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ABSTRACT

I extend the application of expectation states theory to develop, test, and replicate a model that explains how and when strategic self-presentations is associated with person-environment fit perceptions. In Study 1, a laboratory experiment with student teams, results support the prediction that the enhancing effects of strategic self-presentations (self-promotion and ingratiation) on coworker receptivity to newcomers (knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance) is stronger when the self-presenter is White compared to racial minorities. However, these group effects are attenuated when the perceiver holds a favorable mindset about how diversity might affect team and organizational processes. Study 2, a multi-wave longitudinal study of hospital employees, shows that the effect of strategic self-presentation on coworker receptivity to newcomers is stronger for Whites than racial minorities, particularly for racial minorities characterized as tokens. Coworker receptivity, in turn, was positively associated with the extent to which newcomers perceived their organization and job as a good fit. These studies extend theory and research on workplace diversity, socialization, and impression management.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

“People are constantly observing your behavior and forming theories about your competence, character, and commitment, which are rapidly disseminated throughout your workplace... It is only wise to add your voice in framing others’ theories about who you are and what you can accomplish.” – Morgan Roberts

People are relentless categorizers. When we meet new people, we fit them into categories and form judgments accordingly to conserve cognitive resources (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). People generally aspire to avoid categorization processes and make positive impressions on others based on their personal attributes (Holoien & Fiske, 2013). They ingratiate themselves at social gatherings in hopes of being liked, and they subtly promote their accomplishments and accolades in order to be respected (i.e., seen as competent). That is, the ingratiate wants to be liked, and the self-promoter wants to be respected. People are particularly motivated to strategically use verbal or symbolic actions to share accurate information about (or project an image of) the self to influence higher-status or powerful people, given their dependence on such people for valued resources and outcomes (Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Major, Quinton, McCoy, & Schmader, 2000; Pandey, 1986; Schlenker, 1980). It is expected that such actions will result in favorable changes in the cognitions and behaviors of the target (e.g., superior) that may not have occurred otherwise. A substantial body of empirical work indicates that strategic self-presentations generally elicit feelings of positive regard and interpersonal attractiveness (Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Yukl & Tracey, 1992), enhancing the quality of exchange relationships (e.g., Sparrowe, Soetjitpo, & Kraimer, 2006; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne, Linden, & Sparrowe, 1994), supervisor performance ratings (e.g., Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Wayne & Kacmar, 1991),
promotion (e.g., Hui, Lam & Law, 2000), and career success (e.g., Judge & Bretz, 1994; Wayne, Liden, Graft, & Ferris, 1997).

Comparatively little empirical attention has been given to understanding how actor attributes such as race can influence the interpretation of strategic self-presentations (Gardner & Martinho, 1988; Rosenfeld, 1994). This lack of attention is surprising given that employee race has been linked to many other interpersonal processes in organizations. For instance, Blacks have been shown to elicit disrespect for perceived lack of competence, whereas Asians elicit dislike for perceived lack of warmth (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Ho & Jackson, 2001; Lin, Kwan, Cheung, & Fiske, 2005). Racial minorities are thus less socially integrated than majority members (Sacco & Schmidt, 2005) and are less likely to feel that they belong and “fit in” at work (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996). In order to counteract negative stereotypes and “fit in” or appear acceptable at work, racial minorities often perceive the need to strategically manage self-presentations (e.g., Bergsieker, Shelton, & Richeson, 2010; Hewlin, 2009; Roberts, 2005), yet we know little about the social benefits (or costs) of these self-presentations. Understanding how others interpret and react to racial minorities’ strategic self-presentations can serve as means for solving social issues among employees of different racial backgrounds. It is therefore critical that we unpack the complex challenges racial minorities face in creating a positive professional image and becoming socialized into their new work environments (Roberts, 2005).

Employees can put on a suit or cut their hair to improve their appearance, but how do they manage something like skin color? On the one hand, perhaps, strategic self-presentations provide self-characterizing information that counteracts negative stereotypes and therefore enhances the extent to which racial minorities are liked and respected at work (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Richeson & Shelton, 2007). On the other hand, maybe strategic self-presentations are less
effective for racial minorities than Whites (Westphal & Stern, 2007) because the information provided is likely to be inconsistent with widely shared cultural beliefs, rendering it less believable (Gardner & Martinko, 1988). Does it really depend on the context? We simply do not know.

The dominant perspective on impression formation processes suggests that people form impressions of others on a continuum reflecting category-based processes at one end and individuating processes (i.e., personal attributes) at the other (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990, 1999). Categorization is often prioritized over individuation to initially understand people, especially when the categorization involves visually salient categories such as race (Biernat & Vescio, 1993; Gardner, MacIntyre, & Lalonde, 1995). We categorize others in part because doing so offers a wealth of information at little cognitive cost. Perceivers quickly apply social categories to targets, usually within a fraction of a second (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1993; Fiske, 1998). Once perceivers categorize a target, they immediately associate affective, cognitive, and behavioral responses with little effortful thought (Fiske & Neuberg, 1999; Macrae, Bodenhausen, & Milne, 1995). The use of strategic self-presentations that provide individuating information can activate individuating processes that lead others to form impressions of racial minorities beyond the rapid, initial categorization (Fiske & Neuberg, 1990, 1999). It may also help minorities to overcome difficulties with being accepted and to acquire the social-psychological support needed to succeed (Mor Barak, 1998; Avery, 2011)—because the motive for helping others is largely influenced by perceived attributes (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011; Lepine & Van Dyne, 2001).

While this perspective on individuating information offers many valuable insights, I propose that additional perspectives are also relevant for unpacking the number of complex challenges racial minorities face managing negative impressions and, consequently, forming relationships that
facilitate adjustment at work.

In approaching the phenomenon of impression management as a dynamic influence rather than a fixed process, the current study provides a number of contributions to the literature. I offer a more nuanced model that accounts for the unique experiences of organizational members by race and outlines how contextual factors facilitate (or hinder) the effectiveness of strategic self-presentation over time. Expectation states theory (Berger, Conner, & Fisek, 1974) is particularly relevant to understanding impression formation as a dynamic process that may be influenced by the salience of race-based expectations. Thus, I introduce an integrated model that extends the application of self-presentation and expectation states theory to a socialization context and identifies relational demography (i.e., the comparative racial characteristics of work environment) as an important boundary condition that is “critical in understanding demographic effects in organizations” (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989, p. 403).

Specifically, I propose that newcomer status (i.e., recent hire) creates a motive to engage in self-presentational behaviors stimulated by a desire to be socially accepted and to “fit in” (Baumeister, 1982). Newcomers expect that providing individuating information via strategic self-presentations will increase organizational members’ receptivity to them (Leary, 1990). Further, I propose that the extent to which organizational members are receptive to newcomers is a key determinant of employee adaptation and perceived fit (or misfit) to their new organization. In other words, organizational members’ receptivity to newcomers explains the theoretical linkage between strategic self-presentation and subjective fit perceptions. However, I explain how racial representativeness affects the real probability of minorities’ self-presentational behaviors leading to individuating processes and leads to minorities ultimately perceiving their new work environment as a good fit. By developing the rationale underlying my model, I can
also account for previous contradictory findings regarding the relation between individuating information and an important determinant of diversity-related issues at work: group-based stereotypes (Roberson & Kulik, 2007). My conceptual model is visually summarized in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. Proposed Conceptual Model**

Examining the interplay of employee race and strategic self-presentations in a socialization context has a number of key benefits. First, it brings a much-needed understanding of how racial minorities overcome negative stereotypes about their competence or warmth and thus successfully transition from being organizational outsiders to becoming organizational insiders in a predominately White workforce. This is critical because the effects of self-presentations on organizational members’ receptivity to racial minorities have important social implications that might further our understanding of why racial minorities are at the highest risk for turnover within the first few weeks or months on the job (Sacco & Schmitt, 2005).
Second, prior research has focused too narrowly on the effects of strategic self-presentations directed toward high-status or powerful people such as interviewers (e.g., Higgins & Judge, 2004; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, & Franke, 2002) and supervisors (Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998; Sparrowe, Soetjitpo, & Kraimer, 2006). An important next step is to examine the effects of strategic self-presentations directed toward coworkers who also have the power to dispense valued resources and outcomes to newcomers. A greater understanding of the factors that enhance the quality of newcomers’ relationships with coworkers is important because it has been shown to be the most reliable predictor of newcomer adjustment (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992), particularly within 90 days of employment (Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013).

Third, my findings can provide organizations with key insights about how to (a) enhance coworkers’ receptivity to diverse newcomers so that they can minimize the drawbacks and maximize the advantages of introducing newcomers who are different and (b) sustain talented employees from minority racial groups. Thus, the current study is both timely and practically important. In the sections to follow, I articulate the theoretical rationale for the proposed study and research hypotheses.

**THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

The fundamental question newcomers must contemplate is, “How do I fit in here?” (Dawes & Lofquist, 1984). Scholars have long noted that the primary goal of socialization processes is to ensure person-environment fit or provide a framework to newcomers for responding to their new work environment and interacting with coworkers (e.g., Jones, 1986; Kim, Cable, & Kim, 2005; Van Maaen & Schein, 1979). I draw on a general theory of strategic self-presentation (Jones & Pittman, 1982) and expectation states theory (Berger, Conner, &
Fisek, 1974) to introduce a dynamic process model of impression-formation processes. In doing so, I explain why and when proactive attempts to project warmth and competence via strategic self-presentation affect how existing organizational members respond to newcomers (conceptualized as *coworker receptivity*; Rink et al., 2013), which in turn shapes the extent to which newcomers perceive their organization and job as a good fit. The current study represents the first time these two complementary theories have been integrated to study the effects strategic self-presentations have on the nature and quality of coworker relationships.

**Expectation States Theory**

Berger, Conner, and Fisek’s (1974) theorizing on *expectation states* highlights how the effect of individuating information on perceptual and behavioral responses can vary depending on the actor’s race. This is because social categories such as race trigger cultural stereotypes. These stereotypes are automatically activated by visible physical characteristics and consequently shape the expectations of the stereotyped person’s general abilities and tendencies, which is expected to affect his or her performance on various tasks within some domain (i.e., diffuse status cues). For example, Blacks and Hispanics tend to be stereotyped as unmannerly, threatening, aggressive, and unintelligent (Block, Aumann, & Chelin, 2012; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Fiske et al., 2002; Weaver, 2007), whereas Asian-Americans are viewed as intelligent but unfriendly and “cutthroat” (Jackson et al., 1996; Jackson, Lewandowski, Ingram, & Hodge, 1997, p. 386).

As a result of these stereotype-based inferences, different standards will be used to evaluate individuating information regarding a particular attribute depending on whether the information is congruent or incongruent with prior group expectations (Foschi, 2000). These differences in evaluative standards occur because incongruent information is more difficult to
integrate with existing expectations and requires additional thought, whereas congruent information that confirms expectations is processed rather effortlessly (Hastie, 1980). Researchers have shown that perceivers spend more time processing incongruent information than congruent information in order to devise external causal explanations for the discrepancy and maintain existing beliefs about the group member (e.g., Crocker, Hannah, & Weber, 1983; Sherman & Hamilton, 1994; Srull, 1981; Stern, Marrs, Millar, & Cole, 1984), particularly when perceivers hold strong expectations or prejudice attitudes (e.g., Clary & Tesser, 1983; Sherman et al., 2005). In fact, high-prejudice individuals are more likely to ascribe expectancy-inconsistent information to situational factors (cf. Kulik, 1983).

In support of expectation states theory, research indicates that even when lower-status individuals perform well on a work-related task, there is a confirmation bias such that observed performance is critically scrutinized and discredited since good performance is inconsistent with what is expected based on their social status. When higher-status individuals (e.g., Whites) perform equally well, their performance is consistent with perceivers’ expectations and is thus less scrutinized. As a result, equal task performance is most likely to be viewed as indicative of ability when performed by higher-status individuals. For instance, researchers manipulated the performance levels of Blacks and Whites and found that equally high performing Black employees received significantly poorer performance evaluations than their White counterparts (Hamner, Kim, Baird, & Bigoness, 1974). Relatedly, Foschi (1996) informed participants that the group’s task was one in which men generally perform better than women and then asked participants to estimate the percentage of questions that high performers would need to have correctly answered to infer task competence. As predicted, participants set the standard for
inferring competence relatively higher when the better performer was a woman rather than a man. Biernat and Kobrynowicz (1997) reported a similar pattern of findings for race and gender.

Social categories such as gender and race do not influence social judgments in all settings. A key tenet of expectation states theory is the salience assumption. The theory predicts that a widely shared stereotype affects general impressions and expectations only when the stereotype is salient in the setting (Correll & Ridgeway, 2006). When stereotypes are salient, perceivers are more likely to rely on social categories to inform initial impressions of others. Once a social category is assessed, forming impressions based on personal characteristics becomes difficult and less likely. As previously noted, this is because expectancy-inconsistent information would be scrutinized and discredited in order to reduce discrepancy and maintain the original expectation. Less energy is spent discrediting individuating information that does not challenge existing beliefs (Foschi, 2000). When stereotypes are not salient, group membership is less likely to inform initial impressions. Thus, counter-stereotypic behaviors are less likely to be inconsistent with initial impressions because the person is seen as an individual. As such, less effort would be spent seeking alternative causal explanations, thereby enhancing the likelihood of individual-based social judgments. Thus, expectation states theorists (e.g., Berger, Conner, & Fisek, 1974; Correll & Ridgeway, 2006) argue that the extent to which widely held stereotypes in the general society shape expectations in the workplace depends on the local context itself. This implies that the organizational context may serve as a boundary condition.

In short, individuating information that does not challenge existing beliefs is processed and integrated rather effortlessly, thereby enhancing the probability of individuation. Conversely, perceivers spend more time scrutinizing information that is incongruent with expectations in an effort to discredit or devise external causal explanations for the discrepancy and maintain
existing beliefs (i.e., confirmation bias). When stereotypes and category-based expectations are not salient (or contextually relevant) in a particular setting, individuation is posited to occur in response to available personal information irrespective of group membership.

**HYPOTHESES**

In light of the above, I hypothesize that self-presenter race will moderate the effects of strategic self-presentations on the extent to which old-timers are receptive to newcomers in two ways: (1) *knowledge utilization* (of unique newcomer knowledge) and (2) *newcomer acceptance*. According to Rink et al. (2013), the first component of *coworker receptivity* reflects existing organizational members’ tendency to utilize and adopt the newcomers’ unique knowledge, skills, and aptitudes. Perceptual measures of knowledge utilization have included leaders’ perceptions of newcomers’ competence and task contributions (e.g., Craig, 1996; Molleman & Van der Vegt, 2007). Researchers assessed behavioral knowledge utilization by observing teams’ adoption of unique newcomer ideas and task knowledge (e.g., Gruenfeld, Martorana, and Fan, 2000; Rink & Ellemers, 2009). The second psychological component of coworker receptivity involves coworkers’ willingness to accept newcomers as full organizational members (Rink et al., 2013). Past research has assessed newcomer acceptance directly through both perceptual measures (e.g., perceived pleasantness of newcomers; Ziller & Behringer, 1960) and behavioral measures (e.g., social support; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013), or indirectly through the eyes of the newcomer (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Smith et al., 2012). In my hypothesized model, I distinguish between these two distinct components of coworker receptivity to provide greater conceptual specificity in the exact ways that self-presentation strategies facilitate old-timers’ receptivity to newcomers. This conceptualization of coworker receptivity provides a logical
conceptual framework for elucidating the unique effects of self-promotion and ingratiation on knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance respectively.

**Effects of Race and Self-Promotion on Knowledge Utilization**

Self-promotion involves self-characterizing references to general ability level or specific skills to communicate individuating information about the self-promoter’s task competence (Jones & Pittman, 1982). The logic of expectation states theory suggests that using self-promotion tactics would be less effective for racial minorities stereotyped as incompetent (i.e., Blacks, Hispanics) relative to their White counterparts. There is a greater probability that people would be less critical of the prototypical competent White and thus view self-characterizing references as credible information about the self-promoter’s task competence. On the other hand, racial minorities’ self-promotion—personal references to task competence—is likely to be incongruent with stereotype and thus judged by stricter standards. Consequently, perceivers are likely to discredit the information provided or attribute external causal explanations in order to reduce discrepancy and maintain original expectations. In other words, more evidence is needed to infer competence for racial minorities relative to what would be required to infer competence for Whites (Carter, 1993; Foschi, 2000).

Thus, I propose that self-promotion will confirm and enhance competence perceptions (i.e., perceptual knowledge utilization) for Whites. To the contrary, self-promotion is expected to have a null (or weaker positive effect) on the extent coworkers perceive Black or Hispanic newcomers as competent. Likewise, I assert that self-promotion will have a stronger effect on the frequency with which coworkers seek task-related information from White newcomers and are accepting of their proposed ideas (i.e., behavioral knowledge utilization) relative to Black or Hispanic self-promoters. This assertion is predicated on the proposition that people tend to seek
information from sources they perceive to offer the highest quality information (O’Reilley, 1982). Research has also shown that the most dominant determinant of seeking information from a potential source is based on the perceived quality of available information (e.g., Ashford, 1986; Morrision & Vancouver, 2000; Xu, Tan, and Yang, 2006). Providing some support for my propositions, it was discovered by Gurevitch (1984) that the incongruent status of self-promoters influenced perceptions of competence. Third-year (higher-status) students’ self-promotion led to favorable impressions of their academic ability without appearing manipulative by confirming competence beliefs. First-year (lower-status) students’ self-promotion was associated with lower perceptions of their academic ability because their competence was questionable and thus personal references to competence were discredited. Therefore, I predict the following:

Hypothesis 1: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of self-promotion on (a) perceptual knowledge utilization and (b) behavioral knowledge utilization, such that the relationships will be strongest among White newcomers and weakest among minority members stereotyped as having low competence (viz., Blacks and Hispanics).

Effects of Race and Ingratiation on Newcomer Acceptance

Likewise, using ingratiation to enhance social acceptance may not work for racial minorities who are at risk of being stereotyped as low in interpersonal warmth. Ingratiation refers to assertive tactics used to enhance interpersonal liking and “gain favor” with those who have access to valued resources (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Three specific ingratiatory behaviors have been characterized in the social psychology and organization behavior literatures: favor doing, opinion conformity, and other-enhancements (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). The intended purpose of favor doing is to appear helpful and considerate, which may promote feelings of obligation in the target to reciprocate.
Opinion conformity includes verbally endorsing the attitudes and/or values of the target, which may elicit interpersonal liking because individuals generally like others whom they perceived to be similar to themselves (Byrne, 1961). Other-enhancement refers to the act of verbally praising another person. Other-enhancement “operates on the principle of reciprocal attraction: People are attracted to others who seem to be attracted to them” (Stevens, Kay, & Kristof, 1995, p. 589). Ingratiating with coworkers should engender interpersonal liking and a feeling of indebtedness toward the newcomer, thus encouraging coworkers to reciprocate when given the opportunity (e.g., Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne & Liden, 1995).

I propose that the social benefits of ingratiation are more likely to emerge for Whites than racial minorities. Expectation states theorists (e.g., Berger, Conner, & Fisek, 1974; Foschi, 2000; Ridgeway, 2001) would argue that ingratiation performed by groups stereotyped as having low social warmth—such as Blacks (Devine 1989), Asians (Jackson et al., 1996), and Hispanics (Weaver, 2007)—would be less effective at eliciting liking sentiments. This is because the behaviors are inconsistent with stereotypic perceptions, which results in more effort spent scrutinizing and discrediting expectancy-inconsistent information. Supporting this logic, Westphal and Stern (2006; 2007) examined archival data collected from directors of U.S. corporations randomly selected from the Forbes 500 index and found that ingratiating with CEOs and peer directors increased the likelihood of Whites receiving recommendations for additional board appointments at other companies. Conversely, racial minorities received less support from CEOs and peer directors when enacting the same ingratiable behaviors. However, it is unknown whether racial minorities’ attempts to ingratiate themselves would be similarly ineffective for newcomers as with high-status directors of large corporations. I hypothesize that ingratiation is
positively and more strongly associated with being liked and supported by coworkers when
performed by Whites than racial minorities. More formally, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of ingratiation on newcomer
acceptance indices, specifically (a) interpersonal liking and (b) coworker support, such that
the relationships will be strongest among White newcomers and weakest (or null) among
minority members stereotyped as having low interpersonal warmth (viz., Blacks, Asians, &
Hispanics).

**Moderating Effects of Relational Demography**

Managing impressions does not have to be less beneficial for racial minorities (Houston &
Grandey, 2013). According to expectation states theory (Berger et al., 2002), for any social
category to affect general impressions, category-based stereotypes must be salient or come to be
admitted as usable cues of warmth and competence in the current setting. The theory posits that
stereotypes become salient when a social category such as race either differentiates actors or is
believed to be socially significant (e.g., low social warmth) or relevant to completing work tasks
(e.g., low competence). A substantial body of research indicates that numerical distinctiveness or
the relational demography of work environments is a key determinant of when category-based
stereotypes are most likely to become salient (e.g., Cohen & Swim, 1995; Kanter, 1977;
Niemann & Dovidio, 1998; Roberson, Deitch, Brief, & Block, 2003; Steele, 1997). In her
seminal work, Kanter (1997) found that when the proportional representation of social groups is
skewed (up to a ratio of 85:15), the presence of tokens (i.e., 15% or less representation of racial
group) exaggerate group differences, and consequently, tokens experience heightened visibility
and stereotyping.
If token status increases the salience of negative stereotypic expectancies, then it is likely that self-promotion and ingratiation would be less effective at promoting coworker receptivity to newcomers when the self-presenter is a racial minority and characterized as a token. Whereas strategic self-presentations will likely lead to individuating processes that enhance the extent to which coworkers are receptive to non-token minorities. However, research indicates that not all people characterized as token seem to suffer negative effects on the basis of their distinctiveness, particularly token Whites (e.g., Heikes, 1991; Sackett, DuBois, & Noe, 1991; Yoder, 1991). Thus, token status should not affect the beneficial effects of purposefully managing self-presentations for White newcomers due to widely held cultural beliefs associating competence and interpersonal warmth with being White, even when they are not a local majority (Fiske et al., 2002). More formally, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 3: Self-presenter race, self-promotion, and token status will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict (a) perceptual knowledge utilization and (b) behavioral knowledge utilization. The interactive effects of self-promotion and self-presenter race will be strongest when racial minorities are characterized as tokens. Self-presenter race will have a weaker (or null) effect when racial minorities are characterized as non-tokens.

Hypothesis 4: Self-presenter race, ingratiation, and token status will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict (a) interpersonal liking and (b) coworker support. The interactive effects of ingratiation and self-presenter race will be strongest when racial minorities are characterized as tokens. Self-presenter race will have a weaker (or null) effect when racial minorities are characterized as non-tokens.
Effects of Coworker Receptivity on Newcomer Adjustment

The differential effect of strategic self-presentations on coworker receptivity as a function of self-presenter race and the racial context has important implications for the newcomer’s feeling of fit. Coworkers are important conduits of messages that convey organizational values and the extent to which an employee fits in at work (Allen, 1992; Liao, Joshi, & Chuang, 2004; Shanock, Roch, & Mishra, 2012). Newcomers tend to report experiencing greater fit when organizational members affirm their unique value to the workgroup (Cable & Parson, 2001) and when they are socially accepted by organizational members (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Moreland & Levine, 2001; Reichers, 1987). Asking newcomers for task-relevant information and adopting their proposed ideas should increase fit perceptions by increasing newcomers’ feelings of competence. Consistent with this rationale, favorable task performance feedback has been shown to positively relate to one’s perceived task competence (Sansone, 1986), which is related to subsequent person-job fit and person-organization fit perceptions (Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009). Feeling liked and supported by coworkers has also been shown to positively relate to person-job fit and person-organization fit by satisfying the psychological need to feel connected with others (Cable & Parson, 2001; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009).

Moreover, when experienced coworkers provide guidance to newcomers and share acquired knowledge and resources, newcomers are better able to perform effectively and perceive a match between abilities and job requirements. It also conveys to employees that the organization cares about them (Shanock et al., 2012), resulting in enhanced person-organization fit perceptions (Cable & DeRue, 2002).

As hypothesized above, newcomer race is thought to influence the link between strategic self-presentations. I therefore proposed that for Whites, self-promotion and ingratiating with
coworkers will have social benefits that positively influence subsequent feelings of fit via enhanced coworker receptivity to White newcomers. In contrast, strategic self-presentation are less likely to enhance coworker receptivity to racial minorities, resulting in a comparatively weaker (or null) effect on subjective fit perceptions. Thus, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 5: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect effects of self-promotion on person-environment fit through its effect on (a) perceptual knowledge utilization and (b) behavioral knowledge utilization, such that the positive indirect effect will be strongest among White newcomers and weakest (or null) among minority members stereotyped as having low competence (viz., Blacks and Hispanics).

Hypothesis 6: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect effects of ingratiation on person-environment fit through its effect on (a) interpersonal liking and (b) coworker support, such that the positive indirect effect will be strongest among White newcomers and weakest (or null) among minority members stereotyped as having low interpersonal warmth (viz., Blacks, Asians, & Hispanics).

Hypothesis 7: Coworkers’ (a) perceptual knowledge utilization and (b) behavioral knowledge utilization mediate the interactive effects of self-presenter race, self-promotion, and token status on person-environment fit.

Hypothesis 8: The extent to which newcomers are (a) liked and (b) socially supported by coworkers mediate the interactive effects of self-presenter race, ingratiation, and token status on person-environment fit.
Figure 2. Hypothesized Model
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OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

Across two studies, I investigated whether people in fact respond differently to self-presentation strategies based on the self-presenter’s race. A laboratory experiment (Study 1) was conducted to strengthen confidence in the moderating effects of self-presenter race by examining the hypothesized model in a controlled environment, reducing alternative explanations for the observed effects (McGrath, 1982). Granted the pervasiveness of Blacks as stereotypically less intelligent and interpersonally warm than the prototypical White, I first observed small groups, consisting of a Black or White new team member. A longitudinal field study (Study 2) was conducted to investigate whether experienced organizational members in fact respond differently to self-presentation strategies based on the self-presenter’s race, and, if so, how these differences might influence subjective fit perceptions. Further, I investigated whether token status and self-presenter race interactively explain when differences in the effectiveness of strategic self-presentations are most likely to emerge. Altogether, the data contributes to our understanding of how and when self-presenter race and individuating information (via strategic self-presentations) facilitate coworker receptivity to newcomers and have implications for workplace diversity, newcomer adjustment, and person-environment fit.
Chapter Two

STUDY 1: MODERATING EFFECTS OF RACE

Study 1 tested a key assumption of individuation models of impression formation: whether providing individuating information via strategic self-presentation reduces category-based impression formation and, ultimately, enhances the likelihood of person-based attributes. Specifically, I examine whether speaking about past accomplishments relevant to the current task (self-promotion) increases (a) perceptions of new team members’ competence (i.e., perceptual knowledge utilization) and (b) coworkers’ adoption of new team members’ proposed ideas (i.e., behavioral knowledge utilization). I also examine the effect non-verbal (e.g., smiling, nodding) and verbal (e.g., compliments, opinion conformity) attempts to ingratiate themselves have on (a) team members’ perception of newcomers’ likability and (b) their tendency to share task-related information with the new team member (i.e., coworker support). Additionally, I explore whether team members’ diversity mindset (i.e., attitudes towards demographically different others; De Meuse & Hostager, 2001) influence the extent to which self-presenter race influences reactions to self-presentation strategies. Category-based expectations should be less likely or socially relevant to those who have favorable mindset about how diversity might affect team and organizational processes (van Knippenberg, Ginkel, & Homan, 2013).
STUDY 1

METHODS

Participants and Procedures

Two hundred nineteen undergraduate students at a large northeastern university were recruited for this study from a research subject pool. Students received course credit for their participation. To ensure the quality of data, I included a single-item measure at the end of the survey intended to allow participants the opportunity to indicate how much effort and attention devoted to the study (Meade & Craig, 2012): “In your honest opinion, should I use your data in our analyses in this study?” with a 1 = “yes” or 0 = “no” response option. A total of nine participants responded “no” and thus their data were removed. This method resulted in a final sample size of 210 (96% of total sample). The participants were 75% female, had an average age of 18.06 years (SD = 3.40), and identified as the following ethnicities: 73% White, 3% Black, 8% Hispanic, 12% Asian, 1% Native American, and 2% other.

The study consisted of a 2 (newcomer race: Black, White) × 2 (newcomer gender: male, female) × 3 (self-presentation: ingratiation, self-promotion, control) research design. Using Excel’s random number generator, participants were randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions, creating five-person teams on average (SD = .93; Range = 3 to 6; Mode = 5), which included four participants and a confederate. All participants were informed that they have to perform two tasks designed to improve one of two local not-for-profit organizations’ online donations. After obtaining informed consent, participants were asked to
complete a brief questionnaire, which included demographic and personality items. Next, two randomly composed teams were guided to their individual rooms to begin tasks.¹

First task required teams to create a clear vision statement that communicates both the purpose and the values of the not-for-profit organization. The sole purpose of this task was to create a common bond between team members to form a cohesive group (Postmes, Spears, & Cihangir, 2001). Team members were introduced and received 20 minutes to read their individual handbook containing unique information about the organization and to complete Task 1.² Consistent with related research (e.g., Rink & Ellemers, 2009), upon completion of the task, participants individually completed a brief questionnaire to measure their level of group cohesion: (a) “My teammates and I fit well together”, (b) “I feel comfortable with my teammates”, (c) “I like working with my teammates”, and (d) “My teammates are similar to me” (Ellemers, Kortekaas, & Ouwerkerk, 1999; $\alpha = .91$). A one-way ANOVA revealed that the responses of members within teams varied significantly less than between groups, $p < .001$. The ICC(1)³ and ICC(2)⁴ estimates were also reliable, .59 and .85, respectively. As intended, across conditions, all groups reported relatively high levels of cohesion ($M = 4.79; SD = .90; 1 = \text{Not at all}; 6 = \text{Very much}$). Thus, I successfully created a sense of cohesion between team members before introducing the newcomer (i.e., confederate).

¹ Teams were created using the sign-in sheet. Upon entering the lab, students were first instructed to sign in. Later, two teams were formed based on when they signed in, such that odd numbers created one team, and evens created a second team. For example, the first person to sign in would have been assigned to Team 1, and the second person to sign in would have been assigned to Team 2. After one confederate signed in, the other confederate would be messaged and asked to enter the lab and sign in, such that the confederates were always assigned to different teams.
² Each team member received different information about the organization (i.e., handbooks on About Us, FAQ, Background, What We Do, How We Succeed) to encourage information sharing. Also, it allowed me to examine whether information about the organization was shared with the newcomers/confederates once they joined the team.
³ ICC(1) reflects the proportion of variance in individual responses that can be explained by group membership.
⁴ ICC(2) indicates the reliability of the group mean score when individual scores are aggregated.
After Task 1, teams were informed that in order to simulate turnover in teams, a team member has been randomly selected to change places with a member of the other team. A teammate (i.e., trained confederate) from each team was then asked to take their things and join the other team. Then, the newcomer (confederate) was introduced and teams began working together on Task 2. Second task required teams to generate ideas for a 2- to 5-minute promotional video that helps expand the organization’s donor base by building public awareness of its mission and the unique impact it is having on community needs. Upon completion of Task 2, participants completed a brief questionnaire to measure their perceptions of each individual team members. Afterwards, participants were asked to respond to questions about their attitudes toward workplace diversity. Participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation upon completion of the study.

Measures

Manipulations. In the self-promotion conditions, four trained confederates (Black male and female; White male and female) were instructed to speak about past accomplishments working on a similar task that involved raising funds for their high school. In the ingratiation condition, the newcomer was instructed to perform nonverbal (e.g., smiling; nod in agreement) and verbal ingratiatory behaviors (e.g., compliment team on task; verbal agreement). The control condition involved no active attempts to manage impressions.

Knowledge utilization. Consistent with prior research that included perceptual (e.g., Molleman & Van der Vegt, 2007) and behavioral (e.g., Gruenfeld et al., 2000) measures of team

---

5 During debriefing, all participants were verbally asked about their awareness of the presence and identification of confederates. Based on participants’ responses, the manipulation was shown to be very effective at concealing confederates’ identity. Equally important, participants did not report awareness of the study purpose prior to debriefing.

6 Though no active attempts were made to manage impressions, confederates were instructed to be polite and engaged.
utilization of newcomer knowledge, I measured competence perception (perceptual knowledge utilization) with three items adapted from Chen, Gully, and Eden’s (2001) New General Self-Efficacy Scale: “In general, I think that [team member name] can obtain outcomes that are important for a job”, “I am confident that [team member] can perform effectively on many different work-related tasks”, and “Compared to other people, I think [team member name] would perform his/her work tasks quite well”. The response scale ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree), and the Cronbach’s alphas for this measures was .83. To assess behavioral knowledge utilization, study sessions were recorded using two high-definition video cameras (including audio recording). Four trained research assistants watched the video recordings and coded the extent teams adopted the newcomer’s proposed ideas. Specifically, behavioral knowledge utilization was operationalized in Study 1 as the number of times teams’ explicitly agreed about the usefulness of a proposed idea.

Newcomer acceptance. Consistent with recent research (e.g., Burke, Kraut, & Joyce, 2010; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2012), interpersonal liking and information sharing were included as measures of newcomer acceptance. Two items developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990) were used to measure perceived likability: “I like [team member name] very much as a person” and “I think [team member name] will make a good friend”. The response scale ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree), and the Cronbach’s alphas for this measures was .76. Four trained research assistants watched the video recordings and coded the extent to which teams shared task-related information with newcomers. Information sharing was operationalized as the number of occasions that a team member verbally shared task-related

---

7 In addition to including team members’ names on Survey 3, their sign-in numbers were also included. Before beginning tasks, team members were provided time for introductions. Also, team members’ seating was associated with their sign-in number, which was located on the table.
information or shared their individual handbook containing unique information about the
organization with the newcomer.

**Diversity mindset.** Diversity mindset can be defined as team members’ individual
cognitions about the relational effects of diversity on their work group or organization, and their
associated evaluations of diversity (van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007; van Knippenberg, van
Ginkel, & Homan, 2013). I used eight items adapted from the Workplace Diversity Scale (WDS)
developed by de Meuse and Hostager (2001) to measure diversity mindsets. The WDS is a self-
report measure that includes four items for each of the subscales measuring cognitions and
behavior reactions toward diversity. Sample items included: “I believe diversity is worthless”
(attitude), and “I support diversity efforts in organizations” (behavior). Response options ranged
from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*). The Cronbach’s alphas of the diversity attitude
and behavioral reaction scales were .77 and .79, respectively. The aggregate reliability of the
scale was .87.

**Manipulation check.** Poisson regression analysis was used to assess whether ingratiatory
and self-promoting behaviors performed by confederates were successfully manipulated by
condition. This analytic technique is appropriate when the dependent variable assesses the
occurrence of an event that rarely occurs despite having multiple opportunities to occur (Cohen,
Cohen, West, and Aiken, 2003), as is the case with count variables in the current study. Analyses
confirm that the conditions were successfully manipulated as intended. In the ingratiation
condition, there were significant more occurrences in which the confederates smiled ($b = 1.06; p
< .01$), verbally ($b = .80; p < .01$) and non-verbally ($b = .97; p < .01$) agreed with team
members, and complimented team members ($b = 1.62; p < .01$) relative to the self-promotion
and control conditions. Also, confederates spoke about past success creating a promotional video
in the self-promotion condition ($b = 2.30; p < .01$) and were less likely to do so in the ingratiation or neutral condition. Importantly, these findings did not significantly vary depending on the race of the confederate.
STUDY 1

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and correlations for all Study 1 variables.

| Variable               | M   | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  |
|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Perceiver Gender    | .77 | .44 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. Perceiver Race      | .72 | 1.35| -.04|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. Newcomer Gender     | .41 | .49 | .15*| -15*|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. Newcomer Race       | .51 | .50 | .04 | -.06| .02 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5. Ingratiation        | --  | --  | .05 | -.11| -.06| .03 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6. Self-Promotion      | --  | --  | -.03| .03 | -.05| .00 | -.51**|     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7. Interpersonal Liking| 6.03| .83 | -.01| .05 | -.04| .15*| .02 | .07 |     |     |     |     | (.76)|
| 8. Perceived Competence| 6.21| .56 | .01 | .02 | .02 | .09 | .12 | -.03| .58**|     |     |     | (.83)|
| 9. Diversity Mindset   | 5.69| .88 | .10 | .08 | .02 | .11 | .03 | -.01| .21*| .17*|     |     | (.87)|
| 10. Intent to Work Together| 7.70| .99 | -.05| .00 | -.03| .01 | .05 | .05 | .59**| .43**|     |     | .26 |

$N = 210$. Gender was coded 1 for “female” and 0 for “male”. Newcomer race was coded 1 for “Black” and 0 for “White”. The ingratiation variable in Table 4 is coded 1 for “ingratiation” and 0 for “neutral”. Self-promotion variable is coded 1 for “self-promotion” and 0 for “neutral”. Coefficient alpha reliabilities are reported on the main diagonal in parentheses.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$
Table 2. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Likability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>η²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.09⁺</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>551.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>997.79**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>579.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1894.86**</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiver Gender</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Race</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation (ING)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion (SP)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.18⁺</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING × Black</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP × Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 210. Race was coded 1 for “Black” and 0 for “White”.
⁺ p < .05
** p < .01
⁺⁺ p < .10

Test of Hypotheses

Knowledge Utilization

To test Hypothesis 1 which predicts that self-presenter race modifies the link between self-promotion and knowledge utilization, a 2 (condition) × 2 (self-presenter race) ANCOVA with gender as a covariate were performed for each of the outcome variables: perceived competence (H1a) and adoption of newcomers’ proposed ideas (H1b). As Table 2 shows, the interactive effects of self-presenter race and self-promotion on competence perceptions [F(1, 208) = 1.31, p = .25] was not statistically significantly. Thus, Hypothesis 1a was not supported.
Poisson regression analysis was used to assess whether self-promotion × self-presenter race predicted the extent teams adopted newcomers’ proposed ideas. In support of Hypothesis 2b, self-presenter race significantly affected the extent to which self-promotion enhanced the adoption of newcomers’ proposed ideas ($b = -1.34; p = .03$); such that the slope was positive and significant for Whites ($b = 1.38; p = .00$), but non-significant for Blacks ($b = .05; p = .93$).

**Figure 3. Interactive Effect of Race and Self-Promotion on Idea Adoption**

![Bar chart showing the interaction effect of race and self-promotion on idea endorsement](image)

**Newcomer Acceptance**

Hypothesis 2 predicts that performing ingratiatory behaviors will be more strongly associated with interpersonal liking (H2a) and information sharing (H2b) for White newcomers relative to Black newcomers. As summarized in Table 2, the interaction between self-presenter race and ingratiation was significantly related to interpersonal liking [$F(1, 208) = 4.03, p = .04$]. For Whites, ingratiation had a positive effect on liking ($b = .41; p = .02$), but a non-significant effect on liking for Blacks ($b = -.06; p = .73$). The means are plotted in Figure 4 to facilitate interpretation. Poisson regression analysis also indicate a significant two-way interaction predicting the number of occurrences in which team members proactively shared information about the organization with the newcomer ($b = -10.57; p = .00$); such that the slope was negative
and significant for Blacks ($b = -10.01; p = .00$), but not for Whites ($b = .56; p = .48$). Thus, Hypothesis 2a and 2b were supported.

Figure 4. Interactive Effect of Race and Ingratiation on Interpersonal Liking

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 5. Interactive Effect of Race and Ingratiation on Information Sharing

![Figure 5](image)
Supplementary Analysis

Next, I conducted supplementary analyses to explore whether team members’ diversity mindset predict the interactive effects of newcomer race and self-presentation strategies on knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance indices. I examined a model that included diversity mindset as a between-person predictor of whether the effects of self-promotion on competence perceptions vary as a function of race. The results did not support a significant interactive effect of self-promotion × self-presenter race × diversity mindset on perceived competence (b = -.09; p > .10). However, results indicated a statistically significant three-way interaction (ingratiation × self-presenter race × diversity mindset) predicting interpersonal liking (b = .41; p < .05). Following the recommendations of Aiken and West (1991), I then plotted the interaction effects computing slopes one standard deviation above and below the mean of diversity mindset. For Black, the slope of the relationship between ingratiation and liking was negative and marginally significant when diversity mindset was low (-1 SD; b = -.33, p < .10), but positive and significant for Whites (-1 SD; b = .50, p < .05). These differential effects were found to be statistically significant (b = -.84; p < .01). When perceivers held favorable diversity mindset, self-presenter race did not have a significant effect on the relationship between ingratiation and interpersonal liking (b = -.11; p < .01) for White (+1 SD; b = .25, p > .10) and Black (+1 SD; b = .14, p > .10) newcomers.

Finally, to rule out potential gender effects, I conducted 2 (self-presenter race) × 2 (self-presenter gender) × 2 (condition) between-person analyses. Results indicated that self-presenter gender did not modify the relationship between ingratiation and interpersonal liking [F(1, 208) = 2.19, p > .10]. Likewise, the interactive effects of self-presenter gender and self-promotion did not significantly predict competence perceptions [F(1, 208) = .27, p > .10]. It is important to note
that I found the same pattern of results when I examined the influence of the perceiver race on the interactive effects of self-presenter race and strategic self-presentations: 2 (self-presenter race) × 2 (perceiver race) × 2 (condition) between-person analyses.

**Figure 6. Interactive Effect of Diversity Mindset, Race, and Ingratiation on Interpersonal Liking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Ingratiation Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Diversity Mindset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(White)</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Diversity Mindset</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(White)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Diversity Mindset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Black)</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Diversity Mindset</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Black)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, Study 1 findings support the prediction that the social benefits associated with strategic self-presentations is conditioned by the race of the self-presenter, particularly when the perceiver hold unfavorable attitudes about the relational effects of diversity on work groups or organizations. These differential effects were most likely to be observed when examining team members’ behavioral reactions to newcomers’ strategic self-presentation. For instance, ingratiation enhanced team members’ tendency to share information with White newcomers, but this was not the case for Blacks. Self-promotion reduced the likelihood that Black newcomers’ proposed ideas were viewed as useful in completing the team’s task. When examining perceptual knowledge utilization, self-promotions did not significantly improve (or worsen) competence
perceptions for Whites or Blacks. However, ingratiating with team members improved perception of likability for White newcomers only and not their Black counterparts.

Table 3. Poisson Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Idea Adoption</th>
<th>Information Sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>551.43</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomer Race</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Promotion (SP)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP × Race</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 210. Race was coded 1 for “Black” and 0 for “White
Chapter Three

STUDY 2: THEORETICAL EXTENSIONS AND CONTEXT

The findings from Study 1 support my theory that newcomer race modifies the effects of strategic self-presentations on knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance indices. In general, ingratiation attempts tended to be effective for Whites but ineffective for Blacks. Study 1 findings extend past research (e.g., Westphal & Stern, 2007) by showing that the effect of self-presenter race on these relationships is attenuated when perceivers hold positive attitudes toward diversity. However, these findings are subject to important limitations.

Study 2 was designed to strengthen confidence in the moderating effects of race and extend Study 1 in several ways. First, I sought to constructively replicate Study 1 by examining my model with new hires (at three time points) in an organizational context and extending my focus to other minority groups such as Asians and Hispanics. The second major objective of Study 2 was to investigate whether the racial representation of newcomers’ racial group within their work unit weakens the interactive effects of strategic self-presentations and self-presenter race on coworker receptivity to newcomers, as predicted by Hypotheses 3 and 4. Third, Study 2 investigates whether strategic self-presentations and race indirectly influence the extent to which newcomers perceive their organization and job as a good fit, through its interactive effects on both components of coworker receptivity: knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance. I outline the research design and measures below.
STUDY 2

METHODS

Participants and Procedure

Study 2 participants were recently hired employees at a university hospital in a southwestern city. After obtaining commitment from the Vice President of Human Resources and new employees’ contact information, an invitation to participate in the study (endorsed by the VP of Human Resources) was sent electronically to all new hires. Data for this study were collected at three time points (separated by 30 days) to obtain information from new employees about their experiences as they unfolded in real time while adjusting to a new work environment. Related research suggests that a 30-day lag is sufficient for observing changes in newcomer adjustment (e.g., Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013). Moreover, the collection of independent, mediator, and dependent variables at different time points reduces methodological and analytical issues that might occur in cross-sectional studies such as common method bias (Mitchell & James, 2001; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

I obtained 431 responses to the survey at Time 1 (62% White, 72% female) and obtained 416 employee responses to the second-wave survey (59% White, 72% female). Another 30 days after T2, I administered the third-wave survey and obtained 235 employee responses (62% White, 72% female). Using a personalized code to link employees’ responses and ensure anonymity, I was able to obtain a total of 164 matched cases that had completed all three surveys (38% completion rate). Of the 164 employees across 19 work units (e.g., hospital, campus

---

8 To ensure anonymity of survey responses, survey links were sent to all new employees each wave and, therefore, some employees completed Survey 2 and not Survey 1, or completed Survey 3 and not Survey 2, and so forth. Data was also lost because respondents reported different IDs, although each survey instructed respondents to include: 1st letter of place of birth, 1st letter of first name, 1st letter of mother’s name, and day of birth. However, the attrition rates in the current study were consistent with past research

9 Work units are operationalized as the department in which respondents worked.
clinic, community clinic): 72% were women. 70% percent of the employees indicated that they were Caucasian, 8% Black, 6% Asian, and 15% Hispanic. At Time 1, their average organizational tenure was 44.33 days ($SD = 25.94$), which correspond with what is generally conceptualized as “newcomer” (Bradt, Check, & Pedraza, 2006; Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2012; Watkins, 2003). Finally, 85% of respondents held a vocational (8%), bachelor (30%), or postgraduate degree (5% professional; 11% doctorate), indicating that this sample was highly educated. Common occupations for respondents included nurse clinician, nurse practitioner, physician, patient registration and service specialists, community health worker, and business coordinator.

At Time 2, respondents were asked to provide the contact information of three coworkers and were reminded that all responses were confidential. Coworkers were then sent an electronic invitation (via their employee email address) to participate in the current study. Using a personalized code to link responses, I obtained coworker ratings (average: 1.64 ratings per participant; $SD = .73$) for 74 newcomers. Sixty-four percent of newcomers with coworker ratings were female, 65% White, 12% Black, 8% Asian, and 13% Hispanic with an average tenure of 46.40 days ($SD = 28.03$). Following accepted practices (e.g., Scott & Judge, 2009), comparison of Internet Protocol (IP) addresses for each survey provided evidence that the newcomers did not complete the coworker surveys themselves.

---

10 Analysis indicated that newcomer race did not significantly predict the extent to which coworkers shared the same race with newcomer or the number of coworkers who completed the survey on behalf of the newcomer. For Whites, there was a 77% probability that at least one of the coworker respondents shared the same ethnicity, 44% for Blacks, 88% for Asian, and 29% for Hispanics. The average coworker responses were 1.72 for Whites, 1.25 for Blacks, 1 for Asians, and 1.13 for Hispanics.
Measures

**Strategic self-presentations (T1).** Seventeen items, adapted from scales developed and validated by Bolino and Turnley (1999), assessed the extent to which newcomer used strategic self-presentations when interacting with coworkers, within past 30 days. Eight items measured self-promotion (e.g., “Make coworkers aware of my talents or qualifications” and “Make coworkers aware of my accomplishments”). Nine items assessed the use of ingratiatory behaviors (e.g., “Compliment my colleagues” and “Smile a lot or use friendly non-verbal behavior when interacting with coworkers”). All items were scored on a 5-point scale (1 = Never behave this way to 5 = often behave this way). Reliability estimates for the self-promotion ($\alpha = .92$) and ingratiation ($\alpha = .85$) scales were acceptable.

**Knowledge utilization (T2).** I included six attributes previously used by Fiske et al. (2002) to measure perceptual knowledge utilization (i.e., perceived competence): intelligent, confident, competent, capable, efficient, and skillful ($\alpha = .95$). Each attribute was measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely). The inter-rater agreement ($r_{wg(j)}$, James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) for the set of six parallel items was .76. On the basis of these results, I aggregated the perceived competence items across raters (i.e., coworkers) for each focal participant. A two-item self-report measure was used to assess behavioral knowledge utilization, with response options ranging from 1 (Never) to 7 (All the time). Items included: “Coworkers have…asked for your opinion on a work-related matter” and “…asked for you help on a task” ($\alpha = .85$).

**Newcomer acceptance (T2).** Newcomer acceptance was operationalized as the extent to which newcomers were liked and supported by coworker. I included six attributes previously used by Fiske et al. (2002) to measure interpersonal liking: friendly, well-intentioned,
trustworthy, warm, good-natured, and sincere ($\alpha = .92$). Each attribute was measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely). Supporting aggregation of coworker ratings, the average $r_{wg(j)}$ for likability items was .72 (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984). The degree to which newcomers perceived their coworkers as helpful in the socialization process (i.e., coworker support) was measured with Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg’s (2003) 7-item scale. Sample items included, “My coworkers have…shared task-related knowledge and resources”, and “…provided guidance as to how you should perform your job” ($\alpha = .93$).

**Person-environment fit ($T_3$).** Self-rated person-environment fit perceptions were assessed as an indicator of newcomer adaptation to their environment using a 6-item scale developed and validated by Cable and DeRue (2002) – three items for each of the subscales measuring person-organization (P-O) fit and person-job (P-J) fit. Sample items included: “My organization’s values and culture provide a good fit with the things that I value in life ($\alpha = .98$) and “The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills” ($\alpha = .96$). All items were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree).

**Relational demography.** Relational demography was operationalized as the numerical representation of respondents’ racial group (i.e., token status). Those whose racial group was represented by 15% or fewer group members were characterized as tokens, whereas those with greater than 15% representation were characterized as non-tokens. At Time 1, respondents were asked to report the percentage of coworkers working in their department who shared the same race or ethnicity as them. The response scale was in 5% increments, ranging from “less than 5%” to “greater than 50%” racial representation. Approximately 56% of racial minorities were
characterized as tokens and 46% as non-tokens, whereas 95% of Whites were characterized as non-tokens.\footnote{To confirm the accuracy of racial representation, I examined the degree to which individuals within the same department report similar racial representation. Self-reports of racial representation were generally consistent within departments, with the exception of 3 cases. I therefore proceeded to examine hypotheses.}

**Control variable.** Because research suggests that pervasive gender-based stereotypes affect warmth and competence judgments (Cuddy et al., 2011), and the relationship between gender and subjective fit perceptions (Lovelace & Rosen, 1996), I included newcomer gender as a control variable. Following prior socialization research (Harris, Li, Boswell, Zhang, & Xie, 2013; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003), I controlled for newcomers’ education level due to its potential effect on organizational members’ perceptual and behavioral reaction to newcomers.

**Analytic Strategy**

**Response bias checks.** To access nonresponse bias (Halbesleben & Whitman, 2013), I coded longitudinal participants (i.e., those who completed all three waves) as 1 and coded participants who completed only the first survey as 0 and included this dichotomy as the dependent variable in a logistic regression analysis with Time 1 predictors (ingratiation and self-promotion) as well as demographic variables (gender and race). No variable in the equation was significant. I also compared longitudinal participants (coded 1) with those participating only at Time 2 (coded 0) on demographic variables and Time 2 coworker receptivity indices. Again, I found that this categorization of participants was not a significant predictor of any the variables. This procedure has been shown to be an acceptable and effective approach to check response bias (e.g., Duffy, Scott, Shaw, Tepper, & Aquino, 2012). Thus, I proceeded with data analyses.

**Non-independence.** Due to the nested nature of the data (individuals nested within 19 units), I tested my moderated mediation model using the nested-equations path analytic
approached. This approach allowed for simultaneous estimation of the parameters in the models. My theoretical model is an example of a “first-stage” moderated mediation hypothesis because the moderating effect of self-presenter race is predicted to operate on the first stage of the indirect relationship between strategic self-presentations and person-environment fit.
STUDY 2

RESULTS

The descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables are shown in Table 4. As expected, newcomers reported frequently performing ingratiatory behaviors \( (M = 3.49, SD = .77) \). On average, newcomers reported infrequently engaging in self-promotions \( (M = 2.49, SD = .92) \).

### Table 4. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Education</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.82</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. Newcomer Gender</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-27**</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. Newcomer Race</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</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. Token Status</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ingratiation</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Promotion</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Competence</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Information Sought from</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>Newcomer</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interpersonal Liking</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coworker Support</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. P-O Fit</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. P-J Fit</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 164 \). Newcomer race was coded 1 for “Minority” and 0 for “White”. Token status was coded 0 for “non-tokens” and 1 for “tokens”. Coefficient alpha reliabilities are reported on the main diagonal in parentheses.

* \( p < .05 \)

** \( p < .01 \)
First, I examined the prediction that self-presenter race modifies the effect of self-promotion on the hypothesized mediating processes – i.e., perceived competence (H1a) and the use of newcomers’ unique knowledge (H1b) – that explain the indirect effect of self-promotion on subjective fit perceptions. To test my hypotheses, a dummy variable was used to capture the
effects of self-promotion performed by Whites (coded as 0) compared to racial minorities stereotyped as having low competence (coded as 1: Blacks and Hispanics). Results indicate that the interactive effect of self-presenter race and self-promotion on competence perceptions was statistically significant ($\gamma = -.19; p = .00$). As depicted in Figure 7, the promotion-competence slope was positive and significant for Whites ($b = .30; p = .00$) and non-significant for racial minorities ($b = -.03; p = .85$). Thus, Hypothesis 1a was support. Contrary to Hypothesis 1b, self-presenter race did not have a significant effect on the relationship between self-promotion and coworkers’ tendency to seek task-related information from newcomers ($\gamma = -.33; p = .33$).

**Figure 7. Interactive Effect of Race and Self-Promotion on Perceived Competence**

Analysis of the predicted three-way interaction (H3) revealed that the numerical representation of newcomers’ racial group (i.e., token status) did not significantly attenuate the effects of self-presenter race on the relationships between self-promotion and coworkers’ competence perceptions ($\gamma = -.40; p = .10$), but trending in predicted direction. For example, simple slope analyses revealed that self-promotion had a significant positive effect on competence perceptions for non-token racial minorities ($b = .47; p = .00$) and a non-significant
and negative effect for token racial minorities ($b = -0.08; p = .17$). The three-way interaction predicting organizational members’ tendency to seek task-related information from newcomers was not supported ($\gamma = -0.63; p = .47$). I therefore had no grounds for testing Hypothesis 6: token status predicts the extent to which self-presenter race modifies the indirect effect of self-promotion on person-environment fit via perceptual (H6a) and behavioral (H6b) knowledge utilization.

To confirm Hypothesis 5, I examined whether the indirect effect of self-promotion on person-environment fit perceptions (via perceived competence) was conditioned by the race of the self-promoter. Providing some support for the link between the mediating variable and person-environment fit, competence perceptions significantly predicted person-job fit perceptions ($\gamma = .93; p = .03$), but did not predict person-organization fit perceptions ($\gamma = .10; p = .74$). I therefore proceeded to examine first-stage moderation mediation. Results indicate that self-promotion had a positive and significant indirect effect on person-job fit perceptions (via perceived competence) for Whites ($b = .13; p = .05$), but the indirect effect was non-significant for racial minorities ($b = -0.05; p = .35$). Based on the procedure outlined by Preacher and Hayes (2008) for comparing indirect effects, analyses revealed that these differences were not statistically significant ($b = -0.18; p = .11$). Thus, Hypothesis 5a was not supported. In light of the non-significant two-way interaction predicting coworkers’ tendency to seek task-related information from newcomers (H1b), Hypothesis 5b was also not empirically supported.

**Newcomer Acceptance Path**

Next, I examined whether self-presenter race modified the effects of ingratiation on the hypothesized mediating processes – i.e., interpersonal liking (H2a) and coworker support (H2b) – that explain the indirect effect of ingratiation on subjective fit perceptions. To test my
predictions, a dummy variable was used to capture the effects of ingratiation performed by Whites (coded as 0) compared to racial minorities stigmatized as having low interpersonal warmth (coded as 1: Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics). Providing some support for Hypothesis 2a, results indicate a marginally significant interactive effect of ingratiation and self-presenter race on the extent to which coworkers viewed newcomers as likable ($\gamma = -.27; p = .05$). As expected, the slope was significantly positive for White newcomers ($b = .14; p = .00$) and non-significant for racial minorities ($b = -.06; p = .23$). Figure 8 depicts the pattern of these interactions. In support of Hypothesis 2b, simple slope analyses indicate that ingratiation had a significant positive effect on coworker support for Whites ($b = .52; p = .01$), but a non-significant effect for racial minorities ($b = -.08; p = .74$) – see Figure 9. Analyses revealed that these differential effects are statistically significant ($b = -.59; p = .04$).

**Figure 8. Interactive Effect of Race and Ingratiation on Interpersonal Liking**
Hypothesis 4 predicted that the numerical representation of newcomers’ racial group (i.e., token status) attenuates the effects of self-presenter race on the relationship between ingratiation and newcomer acceptance indices. As Table 4 shows, the three-way interaction predicting interpersonal liking was statistically significant ($\gamma = -1.93; p = .00$). Ingratiation had a significant negative effect on interpersonal liking when racial minorities were characterized as tokens ($b = -0.19; p = .03$), but the effect was positive and significant for non-token racial minorities ($b = 1.90; p = .00$). A comparison of indirect effects revealed that the effect of ingratiation on liking was significantly more positive for non-token racial minorities than token racial minorities ($b = 2.10; p = .00$) and Whites ($b = 1.68; p = .00$). Thus, Hypothesis 4a was supported. Token status also predicted the effect of ingratiation $\times$ race on coworker support ($\gamma = 2.28; p = .00$). Specifically, ingratiation had a negative and significant effect on coworker support for token racial minorities ($b = -0.66; p = .02$), but a significant positive effect on coworker support for non-token racial minorities ($b = 0.81; p = .03$). Analyses indicate that these differential effects are statistically
significant \((b = -1.47; p = .00)\). Further, I found no significant racial difference between Whites and non-token minorities when predicting the ingratiation-support slope for non-tokens \((b = .57; p = .19)\). These results provide support for Hypothesis 4b. See Figure 10 and Figure 11 for a graphical representation of three-way interactions.¹²

**Figure 10. Interactive Effect of Token Status and Ingratiation on Interpersonal Liking Among Racial Minorities**

---

¹² It is important to note that when token status was treated as a continuous variable (1 = less than 5% to 11 = greater than 50%), analyses revealed a similar pattern of findings. However, to facilitate interpretation and follow traditional approaches to examining the effects of token status (e.g., Roberson et al., 2003), token status was analyzed as a dichotomous variable as initially conceptualized by Kanter (1977).
To confirm moderated mediation as predicted by Hypothesis 7, I first examined the link between mediating variables and person-environment fit. As shown in Table 2, interpersonal liking significantly predicted person-organization fit perceptions ($\gamma = .77; p = .01$), but its effect on person-job fit perceptions was not statistically significant ($\gamma = -.17; p = .60$). Coworker support significantly predicted person-organization fit ($\gamma = .28; p = .00$) and person-job fit perceptions ($\gamma = .16; p = .00$). Thus, I proceeded to examine Hypothesis 7, which predicted first-stage moderated mediation. For Whites, results indicate that ingratiation had a significant positive indirect effect on person-organization fit through its effect on interpersonal liking ($b = .23; p = .02$). For racial minorities, the indirect effect of ingratiation on person-organization fit was non-significant ($b = .02, p = .84$). However, results indicate that these differential effects were not statistically significant ($b = -.21; p = .19$). Hypothesis 7a was therefore not supported.

As expected, ingratiation also had a positive significant indirect effect on person-organization fit via coworker support for Whites ($b = .14; p = .00$) and a non-significant effect for racial minorities ($b = -.02; p = .74$). Supporting Hypothesis 7b, these differential effects were
statistically significant \( (b = -.17; p = .04) \). Likewise, the indirect effect of ingratiation on perceptions of person-job fit varied by race \( (b = -.10; p = .05) \). Results suggest that the indirect effect was significant and positive for Whites \( (b = .08; p = .00) \) and non-significant for racial minorities \( (b = -.01; p = .75) \). Moreover, the mediated effects of self-presenter race \( \times \) ingratiation on perceptions of person-organization fit via coworker support was conditioned by token status. Results indicate that ingratiation had differential effects on person-organization fit for token racial minorities \( (b = -.12, p = .13) \) compared to non-tokens \( (b = .15, p = .12) \); such that, the negative effect was weaker for non-tokens \( (b = -.28, p = .08) \). The conditional indirect effect of ingratiation on racial minorities’ perception of person-job fit also varied by token status \( (b = -.17, p = .08) \). Specifically, ingratiation had a positive and marginally significant indirect effect on person-job fit perceptions for non-token racial minorities \( (b = .10, p = .07) \) and a non-significant indirect effect for token racial minorities \( (b = -.08, p = .19) \). Further, I found no racial differences between Whites and non-token racial minorities when testing the indirect effects of ingratiation on perceptions of person-organization fit \( (b = .11, p = .28) \) or person-job fit \( (b = .07, p = .23) \). These patterns of findings provide support for Hypothesis 8b.

Study 2 complements Study 1 findings in several ways. First, I replicated findings indicating that self-promotion and ingratiation tend to be ineffective for racial minorities, while enhancing knowledge utilization and newcomer acceptance for Whites. Specifically, self-promotion was shown to enhance perceptions of Whites’ competence, while ingratiation enhanced the extent to which White newcomers were liked and supported (e.g., shared task-related information) by coworkers. However, these social benefits were not linked to racial minorities’ attempts to self-promote and ingratiate with coworkers. Second, I extend Study 1 findings which demonstrates the influence of diversity mindset on the effectiveness of
ingratiation performed by racial minorities by identifying token status as another key determinant of when race matters. I show that the differential effects of ingratiation on newcomer acceptance indices were less likely to emerge when racial minorities were characterized as non-tokens (more than 15% racial representation). Moreover, ingratiation significantly enhanced newcomer acceptance for non-token racial minorities, but this was not the case for tokens. Token status did not attenuate the effects of self-presenter race on the relationship between self-promotion and knowledge utilization as found in Study 1 with respect to diversity mindset. Third, Study 2 findings extend our understanding of how interpersonal liking and coworker support mediate the link between ingratiation and person-environment fit perceptions, as a function of self-presenter race (see Figure 12). A summary of findings is provided in Appendix A.
Figure 12. Empirically Supported Moderated Mediation Model

Note. Values above the arrows on the $b$ Path are estimates for P-O fit, whereas values below the arrows on the $b$ Path are estimates for P-J fit.

** $p < .01$
*p $p < .05.$
Chapter Four

GENERAL DISCUSSION

I developed and tested a model that explicates how and under what conditions newcomers’ use of strategic self-presentations to provide individuating information about the self influences adaptation to their new work environment. Two studies show that self-presentation strategies are less effective for racial minorities (relative to Whites), particularly among token minorities. These findings, replicated across two different samples and using different measures and designs, provide new insight into when proactive self-presentation behaviors predict coworker receptivity and newcomer adaptation.

Interestingly, the negative effects of self-presenter race on others’ reactions to strategic self-presentations were more reliable when predicting the effects of ingratiation than self-promotion. Ingratiating with team members (Study 1) or coworkers (Study 2) did not increase the extent to which a racial minority was liked and supported by coworkers. Consistent with related research (Westphal & Stern, 2007), Whites garnered more social benefits for engaging in ingratiaitory behaviors that are thought to contribute to the quality work relationships. My findings extend prior research by revealing that ingratiation can have a positive effect on both affective and behavioral outcomes when racial minorities are numerically represented (i.e., non-tokens). Racial minorities risk backlash—e.g., reduced information sharing—for behaving counter-stereotypically, primarily when there are very few of them in a specific environment (i.e., tokens).

Findings were mixed across studies regarding the effects self-promotion on knowledge utilization as a function of self-presenter race. In Study 1, self-promotion did not have a significant effect on competence judgments regardless of the self-presenter’s race. However, the
extent to which ad hoc teams comprised of college students were observed explicitly adopting newcomers’ task-related ideas was contingent on the self-promoter’s race. Self-promotion tended to differentially influence competence judgments within organizations (Study 2) where newcomers interact with coworkers over time, providing several opportunities to shape perceptions and counteract misperceptions based on categorical judgments. But, self-promotion did not increase the frequency at which coworkers sought task-information from newcomers for either group. Taken together, these findings indicate that self-presenter race can play an important role in predicting when self-promotion and ingratiation enhance the extent that newcomers are respected and valued or liked and supported by coworkers, respectively. Below, I discuss how my findings offer several important implications for theory and practice and then highlight study limitations and areas for future research.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

My research extends the literature by demonstrating that it is important to explicitly consider the social context when investigating the effects of racial minorities’ self-presentation behaviors that proactively communicate warmth and competence information. In their seminal model, Fiske and Neuberg (1990, 1999) theorized that rapid, category-based impression-formation processes are likely to manifest in the absence of individuating information. Thoughtful attributions based on personal characteristics were posited to occur when individuating information is provided. However, it is unclear whether self-characterizing information provided via strategic self-presentation will similarly individuate judgments as objective information. Moreover, prior studies testing Fiske and Neuberg’s (1990) theory of individuation produced mixed results (cf., King, Shapiro, Hebl, Singletary, & Turner, 2006; Singletary & Hebl, 2009). In addressing these issues, I uniquely apply Berger, Conner, and
Fiske’s (1974) theorizing on expectation states to explain why stereotype-inconsistent information may not improve warmth and competence judgments. Importantly, I show that the individuating processes proposed by Fiske and Neuberg (1990) are most likely to occur when negative stereotypic expectations are not salient in the current setting, as is the case for non-token racial minorities. By doing so, I integrated the organizational literature on impression formation processes and stereotype content with a conceptual framework—expectation states theory—that allows us to consider the social context in which strategic self-presentations occur. My findings show that expectation states theory can be applied to workplace situations and can help integrate work on diversity management and self-presentation theory.

Moreover, impression management theorists and prior studies have tended to focus on leader-follower relationships (Wayne & Ferris, 1991) or images candidates project in the job interview (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009). My model differs from previous theories of impression management in that I suggest that the theoretical linkage between self-presentation strategies and impression formation is not limited to vertical relationships. My model further proposes that the effects of self-presentation strategies on individuating processes partly depend on the race of the self-presenter. Finally, rather than assuming that self-presentation strategies will always be counterproductive for racial minorities, my model introduces a second moderator (relational demography) that explains when race matters. By doing so, I provide new insights into when and for whom self-presentation strategies enhance the quality of coworker relationships, revealing that racial representation is particularly important to protecting against negative reaction to minorities’ proactive efforts to be liked and respected at work.

In addition, my research demonstrates when, why, and how racial minorities adjust to their new work environment. Scholars have begun to demonstrate the interplay between self-
presentations and newcomer adaptation (Roberts, 2005). However, little theory and research exists to provide a comprehensive explanation of the key determinants that underlie this dynamic. My findings suggest that providing individuating information (via strategic self-presentations) may facilitate newcomer adaptation when self-promotion and ingratiation attempts induce positive attributions from their interaction partner(s); when newcomers satisfy the psychological needs to belong and be respected as a unique contribution to the work unit; and when senior coworkers transfer skills, knowledge, and resources to racial minorities through informal channels. My research take a much-needed step toward explaining when, why, and how racial minorities become socially integrated with stronger interpersonal bonds that enhance fit and reduce misfit.

Finally, by examining minorities’ proactive effort to manage negative stereotypes, my research informs diversity theorists on the importance of examining “bottom-up” approaches to minimizing the challenges of diversity. Extensive research has shown that “top-down” approaches help eradicate social disparities, focusing primarily on leaders and organizational efforts (Cox & Beale, 1997; Thomas & Ely, 1996; Thomas, 1990). However, sparse research has examined minorities as active agents who enact behaviors aimed at influencing socialization processes and outcomes and how these behaviors affect the real probability of minorities “fitting in” as opposed to being marginalized in the workplace. My research suggests that “top-down” (e.g., increasing racial representation within organization) and “bottom-up” approaches collectively play an important role in the successful socialization of racial minorities.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION

My research is subject to a number of limitations that point to several avenues for future research. One is that a single source provided the data in Study 2 when testing the interactive
effects of strategic self-presentations on behavioral indicators of newcomer acceptance (e.g., coworker support), which raises concern about common method bias. This concern may be somewhat mitigated because 30 days separated the two waves of data collection, and Study 1 yielded a similar pattern of results when observing behavioral indicators of social support.

Second, I focused on coworker receptivity (to newcomers) as a mediator of the relationship between strategic self-presentation × self-presenter race and subjective fit perceptions, but I did not explore the mechanisms that mediate the relationship between strategic self-presentation × self-presenter race and coworker receptivity. I hope to see researchers directly test my assumptions that perceived credibility and time spent scrutinizing expectancy-inconsistent information explain why we see differences in targets’ perceptual and behavioral response to strategic self-presentations. Similarly, the type of self-presentation strategy used and demographic characteristics of the self-presenter may affect targets’ emotional response — such as contempt (low competence; low warmth), envy (high competence; low warmth), or admiration (high competence; high warmth).  

Third, although replicating my results across two studies is a step toward establishing the generalizability of my model, I cannot be certain that these findings generalize to a broader range of organizations and contexts. My results merely suggest the plausible mediation pathways through which strategic self-presentations and race interactively influence the extent to which newcomers “fit it” and adjust at work. A fruitful avenue for future research would be the pursuit of a better understanding of when strategic self-presentations and interpretational processes are more (or less) likely to improve hiring decisions or succession planning practices that facilitate talent identification and assessment of stigmatized groups. For instance, interviewers often need

---

13 Emotional responses (envy, contempt, and admiration) to warmth and competence judgments are based on Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick’s (2007) Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) Map.
to judge job candidates quickly and could therefore be at risk of making unfair and inefficient judgments based on inaccurate interpretations of self-characterizing information by, for example, elderly people or military veterans reentering the workforce. Such misjudgments could have unfortunate consequences for not only the candidate but also the decision maker, who is at risk of overlooking talented recruits based on imperfect data. As a result, stigmatized groups may be disproportionately hired for qualified jobs. Moreover, the organizational climate (e.g., representation of racial minorities in leadership roles) might modify the effect of strategic self-presentations on the perceived legitimacy of minority leaders. It is thought that leadership positions require both warmth and competence. Thus, understanding the conditions in which communicating warmth and competence information (via strategic self-presentation) is most likely to help members of stereotyped groups overcome negative stereotypic expectations and thus successfully emerge as legitimate leaders can have important implications for succession planning practices.

Fourth, future research will be necessary to identify facilitating conditions in which individuating information is most likely to improve the quality of exchange relationships and reduce the social exclusion of racial minorities. Perhaps third party endorsement of racial minorities’ competence and imperceptible qualities overrides misperceptions based on categorical judgments. Such that, coworkers are more accepting of racial minorities without the social backlash when competence and warmth information are provided by a credible third-party source (e.g., leader network facilitation). Moreover, the organizational climate for diversity should be explored as an important determinate of when self-presentation behaviors are equally rewarding for majority and minority members. Through its influence on the salience of negative
stereotypic expectations, it is likely that strategically managing self-presentations promotes individuation when the climate is highly supportive of diversity.

It is of importance that consciously managing impressions involves the expenditure of energy and attentional focus that may reduce available resources needed to meet job demands. This phenomenon is referred to as ego-depletion (i.e., a state of diminished resources following exertion of self-control; Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007, p. 352). However, it is unclear how characteristics of the self-presenter might influence the link between managing self-presentation and ego-depletion. I therefore encourage future research to explore the possibility that racial minorities in particular may differentially experience ego depletion following actively managing impressions compared to non-stigmatized groups. For example, racial minorities’ motivation to prevent undesired perceptions of their competence and interpersonal warmth (via strategic self-presentations) should be more strongly related to ego depletion than promotion-focus strategies. Racial minorities are likely to experience more depletion following strategic self-presentations due to differences in the amount of energy expended to prevent race-based judgments versus promote personal attributes (Higgins, 1997). On the other hand, if racial minorities generally perceive strategic self-presentations as more necessary than majority members across domains, the strength model (Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007) would suggest that strategic self-presentation could be less depleting for racial minorities due to regular exertions of self-control.

Last, my findings provide theoretical implications for the organizational impression management literature (e.g., Avery & McKay, 2006; Highhouse, Brooks, & Gregarus, 2009). People often stereotype organizations and industries on their competence and warmth, which are thought to affect organizations’ bottom lines (Cuddy et al., 2011). For example, Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner (2010) found that consumers stereotyped non-profit organizations as more warm
than competent and for-profit organizations as more competent than warm. Future research could explore whether my theorizing about individuating information generalizes to help guide senior executives in strategically managing their organization’s image and reputation in today’s global economy.

**PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

My research offers meaningful insights for new hires and managers. My moderating results suggest it is imperative that racial minorities are represented within organizations. These findings suggest that interventions to attract and select racial minorities and individuals who endorse diversity—both of which can increase perceptions of diversity (Avery, 2011)—may prove valuable in preventing negative reactions to minorities’ efforts to “fit in” and adjust to their new work environment. One approach involves using organizational impression management to propagate a corporate employment image as a diversity-friendly employer (Avery & McKay, 2006). Managers may also wish to communicate to experienced organizational members the value that new hires brings to the work unit and make employees aware of social perception biases. As Sanchez and Medkik (2004) pointed out, raising awareness of social perception biases may increase the attention and motivation to form individuated impressions of racial minorities and, consequently, induce positive changes in trainees’ behavior related to the acceptance of racial minorities. Thus, training may catalyze a context in which racial minorities and majority members are judged by similar standards. Importantly, findings from this study highlight the importance of making new hires feel accepted and valued (i.e., coworker receptivity) in developing employees from minority racial groups, making it possible for them to adjust and succeed at work. Social support and guidance provided by experienced
organizational member are expected to enrich the onboarding experience, increase perceptions of fit, and reduce withdrawal behaviors (Bauer et al., 2007).
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### APPENDIX A

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESES</th>
<th>METHODOLOGY</th>
<th>LAB STUDY</th>
<th>FIELD STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptual Component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of self-promotion on coworkers’ judgments of newcomers’ competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2a: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of ingratiation on interpersonal liking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a: Self-presenter race, self-promotion, and token status (Study 1: diversity mindset) will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict judgments of newcomers’ competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a: Self-presenter race, ingratiation, and (diversity mindset) token status will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict interpersonal liking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5a: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect effects of self-promotion on person-environment fit through its effect on judgments of newcomers’ competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6a: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect effects of ingratiation on person-environment fit through its effect on interpersonal liking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7a: Coworkers’ judgments of newcomers’ competence mediates the interactive effects of self-presenter race, self-promotion, and token status on person-environment fit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8a: The extent to which newcomers are liked mediates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTHESES</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Component</strong></td>
<td>Lab Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of</td>
<td>Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-promotion on coworkers’ use of newcomers’ unique knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2b: Self-presenter race will moderate the effects of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingratiation on coworker support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b: Self-presenter race, self-promotion, and token status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newcomers’ unique knowledge.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b: Self-presenter race, ingratiation, and token status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will interact (i.e., three-way interaction) to predict coworker support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5b: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of self-promotion on person-environment fit through its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect on the use of newcomers’ unique knowledge.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6b: Self-presenter race will moderate the indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of ingratiation on person-environment fit through its effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on coworker support.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7b: The use of newcomers' unique knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mediates the interactive effects of self-presenter race, self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion, and token status on person-environment fit.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8b: The extent to which newcomers are socially supported by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coworkers mediates the interactive effects of self-presenter race,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingratiation, and token status on person-environment fit.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

STUDY MEASURES

PREDICTORS

Study 2

Impression management (Bolino & Turnley, 1999)

Self-Promotion
1. Talk proudly about my experience or education.
2. Make people aware of my talents or qualifications.
3. Let others know that I’m valuable to the organization.
4. Let coworkers know that I have a reputation for being competent in a particular area.
5. Make people aware of my accomplishments.
6. Describe my skills and abilities in an attractive way.
7. Talk about important people that I know.
8. Display my diplomas and/or awards that I have received.

Ingratiation
9. Compliment my colleagues (e.g., on their dress, accomplishments).
10. Take an interest in my colleagues’ personal lives.
11. Praise my colleagues for their accomplishments.
12. Do personal favors for my colleagues.
13. Discuss interests I share in common with coworkers.
14. Use flattery and favors to make my colleagues like me more.
15. Smile a lot or use other friendly non-verbal behavior when interacting with coworkers.
16. Laugh heartily at your coworkers’ jokes.

MEDIATORS

Study 1

Perceived liking (Wayne & Ferris, 1990)
1. I like [team/unit member] very much as a person
2. I think [team/unit member] will make a good friend.

Perceived competence (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001)
1. In general, I think that [focal newcomer] can obtain outcomes that are important for the job.
2. I am confident that [focal newcomer] can perform effectively on many different tasks
3. Compared to other people, I think [focal newcomer] can perform job quite well
Interest to work with newcomer in future
1. Please rate how much they would like to be grouped with each team member if you were given the opportunity to work together again

Study 2

Social Support (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003)
1. My coworkers have provided guidance as to how I should perform my job.
2. My coworkers have provided guidance as to how I should act in my work environment.
3. My coworkers have affected my ideas about appropriate behaviors for your job, work group, and organization.
4. My coworkers have affected my ideas about appropriate attitudes and norms for your job, work group, and organization.
5. My coworkers have helped me adapt to my work environment.
6. My coworkers have shared task-related knowledge and resources.
7. My coworkers have me understand what is most important to learn.

Task-Related Information Sought from Newcomer
1. Coworkers asked for your opinion on a work-related matter.
2. Coworkers asked for your help on a task.

MODERATOR

Study 1

Diversity Mindset (De Meuse & Hostager, 2001)
1. Diversity leads to harmony in organizations.
2. I feel frustrated with diversity
3. I feel hopeful about diversity
4. I believe that diversity is worthless.
5. I support diversity efforts in organizations
6. I withdraw from organizational diversity efforts.
7. Diversity is rewarding for me.
8. I feel resentful about diversity

OUTCOMES

Study 2

Person-Organization Fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002)
1. I expect that my organization’s values and culture will provide a good fit with the things that I value in life.
2. I expect that the things that I value in life are very similar to the things that my organization values.
3. I expect that my personal values match my organization’s values and culture.
Person-Job Fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002)

1. I expect that the match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills.
2. I expect that my abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job.
3. I expect that my personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me.
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