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INTRODUCTION

Due to fierce competition for scarce resources in the workplace, considerable research attention (e.g., Deluga & Perry, 1994; Vonk, 2002; Westphal & Stern, 2007) has been given to a better understanding of the exercise of ingratiation, which refers to '...an attempt by individuals to increase their attractiveness in the eyes of others' (Liden & Mitchell, 1988: 572). As such, ingratiation is often used by employees to gain the approval of their supervisors (Deluga & Perry, 1994), who determine relevant career outcomes, such as performance evaluations, salary levels and promotions (Higgins, Judge & Ferris, 2003; Singh, Kumra & Vinnicombe, 2002; Thacker & Wayne, 1995), all of which contribute to one's overall career success (Judge & Bretz, 1994). Past research has shown that ingratioratory behaviours are mainly predicted by individual characteristics, such as Machiavellianism (e.g., Pandey & Rastogi, 1979), self-monitoring (e.g., Bolino & Turnley, 2003), extraversion (e.g., Cable & Judge, 2003), need for power (e.g., Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991), locus of control (e.g., Harrison, Hochwarter, Perrewe & Ralston, 1998) and self-esteem (e.g., Kacmar, Carlson & Bratton, 2004).

It is a clearly made notion that ingratiation should serve as a career strategy that enables career-motivated employees to achieve favourable career outcomes (King, 2004). For instance, past research has separately shown that individuals with a high need for power are likely to engage in ingratiation (Harrison et al., 1998), and that their ingratiation attempt would increase their number of promotions (Higgins et al., 2003). However, so far only main-effect relationships have been examined with no research attempt made to test ingratiation as a behavioural mediator. In addition, despite an extensive research done in predicting positive career outcomes of ingratiation, past research has rather shown inconsistent findings concerning their positive associations (e.g., Ayree, Wyatt & Stone, 1996; Rao Schmidt & Murray, 1995; Thacker & Wayne, 1995). As shown in Thacker and Wayne's (1995) study, ingratiation was found to be negatively associated with promotability. Such inconsistency of the results received implicitly suggest that it is not the frequency of the use that contributes to positive outcomes but rather the effectiveness of the tactic being exercised.
To address the research gaps identified previously, this paper offers two main research objectives. First, the current study attempts to address the mediating role of ingratiation, which enables us to concurrently examine *why* and *how* people engage in ingratiation. Informed by the *functional approach to motivation* (Snyder, 1993), the current study suggests that employees perform ingratiatory behaviours (i.e., other-enhancement, opinion conformity and favour rendering) with an attempt to fulfill their career-related psychological needs, such as *need for power* (McClelland, 1975) as a result of achieving desired career-related outcomes, such as higher *promotability* ratings. Second, it is further argued that ingratiation will serve as a mediator to the extent that employees 1) possess high *political skill* (Ferris, Davidson & Perrew, 2005) that enable them to exercise ingratiation in a politically astute manner, and 2) view their organisation as an instrumental agency that enables them to fulfill their power motive through advanced career prospects, which is an indication of displaying high levels of *organisation-based self-esteem* (OBSE) (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings & Dunham, 1989). Informed by the *attribution theory* (Kelley, 1967), the current study argues that political skill and OBSE will serve as moderators to the extent that they distinguish those who look sincere from those who look manipulative. As depicted in *Figure 1*, two moderated-mediation relationships that are consistent with 'Model 3' proposed by Preacher, Rucker and Hayes' (2007: 197) are hypothesised in the current study.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

The Mediating Role of Ingratiation: Functional Approach to Motivation

Past research has empirically demonstrated how one's motivation to engage in ingratiation may be predicted by need for power (Harrison et al., 1998), and how one's performance of ingratiatory behaviours would enhance career benefits, such as promotions (Higgins et al., 2003). In this regard, this paper incorporates the *functional approach to motivation* (Snyder, 1993) to account for how ingratiation may
serve as a mediating mechanism. The theory posits that people perform a particular behaviour in order to fulfill their personal needs as a result of achieving desired outcomes (Clary & Snyder, 1999). Accordingly, the current study argues that employees with a high need for power, which is defined as "...the desire for power or for the feelings associated with having power" (Jenkins, 1994: 155), may ingratiate their supervisors in order to enhance their chances of getting promoted, and the fact that they want to get promoted is driven by their desire to have more control over their work environment and to direct employees who are at lower positional levels, which is an indication of displaying high need for power (Steers & Braunstein, 1976).

**Political Skill as a Second-Stage Moderator**

Eastman (1994) argued that ingratiable behaviours and citizenship behaviours are similar in their extra-role nature but they can be differentiated by an actor's motive and how a target person perceives the motive. In this regard, the current study argues that the extent to which employees' ingratiable behaviours will be perceived by their supervisors either as sincere or manipulative is partly determined by 'the accuracy of the ingratiator's perceptions of the target's characteristics and situational determinants' (Liden & Mitchell, 1988: 580), which is an indication of one's level of political skill. Politically skilled employees are said to display four major characteristics, including social astuteness (i.e., the ability to be observant of and understand social interactions), interpersonal influence (i.e., the ability to exercise influence over their social environment), networking ability (i.e., the ability to develop a large network of support) and apparent sincerity (i.e., the ability to come across as being genuine and sincere) (Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony & Gilmore, 2000). Given these characteristics of politically skilled individuals, past research has shown that employees with high political skill were better able to consciously manage their own behaviour to effectively influence others and to subsequently receive higher promotability ratings from their bosses, direct reports and peers (Gentry, Gilmore, Shuffler & Leslie, 2011).
According to the attribution theory (Kelley, 1967), a supervisor evaluates a behaviour of an employee based on different types of information, one of which is distinctiveness (i.e., whether the behaviour is also exercised towards individuals other than the boss). This paper suggests that power-driven employees who possess high political skill are more likely to direct their ingratiation attempts at a variety of individuals, whereas those with low political skill are more likely to make their ingratiation attempts appear more apparent towards their supervisors. This is due to their interpersonal influence and networking ability, which are generally aimed towards a large group of people rather than specific individuals. Hence, high need for power employees whose ingratiation behaviours are directed at a variety of people are more likely perceived by their supervisors as being sincere rather than as being political (Eastman, 1994). Furthermore, differential impacts that ingratiation poses on perceptions of target individuals were subsequently found to influence career-related outcomes (Harris, Kacmar, Zivnuska & Shaw, 2007; Treadway, Ferris, Duke, Adams & Thatcher, 2007). As shown in Eastman's (1994) study, the monetary rewards received by employees who were perceived as 'good corporate citizens' are greater than those of employees who were perceived as 'ingratiators'. In support of the foregoing argument, this paper hypothesises the following:

Hypothesis 1: The interaction between ingratiation and political skill will mediate the relationship between need for power and promotability. Specifically, ingratiation will mediate the indirect effects when political skill is high but not when it is low.

Organisation-Based Self-Esteem as a Second-Stage Moderator

The efficacy of the ingratiation tactics being exercised by power-driven employees to enhance promotability ratings may also be accounted by the confidence they place on their employing organisation as an instrumental agency that enables them to fulfill their power motive through advanced career prospects. In other words, as a need-satisfying agency, which can be determined by their levels of OBSE (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). OBSE reflects the degree to which individuals experience a sense of having
satisfied their needs through organisational roles they serve in a particular organisational context (Pierce et al., 1989). In this regard, the current study argues that such view towards the organisation would determine the effort one puts into finessing the style, which should make them become proactive in their style of ingratiation. As shown in Staehle-Moody's (1998) study, employees with high levels of OBSE were more proactive in their coping style, which results in them doing a better job coping with organisational changes throughout a longer period of time compared to those who display low levels of OBSE.

According to attribution theory (Kelley, 1967), another type of information from which a supervisor evaluates a behaviour of an employee based on is consistency (i.e., the generality of the behaviour across time or place). Accordingly, the current study argues that the effort that power-driven employees with high levels of OBSE put into finessing the style of their ingratiation should contribute to the consistency of their ingratiation attempts. This is because high OBSE employees tend to think highly of their organisation and such view towards their employer does not fluctuate within a short period of time, which contributes to the consistency of their effort put into ingratiating over time. In contrast, given that low OBSE employees tend to think less highly of their organisation as a need-satisfying agency, they tend to be less proactive in their style of ingratiation, and as a result they tend to be inconsistent in their ingratiation attempts.

Furthermore, when power-driven employees with high OBSE continuously exhibit extra-role behaviours throughout the year, despite their actual ingratiation attempt, they are more likely to be labeled by their supervisor as 'good corporate citizens', which should positively impact how they are being assessed on their promotability. In contrast, power-driven employees with low OBSE may engage in extra-role behaviours just before their supervisor conducts performance evaluations, which results in them being perceived by their supervisor as 'ingratiators', which should negatively impact how they are being assessed on their promotability (Eastman, 1994). In support of the foregoing argument, this paper hypothesises the following:
Hypothesis 2: The interaction between ingratiation and organisation-based self-esteem will mediate the relationship between need for power and promotability. Specifically, ingratiation will mediate the indirect effects when organisation-based self-esteem is high but not when it is low.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

The current study consists of 600 participants, all of which are full-time employees coming from nine different organisations in Thailand. The sample was further divided into 200 subordinates, 200 peers and 200 supervisors - thereby representing 200 subordinate-peer-supervisor triads. Triadic data were obtained using a cross-sectional designed survey. Self-reported surveys were administered by the Human Resource (HR) department of each organisation. The HR people in charge were instructed to pass on a packet that consists of three different surveys (i.e., supervisors, subordinates and peers) in it to participants who are at the supervisory level. Supervisors were then instructed to pass on a survey to their immediate subordinate and to advise him/her to pass on another survey to a nominated peer with whom the subordinate had regular interactions at work. Completed surveys were returned to the HR department and compiled back into the same packet using an anonymous code. Out of the 600 surveys distributed, 519 were returned by employees (i.e., a response rate of 86.5%). After deleting packets with missing responses from either subordinates, peers or supervisors, 450 surveys remained (i.e., a valid response rate of 75%). Concerning the subordinate sample, 55% of the participants are young adults (i.e., in the range of ages between 25 and 35), 57.3% of them are female and 42.7% of them are male. For the peer sample, 69.3% of them are young adults (i.e., in the range of ages between below 25 and 35), 58% of them are female and 42% of them are male. The average tenure of both subordinates and peers is approximately 6 years. Regarding the supervisors, 70% of them are in the range of ages between 36 - 65, 47.3 % of them are female and 52.7% of them are male. The average tenure is approximately 10 years.
Measures

The following scale items, excluding the control variables, were rated along a 7-point Likert-type scale which was used with strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7) as endpoints, unless otherwise specified.

Need for Power (α = .81). Need for power was assessed by subordinates using a 5-item subset of Steers and Braunstein's (1976) Manifest Needs Questionnaire. Sample items of need for power include "I strive to gain more control over the events around me at work," and "I try to influence those around me."

Political Skill (α = .86). Political skill was rated by subordinates using 11 items, which were selected based on those with the highest factor loadings from the full 18-item scale created by Ferris et al. (2005). Examples are "It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do," and "It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people."

Organisation-Based Self-Esteem (α = .92). OBSE was rated by subordinates using a 10-item scale developed by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham (1989). Sample items include "I count around here," and "There is faith in me."

Ingratiation (α = .94). Ingratiatory behaviours of subordinates were assessed by peers using the ingratiation scale developed by Kumar and Beyerlein (1991). The scale consists of 19 items representing other-enhancement, opinion conformity and favour rendering. Sample items include “gives frequent smiles to express enthusiasm/interest about something the supervisor is interested in even if he/she does not like it” and “tries to do things for the supervisor that shows his/her selfless generosity.” These items were rated along the seven-point Likert-type scale, which was used with not at all (1) and to a very large extent (7) as endpoints.

Promotability (α = .94). Promotability ratings of subordinates were rated by supervisors using the 4-item scale developed by Wayne, Liden, Graf and Ferris (1997). Sample items include "If I have to
select a successor for my position, it would be this subordinate," and "It would be best for the organisation if this subordinate was promoted from his/her current level during the next five years."

*Control Variables.* Although not directly examined, certain demographic characteristics of individuals may have impacts upon assessments of promotability and should, therefore, be controlled. For instance, *organisational tenure* has been empirically shown to affect promotions (e.g., Bowman 1964). *Gender* was found to significantly affect promotability (Stewart & Gudykunst, 1982). More specifically, empirical evidence has shown that females tend to receive fewer promotions than males (Olson & Becker, 1983). In addition, *age* may also pose confounding impacts on promotability as it implicitly implies work experience.

**RESULTS**

**Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities and Bivariate Correlations**

Inter-correlations, descriptive statistics (i.e., means and standard deviations), and reliability estimates (i.e., Cronbach Alpha) of the variables examined are presented in Table 1. All variables revealed acceptable reliabilities with their alphas being above 0.70. A close inspection of the bivariate correlations shows that need for power was significantly and positively correlated with ingratiation (*r* = 0.21, *p* < .05). Concerning an outcome of ingratiation, there was no significant relationship found between ingratiation and promotability (*r* = 0.14, ns). The non-significant result received implicitly suggests that certain boundary conditions may come into play to affect the effectiveness of ingratiation.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses**

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted using AMOS 19 to compare the hypothesised five-factor *Model 5* (i.e., need for power, ingratiation, political skill, OBSE and
promotability) against the four alternative models, including Model 1 (i.e., all constructs into F1), Model 2 (i.e., need for power, ingratiation, political skill and OBSE into F1, and promotability into F2), Model 3 (i.e., combined constructs based on source of measurement), and Model 4 (i.e., need for power into F1, ingratiation into F2, political skill and OBSE into F3, and promotability into F4). As shown in Table 2, Model 5 had a good fit $\chi^2 (160, N = 450) = 231.35$, $p < .001$, CFI = .96, TLI = .95, and RMSEA = .06.

Tests of Moderated Mediation

Hypothesis 1 proposed the second-stage moderating impact of political skill on the conditional indirect effects of need for power on promotability via ingratiation. More specifically, I proposed that ingratiation would serve as a behavioural mediator to the extent that political skill is high as opposed to when it is low. As shown in Table 3, the results revealed that the conditional indirect effects were significant at high levels of political skill (Indirect effect = 0.06, SE = 0.04, $z = 1.44$, 95% CI: 0.004 to 0.19) given that confidence intervals did not contain zero, but not at low levels of political skill (Indirect effect = -0.01, SE = 0.03, $z = -0.53$, 95% CI: -0.07 to 0.02). As shown in Figure 2, the simple slope analysis suggests that ingratiation was significantly and positively related to promotability ($\beta = .27$, $t(150) = 2.22$, $p < 0.05$). Hence, Hypothesis 1 received full empirical support.

Hypothesis 2 proposed the second-stage moderating impact of OBSE on the indirect effects of need for power on promotability via ingratiation. More specifically, I argued that ingratiation would serve as a mediating mechanism to the extent that OBSE is high as opposed to when it is low. Consistent with what I initially hypothesised, the results revealed that the conditional indirect effects were significant only at high levels of OBSE (Indirect effect = 0.08, SE = 0.05, $z = 1.6$, 95% CI: 0.004 to 0.24), but not at low
levels of OBSE (Indirect effect = -0.03, SE = 0.03, z = -1.09, 95% CI: -0.11 to 0.003). As depicted in Figure 3, when OBSE was high, ingratiation was significantly and positively associated with promotability (β = .37, t(150) = 3.31, p < 0.01). Thus, Hypothesis 2 received empirical support.

DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contributions

By incorporating attribution theory (Kelley, 1967) to examine how certain boundary conditions (i.e., political skill and OBSE) may affect the dynamics involved in the use of ingratiation, this paper offers two major theoretical contributions that extend from past research on ingratiation. First, the current study takes into account the notion that it is not the frequency of the use of ingratiation that contributes to positive outcomes but rather the efficacy of the use, which the current study has empirically shown it to be contingent on one's levels of political skill and OBSE (i.e., providing support for Hypotheses 1 and 2). So far past research has primarily examined how the moderating role of political skill may contribute to the effectiveness of ingratiationary tactics (e.g., Harris et al., 2007; Treadway et al., 2007). The current study incorporates additional boundary conditions, which in this case OBSE was empirically found to be one of the factors contributing to the effectiveness of ingratiation.

Second, by incorporating the second-stage moderating roles of political skill and OBSE, the paper also addressed how ingratiation may serve as a behavioural mediator that enables high need for power employees to obtain positional power through their chances of getting promoted (i.e., promotability). Despite the notion made regarding ingratiation as a career strategy (e.g., King, 2004), no research attempt has been made so far to test ingratiation as a mediating mechanism that enables career-motivated employees to advance in their career. Accordingly, the empirical results received from the current study
revealed that ingratiation would serve as a mediator to the extent that the tactics were exercised effectively, as shown to be contributed by high levels political skill and OBSE.

**Practical Contributions**

From the standpoint of the organisation, the results obtained suggest that engaging in ingratiation can be considered political and dysfunctional given that organisational resources are rather used up by those who get rewarded from their political attempts than those who actively take part in task performance. To address this, the whole performance management system has to be effectively managed. First, performance criteria that are used to determine promotion decisions should be developed in consistent with the organisation's overall HR policies. This is to minimise the gap between the HR policies developed and the actual HR practices being implemented. Second, performance evaluations should be carried out in an objective manner, which can be done by, for instance, providing training to line managers who are in charge of assessing their subordinates' performance or conducting a 360-degree feedback to obtain assessments from various perspectives, which can potentially reduce any possible biases coming from one single source. From the standpoint of individual employees, however, our results suggest that in order for them to advance more progressively in their career, particularly for those who already have very good performance records, they may also have to develop ingratiiatory tactics.

**Strengths and Limitations**

One major strength of this study lies in how data were obtained using triadic data sources, including subordinates, peers and supervisors. Accordingly, ingratiiatory behaviours of subordinates were assessed by peers, whom they had regular interactions with at work, rather than by subordinates themselves or supervisors. There are two major reasons underlying this strategy. First, ingratiiatory behaviours can be interpreted differently according to the source that reports the behaviour, such as, the actor, target or observer (Rao, Schmidt & Murray, 1995; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). For instance, when ingratiation is rated by the actor, responses obtained from self-reports may be contaminated by social
desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Another reason for obtaining triadic data is to deal with possibilities for common method bias. When ingratiation is rated by subordinates' peers rather than by supervisors, this would minimise the same-source bias that may occur from using both supervisory ratings of ingratiation and promotability.

A limitation of the current study, however, lies in the cross-sectional design, which cannot infer causal relationships. To address this limitation, future research should consider conducting a longitudinal study or at least adopting a time lag in between the collection of independent variables and the collection of dependant variables.

**Future Research Directions**

To provide a more in-depth understanding regarding the effectiveness of ingratiation in achieving desired outcomes, future research may consider how the conduciveness of a situational context where ingratiation is to be exercised may come into play. Liden and Mitchell (1988) argued that the success of the execution of ingratiation is in part determined by the level of risks associated in the situation. In a highly political workplace, for example, organisational policies tend to be relatively slack, which enables organisational members to get away with formal policies through political tactics, such as ingratiation. In this regard, future studies may examine how organisational politics (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997) can come into play to determine the effectiveness of ingratiation.

To provide a better understanding of how ingratiation may serve as a career strategy that enables employees to fulfill their career-related psychological needs through the achievement of career-related benefits, future research may consider examining a mediating mechanism that is placed in between ingratiation and outcomes. For instance, future research may examine how employees who engage in ingratiation may use their interpersonal attraction to enhance network benefits obtained from their superiors (Seibert, Kraimer & Liden, 2001), such as access to organisational resources and information, and to subsequently capitalise on these network benefits to advance their career prospects.
REFERENCES


Figure 1: Proposed Theoretical Model

Political skill

Need for Power → Ingratiation → Promotability

Organisation-Based Self-Esteem
Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability, and Bivariate Correlations Among Variables Studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age (Subordinate)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender (Subordinate)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenure (Subordinate)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age (Peer)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender (Peer)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tenure (Peer)</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age (Supervisor)</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender (Supervisor)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tenure (Supervisor)</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Need for Power</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Organisation-Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ingratiation</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Political Skill</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Promotability</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1. N = 450 participants
2. * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01 (two-tailed test)
### Table 2: Confirmatory Factor Analyses of the Final Model and Alternative Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 incorporates all five constructs into one factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 combined need for power, ingratiation, political skill and organisation-based self-esteem into F1, and promotability into F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 combined constructs based on source of measurement in which need for power, political skill and organisation-based self-esteem into F1, ingratiation into F2 and promotability into F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4 combined need for power into F1, ingratiation into F2, political skill and organisation-based self-esteem into F3, and promotability into F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5 combined need for power into F1, ingratiation into F2, political skill into F3, OBSE into F4, and promotability into F5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1. CFI = comparative fit index
2. TLI = Tucker - Lewis index
3. RMSEA = root mean square error approximation
Table 3: Regression Results for Conditional Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second-Stage Moderation of Political Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple paths for low political skill</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.07 to 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple paths for high political skill</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.004 to 0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 2</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second-Stage Moderation of Organisation-Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple paths for low Organisation-Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.11 to 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple paths for high Organisation-Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.004 to 0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Interactive Effect Between Ingratiation and Political Skill in Predicting Promotability
Figure 3: Interactive Effect Between Ingratiation and Organisation-Based Self-Esteem in Predicting Promotability