

Zbigniew Nowacki

Prison in Pińczów [zbigniew@nowacki.edu.pl]

The Tendency Towards Ingratiation in Convicts

Abstract: The subject of the research is the convicts' tendency towards ingratiation. The tool used was the author's own Survey Questionnaire for Examining the Tendency towards Ingratiation. The tendency to present themselves in an excessively favorable manner and the mood of the respondents was controlled. The concordance between a convict's statements and his behavior was analyzed. The impact of so-called Strayed Words was checked. To verify the formulated hypotheses, the method of diagnostic survey and methods of statistical and comparative analysis were adopted. Factor analysis showed that ingratiating behavior does not come down to a uniform dimension. The tendency towards ingratiation is a construct wherein one can distinguish three factors: Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, Conformism, and Manipulation of One's Own Image. It turned out that convicts sent to prison for the first time are more likely to resort to Conformism than those reconvicted. In terms of Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, and Manipulation of One's Own Image, there were no significant differences between those staying in prison for the first time and reconvicted offenders.

Key words: Ingratiation, time of imprisonment, increasing a partner's and one's own value, conformity, manipulation of own image.

Introduction

Coexistence with others requires a person to care for the impressions they make on others. The pursuit of being in the favor of others can prompt to controlling the environment but also influencing the behavior of the partner's interaction or shaping the desired image of oneself in their mind. The way we are perceived by

others can be shaped in the process of self-presentation. The impression as a result of the self-presentation of a human being depends on the situational context and the personality of the individual, and it is shaped by many factors, such as the social norms in force in a given environment, roles and significance of the addressee of the self-presentation. Self-presentation can also be, and often is, thought-out and intentional behavior. As Edward E. Jones and Thane S. Pittman point out, the purpose of making the desired impression may imply taking up one of the several intentional strategies: pleading, intimidating, exemplifying, self-promoting or ingratiating (Jones, Pittman 1982, pp. 231–262). From this point of view, ingratiating behaviors, being one of the forms of communication, are conscious and used deliberately. But does consciousness and intentionality always accompany ingratiating behaviors? When analyzing ingratiating behaviors, Agnieszka Olszewska-Kondratowicz indicates that they can be placed on a continuum, starting from unconscious reactions of the learned automatism variety to strategic behaviors known as ingratiation (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, pp. 49–50). It should also be noted that in psychological literature there are no categorical conclusions on the understanding of ingratiation. Barry Schlenker and Michael Weigold indicate two approaches in their division of stances: “restrictive” and “expansive” (Schlenker, Weigold 1992 cited from: Mandal 2004, p. 165). In the “restrictive” approach, ingratiation primarily comes down to strategic behaviors aimed at exerting an impression, and motivated by the attainment of the assumed goal – here, Jones’ classicist beliefs are reflected (1964). On the other hand, the views of Goffman, Schlenker and Weigold fit into the “expansive” stance, where ingratiation is understood as an integral and automatic component of interpersonal interactions, implied by interpersonal relationships, constituting a personal human experience (Mandal 2004).

There is some information noise in the literature. When referring to the phenomenon of ingratiation, researchers use different terms: “ingratiation”, “ingratiating behaviors”, “behaviors of an ingratiating nature”. This paper uses these terms interchangeably to refer to the same class of behaviors, the essence of which is accurately reflected by the term “ingratiation”.

The essence of ingratiation

As already mentioned, the relevant findings regarding ingratiation were described by Edward E. Jones (1964), who pointed to the behaviors of a subject aimed at increasing their attractiveness towards another person. Jones introduced the term “ingratiation” into the literature on the subject, referring it to “a class of strategic behaviors that are aimed at making an impression on another person, in an unauthorized (*illicit*) manner, in order to increase the attractiveness of the subject” (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1974, pp. 617–618). Since the free translation of the

term “ingratiating” as “przypodobywanie się” does not completely present the meaning of the term expressed in English, hence the term “ingracjacja” is often used (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1974, p. 617–618). To demonstrate the incongruity of ingratiating behavior, it is worth referring to the assumptions of undistorted interaction, based on the following principles: partners behave in line with the roles they play, they observe the rules governing a particular situation, and behave consistently. This illegality manifests itself in an explicit strategy implemented by the ingratiation, who, while pretending to adhere to the rules of appropriate interactions (and expecting reciprocal responses as a consequence), directs their behavior towards such a change of the situation so as to show themselves in a better position than they are actually in (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1974, p. 618).

But does considering ingratiating only in terms of unlawfulness fully reflect the essence of the phenomenon? According to Zdzisław Chlewiński (1992), ingratiating behavior is without a doubt manipulation, which boils down to objectifying the other human being. The ingratiation uses their interaction partner (as a tool) to accomplish personal goals. Chlewiński describes ingratiating as moral evil, unworthy of a human being (Chlewiński 1992, p. 203). This “facade engineering” is addressed at meaningful, influential people whose decisions can have serious implications not only for the ingratiation and themselves. The ingratiation is the director of the image sold, often falsified, calculated to achieve a certain effect. Their behavior does not always result in success. However, these are often effective actions (Chlewiński 1992, p. 207). The effectiveness of ingratiating may result from the broadly understood ingenuity. After all, one may lie not only using words. A lie can be exemplified in behavior, way of being but also in failure to act. Hence the difficulty in deciphering it (Chlewiński 1992, p. 213). Chlewiński notices the implications of “bottom up” ingratiating (the status of the ingratiation is lower than the addressee of the ingratiating) and “top down” ingratiating (the ingratiation has a higher status than the object of the ingratiating). He indicates the importance of insight of people holding important positions (the ingratiation’s superiors), especially vulnerable to the “maneuvers” of the ingratiations. People of note, often surrounded by a group of ingratiations, should be vigilant in order to be able to perceive the far-reaching negative effects of being prone to ingratiating, including the threat of personal deformation of the other human being. In the final part of the article, Chlewiński indicates something that seems obvious, although it is not something people are necessarily aware of. It is much easier to spot ingratiating behaviors in others than in oneself. Self-deception mechanisms can effectively prevent the objective interpretation of one’s own behavior (Chlewiński 1992, pp. 213–214).

With the use of Heider’s conceptual apparatus, Edward Jones describes ingratiating behavior (X) as implemented by an ingratiation (i.e. the subject of ingratiating, denoting them as P) in a situation when it is received by the addressee of the ingratiating (i.e. the object of ingratiating O). The ingratiation (P) assumes

that their behavior (X) will be received positively by the object of ingratiation (it may even be the behavior expected by O), and as a consequence it will result (as a reaction) in the behavior Y expected by the ingratiator (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1974, p. 625). The assumptions made postulate the division of factors conducive to ingratiation into at least two groups: those associated with the subject and the object of this interaction.

Factors associated with the object of ingratiation

The presented research paper deals with ingratiating behaviors, where the ingratiator, the subject – the producer (P) of these behaviors is a man in prison isolation, while their object, the addressee (O) is a warden or educator – Prison Service officers. The selection of the object of ingratiating behaviors was not accidental. There is no doubt that from the perspective of the inmate, the object of ingratiation (O) is able to generate (produce) the behavior (Y) expected by the convict. It can even be said that in prison relations, the object of ingratiation, the warden, is one of the most important legitimate producers of Y behaviors. They decide on the manner and scope of meeting many of the daily needs of a convict, they can make requests for statutory rewards. Another significant producer of Y behaviors is the relevant educator who additionally gives their opinion on all the requests forming the basis for the decisions regarding the convict, they prepare opinions regarding the prisoner, they decide about their placement in the ward. The second important factor for ingratiation to occur is the willingness of the object of ingratiation to accept the behavior X. The prisoners' collective, knowing their dependence on the Prison Service officers, allows many acts against the officers (not necessarily sincere), we shall give them a working name of “favorable towards the officer”, which serve the purpose of fulfilling the convicts' needs. On the other hand, by showing tolerance, the officers accept the reasonable behaviors of X. The third factor determining the existence of an ingratiating behavior is the recognition by the object of the suitability of behavior Y against X. The Executive Criminal Code and the Ordinance of the Minister of Justice on the regulations governing the execution of the penalty of imprisonment determine the scope of possible/acceptable behaviors (X and Y) of the subject and object of interaction. The whole is complemented by unwritten norms regulating the functioning of the prison community. In addition, X and Y behavior usually has observers, which further provokes the parties to behave acceptably.

As Schlenker and Weigold emphasize – (1992) human behavior can be perceived by different observers, namely: “myself-as-audience”, “immediate others-as-audience” and “imagined others-as-audience”. From this point of view, the vast majority of the individual's behaviors are public (Szmajke 1996, p. 28). The above also suggests that the manner of self-presentation also has its consequences

in terms of one's own self. Nevertheless, creating a self-image aimed at increasing one's own worth usually has sensible proportions. People emphasize their advantages and present their own achievements in a modest manner so that the presented image does not deviate greatly from the actual one (Schlenker and Weigold 1992, p. 27).

Factors associated with the subject of ingratiation (the convict)

It is worth starting the review of the factors that determine the subject's willingness to undertake an ingratiating behavior with an assessment of this manipulative behavior. A person existing in the Western culture probably realizes that such behavior lacks elegance. An incarcerated person may not. In prison, the effectiveness of a certain behavior is rated higher than its elegance. The dependence of the convict on the object of ingratiation, the antagonisms between the basic subgroups of the prison community (Prison Service officers and convicts), and the explicit definition of the object of ingratiation determine the fact that the prison community makes ingratiating behavior possible. Even more so if it is for the benefit of the group. It is also unlikely that the disposition of a convict to respect universally accepted norms could undermine their tendency towards such behavior. Since we are discussing effectiveness, it is worth taking a look at the ingratiator's goals.

Edward E. Jones (1964) lists three basic groups of an ingratiator's goals, suggesting that the intended purpose implies a specific strategy for action. The first group of goals will boil down to obtaining some good (Y) from the subject of ingratiation, the second involves raising one's own widely understood value (prestige, position in the community, significance), in the case of the third group it will involve minimizing the threats associated with potential capabilities of the object of ingratiation (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1974, pp. 626–627).

Observation of the convicts' actions seems to indicate that their behavior may be reduced to the achievement of the first type of goals, that is, to benefit the subject. In this case, a particularly good technique may be to raise the value of the object of ingratiation. It also seems that the goals of the second group would be widely implemented. Here, a good result can be brought by actions aimed at positive self-presentation. The realization of the third type of goals is easy to specify. It suggests the possibility of occurrence of improper behavior of the object of ingratiation, which should not happen. It is difficult to completely exclude the possibility that no subject may pursue a goal that boils down to defending themselves against a threat from the object of ingratiation. It may, in fact, turn out that for some reason the ingratiator (e.g. in the event of their non-statutory behavior) will subjectively perceive the object of ingratiation as a threat. In the

presumed situation, the ingratiation may emphasize their dependence on the object of ingratiation.

Since men were the test subjects, it is worth discussing the matter of gender. According to Eugenia Mandal, gender as such does not affect the overall tendency to ingratiate, although stereotypes encourage men to use positive self-presentation and women towards conformist behaviors (Mandal 2004, p. 166). A similar position is taken by Olszewska-Kondratowicz, showing that sex does not affect the general inclination towards ingratiation (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, p. 55). The role of the intermediate variable seems to be played by self-esteem. It turns out that the most ingratiating behaviors can be found in boys with moderate self-esteem, and the least in those with low self-esteem (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, p. 54). The author also showed that the least tendency to conformism is characterized by boys with a medium level of self-esteem, while the most susceptible to conformism are those with low self-esteem (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, p. 55). It is also worth adding that people who are aware of their ingratiating behaviors actually produce more such behaviors than “unaware” persons. “Aware” persons are also more inclined towards using the positive self-presentation technique than others (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, p. 56).

Prison life comes down to human functioning in an extensive social network consisting of a large number of people and groups concentrated on a small area. Relations seem to be governed by the principle of maximizing one’s own interest, and the influences, often contradictory, come from people with different systems of values. How often a human being is an isolated element of a community, whose condition and behavior seems to be dependent on two parameters describing their location: from the time of prison isolation and from the time remaining until the end of imprisonment. Both factors have an impact on the manner in which the facility’s administration deals with the convict. Could one expect manipulative behaviors in convicts in such circumstances? Some insight is made possible through studies on the convicts from the Penitentiary Facility in Pińczów (Nowacki 2014). As a result of research, it was determined that along with the duration of prison isolation of first-time prisoners, their vulnerability to manipulation focused on the depreciation of others increases. Research results also show that along with the duration of prison isolation of the repeated convicts, their vulnerability to manipulation that refers to conformity decreases. The results of the research furthermore indicate that not less than 80% of the male convicts not belonging to the prison elite subculture showed at least moderate vulnerability to manipulations focused on the depreciation of others and referring to conformity (Nowacki 2014, pp. 196–198). The findings pertaining to the manipulative behaviors of prisoners seem to suggest that they may exhibit a tendency toward ingratiating behaviors towards wardens and educators.

Ingratiation techniques and their co-occurrence

The issue of basic ingratiation techniques was described extensively in the literature on the subject. For the sake of clarity, however, it is worth mentioning the division of ingratiation techniques proposed by Jones (1964). One can distinguish three basic techniques: increasing the partner's value, manipulations associated with self-presentation, and conformism (Witkowski 2000, p. 43). As Witkowski states, meddling related to self-presentation is not limited to presenting oneself in a positive light. As it turns out, an ingratiator may also depreciate their value in certain situations (Witkowski 2000, p. 43).

The reference to ingratiation techniques results in further questions, such as those pertaining to the intensification of ingratiation, the number of the techniques utilized but also their combinations. Referring to the intensity of the ingratiating behaviors and the amount of the techniques used, moderation seems to be most appropriate. Excess in their scope may result in the exposure of the ingratiator's malicious intentions and bring about a counter-productive result.

Agnieszka Olszewska-Kondratowicz (1975), who emphasized the role of the typology of people due to the type of preferred ingratiation techniques, made some relevant findings concerning the techniques used and their combinations. The basis for this typology consists of the gender and self-esteem of the ingratiator. The selection of the techniques will probably also be adapted to the intended purposes and will depend on the situational context. Thus, various "co-occurring" and "co-excluding" configurations of the techniques may arise (Olszewska-Kondratowicz 1975, p. 57).

It is difficult not to agree with what was said above. The situational context of the convict is especially characterized by numerous limitations in terms of fulfillment of their needs. The warden and the educator play a key role in fulfilling them. The desire to obtain "something" can stimulate the ingratiator to employ creative problem-solving and use more than one technique. The conjecture of the success of such tactics can lead to choosing such a strategy. People usually try to be effective in what they do. When presenting yourself in a favorable light, it will not hurt to deliberately tell the educator something that will raise their self-esteem. The prosiness of human behavior suggests that a combination of techniques should be expected rather than just one isolated method. Although that may also be the case. This is where the question regarding the possible combinations of ingratiation techniques should be posed. I assume that the most likely combination is a combination of two techniques, that is, increasing one's partner's and one's own value. A competitive combination may consist of self-esteem manipulation techniques and techniques referring to conformism. Certain premises prompt the author to indicate conformism as a separate technique. The correctness of these assumptions will be verified by the results of the research.

Methodology of own research

The main purpose of the research was to identify the tendencies of convicts towards ingratiation against wardens and educators. The research objective decided on the following research problems:

- Is there a link between the age of convicts and the tendency towards ingratiation?
- Is there a link between the length of stay in conditions of prison isolation and the tendency towards ingratiation?
- Is there a link between the time remaining to the end of imprisonment and the tendency towards ingratiation?
- Do first-time convicts differ from reoffenders in their tendency towards ingratiation?
- Do convicts participating in the prison slang subculture differ in their tendency towards ingratiation from the convicts not participating in that subculture?

The following independent variables were examined: age, time of stay in prison, remaining prison sentence, the number of stays in isolation, participation in the prison subculture. Dependent variables were separated by means of factor analysis of the obtained results and will be presented in the later part of the article.

The following research hypotheses were formulated:

- H1. Elder convicts are characterized by a higher tendency towards ingratiation than the younger convicts.
- H2. Convicts staying in prison longer are characterized by a lower tendency towards ingratiation than convicts staying in prison shorter.
- H3. Convicts with a longer sentence remaining are characterized by a higher inclination to ingratiate than convicts with shorter remaining sentences.
- H4. Convicts staying in prison for the first time are characterized by a higher inclination to ingratiate than convicts serving a subsequent sentence.
- H5. Convicts participating in the prison slang subculture and not participating in this subculture do not differ in their tendency towards ingratiation.

In order to answer the posed research problems and verify the formulated research hypotheses the method of diagnostic survey and the method of statistical comparative analysis were adopted. Accordingly, the questionnaire technique and interview technique were used for the adopted method. The research tool used was the author's own Survey Questionnaire for Examining the Tendency towards Ingratiation. The respondents take up a stance towards questions and statements by checking the appropriate number on a 5-point Likert scale. The mood of the convicts was controlled on a single-point Likert scale – *How are you feeling today?*. The survey questionnaire also contains a pool of five positions likened

to questions of verification scales with an inventory of personalities, mainly the “Lie” scale (KŁ) with Eysenck’s MPI (Choynowski 1968, pp. 51–95; Drwal 1981, pp. 144–145). The survey questionnaire also contains specially selected so-called Stray Words: *Freedom is a state of mind*. These words were introduced in order to control whether the perception of the world (here stimuli in the form of questionnaire questions and statements) is affected by other uncontrolled factors (Marcus 2009, p. 56). The consistency of the convict’s declarations regarding a particular behavior was also examined (commitment to participate in the second part of the study) with the behavior (personal and voluntary referral to the second part of the study). It was also analyzed whether there are differences in the tendency towards ingratiation between the voluntary participants and those who did not participate.

To obtain a representative sample of the population of convicts, the selection of prisoners was random. Participation in the study was voluntary. After obtaining the consent of the convicts for the examination, the research procedure was discussed, i.e. they were informed that the study would be conducted in two stages (after four days the convicts would personally report for the second part of the study). They were given instructions on how to address the statements contained in the survey. It stressed the need to reflect before answering. The prisoners were informed, that at any stage they can resign from participation in the study. In the case of the Prison in Pińczów, the study was conducted in common rooms of residential wards. Whereas in the Prison in Trzebinia, it was conducted in a psychologist’s room, in one step, for organizational reasons. The research subjects from the Prison in Pińczów who did not report for the second part of the research were reminded about their declaration by the person conducting the research. An appropriate quality of contact between the researcher and the respondent was attempted. The research was completed with a brief conversation with the convict, the aim of which, among others, was to obtain data for statistical analysis.

The study involved 508 convicts ($N = 508$). Research material from 7 questionnaires was discarded (due to the research subjects not wanting to participate in the second part of the study). The research results of 469 convicted adult men not participating in prison elite subculture (93.6%) and 32 participating in this subculture (6.4%) were used for statistical analysis. Little more than 64% of the respondents were first-time convicts, the remaining persons were reconvicted offenders (35.9%).

Table 1. Age of the respondents

Respondents		Early adulthood	Medium adulthood	Late adulthood
Convicted adults	M	24.22	40.06	62.69
	SD	2.99	8.49	2.72
	N	241	247	13

Source: own research.

Table 2. The time spent in prison isolation and the time remaining until the end of the sentence of the respondents

Respondents		Time spent in prison isolation	Time remaining until the end of the sentence
First-time convicts	M	18.08	30.76
	SD	29.2	48.50
	N	321	321
Repeated convicts	M	11.35	23.66
	SD	16.83	27.54
	N	180	180

Source: own research.

In the Pińczów Penitentiary Facility (closed-type facility), the study lasted from December 19, 2014, until March 19, 2016 (N 396), while in the Trzebinia Penitentiary Facility (semi-open), it was conducted on November 16–20, 2015 (N 105). The education of the respondents was as follows: primary – 22.4%, junior high school – 20.4%, basic vocational – 32.7%, high school – 22.2%, tertiary – 2.4% of the respondents.

Research results

For 18 questions of the survey questionnaire¹ on evaluations of the tendency towards ingratiation, applying factor analysis using the method of principal components, the dimensional construct was determined by exploration. According to Field's recommendation (2013), using a matrix of counter-images, KMO value was determined for individual questions, specifying whether they are consistent enough with other questions so that they can be left in the analysis. 17 questions had satisfactory individual KMO measurement values. Only the question *P22. For the sake of your own good opinion, it's OK to lie to the educator a little* (KMO = 0.512) had a moderate value. However, due to the diagnostic value of this question, it was included in the analysis.

The measure of the adequacy of selection for the entire sample (all questions) amounted to the fully acceptable KMO = 0.879, which means an acceptable adequacy of sampling for analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity [$\chi^2(153) = 2158.85$, $p < 0.001$] showed that the correlations between individual dimensions were sufficiently large to carry out the extraction of factors (Bedyńska, Brzezicka 2007).

Both the scree plot and the Kaiser criterion indicated a tripartite solution, explaining a total of 43.54% of the variance. This means that given the approach

¹ P17, P18, P19, P21, P22, P23, P25, P28, P29, P30, P31, P32, P33, P34.

of exploration for the created tool to measure the evaluations of the tendency towards ingratiation, the respondents treated the given responses as ones for three clearly separable dimensions. For the extraction of factors, the Varimax method was used (Field 2013).

The first extracted dimension (factor), called Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, includes statement questions regarding the content certifying that it is worthwhile to say something pleasant or friendly to the educator or to present one's good side to them, e.g.: P21. You can say something good about them in private. This factor explains 29.05% of the variance. The second factor, Conformism, consists of statement questions having a connotation indicating that it is worth agreeing with the opinions, views and beliefs of the wardens/educators, e.g.: P18. It is worth agreeing with the beliefs expressed by the educator. This factor explains 7.535% of the variance.

Table 3. Results of the factor analysis of data obtained using the Questionnaire for Studying the Tendency towards Ingratiation

No.	Questions	Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	Conformism	Manipulation of One's Own Image
P 21	P21 You can say something good regarding the warden to them in private.	.763	.174	.128
P 31	P31 You can mention to them in passing about the positive opinion the educator has among other inmates.	.664	.083	.081
P 32	P32 You can say something good regarding yourself to the warden in private.	.662	.141	.261
P 25	P25 If you value the educator, it's worth telling them that.	.642	.195	-.188
P 19	P19 When you want something from the educator, it is good to tell them something good about them.	.627	.250	.039
P 17	P17 If you want to get something, you can say something pleasant to the warden.	.576	.148	.117
P 34	P34 It's worth to present yourself to the warden from your good side	.492	.340	.119
P 18	P18 It is worth agreeing with the beliefs expressed by the educator.	.097	.740	-.147
P 33	P33 It pays to adhere to the opinions expressed by the educator.	.155	.738	.011
P 28	P28 Supporting the warden's beliefs has a good effect on the relations (with this warden).	.279	.529	.195

No.	Questions	Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	Conformism	Manipulation of One's Own Image
P 23	P23 You can accept their views during a conversation with the warden.	.253	.428	.026
P 22	P22 For the sake of your opinion you can lie a little to the educator.	.009	-.226	.742
P 29	P29 You can support the educator's beliefs if it can benefit you.	.021	.437	.611
P 30	P30 When no one's listening, you can admit the warden is right.	.357	.221	.577
	Own factor value	5.228	1.356	1.253
	% of the explained variance	29.045	7.535	6.960
	% cumulated	29.045	36.579	43.539
	Cronbach's Alpha	0.803	0.636	0.484

Method of extracting factors – Main components. Method of rotation – Varimax with Kaiser normalization.

Source: own research.

The third factor was called Manipulation of One's Own Image, because it contains statements indicating that one can manipulate the information/situation for the sake of one's opinion, e.g.: P22 For the sake of your opinion you can lie a little to the educator. This factor explains 6.96% of the variance.

In order to determine the level of accuracy (reliability understood as a feature meaning measurement accuracy) of the questionnaire Cronbach's Alpha² statistics were calculated. The reliability of the scale Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value consisting of 7 items: P17, P19, P21, P25, P31, P32, P34 amounts to $\alpha = 0.803$, which means the scale is characterized by satisfactory reliability. The reliability of the Conformism scale consisting of 4 positions: P18, P23, P28, P33 amounts to $\alpha = 0.636$, which means that the scale is characterized by low but satisfactory reliability. The reliability of the scale Manipulation of One's Own Image consisting of 3 items: P22, P29, P30 $\alpha = 0.484$, is characterized by very low reliability, resulting first and foremost from the little number of items. On the other hand, individual KMO values of the scale items have acceptable values. Discarding the scale would impoverish the dimensional construct determined by exploration. That is why, for cognitive reasons, the scale was included in the analysis.

The calculated statistical measures for the Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value factor revealed that this factor was moderately differentiated. To check

.....

² Since all the scales for questions in the survey questionnaire were such, the measurement result was an average for the results of individual questions.

the normality of the distribution of results the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used, which works well for large groups. Statistics and the significance of this test showed that the distribution of data was not consistent with normal distribution ($p < 0.001$). Skewness statistics (*SK*) indicated a slightly negative-skewness, i.e. the superiority of lower than average values, and kurtosis statistics (*KU*) indicated a slight leptokurtosis, i.e. a concentration of results around the mean.

Table 4. Statistical measures for the factors obtained

Factor	N	M	SD	R	s ²	Me	K-S	SK	KU
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	501	3.7	0.63	3.29	0.394	3.71	0.083**	-0.48	0.46
Conformism	501	3.5	0.63	3.5	0.39	3.5	0.108**	-0.38	0.21
Manipulation of One's Own Image	501	3.1	0.75	4.00	0.56	3.3	0.123**	-0.245	-0.315

** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

Conformism as a factor was characterized by moderate differentiation. Distribution of the factor was not consistent with normal distribution ($p < 0.001$). Skewness statistics (*SK*) indicated a slightly negative-skewness, i.e. the superiority of lower than average values, and kurtosis statistics (*KU*) indicated a slight leptokurtosis, i.e. a concentration of results around the mean.

The factor Manipulation of One's Own Image was also characterized by a moderate variability. Distribution of the factor was not consistent with normal distribution ($p < 0,001$). Skewness statistics (*SK*) indicated a clear negative-skewness, i.e. the superiority of lower than average values, and kurtosis statistics (*KU*) indicated a moderate platykurtosis, i.e. a small concentration of results around the mean.

In order to verify the relationship between the derived factors, correlation analysis was performed. The nonparametric correlation test of Spearman's *rho* was used, based on ranks whose properties enable a good estimation of correlation coefficients in the case of disturbed variable distributions. Factors indicate that with an increasing tendency towards Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value the dimension of Manipulation of One's Own Image grows moderately as well ($p < 0.001$), and there is a strong increase in the tendency towards Conformism ($p < 0.001$). Along with the increase in Conformism, the tendency to Manipulate One's Own Image grows slightly ($p < 0.001$).

Table 5. The rank correlation coefficients of Spearman's ρ between obtained factors

Variables	Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	Conformism	Manipulation of One's Own Image
Increasing – Correlation Coefficient Value – Significance (bilateral) of Partner – N and One's Own			
Conformism – Correlation Coefficient Significance (bilateral) N	.501** .000 501		
Manipulation – Correlation Coefficient of One's Own – Significance (bilateral) Image – N	.343** .000 501	.260** .000 501	

** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

In order to verify the hypothesis regarding the relationship between the mood of the respondents and the tendency towards ingratiating behavior, a correlation analysis was performed. Mood was tested using an 11-point Likert scale (*How are you feeling today?*). A nonparametric correlation test of Kendall's τ -b was used whose properties work well for ordinal data and scales with small ranges. None of the correlations were statistically significant, and thus it can be concluded that the mood of respondents (frame of mind) did not affect the test results.

Table 6. Correlation coefficients of Kendall's τ -b between the obtained factors and the declarations of the respondents regarding their mood

Variables	How are you feeling today?
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value – Correlation Coefficient Bilateral significance bilateral N	0.066 0.051 501
Conformism – Correlation Coefficient Bilateral significance bilateral N	-0.001 0.985 501
Manipulation of One's Own Image – Correlation Coefficient Bilateral significance bilateral N	0.06 0.083 501

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Source: own research.

The questionnaire also contained the lie scale ($K\bar{L}$). To test the relationship between the arithmetic mean of the number of points obtained on the lie scale

and the measurements of the questionnaire, a correlation analysis was performed using the nonparametric correlation test of Kendall's *tau-b*. Only one of the correlations, i.e. that between the Lie Scale and the factor described as Manipulation of One's Own Image (Kendall's *tau-b* -0.118), was statistically significant. This is, however, a very low value of the correlation coefficient, which should be interpreted as a lack of correlation or very weak correlation between the variables (Bedyńska, Cypryańska 2013, p. 201). It can thus be concluded that the research results are reliable.

Table 7. Correlation coefficients of Kendall's *tau-b* between the obtained factors and the results on the lie scale of the respondents

Variables	Lie Scale
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value – Correlation Coefficient	-0.047
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.185
N	501
Conformism – Correlation Coefficient	0.048
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.985
N	501
Manipulation of One's Own Image – Correlation Coefficient	-0.118**
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.001
N	501

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

The manner of perception of the world can be affected by almost everything that occurs in the human mind, one or two stray words as well. It was checked whether the words towards which the convict could be sensitive would affect them. The beginning of the second part of the questionnaire included a stimulus in the form of the words: *Freedom is a state of mind*. None of the correlations were statistically significant, so the reliability of the results could be inferred.

Table 8. Correlation coefficients of Kendall's *tau-b* between the obtained factors and the Stray Words: *Freedom is a state of mind*

Variables	Stray Words: Freedom is a state of mind
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value – Correlation Coefficient	0.039
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.30
N	501
Conformism – Correlation Coefficient	-0.011
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.781
N	501

Variables	Stray Words: Freedom is a state of mind
Manipulation of One's Own Image – Correlation Coefficient	-0.006
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.878
N	501

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

In order to assess whether there is a difference in the tendency towards ingratiation between the convicts reporting (voluntary nature of the participation) and those not reporting for participation in the second part of the research (voluntary nature of the participation, but the researcher had to remind them of their declaration), an intergroup analysis was performed, where the independent variable was the division of the convicts by the form of participation in the study and the dependent variables were the measurements obtained through factor analysis. The analysis of differences for the Conformism factor using the Mann-Whitney U nonparametric rank test showed that the differences are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Convicts who reported for the second part of the research were themselves more inclined towards Conformism than the convicts who did not report for the research. There were no differences between the convicts who reported for the research and those who did not report regarding the tendency towards ingratiation depending on the Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value variable as well as the Manipulation of One's Own Image variable. Behavior in the form of voluntary reporting for the second part of the research foretells the disposition of the convict towards conformist behavior (unchecked ingratiation, because such behavior is expected by the researcher). The propensities they exhibit and which is confirmed by the research result.

It is worth to perceive the research result also in terms of the compliance between the declarations of the respondents and their behavior. It was demonstrated that as many as 66.07% of the convicts reported for the second part of the study on their own initiative. Whereas only 33.93% of the convicts had to be reminded about their declaration by the person conducting the research. It seems that a significant number of convicts, with respect to whom there was consistency between the declarations and their behavior, seems to certify the reliability of the results.

It was noted that the time of current stay in prison has no relationship with the research results. And the longer the time remaining until the end of imprisonment, the greater the tendency of the respondents to Increase a Partner's and One's Own Value ($p < 0.001$). Whereas the older the respondents were, the greater was their inclination towards Conformism ($p < 0.001$), and the smaller was their inclination towards Manipulating Their Own Image ($p < 0.05$).

Table 9. The obtained factors and forms of reporting for the second part of the research

Variables	Respondents reporting for the second part of the research on their own (N = 222)		Respondents not reporting for the second part of the research on their own (N = 114)		U	Z	P
	mean rank	total of ranks	mean Rank	total of ranks			
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	170.04	37749.00	165.50	18867.00	12312.000	-0.407	0.684
Conformism	175.95	39060.50	154.00	17555.50	11000.500	-1.980*	0.048
Manipulation of One's Own Image	165.09	36650.00	175.14	19966.00	11897.000	-0.907	0.365

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

Table 10. Spearman's rho rank correlation coefficients between the obtained factors and the variables: age, time of prison isolation, time remaining until the end of the sentence

Variables		Age	Time of prison isolation	Time remaining until the end of the sentence
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	Correlation coefficient	0.037	0.072	0.144**
	Bilateral significance	0.409	0.107	0.001
	N	501	501	501
Conformism	Correlation coefficient	0.126**	0.002	0.039
	Bilateral significance	0.005	0.970	0.382
	N	501	501	501
Manipulation of One's Own Image	Correlation coefficient	-0.108*	-0.012	-0.063
	Bilateral significance	0.015	0.787	0.159
	N	501	501	501

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

In order to assess whether there is a difference in the propensity for ingratiation between convicts who are in prison for the first time and reconvicted of-

fenders, an intergroup analysis was performed, where the independent variable was the division of prisoners due to whether it was their first or subsequent stay in prison, and the dependent variables were the dimensions obtained through factor analysis. The analysis of differences for the Conformism factor using the Mann-Whitney U nonparametric rank test showed that the differences are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). First-time convicts were more inclined towards Conformism than convicts serving their subsequent sentences. In turn, there were no differences between first-time convicts and those serving their subsequent sentences in terms of the tendency towards ingratiation through Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value variable as well as the Manipulation of One's Own Image variable.

Table 11. Obtained factors and the number of stays in prison

Variables	First-time convicts (N = 321)		Convicts serving their subsequent sentences (N = 180)		U	Z	P
	average range	total of ranks	average range	total of ranks			
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	256.90	82465.00	240.48	43286.00	26996.000	-1.222	0.222
Conformism	263.00	84421.50	229.61	41329.50	25039.500	-2.498*	0.012
Manipulation of One's Own Im- age	247.40	79415.00	257.42	46336.00	27734.000	-0.751	0.453

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Taking into account the self-division of the prison community into those using prison elite slang and those that do not allows to see that there are no differences in the tendency towards ingratiation through Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, nor Conformism, nor Manipulation of One's Own Image.

It was also noted that the more times a respondent was in prison isolation, the lower their tendency towards Conformism ($p < 0.05$). In contrast, no relationship between the number of stays in prison isolation and the tendency towards Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value and Manipulation of One's Own Image was found. The dependencies shown are significant at the lowest but satisfactory statistical level. The experience gained during subsequent stays in prison convinces the convict that it is highly likely that conformist behavior towards a representative of an alien group will be perceived as suspicious and disloyal. It is thus better to gain the favor of an officer through different means.

Table 12. The obtained results and participation of respondents in the structures of a second life in prison

Variables	Non-elite (N = 469)		Elite (N =32)		U	Z	P
	mean Rank	total of ranks	mean Rank	total of ranks			
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value	249.29	11691.50	276.08	8834.50	6701.500	-1.016	0.310
Conformism	253.90	119080.00	208.47	6671.00	6143.000	-1.733	0.083
Manipulation of One's Own Image	250.41	117444.50	259.58	8306.50	7229.500	-0.350	0.727

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

Table 13. Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficients for the obtained factors and the number of stays in prison isolation

Variables	The number of stays in prison isolation
Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value – Correlation Coefficient	-0.036
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.314
N	501
Conformism – Correlation Coefficient	-0.081*
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.027
N	501
Manipulation of One's Own Image – Correlation Coefficient	-0.033
Bilateral significance bilateral	0.369
N	501

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Source: own research.

Discussion

Prison life is the reality of the widely understood social impact within the prison community (Nowacki 2009, pp. 122–133, 2010, pp. 121–129, 2013, pp. 188–194). The impact which is somehow a part of the statutory activity of the Prison Service – the educator (and not just the educator) should have a positive influence on the convict. But also a part of the convicts' attempts to influence the prison staff. With a slight risk of error, it can be assumed that both sides of the

prison community have the motivation to influence their interaction partners. This study is a report from the examination of the tendency of convicts towards ingratiation aimed at wardens and educators, or the convicts intentionally influencing these Prison Service officers.

The linear chart and the Keiser criterion showed that the tendency of convicts towards ingratiation is not limited to a single dimension, but it is a three-factor construct explaining 43.54% of the variance. The first of the extracted factors, namely Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, explains 29.05% of the variance. It is a combination of two ingratiation techniques: increasing one's own value and the value of the interaction partner. The second factor, i.e. Conformism, being an exemplification of a single technique, explains 7.53% of the variance. The third factor, described as Manipulation of One's Own Image, is the configuration of two techniques (conformism and increasing one's own value), and it explains 6.99% of the variance. The percentage of the variance explained by the first factor indicates an important motive for ingratiating behaviors among convicts, the desire to obtain "something". It was established that the older the respondents were, the greater was their inclination towards Conformism ($p < 0.001$), and the smaller was their inclination towards Manipulating Their Own Image ($p < 0.05$). The above hypothesis was partly confirmed. On the other hand, the second hypothesis was not confirmed – time of prison isolation does not differentiate the inclination towards ingratiation. It was also demonstrated that the longer the time remaining until the end of imprisonment, the greater the tendency of the respondents to Increase a Partner's and One's Own Value ($p < 0.001$). Thus, the third hypothesis was partially confirmed. It was also proven that prisoners sent to prison for the first time are more likely to resort to Conformism than reconvicted offenders ($p < 0.05$). In terms of Increasing a Partner's and One's Own Value, and Manipulation of One's Own Image, there were no significant differences between convicts staying in prison for the first time and reconvicted offenders. The above results indicate a partial confirmation of the fourth hypothesis. On the other hand, the fifth hypothesis was fully confirmed; the results show no relation between subculture participation and tendency towards ingratiation.

In conclusion. One may notice a variability in terms of the convicts' tendency towards ingratiation. Together with the end of the sentence drawing near, the tendency of convicts to Increase a Partner's and One's Own Value decreases. The experience gained by convicts serving subsequent sentences seems to decrease their tendency towards Conformism. On the other hand, participation in the prison slang elite subculture has no relation with the convicts' tendency towards ingratiation.

So what can be conducive to prison ingratiation? It seems that it is initiated by an unquenched desire to obtain "something". The realization of the far-sighted projects of a prison ingratiation is facilitated by the direct nature of ingratiation (face-to-face). A convenient circumstance is a time at the disposal of a convict

(limited only by the end date of their sentence). The acceptance of such behavior by other inmates also helps. The effectiveness of ingratiation may be greatly influenced by the lack of any moral inhibitions of the ingratiator. Under such conditions, a lie, especially through one's behavior or deeds, is very likely to succeed. The convicts' tendency towards ingratiation can be explained by the dependency of their prison existence on the wardens and educators. Ingratiating inclinations may result from the nature of the relationship between the imprisoned persons and the staff of the institution (penitentiary unit).

Many researchers claim that ingratiation-triggering institutions do exist (Cooley 1922, pp. 352–353; Jones 1964 cited from: Lis-Turlejska 1976, p. 331; Goffman 1981, pp. 306–310, p. 321; Grzywa 2010, pp. 74, 81–82). Interpersonal relationships in such institutions significantly impede or even prevent their functioning without ingraining (Grzywa 2010, pp. 81–82). Anna Grzywa also indicates a necessary and sufficient condition for effective ingratiation. Thus, respectively, from the ingratiator's side, their mental power aimed at obtaining "something" in a dishonest way, while on the part of the person being ingratiated – susceptibility, a kind of readiness to receive ingratiating behavior, and variously realized consent for ingratiating measures (Grzywa 2010, p. 79).

According to Erving Goffman, to make the intended impression, one does not necessarily have to lie. One can use concealment, ambiguity and allusions. Everyday life provides examples of utilizing the implications of lying without straight out lying as such (Goffman 1981, p. 105).

Literature

- [1] Bedyńska S., Brzezicka A., 2007, *Statystyczny drogowskaz*, Wydawnictwo SWPS AKADEMIA, Warsaw.
- [2] Bedyńska S., Cypryńska M., 2013, *Statystyczny drogowskaz 2. Praktyczne wprowadzenie do analizy wariancji*, Akademickie Sedno, Warsaw.
- [3] Chlewiński Z., 1985, *Ingracjacja jako technika manipulacji obrazem siebie*, "Poszukiwania Naukowe" issue 7.
- [4] Chlewiński Z., 1992, *Ingracjacja czyli „dobrowolny przymus”*. *Szkiec psychologiczno-etyczny*, "Ethos", issue 2/3 (18/19).
- [5] Choynowski M., 1968, *Opracowanie polskiej adaptacji „Inwentarza osobowości” H.J. Eysencka (Maudsley Personality Inventory)*, „Biuletyn Psychometryczny”, issue 2.
- [6] Cooley Ch.H., 1922, *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York.
- [7] Drwal R.Ł., 1981, *Osobowość wychowanków zakładów poprawczych*, Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- [8] Field A., 2013, *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*, SAGE, London.
- [9] Goffman E., 1981, *Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego*, PIW, Warsaw.
- [10] Grzywa A., 2010, *Manipulacja czyli poznaj mechanizmy psychologiczne wywierania wpływu*, Wydawnictwo Psychologia Sukcesu, Kraśnik.

- [11] Jones E.E., 1964, *Ingratiation: A Social Psychological Analysis*, Appelton-Century-Crofts, New York.
- [12] Jones E.E., Pittman T.S., 1982, Toward a General Theory of Strategic Self-Presentation, [in:] *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 231–262), (eds.) Suls J., Erlbaum, Hillsdale.
- [13] Lis-Turlejska M., *Ingracjacja, czyli manipulowanie innymi ludźmi za pomocą zwiększenia własnej atrakcyjności*, [in:] *Osobowość a społeczne uczenie się ludzi*, (eds.) Reykowski J., Książka i Wiedza, Warsaw 1976.
- [14] Mandal E., 2004, *Podmiotowe i interpersonalne konsekwencje stereotypów związanych z płcią*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice.
- [15] Marcus G., 2009, *Prowizorka w mózgu*, Wydawnictwo Smak Słowa, Sopot.
- [16] Nowacki Z., 2009, *Uleganie wpływowi społecznemu przez skazanych przebywających w warunkach izolacji więziennej*, "Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego", issue 64–65, pp. 122–133.
- [17] Nowacki Z., 2010, *Wywieranie wpływu społecznego w warunkach izolacji więziennej*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [18] Nowacki Z., 2013, *Wpływ społeczny – możliwości i ograniczenia dla oddziaływań penitencjarnych*, [in:] *Polski system penitencjarny. Ujęcie integralno-kulturowe*, (eds.) P. Szczepaniak, Wydawnictwo Forum Penitencjarne, Warsaw.
- [19] Nowacki Z., 2014, *Czas izolacji więziennej a podatność skazanych na manipulacje skoncentrowane na deprecjacji innych oraz odwołujące się do konformizmu*, "Resocjalizacja Polska", issue 8.
- [20] Olszewska-Kondratowicz A., 1974, *Ingracjacja, czyli zachowania ukierunkowane na zwiększanie własnej atrakcyjności*, "Psychologia Wychowawcza", issue 5.
- [21] Olszewska-Kondratowicz A., 1975, *Obraz własnej osoby jako mechanizm regulujący rodzaj stosowanych przez człowieka technik ingracjacji*, "Psychologia Wychowawcza", issue 1.
- [22] Schlenker B.R., Weigold M.F., 1992, *Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management*, "Annual Review of Psychology", 43.
- [23] Szmajke A., 1996, *Samoutrudnianie jako sposób autoprezentacji: Czy rzucanie kłód pod własne nogi jest skuteczną metodą wywierania korzystnego wrażenia na innych?*, Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN, Warsaw.
- [24] Witkowski T., 2000, *Psychomanipulacje. Jak je rozpoznać i jak sobie z nimi radzić*, Oficyna Wydawnicza UNUS, Wrocław.

List of legal acts

- [25] Ordinance of the Minister of Justice of 14 August 2003 on the method of conducting penitentiary interactions in prisons and detention centres (Journal of Laws No. 151, item 1469).
- [26] Ordinance of the Minister of Justice of 25 August 2003 on the regulations of serving the punishment of imprisonment (Journal of Laws No. 152, item 1493).
- [27] Act of 6 June 1997 Executive Penal Code (Journal of Laws 1997 No. 90, item 557, as amended).
- [28] Act of April 9, 2010 on Prison Service (Journal of Laws no. 79 item 523, as amended)