for their general effectiveness (Vonk, 2002). Although outside observers usually are suspicious of the ingratiators' motives, the target of the ingratiation tends to see it as more authentic and perceives the ingratiator positively (Gordon, 1996). If the recipients fail to suspect a direct compliment, an indirect compliment could appear to them to be even more sincere. Thus, it is hypothesized here that indirect ingratiation in the form of basking through the usage of second-person pronouns that connects the target to successful others makes the target feel more related to these others. This flattering association should make the target perceive the impression manager in a more positive light.

H1: The target will feel more related to the successful others after being associated with them by the impression manager (through the usage of second-person pronouns).

H2: The target will perceive an impression manager stressing the association between the target and successful others more positively.

H3: The level of relatedness to the successful others that is felt by the target would mediate the relationship between type of pronouns used by the impression manager and the perception formed of the impression manager.

Method
Participants
Forty-nine participants volunteered to participate in the experiment in exchange for 40 shekels (the equivalent of US$11.50 at the time). These participants were students at an Israeli university who responded to announcements that were posted on the university's bulletin boards. They were invited to the communication laboratory after the RA had made sure in a telephone conversation that they had not participated in similar experiments in the past.

Of these participants, 41 were males and 8 were females, and their mean age was 24.30 ($SD = 2.82$). Twenty-seven of the participants were football fans and 22 were basketball fans. All the participants were fluent in Hebrew, which was the language in which the experiment was conducted.

Research assistants and confederates
In each experimental running, there were one RA and one confederate. The RA who led the experiment was a graduate student and the confederate was a B.A. student. Each of them knew only his or her role in the experiment and was not exposed to or informed about the occurrences in the other parts of the experiment. The researcher trained the assistants and confederates by rehearsing the research procedure several times on mock participants.

Experimental design
The current study used a two (pronouns used: second- or third-person) between-subjects design.

Procedure
A similar procedure to that of Experiment 3 was conducted in which an interview was carried out with an interviewer and an interviewee, both of whom were sports fans, but this time the participant was the interviewer and the confederate was the interviewee. As the interviewer, the participant was requested by the RA to ask the research confederate the following questions (which he or she was asked to read from a piece of paper): (a) What is your name? (and gave his or her name too); (b) What is your favorite team? (and gave his or her favorite team too);[8] and (c) Please describe a game in which Y (the team the interviewer admired) won.

After discovering that they were fans of different teams, the research confederate described the games to the participant in the role of the interviewer. The description of the game always had the same format, with minimal variations because of the different teams being described, whether the description was of football or basketball games and the experimental condition: second- or third-person pronouns. The manipulation was the kind of pronouns used by the confederate in the role of the interviewee. The interviewee in a random way mainly used either second-person pronouns (you—which in Hebrew has a specific word for plural) or third-person pronouns (they, their, the team, the players) to describe the teams' success. The general format went as follows:

It was their/your game against X (the competing team) in X stadium in the session of X. They/you won with the outcome of X. They/you played excellently, especially X (a name of a player) who was great and scored a goal and an assist and was all over the field. X (the competing team) were not at all involved in the game and did not even come close to X's (the interviewer's team)/your goal. It was as if X (the interviewer's team)/you were the only ones on the field. I remember their/your goal that X (a name of another player) scored (+ a short description that varied depending on the teams described). The goalie did not

have a chance. I did not believe that they/you would win that way in a session game, which was supposed to be very evenly matched. In general, it was one of the best games I have ever seen. You do not see games like that very often.

Following the interview, the participant (in the role of the interviewer) was asked to fill out a questionnaire to measure his or her level of association with the team (i.e., how much he or she considered themselves to be fans of the team) and provide an evaluation of the confederate (the interviewee). Thus, in the current study a confederate played the role of an impression manager and the participant played the role of the target whose task was to form an evaluation of the impression manager. This evaluation was measured by a semantic differential scale ranging from 1 to 7, which included 12 traits that were related to the confederate's sociability and ability and in which higher values indicated a more positive evaluation. Based on an exploratory factor analysis, one index was calculated. This index was based on the mean of the traits: pleasant, friendly, successful, smart, and considerate ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 0.77$, Cronbach's' $\alpha = .86$).

Results

An ANOVA was conducted with types of pronouns (second- or third-person) as the independent variable and level of association with the team as a dependent variable. This analysis was significant, $F(1, 44) = 4.78$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$. As expected by H1, the participants in the role of the targets were more likely to consider themselves fans of their team in the second-person pronouns condition ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.00$) than those in the third-person pronouns condition ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.07$). Similarly, an ANOVA was conducted with types of pronouns (second- or third-person) as the independent variables and evaluation of the impression manager as a dependent variable. This analysis was marginally significant, $F(1, 44) = 3.84$, $p = .056$, $\eta^2 = .08$. As expected by H2, the targets perceived the impression manager more positively in the second-person pronouns condition ($M = 5.67$, $SD = 0.75$) than in the third-person pronouns condition ($M = 5.24$, $SD = 0.75$).

To examine H3, a regression analysis was conducted with types of pronouns and level of association with the team as independent variables. As reported earlier, the manipulation of type of pronouns had a marginally significant effect on the perception of the impression manager ($b = -.28$, $SE = .11$, $p = .056$). Moreover, the level of association also had a significant effect on the perception of the impression manager ($b = .31$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$). Finally, the effect of the manipulation on the dependent variable, after controlling for the potential mediator, was examined. This coefficient was obtained when regressing the perception formed of the impression manager on the type of pronouns used, controlling for level of association. R^2 for this equation was .13. Results demonstrated that the effect of the manipulation decreased and became insignificant after controlling for level of association ($b = -.21$, $SE = .12$, $p > .17$, compared with $b = -.28$, $SE = .11$, $p = .056$). Thus, the evidence might suggest that the level of association partly mediates the effect of the types of pronouns used on the perception formed of the impression manager.

Discussion

The results of the last study revealed several important findings. Associating a person with successful others indeed makes that person feel more connected to them, and this feeling of connectedness, in turn, makes that person like the impression manager who made this connection. This study, together with Experiment 2, documented the effectiveness of using indirect ingratiation. While Experiment 2 showed that an impression manager who mentions the success of people who are related to the target (ingratiation through burnishing) is perceived positively, the current research showed that a person who connects the target to successful others (ingratiation through basking) is also perceived positively.

General discussion

The current research continued the research path initiated by Cialdini et al. (1976) and further explored the concept of indirect impression management. Cialdini (1989) called the tactics he documented "indirect impression management." However, the aim of these tactics was to enhance the prestige of the impression manager and thus, a better term would be "indirect self-promotion." The current research, on the other hand, explored the occurrence of indirect ingratiation. It was suggested here that when the motive is ingratiation, instead of highlighting the positive characteristics of close others (burnishing) or associating oneself with successful others (basking in reflected glory) (Cialdini, 1989), the impression manager highlights the success of a person who is close to the target or connects the target to successful others.

In early research on direct impression management the definitions of self-promotion and ingratiation were confounded. For example, Jones, Gergen, and Davis (1962) studied ingratiation by asking their participants to say things that would make their interviewer think highly of them as well as to try to be perceived as likable by their interviewer. Only 20 years later has research differentiated between these two tactics (Godfrey et al., 1986). Similarly, the current research showed that in the case of indirect impression management, there are also two distinct tactics whose aim is to self-promote or to ingratiate.

The rationale for using indirect ingratiation is similar to that of indirect self-promotion. According to Heider's (1958) balance theory, in their attempt to achieve cognitive harmony people perceive associated things as similar to one another. Impression managers, as naive scientists (e.g., Wegener & Petty, 1998), realize this effect on perception and understand that when they note their association with successful others, they are supposed to be perceived as more successful themselves (Cialdini & De Nicholas, 1989). However, people connect themselves to successful others not just to impress others but also to enhance their own self (Cialdini et al., 1990). As being associated with successful others enhances the self, impression managers most probably understand that it should be considered a compliment when this association is made by another person.

Experiment 1 indeed revealed that people are aware of the possible benefits of using indirect ingratiation and Experiment 3 showed that people actually use it. Experiments 2 and 4 completed the picture by demonstrating the effectiveness of the two methods of indirect ingratiation. In other words, people actually do perceive others who associate them with successful others, or who talk about the success of their associates, in positive terms.

While succeeding in confirming most of its hypotheses, the current research only partly demonstrated the usage of indirect ingratiation through burnishing in Study 1. Although the results showed that the impression managers were aware of its potential benefit, and although they responded positively to the target's mentioning of the third person who was his or her associate, only a minority of them independently mentioned the success of the third person who was associated with their target.

Several reasons might be suggested for this finding. First, there were multiple direct options available to the impression managers in their attempt to ingratiate. As the manipulation check showed, they attempted to ingratiate by showing interest in their targets' statements and by agreeing with their targets' statements. It might be that the use of indirect ingratiation is limited to situations in which there are no other, more direct ways to ingratiate. Moreover, the impression managers were asked by the RA to ingratiate. Thus, they might have felt that it was appropriate and legitimate to use the direct tactics. Similarly, in the experimental situation the impression managers might not have had much to lose if they had been perceived as manipulative because of the use of the direct tactics. Thus, they did not have to think of alternative ways of ingratiation.

Future research might examine indirect ingratiation through burnishing using different procedures that might allow for more people to engage in that behavior. These procedures might include a basic scenario study in which people will have to report about using this tactic as well as studies that involve a more risky situation in which the participants would have to be careful not to be perceived as manipulative.

In the suggested future research, the closeness of the third person to the impression manager may emerge as a stronger predictor of indirect impression management than in the current research. Previous research has shown that burnishing is most effective when the successful person is close to the impression manager but distant from the target (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). Based on that finding, one might expect that impression managers would be more likely to use indirect self-promotion when the third person was close to them and distant from their target. On the other hand, they would be more likely to use indirect ingratiation when the third person was close to the target and distant from them. This choice would presumably be made because the association with a successful other should be more flattering when this association is unique to the target of ingratiation.

The current research suggests several other interesting paths for future research. First, future studies might examine whether the positive perception the targets form of the ingratiators derives from the boost to their self-esteem and/or from impression management considerations. In other words, do we like those who connect us to

successful others only because we now feel better about ourselves, or also because we think these ingratiators think highly of us? The mediation analysis conducted in Study 4 suggests that feeling connected to the successful other plays a role in making us like the impression manager. However, we might also like the impression manager because we think he or she respects or likes us because of his or her awareness of our connectedness to the success. Future research might examine the targets' level of state self-esteem as well as their estimates regarding the impression managers' perception of them and investigate whether these variables mediate the influence of the indirect ingratiation tactics on the perception formed of the ingratiators. Future research might also manipulate the number of people who hear the ingratiators' words. If the ingratiator is perceived more positively when there is a larger audience, an impression management explanation might be plausible.

Another area that future studies might examine could be other indirect ingratiation tactics. Cialdini (1989) has identified eight indirect self-promotion tactics. Beyond basking and burnishing, which were mentioned in the current research, there are other tactics such as burying—disclaiming a positive association with unfavorable other—or blasting—amplifying the unfavorable characteristics of a negatively linked other. Future research might examine the usage and effectiveness of these tactics in the context of ingratiation. Besides examining other ingratiation tactics, future research might also investigate other relationships. In the current research, people were ingratiated through their association to successful friends or sport teams. Ingratiation tactics might be more successful when applied to people's best friends, spouses, or children.[9]

Moreover, it would be interesting to explore how the impression managers who use the tactics presented in the current research are perceived by outside observers. In the current research, the evaluators were the impression managers' interactants. Previous research has shown that the perception of the impression managers can differ depending on whether those forming the perception are outside observers or people involved in the conversation (e.g., Vonk, 2002). More specifically, people tend to like ingratiators more when they are the target of the ingratiation attempt than when they are uninvolved observers (Gordon, 1996). Indeed, ingratiation was shown to have a detrimental effect on observers (Vonk, 1998). As people usually accept direct ingratiation attempts that are directed at them (Vonk, 2002), indirect ingratiation might be specifically advantageous with relation to outside observers. As indirect ingratiation is supposed to be a more subtle impression management tactic, it might lead to a more accepting and positive reaction from outside observers who usually dislike and are suspicious of these tactics.[9] Thus, future research might compare the perception formed by the target and by outside observers of people who use indirect and direct ingratiation tactics, measuring the perceived sincerity and believability of these tactics as possible mediating variables.[10]

Research into impression management is more than half a century old. This research has traditionally focused mainly on people's attempt to be perceived as competent (self-promotion) or their attempt to be perceived as likable (ingratiation).

With the publication of Cialdini et al.'s (1976) seminal work, this research, which originally focused on direct ways of impression management, changed course and began to examine indirect self-promotion. The current study has taken another step forward by introducing the possibility of indirect ingratiation and exploring its use and effectiveness, demonstrating how simple variations in language such as using different pronouns can make others like us.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1   The phrase ''indirect ingratiation'' here parallels that of ''indirect impression management'' as used by Cialdini (1988). It should be differentiated from other indirect ingratiation tactics such as flattering someone via somebody else (e.g., Liden & Mitchell, 1988).

2   In the condition in which the participants stayed paired with their friends, only the friend who was involved in the conversation was analyzed. In the condition in which the participants were separated from their friends, the whole procedure repeated itself for both of them and each of them was analyzed.

3   The participants were asked to think up a reasonable cover story for explaining their friendship with the confederate. These cover stories were usually about the confederates' being an acquaintance from the army, work, or school. This procedure did not raise any difficulties and the participants cooperated and performed it easily. Moreover, there was no greater loss of participants in this condition than in any of the other conditions.

4   Another independent variable that was included in the current research was the relevance of the field for the participant. As this variable did not show a significant main effect or interaction with the other variable and in order to simplify the arguments of the current study, this variable was dropped from the analysis.

5   A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) conducted on the three dependent variables reached significance when using Roy's largest root criterion, $F(2, 138) = 3.78$, $p < .05$, but not when using Hotelling's trace criterion $F(4, 276) = 1.86$, $p = .12$. The pattern of results parallel that of Aronson and Linder (1965), in which the manipulation had an impact on general liking for the speaker but not on the specific traits describing that person.

6   The author would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

7   Both Study 3 and Study 4 originally included a condition in which the participants and the confederates were fans of the same team. As no significant effects were revealed in this condition and in order to simplify the argument, this condition was dropped from the analysis. Originally, Study 3 also included a condition in which the participants had to describe games in which the teams failed. No significant effects were revealed in this condition except for a main effect for pronouns used: As in the success condition, the impression managers used the first-person pronoun more when describing the team

they admired ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 2.55$) than they used the second-person pronoun when describing the team the target admired ($M = 0.80$, $SD = 1.46$), $F(1, 30) = 6.71$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .18$. In order to simplify the argument, this condition was dropped from the analysis.

8   The information regarding the team that the participant admired was conveyed by him or her in the phone conversation in which the appointment for the experiment administration was scheduled. Thus, the confederate knew this information before the interview, and during the interview claimed to be a fan of a team that differed from the one that the participant supported.

9   The author would like to thank Roos Vonk for these ideas.

10   The author would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

References

Aronson, E., & Linder, D. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, **1**, 156–171.

Backman, C. W., & Secord, P. F. (1959). The effect of perceived liking on interpersonal attraction. *Human Relations*, **12**, 379–383.

Berger, C. R., & Bell, R. A. (1988). Plans and initiation of social relationships. *Human Communication Research*, **15**, 217–235.

Byrne, D. (1997). An overview (and underview) of research and theory within the attraction paradigm. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, **14**, 417–431.

Carter, S. E., & Sanna, L. J. (2006). Are we good as we think? Observers' perceptions of indirect self-presentation as a social influence tactic. *Social Influence*, **1**, 185–207.

Cialdini, R. B. (1989). Indirect tactics of image management: Beyond basking. In R. A. Giacalone & P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 45–56). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Cialdini, R. B., Borde, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Slogan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **34**, 366–375.

Cialdini, R. B., & De Nicholas, M. E. (1989). Self-presentation by association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **57**, 626–631.

Cialdini, R. B., Finch, J. F., & De Nicholas, M. E. (1990). Strategic self-presentation: The indirect route. In M. J. Cody & M. L. McLaughlin (Eds.), *The psychology of tactical communication: Monographs in social psychology of language* (pp. 194–203). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

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.

Finch, J. F., & Cialdini, R. B. (1989). Another indirect tactic of (self-) image management: Boosting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **15**, 222–232.

Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1986). Self-presentation and self-promotion in an organizational setting. *Journal of Social Psychology*, **126**, 321–326.

Gilovich, T. (1981). Seeing the past in the present. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **40**, 797–808.

Godfrey, D. K., Jones, E. E., & Lord, C. G. (1986). Self-promotion is not ingratiating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **50**, 106–115.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Gordon, R. A. (1996). Impact of ingratiation on judgements and evaluations: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **71**, 54–70.

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 impressions: General principles and individual differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **15**, 452–462.

Jones, E. E. (1964). *Ingratiation*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Jones, E. E. (1990). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., & Davis, K. E. (1962). Some determinants of reactions to being approved or disapproved as a person. *Psychological Monographs*, **76**.

Kernis, M. H., & Wheeler, L. (1981). Beautiful friends and ugly strangers: Radiation and contrast effects in perceptions of same-sex pairs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **7**, 617–620.

Leary, M. R., Haupt, A. L., Strausser, K. S., & Chokel, J. T. (1998). Calibrating the sociometer: The relationship between interpersonal appraisals and state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **74**, 1290–1299.

Lebherz, C., Jonas, K., & Tomljenovic, B. (2009). Are we known by the company we keep: Effects of name-dropping on first impressions. *Social Influence*, **4**, 62–79.

Liden, R. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (1988). Ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, **13**, 572–587.

Linville, P. W., Fischer, G. W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **57**, 165–188.

Markham Shaw, C. L. (1997). Personal narrative: Revealing the self and reflecting other. *Human Communication Research*, **24**, 302–319.

Monahan, J. L. (1995). Information processing differences of conversational participants and observers: The effects of self-presentation concerns and cognitive load. *Communication Monographs*, **62**, 265–281.

O'Sullivan, P. B. (2000). What you don't know won't hurt me: Impression management functions of communication channels in relationships. *Human Communication Research*, **26**, 403–431.

Rosenfeld, P., Giacalone, R. A., & Riordan, C. A. (1995). *Impression management in organizations*. London: Routledge.

Seiter, J. S. (2007). Ingratiation and gratuity: The effect of complimenting customers on tipping behavior in restaurants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **37**, 478–485.

Singh, R., Yeo, S. E., Lin, P. K. F., & Tan, L. (2007). Multiple mediators of the attitude similarity-attraction relationship: Dominance of inferred attraction and subtlety of affect. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, **29**, 61–74.

Tal-Or, N. (2008). Boasting, burnishing, and burying in the eyes of the perceivers. *Social Influence*, **3**, 202–222.

Tal-Or, N. (2010). Bragging in the right context: Impressions formed of self-promoters who create a context for their boasts. *Social Influence*, **5**, 23–39.

Tal-Or, N. (in press). Direct and indirect self-promotion in the eyes of the perceivers. *Social Influence*.

Vonk, R. (1998). The slime effect: Suspicion and dislike of likeable behavior toward superiors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **74**, 849–864.

Vonk, R. (2002). Self-serving interpretations of flattery: Why ingratiation works. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **82**, 515–526.

Wegener, D. T., & Petty, R. E. (1998). The naive scientist revisited: Naive theories and social judgment. *Social Cognition*, **16**, 1–7.

Wyer, R. S., Budesheim, T. L., & Lambert, A. J. (1990). Cognitive representation of conversations about persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **58**, 218–238.

间接逢迎：通过与成功人士相提并论和夸其同事而褒扬别人

Nurit Tal-Or

以色列海法大学传播系

【摘要：】

　　大多数关于印象管理的文献都提到直接策略，例如通过个人成就的自我宣传，以及通过褒扬别人的逢迎行为。如果谈话的对象识别出了隐藏的动机，这些直接的策略可能会适得其反。因此，人们通常利用间接的印象管理策略。以往的研究表明，人们通过将自己与成功的他人或者通过放大与他们有关系的他人的特征来间接宣传自己。本研究表明，如果动机是逢迎他人，印象管理者会突出强调与被逢迎目标相近之人的成功。本研究的四个实验记录了这种策略，并研究了其对印象管理者和目标的后果。

La recherche indirecte de faveurs : plaire aux gens en les associant à des personnes ayant réussi et en faisant l'éloge de leurs proches
Nurit Tal-Or

La plupart de la littérature sur la gestion de l'impression examine les tactiques directes comme l'autopromotion par la mention de réussites personnelles et la recherche des faveurs des autres en les complimentant. Ces tactiques directes peuvent avoir l'effet inverse si la cible reconnaît la motivation cachée derrière. Les gens utilisent donc souvent des tactiques indirectes de gestion de l'impression. La littérature a montré que les gens se promeuvent indirectement en s'associant avec des gens ayant réussi ou en embellissant les caractéristique de ceux et celles auxquels ils sont liés. Cette étude suggère que lorsque le motif est la recherche de faveurs, la personne qui gère l'impression souligne les succès d'un individu proche de celui ou celle dont elle veut les faveurs. Les quatre expériences de cette étude ont documenté cette tactique et examiné ses conséquences pour la personne gérant l'impression et pour sa cible.

Indirekte Integration: Das Zufriedenstellen von Menschen durch die Assoziation mit erfolgreichen Anderen und durch das Loben ihrer Kollegen

Nurit Tal-Or

Die meiste Literatur zu Impression-Management betrachtet direkte Taktiken wie Selbsterhöhung durch das Erwähnen persönlicher Errungenschaften und das Beliebtmachen durch das Verteilen von Komplimenten an andere. Diese direkten Taktiken können sich allerdings ins Gegenteil verkehren, wenn die Zielperson die dahinter versteckten Motive bemerkt. Daher nutzen Menschen oft indirekte Taktiken des Impression-Management. Forschung zeigt, dass Menschen sich indirekt erhöhen, indem sie sich mit erfolgreichen anderen in Verbindung setzen oder indem sie die Eigenschaften anderer überhöhen, mit denen sie sich assoziieren. Vorliegende Studie zeigt, dass wenn das Motiv Beliebtmachen ist, der Impression-Manager den Erfolg einer Person hervorhebt, die nah am Ziel des Beliebtmachens ist. Die vier Experimente dokumentieren diese Taktik und untersuchen seine Konsequenzen für Impression-Manager und für das Ziel.

비직접적 통합:성공한 다른 사람들과 연계시키고 그들의 연계를 칭찬하는 것에 의해사람들을 만족시키기

Nurit Tal-Or

감동관리에 대한 대부분의 문헌은 개인적 성취를 언급하는 것에 의해 자기만족화를

시도하거나, 다른 사람들을 칭찬하는 것에 의한 통합을 시도하는 등의 직접적 전략들을

고려하고 있다. 이러한 직접적인 전략들은 만일 목표대상자들이 그들 뒤에 숨겨져 있는

동기를 발결할 경우 문제를 야기할 수 있다. 따라서, 사람들은 종종 비직접적인

감동관리전략을 사용한다. 이전의 연구들은 사람들은 그들 자신을 성공한 다른

사람들과 연계시키는 것에 의해, 또는 그들이 연계되어 있는 다른 사람들의 특징들을

확대하는 것에 의해 자신들을 동기부여하는 것을 보여주고 있다. 본 연구는 동기들이

통합일때, 감동관리는 통합의 대상에 가까운 사람들의 성공을 강조한다는 것을

보여주고 있다. 현재 연구의 4가지 실험들은 이러한 전략을 기록하였으며,

감동관리자와 대상자에 대한 결과들을 실험하고 있다.

El Congraciamiento Indirecto: Satisfaciendo a las Personas mediante su Asociación con Otros más Exitosos y mediante el Elogio de sus Asociados

Nurit Tal-Or

Department of Communication, University of Haifa, Mount Carmel, Haifa 31905, Israel

Resumen

Mucha de la literatura sobre el manejo de la impresión considera las tácticas directas tales como la promoción personal a través de la mención de logros personales y el congraciamiento a través del halago a otros. Estas tácticas directas pueden fracasar si el objetivo o blanco reconoce el motivo escondido detrás de ellos. Por consiguiente, la gente usa a menudo tácticas indirectas de manejo de la impresión. La investigación previa ha demostrado que la gente se auto promueve indirectamente mediante la asociación de sí mismo con otros más exitosos o incrementando las características de los otros con quienes ellos están conectados. La investigación corriente sugiere que cuando el motivo es el congraciamiento, el manejador de la impresión destaca el éxito de la persona cercana al blanco de congraciamiento. Los 4 experimentos de la corriente investigación documentaron esta táctica y examinaron sus consecuencias para el que maneja la impresión y para el blanco.