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Chapter 1
Introduction

Motives of this research

Ingratiation is everyday and everywhere occurrences that frequently impacts on the effectiveness of organizations (Ralston, 1985). Moreover, it is also a large class of ongoing social influence processes in organizations (Liden and Mitchell, 1988). Some people (e.g. Strutton, Pelton & Lumpkin, 1995; Strutton, Pelton & Tanner, 1996) assert ingratiation has existed since the beginning of time. They analogize that “Eve’s acceptance of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden resulted in part from the serpent’s skillful use of ingratiation for self-enhancement in pursuit of his own personal goals” (Strutton et al., 1996, p.151). Nevertheless, there are few empirical studies to explore the use of ingratiation in organizations (Liden & Mitchell, 1988), especially in Chinese societies. Even though some research employ Chinese subjects or study related topics in Chinese societies, these studies are most likely to adopt western points of views. However, Pandey (1981) reminds us that ingratiation is a set of culture-specific behaviors that are influenced by cultural and social variations. Therefore, while studying ingratiation, we should consider the cultural differences. In addition, many scholars have
noted that it seems impossible to understand Chinese social behaviors, including ingratiation, precisely without considering the Chinese indigenous concept, especially guanxi (relation) (Hwang, 1987; Jacobs, 1979; Peng, 1998; 金耀基, 2002; 翟學偉, 2005). As a result, the previous literatures may not reflect accurately Chinese ingratiation. Because of this reason, one of the motives of this research is to investigate the causes of Chinese ingratiation in organizational settings in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, insurance brokerage is a high competitive job in Hong Kong. If they cannot meet the quota each month, it is difficult for them to be promoted or get higher salaries. On the other hand, they may be scolded and criticized by their supervisors or even be fired. Under such a highly competitive condition, it is possible for them to frequently engage in ingratiation towards their supervisor (Pandey & Rastogi, 1979) in order to gain more desirable outcomes and prevent undesirable outcomes in workplace. However, there are no empirical studies to examine ingratiation of insurance brokers. Therefore, the second motive of this research is to study it.

**Research question**

What factors influence an insurance broker to ingratiate oneself with his or her supervisor in the workplace in Hong Kong?
Objectives of this research

1. To explore the causes of ingratiation among insurance brokers in organizational settings.

2. To examine which ingratiation tactics the insurance brokers may use to influence their supervisor.

3. To understand the relationship between guanxi and ingratiation.

Organization of this proposal

This research proposal comprises of six chapters. Chapter one is a belief introduction in which the motives of this research, the research question and the objectives are addressed. Chapter two is a literature review in which the concept of ingratiation, the causes of ingratiation and the relationship between the sense of guanxi with supervisor and ingratiation will be discussed. The theoretical framework and hypotheses of this research will be presented in chapter three. Chapter four and chapter five are respectively the part about conceptualization and operationalization. The chapter six is methodology that introduces the research method, sampling, data collection, questionnaire design, plan of analysis, ethical issues and research schedule.
Chapter 2

Literature review

The concept of ingratiation

Western perspectives

Ingratiation is always defined as an attempt to make individuals become more likeable. However, this kind of definition may simplify its meaning. Jones is the first one to study ingratiation systemically and scientifically. He defined ingratiation as “a class of strategic behavior illicitly designed to influence a particular other person concerning the attractiveness of one’s personal qualities” (Jones, 1964, p.11). This idea is supported by Jones and Wortman who noted that ingratiation is “pertinent to attempt a systematic analysis of the circumstances giving rise to this attraction-oriented cluster of responses” (1973, p.38). In that time, ingratiation was also viewed as manipulative and deceitful (Bohra & Pandey, 1984). Another similar definition is suggested by Tedeschi and Melburg (1984). They defined ingratiation as a set of assertive tactics that organizational members used to gain the approbation of their supervisors, who control significant reward for them. In this sense, ingratiation may help people’s career, so it is also viewed as career management (Aryee et al., 1993). A study conducted by Watt (1993) showed ingratiators
could get more positive performance evaluations from their supervisors and be judged to be highly motivated, cooperative, competent by their supervisors as well as having greater promotion potential. However, some people disagree that ingratiation is illicit or assertive. For example, Liden and Mitchell (1988) suggested ingratiation is only an attempt used by individuals to increase their attractiveness in the eyes of others. Varma et al. (2006) mentioned people may ingratiate either intentionally, unintentionally or both. Therefore, the reason why people ingratiate may be sample: they just want to become more likeable (Strutton et al., 1996). According to these arguments, ingratiation can be regarded as upward influence, organizational politics or impression management.

In addition to the definition, there is still no consensus about ingratiation tactics. Different scholars have discovered and proposed different ingratiation tactics. Jones and Wortman (1973) presented four common tactics. The first one is other-enhancement that “involves communication of enhancing evaluative responses to the target person” (Jones & Wortman, 1973, p.3). Second, opinion conformity “involves expressing agreement with the target person” (Jones, & Wortman, 1973, p.16). The third is rendering favors that involve conveying a “kind act or special consideration to the target” (Strutton et al., 1996, p.152). Finally, self-presentation is commonly defined as a behavior “in a manner perceived to be appropriate by the target person…or in a manner to which this individual
will be attracted” (Ralston, 1985, p.477). Moreover, Pandey (1981) and Bohra and Pandey (1984) discovered four other tactics in India. They are name-dropping, situation-specific behavior, instrumental dependency and self-depreciation. Name-dropping is that people use the name or reference of a third person, who is powerful and well known in the society, while communicating with the target person (Bohra & Pandey, 1984). Situation-specific behavior is “related to opportunism practiced by the ingratiator to please the target, rather than consistent behavior based on some principle, value, ideology, or norm” (Pandey, 1981, p.147). Instrumental dependency is to impress the target person by being totally dependent upon him or her (Pandey, 1981; Bohra & Pandey, 1984). Self-depreciation is the ingratiator degrading or lowering himself or herself in the eyes of the target person (Bohra & Pandey, 1984). Strutton et al. (1995) also found that salespeople may ingratiate themselves with their consumers by court and counsel and self-promotion. Court and counsel is a tactic to beseech advice from the target (Strutton et al., 1995). Self-promotion is people stressing their own professional potency (Strutton et al., 1995). Attitudinal conformity and behavioral conformity are common ingratiation tactics for salespeople, too (Strutton & Pelton, 1998). Furthermore, Cooper (2005) suggested joking and humor should also be considered as ingratiation tactics. There may be two reasons about the disagreement: one is that ingratiation is
culturally specific (Pandey, 1891); another one is that different people focus on different aspects of ingratiation while discussing it.

In contrast with the arguments about the definition and the tactics, scholars seem to commonly agree two classifications of ingratiation tactics. One classification is defensive tactics and offensive tactics (Strutton et al., 1996). The defensive tactics “apparently describe ingratatory efforts intended make it difficult for a target to respond negatively” (Strutton et al., 1996, p.156). This kind of tactics includes other-enhancement, court and counsel, behavioral and attitudinal conformity (Strutton et al., 1996). The offensive tactics are the attempts for people to proactively manipulate a target’s attributions in order to get more positive responds (Strutton et al., 1996). This kind of tactics includes self-enhancement, self-promotion and rendering favors (Strutton et al., 1996). Another classification is self-focused/inward-focused and their-focused/target-focused (Strutton et al., 1996; Varma et al., 2006). If the tactics aim to give the target person a good impression, they are self-focused/inward-focused (Strutton et al., 1996). Self-enhancement and self-promotion are the examples (Varma et al., 2006). On the other hand, the other-focused/target-focused tactics aim to make the target person feel good (Strutton et al., 1996). Opinion conformity and rendering favors are the examples (Varma et al., 2006).
To sum, different people look at ingratiation with different points of views, and so there are still many arguments about the definitions and the tactics. However, if we consider all of the discussions and arguments, we may discover all these agree that a successful ingratiation can increase one’s attractiveness and may give people a desirable outcome.

Chinese perspective

In his bachelor’s degree dissertation, Tsang (2007) pointed out that most of the ingratiation literatures would not be able to reflect the Chinese ingratiation. It is because most of the literatures uses the western perspectives to examine ingratiation and focus on non-Chinese societies. He argued that the indigenous concepts, like guanxi (relation), renqing (favor) and mianzi (face), are important elements to understand Chinese ingratiation. Based on this idea, he defined ingratiation as a set of behaviors that is designed to maintain, improve or promote guanxi with others. Moreover, he also thought that Chinese people do not only ingratiate themselves with a particulate person though increasing their attractiveness, but also through practicing renqing and mianzi. In this sense, ingratiation can be regarded as a guanxi management strategy, which is defined as those behaviors aim to establish, produce, maintain and improve guanxi with others (Kipins, 1997; Peng, 1998).
As a result, Tsang (2007) studied ingratiation with the perspective of Chinese Indigenized Social Psychology among full-time undergraduate students in Hong Kong. In his dissertation, he hypothesized the willingness to ingratiate is related to the sense of the effect of becoming attractiveness, the sense of the effect of renqing and the sense of the effect of mianzi on guanxi. However, the result showed that there was no any relationship between them. On the other hand, Tsang found seven ingratiable tactics the participants may use. The tactics were self-presentation, other-enhancement, behavioral conformity, showing support in front of the public, rendering favors, self-depreciation and modesty. In addition, compared with those who do not have part-time jobs, those students who have part-time jobs were more willing to maintain, improve or promote guanxi through ingratiation. The research also found the females may be likely to ingratiate with other-enhancement and rendering favors rather than males.

Although Tsang’s dissertation makes efforts to find out the picture of Chinese ingratiation, its results must be viewed caution. The reasons are:

1) **Sampling and sample size.** Tsang’s research adopted a non-probability sampling method – snowball sampling. Therefore, the representativeness of the samples may be weak. In addition, the sample size was small (only 75 subjects were selected). As a result, the results may not be generalizable.
2) **Reliability and validity of the instruments.** The three scales developed in the dissertation to measure the sense of renqing, the sense of mianzi and the sense of becoming likeable were lack of validity. Moreover, the internal reliability for each scale was lower than .70. To some extent, the reliability and validity of each scale was inadequate.

Although Tsang’s study has many problems that limit the reliability, as well as the internal and external validity, it gives insights to understand ingratiation in Chinese societies. Moreover, he also reminds us that it is important to understand Chinese ingratiation with the indigenous concepts like guanxi, renqing and mianzi.

**The causes of ingratiation**

**Theoretical models**

*Cognitive and motivational determinants of ingratiation*

In their theoretical analysis, Jones and Wortman (1973) described three sets of factors that are likely to influence the use of ingratiation. The first factor is incentive-based determinants. According to them, this factor is divided into two dimensions: incentive magnitude and the uniqueness of the target person. For the first dimension, ingratiation can be regarded as a set of self-motivated behaviors. It is because the dispositional factors, such as personality and motivational structure of self-concept,
would affect the use of ingratiation. In addition, some conditions related to transient or momentary replicas of the dispositional variables would be likely to increase the chance of ingratiation (Jones & Wartman, 1973). For example, when a person has just been criticized, his or her need for positive feedback may be aroused. Then, he or she may possibly engage in ingratiation. The second dimension, the uniqueness of the target person, is important to govern the incentive to be ingratiating (Jones & Wortman, 1973). It is because this kind of person may be the only one who can satisfy the powerful needs of the ingratiator. Therefore, people may try to achieve their own goal by ingratiating this kind of people.

The subjective probability of success is the second factor suggested by Jones and Wortman (1973). According to them, the factor of incentive-based determinants is not sufficient determinants of ingratiation, but the ingratiator’s subjective probability of success to ingratiate is. The subjective probability of success is related to (1) the estimation how the target person values the ingratiation tactic (2) the calculations about the salience of the benefit desired in the target person’s response hierarchy (3) the assessment of the target person’s personality (4) the effectiveness of controlling over situational resources that are related to the interaction between the ingratiator and the target person and (5) the efficiency of hiding the purpose of ingrating (Jones &
Finally, the major determinant of ingratiation is the perceived legitimacy. Jones and Wortman (1973) suggested that if people think ingratiation is unethical under a condition, they might not ingratiate. Therefore, ingratulators would try to handle the ethical dilemma of employing ingratiation for their own personal gain by several ways: (1) convincing themselves that the statements they make are true (2) attributing their statements and behaviors to be benign, rather than manipulative, self-seeking or motives (3) admitting they are ingratiating, but that under the circumstance, their behavior is morally justifiable (4) perceiving the target person as a natural enemy who does not deserve equitable treatment (5) developing out of an understanding of the plight of extreme dependence and (6) believing their interaction with and relationship to the target person is a voluntary one (Jones & Wortman, 1973).

Although the combination of the three factors has been unclear to Jones and Wortman, they also tried to suggest that

incentive value and subjective probability combine multiplicatively to produce a strong or weak tendency to ingratiate. Legitimacy then plays its role as a threshold factor, providing a go or stop signal for the behavior once the tendency to ingratiate reaches certain strength. Thus, a person may flatter
or ingratiate even though he knows this behavior is illegitimate, once the
importance and the likelihood of obtaining a benefit reach a certain combined
value (1973, p.44)

The interactive effects of individual factors and situational factors

When Jones and Wortman discussed the causes of ingratiation, they only focused on
the individual-psychological factors. However, Ralston (1985) argued that ingratiation
should be the result of the interaction of individual and situational factors. In the
individual level, he suggested three factors that would enhance ingratatory behaviors.
They are Machiavellianism, locus of control and work skill uniqueness (WSU).
According to him (1985), Machiavellianism and locus of control are two personality
factors and WSU is an achieved characteristic. He proposed that individuals high in
Machiavellianism tend to ingratiate more than those low in Machiavellianism. As Christie
and Geis noted in 1970, people with Machiavellianism tend to be manipulative and have
little care for the feelings and well-being of others (as cited in Ralston, 1985), so they
“tend to use manipulative tactics such as ingratiation more often than do individuals who
do not seek to control and manipulate others” (Ralston, 1985, p.480).

He also suggested that people with an internal locus of control will ingratiate more
than those with an external locus of control, because the internals believe their ability and
effort can impact significantly on the outcome they receive (Ralston, 1985).

On the other hand, he pointed out that low WSU people would be more likely to ingratiate than high WSU people in organizational context. It is because they may not be able to distinguish themselves from others in terms of work competency, showing they can favorably compete with their peers, or demonstrating they are better than their peers (Ralston, 1985).

Ralston (1985) further mentioned that these three individual factors should have interactive effects on ingratiation. Based on the above logic, he developed an eight regions model to determine which combination of the factors has the greatest power to encourage ingratiation. The eight regions model is displayed in the figure 1. In the figure, region 1 has the highest probability of initiating ingratiation and region 8 has the lowest, as well as the probability of region 2, 3 and 4 is higher than region 5, 6 and 7’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Machiavellianism</th>
<th>Locus of control</th>
<th>Work skill uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>External</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The eight regions resulting from the interaction of individual factors (as cited in Ralston, 1985, p.482)
For the situational level, Ralston (1985) also proposed three factors that may influence the use of ingratiation in organizations. The factors are management style, task ambiguity and resource scarcity. For management style, he only focused on two styles that were autocratic – managers see subordinates are lack of self-control and external motivated – and democratic – managers see subordinates is good at self-control and internal motivated. He noted, “the autocratic superior is suppressing the subordinates’ opportunities to use their creative abilities in order to distinguish themselves, and thus is encouraging the use of ingratiation” (1985, p.483). Theoretically, therefore, autocratic management style will encourage subordinate to ingratiate.

Moreover, he argued that when a subordinate works in an environment where task responsibility is ambiguous, he or she would be more likely to ingratiate. It is because the unclearness makes the subordinate does not know how to obtain personal goals by completing their jobs (Ralston, 1985).

Finally, he noted that if a supervisor holds the scarce resources and there is no formal room for the subordinates to receive the resources by influencing the supervisor, the subordinates are going to influence the supervisor by informal approaches, such as ingratiation. As a result, if resource is highly scarce, ingratiation may probably happen
Similarly, he demonstrated the interactive effects of the three situational factors on ingratiation by creating another eight regions model. In the figure 2, region A has the highest probability of initiating ingratiation and region H has the lowest probability, as well as the probability of region B, C and D is higher than the region E, F and G’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Management style</th>
<th>Task ambiguity</th>
<th>Resource scarcity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: The eight regions resulting from the interaction of situational factors (as cited in Ralston, 1985, p.484)

In addition, Ralston (1985) also suggested the two sets of regions would interact and then affect the use of ingratiation. This interaction provides 64 possible combinations that are showed in the figure 3.
The dynamic model of the ingratiation process

Liden and Mitchell (1988) presented a dynamic model of the ingratiation process. This dynamic model consists of five main parts: causes of ingratiation, choice of an ingratiation strategy, ingratatory behaviors, target’s reaction and outcome. Similar to Jones and Wortman (1973), Liden and Mitchell (1988) suggested the general dispositional characteristic – the desire to be liked – and the transient or momentary replicas of the dispositional variables – the identification of need to defend or promote...
oneself – are the causes of ingratiation. In addition, they also noted the situational factors would push people to ingratiate. According to them, negative organization’s climate, resource scarcity, high task interdependence and ambiguous performance appraisal systems are the situational variables that affect employees to often engage in ingratiable behaviors.

When an individual decides to ingratiate, he or she has to decide which ingratiation tactics to be used. To make this decision, this person would process a risk assessment (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). The risk assessment comprises (1) the causes for the use of ingratiation (2) the perceived cost and benefit ratio of the choices and (3) the perception of the target susceptibility (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). After this process, the person would ingratiate oneself with the target person. In such interaction, the target would give responses to the ingratiator based on his or her own perception of the ingratiator’s intent and the used ingratiation tactics (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). Finally, the ingratiation would affect the ingratiator, the target person and the organization. At the same time, the outcomes would also influence the causes of ingratiation in the future (Liden & Mitchell, 1988). The model is presented in the figure 4.
Empirical studies

In addition to the theoretical models, there are some empirical studies that investigate the causes of ingratiation. First, Pandey and Rastogi’s experiment (1979) tried to find out the role of Machiavellianism and the situational variable (competition and noncompeteion) on the adoption of ingratiation tactics. Thirty-two males were selected from a pretested subject pool of 100 undergraduates in India to take part in the experiment. After the selection, the 32 subjects were asked to complete the Mach IV Scale for determining their Machiavellianism. Several weeks later, they were randomly assigned into one of the two experimental conditions, which was competitive or
noncompetitive hypothetical job interview situation. All subjects were told that they were facing the challenge of obtaining a job and they might have a number of personal job interviews. The only difference between the noncompetitive and competitive condition was the number of available job position for them. In the noncompetitive interview condition, the subjects were informed the number of applicants was around 20 and the number of available position for them was around 40. On the other hand, the subjects in the competitive interview condition were instructed the same number of applicants, but the number of available position for them was only around 10. Finally, all subjects were requested to complete a questionnaire that measured which behaviors they may or may not perform in the interview condition. The results showed that those subjects with high Machiavellianism would be more likely to ingratiate with praising and agreeing with the target persons. Moreover, the subjects in competitive condition were more willing to demonstrate opinion, value or attitudinal conformity to the interviewers. However, the joint effects of both variables did not achieve significant level.

Another study was conducted by Aryee, Debrah and Chay (1993). They collected data from 214 professional employees in public and private sector organizations in Singapore by using self-administrated questionnaire survey. They hypothesized that (1) the use of ingratiation of employees was positively related to the situational factors,
which were task ambiguity, perceived supervisor reward power, perceived organizational political norms, consideration and organization size (2) internal career concerns would enhance the use of ingratiating, but the relationship should be less and (3) the personality factors that internal locus of control, high Machiavellianism and high need for achievement would be likely to encourage ingratiating. The study showed that the situational variables had the most powerful explanation to the variance in ingratiating, followed by career concern and then personality variables. Moreover, the results revealed that task ambiguity, supervisor reward power, managerial responsibility (an external career concern) and the need for achievement were significantly related to ingratiating. To predict ingratiating with the interaction of the variables, only the interaction of supervisor reward power and Machiavellianism was significant.

Shankar, Ansari and Saxena (1994) examined the effects of organizational climate (authoritarian, nurturant-task and participative leadership style) and ownership (public and private) on ingratiating in organizational settings in India. The research results showed ownership significantly moderated the relationship between ingratiating and organizational climate. It also suggested ingratiating frequently be used in the nurturant-task climate in public sector. Looking at the public sector, the research indicated that people would be likely to use the ingratiating tactics of using a third person,
enhancement of self, instrumental dependency and target gratification; people in the authoritarian climate may less adopt the tactics of using a third person; and there was no effect of participative climate on the use of ingratiatory tactics. Furthermore, in the private sector, the research also noted that the tactics of the disparagement of self may be used frequently in the nurturant-task climate; the tactics of disparagement of self, instrumental dependency and target gratification were used frequently in the authoritarian climate; and the participative climate was not related to the use of ingratiation tactics.

In his master thesis, Chan (陳威琦, 2006) investigated the relationship between organizational culture and organizational upward influence behaviors. Firstly, he found out five upward influence behaviors, including rational persuasion, upward appeal, image management, pressure and ingratiation. Secondly, he adopted the classification of organizational culture – bureaucratic, innovative and supportive – proposed by Wallach (1983) to examine the relationship between the five behaviors and three kinds of cultures. The results showed that organizational culture would affect the use of ingratiation. Especially, people worked in innovative or supportive culture may be likely to engage in ingratiatory behaviors rather than bureaucratic culture.

Summary

Although there are a lot of factors related to the causes of ingratiation, they can be
generally clustered into situational variables and personality variables. The situational variables include management style, task ambiguity, resource scarcity, organizational climate, organizational culture, organizational political norms, and competitive or noncompetitive condition. The personality variables include locus of control, Machiavellianism, desire to be liked, need for promote or defend self, work skill uniqueness, career concerns, need for achievement, and cognition and motivation. Each of them may have imparts on ingratiation and some of them may have joint effects to ingratiation.

The sense of guanxi with supervisor and ingratiation

The concept of guanxi

Characteristics of guanxi

Guanxi is an important concept to understand Chinese social behaviors (Hwang, 1987; Jacobs, 1979; Peng, 1998; 金耀基, 2002; 翟學偉, 2005), because guanxi is important and prominent in every life of Chinese societies (K. S. Yang, 1995). Therefore, it is necessary to consider its impacts on ingratiation. In social science literatures, guanxi is always translated to particularistic tie, interpersonal connection, instrumental-personal tie, or personal network, but these translations cannot capture the whole meanings of guanxi (楊中芳 & 彭泗清, 2005). The reason is that guanxi is endemic in Chinese
societies and it is a cultural product (Peng, 1998). Nowadays, as a result, it is common to use guanxi directly to describe Chinese personal relationship in social science literatures.

In a broad sense, guanxi is a system of personal connections or a form of interpersonal relationship that carries long-term social obligations (Millington, Eberhardt & Wilkinson, 2005). More specifically, there are three significant aspects for the concept of guanxi:

First, guanxi stresses interdependence between two persons. It is characterized by familiarity or intimacy. If two individuals want to develop guanxi, they must know a good deal about each other and share a good deal with each other…

Second, guanxi linkages are always dyadic and hierarchically ranked in relation to ego… Third, guanxi is maintained primarily by specific personal obligations based on norms of reciprocity. People must return a favor with a bigger favor.

(Peng, 1998, p.44)

According to Peng (1998), the most essential aspect of guanxi is the reciprocal obligations.

Another feature of guanxi is chaxugeju (the differential mode of association) (Fei, 1947/1992). According to Fei, Chinese social relationship is “like the ripples formed from a stone thrown into a lake, each circle spreading out from the center become more distant
and at the same time more insignificant” (1947/1992, p.65). In order words, individuals interact with different people with different principles and multiple standards of behaviors (Hwang, 1987). People treat those who have better and closer guanxi with them much better than those who have not. The idea of chaxugeju also notes that guanxi is self-centered. Fei (1947/1992) described guanxi “is like the circles that appear on the surface of a lake when a rock is thrown into it. Everyone stands at the center of the circles produced by his or her own social influence” (p.62). He also pointed out “each network is like a spider’s web in the sense that it centers on oneself…the people covered by one network are not the same as those covered by any other” (p.63). Fei’s idea implies the boundary of guanxi is ambiguous and flexible, because it is decided by individuals. Therefore, everyone has to carefully consider the questions – which kind of guanxi is between him or her and others? How strong is their guanxi? – before the interaction with others (Hwang, 1987).

Guanxi classification

Theoretically, Chinese people always classify guanxi into jiaren (family), shuren (familiar persons such as neighbors, colleagues or classmates) and shengren (strangers) (K. S. Yang, 1995). The importance and intimacy of each guanxi is totally different (Hwang, 1987; K. S. Yang, 1995). Jiaren is a permanent and stable; shuren is unstable but
necessary to people; and shengren is unstable and insignificant (Hwang, 1987). In Chinese societies, jiaren and shuren are classified to zi ji ren (insider), and shengren is wai ren (outsider) (K. S. Yang, 1995). Many people note Chinese treat zi ji ren much better than wai ren, it is because different guanxi operate with different principles or rules. In jiaren, the principle of zeren (responsibility) or need rule is employed (Hwang, 1987; K. S. Yang, 1995). This principle or rule requests individuals to unconditionally do their best for one another and do not expect any return from others in the future. The principle of renqing (favor) or renqing rule is adopted in shuren (Hwang 1987; K. S. Yang, 1995). This principle or rule requests people to consider others’ renqing and mianzi during interaction, which the quality is depended on the accumulated renqing and associated previous transactions (K. S. Yang, 1995). In addition, shuren is not like jiaren, which is permanent and stable, so that reciprocity or social exchange, sympathy, keeping in contact with the acquaintances and offering help to the acquaintances who are in trouble are expected (Hwang, 1987). Finally, people interact with shengren by the use of the principle of libai (gain and loss) or equity rule (Hwang, 1987; K. S. Yang, 1995). According to this principle or rule, people tend to make meticulous and detailed calculations while interacting with others, in order to maximize the benefits and minimize the cost. Therefore, Chinese would treat jiaren much better than shuren and then
Guanxi in organizational settings

Cheng (鄭伯壎, 1995) proposed a cognitive model of employee categorization. He noted that Chinese managers would treat employees differently according to the employee categorization which is based on three criteria: guanxi, loyalty and competence. Based on this model, many research were conducted to investigate the relationship between Chinese managerial behaviors and Chinese business leaders’ employee categorization. All these studies suggest that Chinese leaders tend to allocate more reward and resource to, share more information with, be more likely to promote and empower those employees who have guanxi with them (Cheng et al., 2002; Hu, Hsu & Cheng, 2004; 余伯泉, 1993; 鄭伯壎, 1995). It implies that if employees have better guanxi with their supervisors, it may bring more desirable outcomes to them.

Guanxi management strategies

As a result, everyone develops different social strategies to establish, produce, maintain and improve guanxi (Kipinis, 1997). So (1999) outlined the mechanism of guanxi development and maintenance. According to him, Chinese persons would initiate guanxi with guanxi base or guanxi reference, maintain guanxi by conforming renqing and norm of reciprocity, as well as continue interactions and repeated transactions. Based on
this mechanism, Chinese have developed a lot of guanxi management strategies, such as inheriting, adopting, pulling, digging into, connecting, expanding, exchanging gift, banqueting, doing favor, visiting, and helping out (Kipnis, 1997, 2002; M. F. Yang, 1994).

Ingratiation as a guanxi management strategy

Guanxi is composed of affective component and instrumental component (Hwang, 1987). If affective component is dominant in interpersonal relationship between dyadic persons, it means their guanxi is close, such as kinship (Hwang, 1987). On the other hand, if an interpersonal relationship is dominated by instrumental component, the guanxi will be distant and insignificant, such as strangers (Hwang, 1987). In fact, enhancing affective connection with others is important to manage guanxi (Peng, 1998). As a result, to determinate whether ingratiation can maintain or develop guanxi depends on the effectiveness of ingratiation on enhancing affective component.

Strutton et al. (1996) found out that defensive ingratiation tactics (other enhancement and court and counsel) are positively related to the buyer-seller trust. They also pointed out that self-presentation and rendering favors could increase the affinity between humans. Moreover, Strutton and Pelton’s observation (1998) identified ingratiation could contribute to team solidarity and strengthen team relationships, because ingratiation bolsters interpersonal attachment. Furthermore, Cooper (2005) directly
pointed out ingratiaitory humor is an affective stimulus. All these seem to suggest ingratiation can enhance affective component of interpersonal relationship. Because of this reason, ingratiation may be able to facilitate guanxi so that it should be a guanxi management strategy (Tsang, 2007).

The sense of guanxi with the supervisor

The guanxi between employees and supervisors is a type of shuren. Therefore, it is ruled by the principle of renqing or renqing rule. If employees want to keep good guanxi with their supervisor, they should adopt a number of guanxi management strategies, such as ingratiation. Moreover, it is possible for employees to obtain more rewards from their supervisor because of good guanxi. For example, the research conducted by Shi (石淑令, 2004) showed that those employees who have better guanxi with their supervisors, they may have higher promotion potential. Another study conducted by Hu et al. (2004) showed closer guanxi with reward allocator is one major variable to let subordinates get more rewards.

As a result, if one senses a better guanxi with supervisor is helpful for them to gain desirable outcomes or prevent undesirable outcomes, they may be likely to ingratiate themselves with the supervisor. Therefore, it is proposed the sense of guanxi with supervisor should be a cause of ingratiation in organizations in Chinese societies.
Chapter 3

Theoretical framework and hypotheses

As the previous chapter shows that there are many different kinds of variables that may influence the use of ingratiation, but this research only looks at Machiavellianism, the senses of guanxi with supervisor and organizational culture (bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture). The reasons of selecting these three variables are (1) the results of previous studies about the relationship between Machiavellianism and ingratiation are contradictory (Aryee et al., 1993), so studying this relationship may give a possible answer to this argument (2) no research, either western or Chinese, considers the sense of guanxi with supervisor as a variable that may influence ingratiation, so it is meaningful to explore the relationship, especially in Chinese societies (3) there are lots of studies about the relationship between organizational culture and different kinds of organizational behaviors, but there is less research to study the relationship between organizational culture and ingratiation. Therefore, studying it may have a contribution to the knowledge of organizational behavior. As a result, this research regards all of these as independent variables and ingratiation as a dependent variable. The theoretical framework is illustrated in the figure 4.
Based on this framework, a number of hypotheses are made:

1. People high in Machiavellianism will be likely to engage in ingratiation.

2. If people think guanxi with supervisor is important for them to gain desirable outcomes or prevent undesirable outcomes, the chance of initiating ingratiation is high.

3. Machiavellianism is positively correlated to the sense of guanxi with supervisor.

4. Different types of organizational cultures will encourage ingratiation in different levels. Innovative culture will essentially enhance ingratiation, followed by
supportive culture and then bureaucratic culture.

5. People who are high Machiavellianism, high sense of guanxi with supervisor and place in innovative culture will most frequently ingratiate compared with those who are low Machiavellianism, low sense of guanxi with supervisor and place in supportive culture or bureaucratic culture.
Chapter 4
Conceptualization

Ingratiation

In this research, ingratiation is viewed as guanxi management. Moreover, it is also regarded as upward influence behavior, because this research aims to find out insurance brokers’ ingratitatory behaviors toward their supervisors. In addition, ingratiation should be illicit because Chinese are likely to perceive ingratiators as the experts of ‘doing guanxi’, which is unacceptable in Chinese societies. As a result, ingratiation is defined as an illicit attempt used by individuals to influence their supervisor and maintain or consolidate the guanxi with their supervisor in organizational setting.

The sense of guanxi with supervisor

The sense of guanxi with supervisor is the thought about the impacts of guanxi with supervisor on the outcomes people may receive in the workplace. People high in sense of guanxi with supervisor means they think good guanxi with supervisor is essential for them to receive desirable outcomes and prevent negative outcomes in the workplace. On the contrary, people who are low in sense of guanxi with supervisor do not think guanxi with supervisors has any effects on the outcomes they receive in the workplace.
Machiavellianism

It is a personality disposition that involves manipulative and deceptive intent. People with this personality tend to initiate and control the structure of interpersonal interaction and social situation, achieve goals with any means even though the means is immoral and unethical, maintain the affection and emotion distant from others, and take less care of the feelings of others. Therefore, this kind of people tends to use aggressive, manipulative, exploitative, and tortuous approaches to carry out their own personal or organizational goals.

Organizational culture

This research adopts a broad definition of organizational culture. It is defined as a personality of an organization that can be reflected by a set of assumptions, values and norms which are shared by people or groups as well as can restrict the way of interaction between people in an organization.

This research also adopts the classification of organizational culture suggested by Wallach (1983). According to him (1983), there are three organizational cultures:

1. **Bureaucratic culture:** this culture tends to emphasize the hierarchical and compartmental structure, the clear lines of responsibility and authority, and the organized and systematic work. Moreover, this culture is based on control and power,
so bureaucratic organizations are power-oriented. The organizations are also cautious, established, solid, regulated, ordered, structured, procedural and hierarchical.

2. **Innovative culture**: it is an exiting and dynamic culture, because this culture is filled with creativeness, challenge and risk. The innovative organizations are driving, enterprising, challenging, stimulating, creative, results-oriented and risk-taking.

3. **Supportive culture**: this culture provides a friendly, fair, warm, helpful, open and harmonious environment to workers. Supportive organizations are likely to be trusting, safe, equitable, sociable, encouraging, open, relationships-oriented and collaborative.
Chapter 5
Operationalization

Ingratiation

Although Kumar and Beyerlein (1991) developed a scale – Measure of Ingratiatory Behaviors in Organizational Setting (MIBOS) – to measure ingratiation, Harrison et al. (1998) suspected the validity of this scale according to their examination. Moreover, the most important thing is that this scale is developed with the western perspective, so it may not be adequate for us to apply it to Chinese context.

As a result, this research will use Tsang’s scale (2007) to measure ingratiation. The scale consists of 21 items and the internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha is .755. Each items is followed by a rating scale ranging from strongly agree (score = 5) to strongly disagree (score = 1). The total score is the ingratiation score. A higher score means the ingratitory tendency is higher. In this research, if the ingratiation score of participants is the same as or over the mean of all samples, the ingratiatory tendency will be viewed as high. On the contrary, the tendency will be regarded as low.

This scale also consists of 7 factors: self-presentation (measured by items 13, 14, 15 and 16), other-enhancement (measured by items 1, 2, 3 and 4), behavioral conformity
(measured by items 6 and 8), rendering favor (measured by items 9, 10 and 11), showing support in front of the public (measured by items 5, 7 and 12), self-depreciation (measured by items 19, 20 and 21), and modesty (measured by items 17 and 18).

The opening question of this scale is changed from ‘Are you willing to do the following behaviour(s) to maintain, improve or promote the guanxi between you and a well-known person of yours?’ to ‘Are you willing to do the following behaviour(s) to maintain, improve or promote the guanxi between you and your supervisor?’ in this research. It is because the research aims to find out insurance brokers’ ingratiatory behaviors towards their supervisor.

**The sense of guanxi with supervisor**

Participants will be asked to give opinions about the question – “Do you agree it is easy to achieve the following outcomes if your guanxi with supervisor is good?” – by answering 13 items, which represent desirable outcomes in organization such as getting more promotions, less punishments and higher salary. Each item is followed by a rating scale ranging from strongly agree (score = 5) to strongly disagree (score = 1). Higher score here means higher sense of guanxi with supervisor. If the score is the same as or over the score mean of all samples, the sense of guanxi with supervisor will be considered as high. On the contrary, it will be regarded as low.
Machiavellianism

To measure Machiavellianism, this research will use the scale developed by Liu (劉仲矩) in 1995 (as cited in 張正林, 2002). This scale consists of 20 items which are followed by a rating scale ranging from strongly agree (score = 5) to strongly disagree (score = 1). Items 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are straightforward questions and item 2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 19, and 20 are reversed questions. Higher score here means higher Machiavellianism. If the score is equal to or over the mean of all samples, it implies high Machiavellianism. On the contrary, it is low Machiavellianism.

Organizational culture

Wallach (1983) provided the Organizational Culture Index to measure the type of organizational cultures (bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture). There are 24 items that are followed by a rating scale ranging from ‘describes my organization most of the time’ (score = 3) to ‘does not describe my organization’ (score = 0). However, this index is developed for non-Chinese societies so that it may not be adequate to test Chinese organizations. Because of this reason, Chan (陳威琦) modifies it to suit Chinese organizations. Therefore, this research will employ Chan’s Organizational Culture Scale.

The scale includes 15 items that are followed by a rating scale ranging from strongly
agree (score = 5) to strongly disagree (score = 1). Moreover, it consists of three subscales to identify bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture of organizations. Items 1, 3, 6, 12 and 15 are under the subscale of bureaucratic culture. Items 2, 4, 7, 9 and 13 are under the subscale of innovative culture. Items 5, 8, 10, 11 and 14 are under the subscale of supportive culture. The internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of the whole set of scale is .80. The internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of subscale of bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture is .64, .79 and .76 respectively.
Chapter 6
Methodology

Research Method

A self-administrated and structured questionnaire survey will be employed. This method has its limitations. For example, it may provide less meaningful data than a qualitative approach like an in-depth interview. Moreover, it may be weak at finding out the most common denominator, because designing questions may minimize the appropriation to respondents. However, it is still appropriate to this research. It is because survey research is available for researchers to collect original data for analyzing and describing a large population to observe directly (Babbie, 2007). In addition, survey is also good at measuring behaviors, attitude and orientation (Newell, 1993), such as ingratiation and the sense of guanxi with supervisor. Furthermore, the characteristic of standardization of structured questionnaire is good at assessing personality (Schultz & Schultz, 2007), such as Machiavellianism.

Sampling

First, several insurance organizations will be invited to participate in this research by an email. The email will inform the organizations of all the information about this
research, including the objectives, and request the interested organizations to reply the email. The interested organizations will then be asked to give the name list of their insurance brokers. After collecting all the lists, systematic sampling will be used to select the samples randomly from the sampling frame.

It is anticipated at least 5 insurance organizations will join this research and the anticipated sampling size is 300. Therefore, the first step of sampling is to find out the sampling interval \((K)\) by the formula that the total numbers of units in the sampling frame/300. After that, every unit in the sampling frame is assigned a number and the first unit is selected randomly within the first \(K\) cases. Then, every \(K\)th unit in the whole list is chosen for inclusion in the sample.

**Data collection**

Each selected sample will receive an online self-administrated questionnaire via email. They are asked to submit a completed questionnaire online.

There are several advantages to use this method to collect data in place of the traditional method of postal questionnaires. First, it can reduce the time and costs, because (1) it need not produce a lot of hard copies (2) the distribution and data collection is fast through Internal and (3) it allows great numbers of participants to be contacted with less time and cost expenditure (Hewson et al., 2003). Second, an online
questionnaire is like the postal questionnaire that allows anonymity of both researchers and participants (Hewson, et al., 2003). It is possible to increase the response rates, encourage candidness and reduce demand characteristics (Hewson, et al., 2003).

To increase the response rate, a reminding email will be sent to those who have not submitted the questionnaire after the questionnaire is sent fortnight.

**Questionnaire design**

The questionnaire is divided into five parts. The first part is to measure insurance brokers’ ingratiaitory behaviors. The second part is to assess Machiavellianism. The third part is to identify the organizational culture. The fourth part is to identify the sense of guanxi with supervisor. The final part is to collect participants’ background information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>I 1 to I 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>M 1 to M 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>C 1 to C 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sense of guanxi with supervisor</td>
<td>G 1 to G 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>B 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>B 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority of working as insurance broker</td>
<td>B 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position in the organization</td>
<td>B 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan of analysis

Correlation and partial correlation

To find out the relationships between Machiavellianism, the sense of guanxi with supervisor and ingratiation, correlation and partial correlation will be computed.

Multiple linear regression

Multiple linear regression will be computed to determine the best linear combination of Machiavellianism, the sense of guanxi with supervisor and organizational culture for predicating ingratiation. Moreover, it will be also used to find out which variable(s) has/have the best predictive power to ingratiation.

One-way ANOVA

To examine the variation of the use of ingratiation under different kinds of organizational cultures (bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture), one-way ANOVA will be employed.

Three-way ANOVA

To identify the interaction effects of Machiavellianism (high and low), the sense of guanxi with supervisor (high and low) and organizational cultures (bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture) on the variance of ingratiation, three-way ANOVA will be used.
Cross-tabulation

Cross-tabulation will be adopted to assess the relationships between each demographic variable (sex, age, education level, marital status, working seniority and current position) and ingratiation (high and low) respectively.

Factor analysis

To test the validity of each scale (ingratiation, Machiavellianism, organizational culture and the sense of guanxi with supervisor), factor analysis will be computed. Moreover, factor analysis will also be used to identify the ingratiation tactics the participants may engage in.

Reliability analysis

Internal reliability test with Cronbach’s alpha will be used to examine the reliability of each scale (ingratiation, Machiavellianism, organizational culture and the sense of guanxi with supervisor) in this research.

Descriptive statistic analysis

The distribution, means, percentage, standard deviation of all demographic variables will be described by computing descriptive statistic analysis. It is useful to understand the background information of the samples clearly.
Ethics

This research question and research method are not sensitive, so it should not easily commit unethical issues. However, for the safety, this research will take the following actions to ensure its ethics.

First, voluntary participation is important (Babbie, 1998). It means every participant has the right to join and quit a research. As a result, participants will be received an informed consent before they take part in the research (Wysocki, 2004). If they are not interested in it, they can ignore the questionnaire.

Second, anonymity and confidentiality are also important issues (Babbie, 1998). Therefore, the questionnaire does not request the participants to give their name. In addition, the researcher and the participants should not know one another, because the questionnaire distribution and submission are via Internet. It is supposed they do not have any face-to-face meeting.

Third, at the beginning of the questionnaire, it is an introduction to explain the objectives of this research to participants. Although it may influence the responses of the participants, it is necessary. It is because researchers have to be honest (Babbie, 1998).

Finally, the negative wordings will be avoided in the questionnaire, because negative wordings may give psychological harm to participants. An ethical research should not
harm the participant physically and psychologically (Bryman, 2004).

**Research Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Expected Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires design</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact the insurance organization</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>The early of February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify the questionnaire</td>
<td>The late of February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling and questionnaire distribution</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire submission</td>
<td>The first week of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>The end of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix: Questionnaire

本人是香港城市大學之應用社會科學學系碩士生，本人現正進行一項有關保險經紀
在職場中的討好行為之研究調查。此問卷所得的個人資料只作本研究之用，分析完
畢後，所有資料將會消滅，一切資料絕對保密。如各位能抽出少許寶貴時間，完成整
份問卷，本人將不勝感激。

第一部分

你願意做以下的行為去維持、改善或增進你和你上司的「關係」嗎？請在最能代表你意見的空格中打(✔)

| I1 | 只要有機會，你會在他/她面前表揚他/她的優點 | 十分願意 | 無所謂 | 不願意 | 十分不願意 |
| I2 | 你會不時稱讚他/她，就算他/她沒有做出任何特別值得稱讚的行為 |  |  |  |  |
| I3 | 你會盡量做一些事情來令他/她覺得自己有某方面比別人優勝 |  |  |  |  |
| I4 | 你會向他/她表示你是欣賞他/她的成就或才能 |  |  |  |  |
| I5 | 在他人面前，你偏向支持他/她的想法、觀點或意見，不論你是否 |  |  |  |  |
| I6 | 與他/她相處時，你會避免做出他/她不認同的行為 |  |  |  |  |
| I7 | 與別人進行討論時，你偏向贊同他/她的意見 |  |  |  |  |
| I8 | 和他/她相處時，你盡量做出他/她所認同的行為 |  |  |  |  |
| I9 | 你喜歡不時送一些小禮物給他/她 |  |  |  |  |
| I10 | 他/她需要你的幫助時，你會主動伸出援手 |  |  |  |  |
| I11 | 你願意犧牲自己的私人時間，而義務地幫助他/她解決疑難 |  |  |  |  |
| I12 | 當你看見他/她受別人批評或欺負時，不論誰是誰非，你也偏向維護他/她 |  |  |  |  |
| I13 | 一有機會，你讓他/她知道你的長處 |  |  |  |  |
| I14 | 你會用不同的方法，使他/她知道你的優點 |  |  |  |  |
| I15 | 在他/她面前，你會令他/她知道你的成就 |  |  |  |  |
| I16 | 你會令他/她覺得你是個有才能的人 |  |  |  |  |
| I17 | 當他/她稱讚你時，你也不會承認自己是有他/她所稱讚的優點 |  |  |  |  |
| I18 | 與他/她相處時，你較少表現自己比他/她優勝的一面 |  |  |  |  |
第二部分

以下問題，請你在適當的空格中打(✓)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>号</th>
<th>項目</th>
<th>評價</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>與人相處最好的方法，是對他們說他們喜歡聽的話</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>若你希望別人幫你做事，最好告訴他們真正理由，而非冠冕堂皇的理由</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>完全信任別人的人，必然會惹來許多麻煩</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>一個人不投機取巧便很難出人頭地</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>無論如何，誠實永遠是最好的策略</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>我們最好假定人性本惡，只要遇到適當的時機，惡性便會顯露出來</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>除非說出來對你有利，否則不要把你做某事的真正理由告訴別人</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>唯有確定某事在道德上正確無誤後，我們才可以放手去做</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>奉承巴結重要人物是明智之舉</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>卑微而誠實比顯赫而虛僞好些</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td>一個人患了無法治癒的重病時，應有權選擇安樂死</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>成為十全十美的人是有可能</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>大多數人基本上是善良與仁慈的</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td>對別人說謊是不可原諒的</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td>大多數人對於失去財產比失去父母更加耿耿於懷</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td>在這個世界上成功的人，大多過著清靜而道德的生活</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td>一般來說，除非不的已，否則人們便不會努力工作</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td>罪犯和一般人最大的差別在於前者太笨而被逮住</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M19</td>
<td>大部分的人都是勇敢的</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td>曾有位諷諷的小丑說“世界上每一分鐘就有一個呆子出生”</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第三部分

以下有關貴公司的敘述，請依據你的實際情形決定你的同意程度。在你認為最接近你的想法的空格中打(✔)

| C1  | 本公司常以權力為導向，講求層層節制                  | 十同意 | 沒意見 | 不同意 | 十同
| C2  | 本公司員工富冒險進取的精神                          |       |       |       | 意
| C3  | 本公司內部管理相當嚴格                                |       |       |       | 同
| C4  | 本公司鼓勵員工接受新觀念並力求創新                    |       |       |       | 同
| C5  | 本公司對待同仁均一視同仁                              |       |       |       | 同
| C6  | 本公司作風保守、小心謹慎，大多依循法規程序辦事        |       |       |       | 同
| C7  | 本公司經常鼓勵員工思考問題                              |       |       |       | 同
| C8  | 在本公司工作能給予人安全感                              |       |       |       | 同
| C9  | 本公司會積極從外界蒐集與顧客相關資訊                    |       |       |       | 同
| C10 | 本公司給予員工相當的自主和自由                        |       |       |       | 同
| C11 | 本公司員工彼此相互合作完成工作                        |       |       |       | 同
| C12 | 本公司擁有完整制度供員工遵循                          |       |       |       | 同
| C13 | 本公司相當重視工作績效                                  |       |       |       | 同
| C14 | 本公司員工彼此相互信賴                                  |       |       |       | 同
| C15 | 本公司各層級間劃分明確                                  |       |       |       | 同

第四部分

你是否同意與上司關係良好，在工作中較易達至以下的結果？請在最能代表你意見的空格中打(✔)

| G1  | 有較多升遷的機會                                       | 十同 | 沒意見 | 不同 | 十同
| G2  | 被上司引薦的機會較高                                   |       |       |       | 同
| G3  | 在公司中有較好的待遇                                   |       |       |       | 同
| G4  | 工作出錯時，受到的處罰較少                              |       |       |       | 同
| G5  | 公司會給予較多發揮才能的機會                           |       |       |       | 同
| G6  | 當薪金調整時，薪金的升幅相對較多                        |       |       |       | 同
| G7  | 在公司中，較易被委以重任                                 |       |       |       | 同
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G8 被解僱的機會較低 □ □ □ □ □
G9 在公司中所享有的特權較多 □ □ □ □ □
G10 有花紅分時，所分的花紅較多 □ □ □ □ □
G11 在公司中，較為受重視 □ □ □ □ □
G12 工作中受到的制約較少 □ □ □ □ □
G13 當上司對員工進行工作表現評估時，會給予你較好的 □ □ □ □ □
分數

第五部分

個人基本資料

B1 性別： 男 □ 女 □
45-49 □ 50 歲或以上 □
B3 婚姻狀態： 未婚 □ 已婚 □ 分居、離婚或配偶死亡 □
其他 □ 請註明：
B4 學歷： 初中以下 □ 初中 □ 高中 □ 預科 □ 大專 □
大學畢業 □ 碩士畢業 □ 博士畢業 □
其他 □ 請註明：
B5 從事保險經紀的年資： ________ 年
B6 現時的職級： 基層員工 □ 中層員工 □ 高層員工 □

~問卷填答到此結束，感謝你的用心參與~