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ABSTRACT
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This study examines the differential experiences of men and women with regard to the possession of power. Power—or the unequal control, influence, and access to resources, people, and things—is a byproduct of the hierarchical order that forms in a multitude of social contexts. As well as being unequally held, power is also unequally exercised. This study aims to understand the differences between men’s and women’s experience of power through the lens of another hierarchical variable: social status. One area with large implications for the impact of unequal power is within the workplace. Past literature has found that women and men not only have unequal access to the attainment of power, but also exercise their power in different ways. This study’s purpose was to explore social status as the underlying mechanism in the relationships among gender, power, and power behaviors, as well as to investigate the internal experiences of men and women in reaction to their own level of power, as it aligns with relative social status. Data from study 1 did not find support for a mediated moderation effect of social status on gender. However, study 2 found a significant moderation effect of social status on the relationship between power and power behavior, accounting for gender. Thus, there was partial support for social status’ role as a construct connecting the effects of gender and power on power behaviors.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The formation of hierarchy in social interactions is a pervasive and foundational component of human society (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Hierarchies form when, either implicitly or explicitly, a rank order is used to rate individuals or groups on a valued social dimension (e.g., skill, power, competence). Hierarchies can exist formally, as in the case of workplaces with structured organizational charts (Mintzberg, 1979). They also occur informally, even spontaneously, as has been found in small groups research (Anderson, John, Keltner, & Kring, 2001; Eagly & Karau, 1991). As a natural outcome within pyramid-type hierarchies, groups and individuals emerge as having higher or lower ranking than others (i.e., more resources are afforded to fewer people at the top of the hierarchy). Although there are numerous resources that are differentially distributed in hierarchies, the purpose of this study is to discuss the effects and interactions of two: power and social status. Using broad definitions for the terms, these variables have both unique and similar effects on behavior in that having high power is typically correlated with having high status, and vice versa. The possession of power will often result in high power behaviors. However, the attainment of (or lack of) general social status can disrupt the connection between power and power behaviors. Owing to historical differences in social status, actor gender may have a disruptive effect on the relationship between power and power behaviors. This study aims to explore the effects of both status and gender (i.e., as one
manifestation of status differences) on this power-behavior connection and will make the case that status and gender disrupt this connection in similar ways.

Historically, early research in social power defined this construct as the ability for an actor within a social relationship to carry out his or her will despite resistance, and speaks to an imbalance of resources and an unequal opportunity to deploy those resources to influence outcomes (Weber, 1978). Although the operationalization of power has changed over time, at its most basic definition, power requires that the possessor have access to resources or outcomes in a way that affords them influence over others who do not have the same access. Status on the other hand, is the extent to which an actor is perceived to be highly respected, or held in high regard, by others (Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). (An important and recent distinction between the two argues that power is rooted in influence over tangible outcomes while status grants the owner social leverage without influence on tangible outcomes (Lammers, Stappel, & Galinsky, 2010)). Both power and status are variables used in comparing, and therefore rank-ordering individuals against others (i.e., one’s power or status is defined in relation to another person’s power or status). Being similar relational constructs, they can often form a causal relationship—attainment of one can lead to attainment of the other (Thye, 2000). For example, managers with control over resources are often afforded some amount of respect from subordinates. Further, the possession of power typically leads to behaviors demonstrating power, e.g., dominance or control. However, it is important that the two are kept distinct, as there are situations where this connection is disrupted (i.e., such as when possessing status without power, and vice versa), potentially leading to distress for both actors and observers (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012; Kipnis, 1976; Lammers, Stappel, & Galinsky, 2010).
Accordingly, this study will keep power and status separate; power will be manipulated and power behaviors will be measured as outcomes. Status will be treated in two ways: 1. As status is a socially-derived standing, it exists informally, without having to possess any resources (or access to resources) in the way power is required. In particular, social categorizations such as race and gender carry with them deep-seated and society-wide status characteristics that form from group expectations, perceived value, and related status indicators (e.g., education, wealth) (Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). This gives rise to one form of status examined in this study—general social status—that will be measured and treated as a baseline, i.e., the status that participants walk around their everyday lives experiencing. 2. As status arises from expectations individuals have of themselves and others, status can also be context-dependent (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Importantly, status has been successfully manipulated in recent empirical studies, lending credence to the existence of a situationally-arising feeling of status (Blader & Chen, 2012; Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012). Therefore, situational status will also be empirically manipulated, with the expectation of status effects that parallel general social status.

Just as status can disrupt or affect the relationship between power and power behaviors, so too does gender have a unique relationship with power and power outcomes. The intersection of power dynamics and gender has yielded intriguing, if tenuous, findings. Researchers have found that patterns of communication often attributed to power are often also correlated with communication styles more typically found among men than women, on average (Berger, 1994). For example, powerful individuals are more likely than powerless individuals to: control the physical distance between themselves and their interaction partner (Dean, Willis, & Hewitt, 1975), take longer speaking turns (Street & Buller, 1987), and use strong language and expletives (Lakoff, 1975). Those in powerless positions are more likely to use tentative language,
make polite requests (versus demands), prefer to formally address interaction partners, and more often withhold grievances (Baxter & Wilmot, 1985; Lakoff, 1975). Similarly, early gender-differences literature found that men are more likely to initiate physical closeness with interaction partners (thereby controlling physical distance) (Henley, 1977), use forceful language, and use power-relevant language (Tannen, 1990). Women are generally more likely to use hedging, careful language (i.e., tag questions, rising intonation, correct grammar) (Lakoff, 1975), use pro-social language, and report lower confidence in their ability to persuade others (Andrews, 1987). In sum, these early researchers found some connection between power and behaviors more commonly found in men, and between powerless displays and behaviors more typically found in women.

Even women in power roles (e.g., in workplace leadership roles) can display leadership styles that echo behaviors expected of one with low power, while typically masculine leadership styles remain closely related to behaviors expected of one in high power. Leadership style, as defined by Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), is a stable (consistent) set of behaviors exhibited by a given leader. Despite women’s rise in recent decades to high levels of organizational leadership, women leaders at all levels are still slightly more likely than men to engage in social-centric, relationship-building behaviors (Matthew, Buontempo, & Block, 2013; Powell, 1990). Further, women are less likely than men to engage in the negotiation process, advocate for their work, request raises, or raise conflict (Bowles, Babock, & Lai, 2007; Kray & Thompson, 2004). Men on the other hand are more likely than women to self-promote, seek formal leadership positions and promotion, and be viewed as agentic (a trait often viewed as consonant with effective leadership) (Bowles & McGinn, 2005; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012). Given that power behaviors involve initiative
and taking charge, we can see the relationship between women’s workplace behaviors and behaviors expected of individuals with low power. As this effect is present even when women are in power, simple power assignment does not seem to eliminate gender differences in power behaviors.

Still, there are situations that do not hold true to this gendered pattern of leadership style. An early meta-analysis found a small pattern for women to engage in more communal (e.g., democratic) leadership style than men; however, this tendency was notably small and more prevalent in laboratory experiments than in field studies (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). On the other hand, a later meta-analysis found a similar pattern in another direction: women were slightly more likely to engage in interpersonally sensitive leadership, but this trend was more pronounced in field studies, not laboratory (van Engen & Williamsen, 2004). Further, there are industry differences moderating these gender effects; for example, women tend toward interpersonal leadership styles more often in female-dominated fields than in male-dominated fields but women in academia and business can be more task-oriented and less interpersonally-oriented than men in these fields (Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; van Engen & Williamsen, 2004). These disparate results are enough basis to examine the underlying reason for gendered power differences.

Missing from the literature is an examination of whether gender fully accounts for the relationships between power and power behaviors, and why gender seems to behave in such variable patterns. That is, given that power behaviors are the result of possessing power, why do men and women display differing levels of power behaviors? In the following, I will first review past findings on the attainment and effects of power on behavior. This is followed by a discussion of the effect of gender on the relationship between power and power behaviors. This
is punctuated with the history of women and Western society and its effects on differential attainment of power and status between men and women. Here, I will introduce the variable of social status, how it relates to power, and how it may be related to—even account for—the gender effects we see in power behaviors. I will make the case that gender’s ability to disrupt the typical relationship between power and power behaviors is in actuality a function of general social status. That is, men and women might hold unequal views of their own general status and have different reactions to the possession of (or lack of) power which in turn affects the exercise of their power in the workplace. Finally, I conducted a two-part study: in the first, I measured general social status and manipulated participants’ power resources in order to isolate their effects on power behaviors. I compared and contrasted the baseline self-perceptions of general status held by men and women, given the same workplace-relevant power resources. In the second study, I manipulated both participant power resources and situational social status (within the context of a fictional organization) in order to examine the effect of situationally-derived status on power behaviors. Together, these studies serve the greater purpose of understanding why and when women and men are likely to exercise their power differentially in work contexts.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An Introduction to Power and Status

This section will begin by explaining the variables of interest in this study, i.e., power, status, and gender. These variables will be defined, detailed, and explained through the lens of various theoretical structures. First, extant literature on power will be defined, as well as its sources and outcomes, i.e., effects on behavior. Next, gender differences in power will be discussed: both in its unequal distribution in society and the workplace as well as in its dissimilar effect on men’s and women’s behavior. Lastly, status will be introduced as a variable with unique relationships with both power and gender. Here, two different conceptualizations of status are presented: general social status and situational status. These are theoretically similar constructs and are derived from the same types of sources (i.e., esteem, respect, etc.); however, they differ in the context in which they arise. Then, the interaction between power and status will be explored, as well as the historical relationship between general social status and gender. The dearth of research that explores this tripartite relationship—while holding them as distinct constructs—calls for more exploration, for which this study is designed. As a next step for research in this area, I aim to explore status as a moderating variable in the relationship between power and power behaviors. In the following, I make the case that many of the gendered behavioral differences in power behaviors parallel differences due to generally held social status.
Power

Power has taken a number of definitions in interpersonal communication literature (Berger, 1994). In its earliest conceptualizations, power was thought of as the ability to produce one’s intended effects—that is, to have power is to have control over outcomes (Russell, 1938). Later researchers thought of power in a simpler social context, as the influence of entity $a$ over entity $b$, concluding that power is the ability to impose one’s will over another being (Blau, 1964; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Along this vein, power has been conceptualized as an attribute within a relationship rather than within an individual. That is, power exists only the asymmetrical influence in social interaction. To that end, this study will use the most common and more current definition of power, integrating its many facets: power is the ability to impact outcomes due to an asymmetric control over resources and outcomes (Berger, 1994; Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). This requires that power exist within the dynamics of social relationships—it can emerge and cease at the inception and conclusion (respectively) of a dependent social interaction (Emerson, 1962). This is an important note to make; as power can arise out of any given social situation in which there exists unequal access to valued resources—this inequality of access is all that is needed for a power dynamic to emerge. Further, observing power behaviors is both possible and demonstrated in spontaneously-generated power situations (Huang, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Guillory, 2011; Lippitt, Polansky, & Rosen, 1952).

Beyond definition, there are also a number of power taxonomies that attempt to explain the various sources of power. Perhaps the most famous power typology identifies six different types, or sources, of power: Informational power is influence produced by the content of a
persuasion attempt. *Coercive* power arises from the threat of consequence, while *reward* power comes from the ability to grant positive outcomes for desirable behavior. *Expert* power is the influential impact one is afforded for being perceived as possessing knowledge others do not. *Referent* power is held when non-powerful others attempt to identify with the powerful party. Lastly, *legitimate* power held when non-powerful others hold the internalized belief that the powerful party has the right to exercise power over others; typically, the non-powerful parties feel obligated to accept the control of the powerful party (Raven, Centers, & Rodrigues, 1975; French & Raven, 1959). Due to the complexity in which power and its behavioral outcome, *dominance*, manifest, power can be classified into three experiential domains. Power *bases* are the tangible or intangible resources that form the basis of influence over others (Olson & Cromwell, 1975). Power *processes* are the behavioral strategies used to exert power in social interactions (French & Raven, 1959). Lastly, power *outcomes* are the desired behavioral reactions of (e.g., compliance, obedience) of individuals on whom power is being exerted (Gray-Little & Burks, 1983).

This study focuses on power processes as well as power bases (Molm, 1981). The power process (strategies used in exerting power over others) in this study are the participants’ reactions to a subordinate other’s performance. Power bases however, are more variable, depending on a researcher’s definition of power. The following study manipulates power as a function of organizational hierarchy (i.e., possessing power is equated to holding a higher organizational role than a fictional target); it should be noted that this designation can encompass many bases of power, according to French and Raven’s taxonomy. For instance, leaders in organizations might hold both coercive and reward power in that their subordinates are compliant out of fear of repercussion or are motivated to achieve a desired outcome. Leaders may also hold expertise or
information that facilitates their influence over outcomes, thus providing them two more bases of power. In practice, methodologies that have claimed to isolate these bases are muddled at best—often, manipulations confound multiple power bases (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). Accordingly, I will follow the more recent and popular conceptualization of power (role power) in an effort to keep this manipulation uncluttered and explicit.

Although the six-category typology is used as a descriptive aid does not provide theoretical explanation, field research on the effects on power in the workplace often utilize the conceptualization of legitimate power as this is the most common source of power at work (Rahim, 1989). Legitimate power at work is often rooted in an individual’s rank or role in a formal hierarchy (Gruenfeld & Tiedens, 2010). Further, hierarchical power within organizations is often encompassing of the ability to reward or punish for meeting (or the failure to meet) desired expectations. Legitimate power, when sourced in workplace hierarchy, is frequently referred to as role power (Huang, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Guillory, 2011). Where the workplace is concerned, the ability to control the outcomes of others through reward and punishment is understandably deemed the most important type of power to possess (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006; Fiske, 1993; Yukl & Fable, 1991). Table 1 outlines various relevant power bases and definitions, including role power, which is used as the working definition of power in the current study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Power</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Power (general)</td>
<td>An property of a social relation; not the individual actor (i.e., the influence of party A over part B is rooted in party B’s dependence on party A)</td>
<td>Emerson, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Power (general)</td>
<td>The ability for an actor within a social relationship to carry out his or her will despite resistance</td>
<td>Weber, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>The ability to influence outcomes/others through persuasive content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>The ability to influence others under the threat of negative consequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>The ability to influence others through the possibility of granting positive outcomes for desirable behavior</td>
<td>French, Centers, &amp; Rodrigues, 1975; French &amp; Raven, 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>The social influence non-powerful individuals achieve through identification/affiliation with a powerful party</td>
<td>Huang, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, &amp; Guillory, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>The ability to influence outcomes/others by being perceived as possessing knowledge others do not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>The ability to influence others through the belief (instilled in non-powerful individuals) that the powerful possesses the right to exercise power</td>
<td>Berger, 1994; Burgoon &amp; Dunbar, 2006; Keltner, Gruenfeld, &amp; Anderson, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Power (general)</td>
<td>An individual’s relative capacity to modify others’ states by providing or withholding resources, or administering punishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Power</td>
<td>The capacity to influence others through the provision or withholding of resources or administering punishment, within the confines of an organizational hierarchy</td>
<td>Huang, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, &amp; Guillory, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Power Effects on Behavior

Although researchers concede that power and power behaviors (dominance) have individual-level personality and motivational variations (e.g., need for power, authoritarianism), this study will take the approach of previous literature in examining power through the lens of social exchange (Kelley & Thibault, 1978). With this approach, power is a characteristic of a relationship. That is, it emerges from, and influences, the interaction between individuals. Power is typically mechanical in its construction, in that it is derived from tangible resources or influence over outcomes. Further, power typically has a positive relationship with both status and displays of dominance (Rollins & Bahr, 1976). However, power and status are not synonymous and their relationship could be disrupted (Ridgeway, Diekema, & Johnson, 1995). For example, the possession of status (e.g., respect) does not guarantee the ability to exercise power (e.g., punishment).

Individuals with power are often able to exhibit more self-interested behavior (compared to non-powerful individuals), feel entitled in their pursuit of goals or rewards, objectify and more easily judge others, and feel threatened when they perceive a mismatch between their power and their competence or status (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012; Keltner, Greunfeld, & Anderson, 2003; Lammers, Stapel, & Galinsky, 2010). Indeed, leaders who experience limited to no accountability for their decisions are often most at risk of displaying self-serving (versus other-serving) behavior (Kipnis, 1976). This is perhaps most true in the case of resource distribution (e.g., bonus allocation, salary decisions), a common source of workplace power. In empirical contexts, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003) found that, although powerful individuals contributed more to dwindling resources than less power individuals, they (powerful individuals)
were also more likely to claim resources from a shared pool. Thus, there is a pattern of self-serving behavior among the powerful.

One area in which power behaviors are considered endemic to social interactions in within the context of supervisor-subordinate relationships (London, 1995). Within these work relationships, performance feedback is considered a critical and common occurrence. The reasons for this are numerous. For example, effective feedback keeps subordinate efforts directed toward an intended goal and has positive implications for subordinate career development and self-awareness (Atwater & Yammarino, 1995; Locke & Latham, 1990). On the other hand, ineffective (or, destructive) feedback can result in subordinate decreased self-efficacy and lowered collaborative efforts (Baron, 1988). Feedback therefore, is a form of power behavior, in that it is an exercise of influence of one individual (with legitimate power) over another (in a powerless position). In keeping with the focus of this study, workplace performance feedback is a critical area in which to study power behaviors and their underlying drivers.

Indeed, past research has found both rater and ratee effects on performance evaluations and outcomes (Looney, Robinson Kurpius, & Lucart, 2004). For example, Looney et al. found that, holding all other performance metrics equal, female subordinates were ascribed more emotionally-charged traits than were male subordinates. Further, Hartman Griffeth, Crino, and Harris (1992) found that female subordinates were rated as more promotable when they also exhibited stereotypical masculine traits, as opposed to women who did not exhibit these traits. Research in rater differences has also found that female supervisors provide more positive feedback on average than male supervisors (Pulakos, White, Oppler, & Bormna, 1989). Benedict and Levine (1988) found similar results, where female leaders were more likely than male leaders to delay performance evaluations and provide positive feedback, regardless of
subordinate gender. Thus, power alone (i.e., position) cannot account for differences in power behavior (i.e., performance feedback).

London’s (1995) model of giving feedback suggests that rater motivation for providing feedback depends upon the dominant theme of the dyadic interaction, which are rooted in rater needs. Accordingly, London identified three main themes in feedback-endemic relationships: control-dominated, in which the rater holds a position of clear authority (e.g., greater expertise, connections, or experience) over the subordinate; reward-dominated, in which one party is dependent upon the other (e.g., deliverables that feed into a larger work system) for rewards and results; and affiliation-dominated, in which the two parties operate as equals (e.g., coworkers, partners) and feedback is typically conducted in assistance to the ratee. To this end, I will employ London’s model to investigate the motivation behind power behaviors of powerful individuals when addressing subordinates.

Further, power can be self-reinforcing; given arbitrary power in experimental settings, individuals attempt to exert more control and influence over subordinates and increase their psychological distance from less powerful others (Kipnis, 1976). Powerful individuals are also more likely than non-powerful individuals to prioritize themselves over others in interpersonal interactions and are more often inaccurate in identifying others’ emotional states (Uskul, Paulmann, & Weick, 2016; van Kleef, Oveis, Homan, van der Lowe, & Keltner, 2015). There are a number of theoretical explanations for the exercise of power. Here, I summarize those theories most relevant to the focus of this study: the internal experiences of power that drive power behaviors.
Dyadic Power Theory

Dyadic power theory suggests that, in a dyadic interaction, perceptions of having legitimate power (e.g., unequal access to resources, authority to make decisions) increase individual perceptions of their own power. These self-perceptions in turn influence individuals to engage in high power behaviors in an effort to control the interaction (Dunbar, 2004; Rollins & Bahr, 1976). According to dyadic power theory, there is a positive and curvilinear relationship between power and displays of power (also referred to as dominance) (Dunbar & Burgoon, 2006; Komter, 1989). Early dyadic power theorists proposed that increases in self-perceived power have a positive linear relationship with power behaviors (e.g., dominance displays) (Rollins & Bahr, 1976). However, Dunbar and Burgoon, (2006) found that individuals with very low power and very high power engage in fewer dominance displays that individuals with moderate power. Individuals with very little power experience what is often termed the chilling effect, in which the cost of inciting conflict outweighs possible benefits, thus intimidating the powerless individuals into silence (Cloven & Roloff, 1993). At the high-power end of the spectrum, individuals exert less dominance over others than individuals with moderate power. This effect is typically explained one of two ways: first that, in close dyadic relationships, the powerful individuals have little to gain from acting on their power—choosing instead to simply allow the status quo of the relationship to continue (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). And second, that individuals with high power feel secure in their position and experience little compulsion to engage in excessive dominant behavior. Thus, past research has attempted to explain the effects of possessing power through the lens of internal reactions to power, creating space for the possibility of an explanatory mechanism. For exploratory purposes, I will measure candidate’s
internal sense of power, using the Personal Sense of Power Scale (Anderson, John, & Keltner, 2012) to examine internal experiences of the power in addition to power outcomes (i.e., power behaviors). However, though the authors have described this process as an internal or felt power, I ultimately posit a different explanation: that behavioral differences in power behaviors are the result of differential reactions to level of social status.

In fact, dyadic power theory also accounts for differences in power behaviors based on societal authority to exercise power. For example, it allows for a disconnect between power and power behaviors as a result of descriptive gender stereotypes: a woman in a position of legitimate power who exercises said power by displaying a level confidence, influence, or assertiveness deemed inappropriate for her gender might be ostracized, reprimanded, and therefore reluctant to enact such displays in the future (Carli, 1999; Meeker & Weitzel-O’Neil, 1985). Further, women in high power positions react to their own (and others’) power differently than men. A later study by Dunbar, Bippus, and Young (2008) found that, in dyadic interactions, women who saw themselves as the more powerful individual also viewed their partner as more dominant (than did women in non-powerful positions). There was no similar pattern for men.

One may argue then that women have a heightened sense of their own standing (compared to men) that is especially activated when in high power positions. This is consistent with research that women in power are both rare and unsupported—therefore more aware of threats to their power—than men. This therefore establishes the possibility that the relationship between power possession and power behavior is not an equivalent process for men and women. Given these findings, we can expect gender or, more precisely, the social status afforded to men and women, to moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors.
Approach Inhibition Theories

The approach/inhibition theory’s connection to power, put forth by Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson (2003), argues that these behavioral tendencies found in the power literature are the result of differential behavioral approach versus behavioral inhibition systems activation. The behavioral approach system (BAS) regulates behavior that is related to food, rewards, and opportunities. Engaging the BAS induces the individual to action, with the promise of obtaining desired outcomes. Conversely, the behavioral inhibition system (BIS) is engaged when the individual senses threat, uncertainty, or the possibility of reward loss. When engaged, the BIS is responsible for avoidant behavior, increased vigilance, and a resistance to risk-taking.

Powerful individuals engage in behaviors that one would categorize as approach behaviors. That is, powerful people are more likely to attend to social rewards, display disinhibited social behavior, experience positive affect when pursuing rewards, and satisfy their own goals (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Carver & White, 1994; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Furthermore, powerful individuals are theorized to experience less loss aversion than their less powerful counterparts, in turn contributing to their willingness to engage in self-serving behavior (Inesi, 2010). Conversely, non-powerful individuals are prone to displays of behavioral inhibition. Non-powerful individuals are more likely to attend to threat, take time to evaluate the intentions and judgments of others, and suppress their true opinions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). In the workplace, this distinction could mean that powerful individuals are more likely to correct underperformance and assert their opinions to others, and are less likely to pay attention to social-emotional cues. Non-powerful individuals are instead less likely to address others’ underperformance, more likely to attend to others’ emotional states,
and more likely to use avoidant behaviors to influence subordinates (e.g., ostracization) (Ferguson, Ormiston, & Moon, 2010). These findings create the expectation that high power always equates to increased BAS while having low power is always associated with increased BIS. Although this is frequently true, past research would also suggest that individuals with high power can concern themselves with keeping their power (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). That is, even one who possesses high power (and exhibits little regard for those in low power) may be vigilant for threats to their power. Inesi, Gruenfeld, and Galinsky (2012) found that individuals in high power positions are more likely to view others’ ambiguous actions as threatening, more likely to display mistrust of others, and less likely to experience thankfulness for kind gestures (compared to individuals with low power). Thus behaviors in line with greater BIS (e.g., vigilance, attending to others’ intentions) can also be true of individuals with high power. This instance would offer support for the premise that individual factors can disrupt the relationship between power possession and corresponding power behaviors. For example, in the case of vigilant high-power holders, increased BIS appears to act as a mediating mechanism that would explain the disconnect between power and power behaviors.

Complementarity Theory

In its common definitions, power is a dynamic, interpersonal property that exists not as a static trait but rather as a feature of the inequality between multiple parties. As such, complementarity theory offers another fitting view through which power might affect individual displays of power. This theory posits that an individual’s behaviors are a reaction to their interaction partner’s actions just as much as they are a result of the individual’s own motivations.
(Markey, Funder, & Ozer, 2003). That is, our behaviors are often a consequence of the behaviors of others. Early interpersonal researchers theorized two dimensions of social behavior: control (ranging from submission to dominance) and affiliation (ranging from coldness to warmth) (Carson, 1969). Based on this concept, complementarity theory argues that complementary behaviors are more likely to occur when two or more individuals are on opposite ends of the dominance continuum but fall similarly within the affiliation continuum. For example, one person behaving in a submissive manner might provoke dominant behavior in another, provided they both are interpersonally warm.

Evidence for complementarity theory is perhaps most abundant in the nonverbal behavior literature. Research suggests that responding to dominance or submissive displays with the contrasting behavior is a function of many natural hierarchies, even occurring in non-human mammals (Goodall, 1986). Further, patterns of complementary behavior between interaction partners can arise without an explicit assignment of power. Tiedens and Fragale (2003) observed the nonverbal behaviors (postural expansion and constriction) between randomly paired dyads containing a confederate. In their design, the pair was assigned an interactive picture description task and then completed measures regarding their experience with the confederate. The confederate served the purpose of engaging in either a postural expansion pose (dominant) or postural constriction pose (submission). The researchers found that participants were significantly more likely to engage in the complementary posture than the same posture as their partner. They also reported liking their partner more and feeling more comfortable when their postures were dyadically complementarity (as opposed to being the same posture).

The underpinning mechanism in complementarity is still to be explored; however, Paulhus and John (1998) offer a perspective especially relevant to gender research: in their
findings on self-deceptive biases, they found evidence for a two-dimensional model of social desirability. They argue that social desirability is driven by either an alpha bias (i.e., an inflated self-perception of dominance) or a gamma bias (i.e., an inflated self-perception of agreeableness). Complementary behaviors, therefore, if driven by social desirability to be liked, could be the reflection of our particular bias. As women are typically socialized to be communal (e.g., agreeable) and men are socialized to be agentic (e.g., dominant), one could argue that men and women are also systematically socialized to adopt one of these self-deception biases. In other words, women, whose prescriptive norms dictate should be agreeable and communal, may operate with the desire to be seen as such—by engaging in conscientious or pro-social behaviors in a bid to be viewed positively by others. Men, on the other hand, typically praised for exhibiting agentic traits, operate with the desire to be seen dominant and will engage in more power-seeking behaviors in their bid to be viewed positively (Paulhus & John, 1998). In this way, gender appears to moderate the relationship between power and power behavior. This pattern in is line with Magee and Galinsky’s (2008) findings on the self-reinforcing nature of power: men exhibiting dominance will continue to engage in dominance displays to continue to be seen as agentic, just as individuals in power think and act in ways that ensure the retention of their power. Likewise, women engage in pro-social and deferential behaviors, creating expectations for their behavior, further necessitating their pro-social behaviors. In the same way, individuals in low power positions behave in ways that ensure the continuation of their low status, such as obeying the demands of high-power individuals, attending to and anticipating the needs of high-power individuals, and being easily influenced by high-power parties (Guinote, Judd, & Brauer, 2002; Milgram, 1974; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).
Although participants in the current study will not have a physical interaction partner, they will be deciding on a course of action that will impact another person in a scenario. To further explore the implications of complementarity theory, I will ask participants to evaluate the other in the scenario, using Saucier’s (1994) general evaluation items. This measure is aimed at understanding interpersonal perceptions using evaluatively-neutral terms (e.g., alert, reasonable, etc.) so as to refrain from triggering biases that color highly-evaluative items (e.g., smart, good, etc.). According to complementarity theory, we could expect that participants will evaluate the other individual more favorably if they feel they are in a complementary position (in this case, in a higher power position). Participants in low power positions (having low organizational power but still able to evaluate the fictional subordinate) may rate their subordinate unfavorably because their position is not as complementary, i.e., there is lessened power distance.

Gender Differences in Power Behaviors

Magee and Galinksy (2008) further argue that hierarchies can emerge based primarily on expectations that individuals hold of each other—many of which may be steeped in group categorization. Classifications of race, social class, or gender for example, carry with them expectations of performance and behavior. Of particular interest in this study, gender acts as a demographic trait that has the potential to disrupt the typical relationship between power and power behaviors. That is, historically, men and women have been afforded differential ability to pursue and exercise power. Early research hypothesizes that the differences in power behaviors can be tied into power typology set forth by French and Raven (1959). Men, therefore, are more at liberty to express reward, coercive, expert, and legitimate power than women (Johnson, 1976).
This is rooted in societal structures that find men more often in roles of authority (e.g., senior leadership) than women, across industries and fields. Given formal, hierarchical power, men therefore have the ability to grant rewards, influence others with the power of threat, be viewed as competent in their role, and command deference more than individuals in typically non-powerful positions, i.e., women.

Further, men are historically in positions of legitimate authority more often than women. Though women make up over half of all undergraduate degrees and workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2016), they are still underrepresented in the highest positions of authority (Elliott & Smith, 2004). Within Fortune 500 companies, just over 20 are led by women, executive boards are comprised of only 14 percent women, and only about 20 percent of elected congressional officials are women (Sandberg, 2013). This disparity has arguably held intact the “think manager, think male” phenomenon that assumes men (more often than women) possess the characteristics necessary for effective leadership (Schein & Davidson, 1993). One could argue that the dearth of women in top leadership positions contributes to the notion that women are simply unfit or incapable of operating at such levels. This in turn promotes the societal understanding that men hold more power than women.

Behaviorally, research within the gender differences literature has found that men and women do in fact exhibit behavior that reaffirms their generally-held positions of powerfulness and powerlessness, respectively. Behaviors that typically signal high power are more often exhibited by men and behaviors associated with lower power are more often exhibited by women (Hall, 1990; Henley, 1977). These behavioral patterns are also evidenced in studies controlling for power. For example, even in leadership positions, women are often less directive than men, more democratic in their approach (as opposed to autocratic), and use more indirect methods of
influence than do men (Carli, 1999). Women are also less likely to self-promote, a practice that acts as a display of confidence, competence, and competition. Self-promotion has also been found to have real impact on career outcomes; self-promotion is closely related to selection and promotion decisions such that self-promoters are allocated more attention (and therefore, more resources) than individuals who do not self-promote (Bowles & McGinn, 2005; Kacmar, Delery, & Ferris, 1992; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Thus the typical connection between possessing power and exercising power does not always manifest in men and women equally.

Research suggests that even within non-gendered or typically masculine work contexts, women are often driven to perform in ways consistent with stereotypically feminine gender roles (Lester, 2008). Even at work, women are pressured by the roles that they have historically been socialized into, as well as the organization’s particular culture of male and female interpersonal dynamics and their own sense of gender identification (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Feingold, 1994; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). In other words, women are often pressured into behaving in societally acceptable ways for women, for their work context, and by their own perceptions of how women ought to behave. Sociological research suggests that globally and historically, women hold few positions of social power, receive fewer educational opportunities, and often hold jobs with lower pay, lower status, and harder working conditions than men (Riley, 1997). Importantly, these outcomes create social networks in which women rarely interact with men of equal status and power (Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1993). This holds true for workplace interactions as well: as women are typically employed in less attractive jobs than men, mixed-gender interactions are generally also cross-occupation, e.g., nurses and doctors or managers with secretaries (Bielby & Baron, 1986; Reskin, 1993). In other words, most cross-gender interactions at work are power differential. In the cases in which women hold high-power
positions equal to men (e.g., at the same hierarchal level), women are often few and far between—the impact of which is that the numerical distinctiveness women hold actually increases gender identity salience and can influence them to once again behave in gender-consistent patterns despite their position or power (Randel, 2002). It would seem then, that gender has the potential to serve as a diffuse power characteristic that signals high power for men and low power for women.

However, many of the above findings on power behaviors can vary by researcher and study, yielding inconsistent results. For example, women’s assumed tendency to engage in more indirect influence strategies (as opposed to direct) compared to men has found non-significant or negligible results in student samples, romantic couples, and indeed in workplace contexts (Aida & Falbo, 1991; Dreher, Dougherty, & Whitely, 1989; Steil & Hillmann, 1993). Thus there are circumstances in which women will not defer to non-powerful behaviors and men to powerful behaviors. At best, power differences between men and women can depend on factors such as context, role, industry, and target. This perhaps grants a re-examination of prescriptive gender norms for power behaviors as well as the power associated with gender roles.

The gender norms that have come to guide men’s and women’s behavior in social situations comprises shared beliefs and characteristics that are thought to be held by most individuals in a gender group (Biddle, 1986). Descriptively, they are the beliefs about what is typical behavior of men and women; in other words, descriptive norms are the societal-wide attributes and behaviors that we assume are representative of most men or most women. Another component of gender norms are prescriptive; these are the expectations we hold for the behaviors of men and women. Descriptive and prescriptive norms typically follow each other, such that feminine or masculine traits are a part of expected and valued behaviors for women and men,
respectively. Importantly, violating these expectations for how men or women ought to behave can have detrimental consequences (Rudman & Glick, 2001). For example, women are often disparaged when displaying masculine behaviors, and men when displaying feminine behaviors.

Within the context of job performance, gender norms influence interpersonal perceptions that can yield real career impact. For example, Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, and Tamkins (2004) found that, when women were described as being successful in stereotypically masculine domains, they were perceived as less friendly, sociable, and likeable than were successful men in the same domain. Additionally, successful women were rated as less interpersonally skilled—even uncivil—than women not explicitly described as successful in their male-typed field. Related research shows that women in either male-typed or male-dominated fields such as management often have their work discredited, devalued, or find themselves personally derogated due to their perceived lack of fit with the job (Heilman, 2001; Schein, 1973).

These findings suggest that women are penalized when not acting according to the prescriptive gender norm in the workplace. According to Snodgrass (1985), these negative consequences of behaving counter-stereotypically may serve as behavioral motivation for women: when their group membership (female) is made salient, women may behave in ways that are more congruent with their social group stereotypes in order to protect their own interests. These situations effectively socialize women to behave in stereotype-consistent ways, especially where gender is made salient. Notably, these stereotype expectations carry with them inherent value characteristics. Male stereotypes and female stereotypes are not perceived as equal across a number of domains, including the workplace. This has been supported by research in the literature on interpersonal perceptions: men are perceived as generally more competent at their role and are given higher evaluations that women who perform at the same level (Carli, 1991;
Wood & Karten, 1986). Women often feel and do in fact need to outperform men to achieve the same perceptions of competence (Foschi, 1996; Shackelford, Wood, & Worchel, 1996). Thus men are generally perceived to hold more expert power than women. This belief is likely held by both men and women, as women typically hold themselves to higher performance standards than do men, and rate their own performance lower when interacting with a man (compared to when interacting with a woman) (Carli, 1991). This then raises the possibility that some gender differences in the literature arise not only out of gendered socialization patterns, but may also be attributed to differences in status.

**Status**

Another component often held in parallel with power that can determine power behavior is status. Unlike power, social status is rooted in intangible societal structures. Whereas power comes from a variety of sources (e.g., expert, reward, legitimate, etc.) and can be formal, status is most often informally constructed. Much like power, social status refers to the position that one holds within a hierarchy—but in the case of social status, this position is based on an individual’s possession of high-value commodities such as wealth, attractiveness, or esteem. Further, status is more likely to motivate individuals to seek its merits; there is evidence that people are generally highly concerned with their status and social standing (Tyler & Blader, 2000). People with status are also more likely to be trusted, forgiven for deviant behavior, and evaluated positively than individuals with low status (Bowles & Gelfand, 2010; Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Torelli, Leslie, Stoner, & Puente, 2014). Status is often derived from interpersonal perceptions of confidence, agency, likeability, and—especially for work settings—competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Torelli, Leslie, Stoner, & Puente, 2014).
According to expectation states theory, status is categorized into two levels of standing: specific status characteristics originating from individual-level attributes (e.g., skills, expertise, accomplishments), and diffuse characteristics originating from group-level social expectations (e.g., race, gender). Expectancy states theory posits that, in interpersonal interactions, individuals create expectations about their own and others’ contributions based on perceived status (Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). These two “levels” of standing, according to expectation states theory, provide some interesting implications for the emergence of status. In one case, status arises from characteristics unique to the individual, such as skill and expertise. From the literature, we understand that this can vary based on context. As status is a social construct, it often emerges from the environment (Anderson, John, Keltner, & Kring, 2001; Harkness, 2017). For example, having relevant expertise in one work group (e.g., finance) can afford the individual high status, but may not carry over into another group where said expertise is less relevant. Therefore, status can be said to be situational. On the other hand, status also arises from society-wide, group-level expectations. Past research has found that race and gender in particular carry inherent behavioral expectations and socially-afforded status (Lee & Fiske, 2006; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986). Therefore, there also exists a diffuse, stable form of status given on a group-level basis. (Accordingly, though both types of status result in similar outcomes, I will attempt to treat situational status as different from general social status as an examination of the origins of individual’s self-perceived status.)

Regardless of the origins of status, differential status holding results in a number of interpersonal effects. For example, when perceived status is high, the target is granted an “expectation advantage” from the perceiver. When perceived status is low, the target is granted an “expectations disadvantage” from the perceiver (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2006). In consequence,
those who possess high status (and are given expectation advantages) are more likely to be viewed positively and be given room to take initiative (e.g., sharing ideas, speaking first) (Ridgeway & Berger, 1986). Similarly, expectancy violations theory proposes that violations of expected contributions (i.e., low status individuals acting with high power, and vice versa) are more detrimental to individuals with low status (Burgoon, 1991). For high status individuals, acting with low power is of little to no risk, and can actually induce more favorable perceptions from others. For low status individuals however, acting with high power can elicit negative perceptions and consequences from others.

However, that is not to suggest that low status individuals accept their low standing without retaliation. There is also evidence to suggest that perceiving oneself as having low social status is a threatening, aversive state. Low social status, much like insults, are a threat to the ego, which in turn produces feelings of shame or guilt (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). These negative emotions then increase the likelihood of acting out in aggression or violence. This exact relationship has been observed among violent criminals: experiences of humiliation and loss of social respect uniquely heightened individuals’ perceptions of threat and led to increased incidence of violent behavior (Gilligan, 2003). This pattern is similarly found among non-clinical populations, such as in bullied school children (Haselager et al., 2002).

Unfortunately, previous literature has frequently used power and status interchangeably. Only recently have researchers begun to make clear lexical and empirical distinctions between the two, making it difficult to identify whether the outcomes they measure are the result of power differences, baseline status differences, or context-dependent status differences (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Thus many findings in the status research cannot be differentiated between
situational or general status, as I attempt to examine in this study. Further, we must assume that the following findings on status can result from both or either kind of status.

For example, in Snodgrass’ (1985) work on high/low power partner dyadic interactions, we find that the distinction between power and status is conceptually blurred. In this study, dyadic interaction partners were randomly assigned to play either the leader (i.e., who would teach their partner sign language) or the subordinate (i.e., the learner). The partners engage in a learning session, followed by a series of unrelated games, before completing a survey asking for their impressions of their partner. Snodgrass found that the subordinate partner in a dyadic interaction exhibited higher interpersonal sensitivity. The higher-power partner in contrast, is less attentive to, and less concerned with the feelings of their low power counterpart. However, this methodology for manipulating power is not aligned with the most current definitions of power, i.e., holding unequal access to resources or outcomes. In this study, the leader has power in name only; in fact, one alternative explanation for this finding is that this manipulation highlighted status differences rather than power differences.

Similarly, supposed examinations of status may in fact be confounded with power. Moskovitz, Suh, and Desaulniers (1994) analyzed the agentic-leaning and communal-leaning behavior of men and women who interacting with either high-status (boss), equal-status (co-worker), or low-status (supervisee) partner over the course of 20 days. They found that possessing higher status than an interaction partner increased the prevalence of agentic (i.e., dominance) behaviors, regardless of gender. However, women exhibited more communal behaviors than men, regardless of status. Though the authors described these positions (i.e., boss, peer, etc.) as having equal status, these positions also hold very real power (resource) differences. As the participants were responding to interactions with real colleagues, these
findings may be a reflection of actual differences in access to resources. Thus the majority of classic research in this space has arguably muddied the lines between status and power, making it difficult to ascertain the driving force behind their pattern of findings.

**Gender and Status**

As with power, the effects of gender on status vary. Revisiting Snodgrass’ (1985) work, we find that lower-status partners displayed greater sensitivity and receptivity to the moods of the higher-status partner, regardless of gender. Snodgrass argues that this is evidence that the driving force behind gendered behavioral differences is in fact status: “when leader/subordinate role was crossed with gender, women showed no advantage over men in sensitivity to others…‘women’s intuition’ would perhaps be more accurately referred to as ‘subordinate’s intuition,’” (p. 152).

Conversely, Dovidio, Brown, Heltman, Ellyson, and Keating (1988) observed high status and low status behaviors in mixed-gender dyadic interactions, with interesting implications. In their study, high and low status behaviors (i.e., the percentage of time the subject spent looking directly at their partner while speaking or listening) were quantified in mixed-gender dyadic interactions. Status was manipulated in the form of expertise, i.e., the task given to dyads to discuss was stereotypically “feminine,” “masculine,” or neutral in nature. Dyads were either instructed to discuss a topic within the male partner’s expertise, within the female’s expertise, or of no one’s expertise. As expected, the non-expert partner spent more time looking at their partner while listening than while speaking—a finding corroborated by Snodgrass’ earlier work. However, they also found few differences between the no expert condition and the condition
with a male expert. That is to say that when there was no stereotypical “expert” in the discussion topic, women still spent more time looking while listening than while speaking—in percentages similar to the male expert condition. Thus there is evidence to suggest that women may simply defer to the role of non-expert (low status) in the absence of explicit status assignment. Unless they were assigned or assumed to be the expert, women were more likely to defer to their male partner as the de facto expert meanwhile exhibiting behaviors expected of one in low status.

There is historical precedent for the automatic and unconscious assignment of women as low status holders and men as high status holders. Status that originates from formal power roles (and the historic gender disparity encased within those roles) has been previously discussed. In addition to formal power however, there is also status that is rooted in informal, social norms. For example, status can originate from resources that socially valued, rather than found in formal hierarchies. Thus, wealth, respect, and a distinguished occupation could serve as markers of high status. Interestingly, even in this regard, women’s status is intertwined with and often dependent upon men; Richardson and Mahoney (1981) found that the general social status of a romantic couple, for example, is a reflection of solely the male partner’s occupation. In fact, a woman’s occupation had nearly no effect on her own status or her partner’s status. Therefore, there may exist baseline differences in men’s and women’s status, in line with commonly-held views of men’s and women’s respective places in society.

Additionally, some researchers might argue that men and women react differently to status, both in having status and not having status. Gilligan (1996) posited that men, who typically hold higher social standing than women, react to the perception of low status with aggression and violence. Men’s reaction is a response to the unique distress this poses to their identity. Having low status is to be the antithesis of the common definition of men; it implies that
one is impotent, weak, and therefore emasculated. As men are typically allowed by their gender roles to act dominantly, it follows that men react to this threat with violence. Women are instead socialized into roles that do not hinge upon status, i.e., low status does not pose a direct threat to their womanhood. In fact, social role theory would argue that possessing low status is part of women’s socialized role, so long as it facilitates expected role performance (Eagly & Wood, 2011). Even in possessing status, women and men also differ. Revisiting Moskovitz, Suh, and Desaulniers (1994), they found that women exhibited more communal behavior than men, regardless of whether they were interacting with a boss, peer, or subordinate. However, agentic behavior was more common when the participant interacted with a subordinate than with a peer or boss—regardless of gender. This raises a few questions. Given the unclear distinction between status and power in such a study, one must ask, is it the power associated with these positions or the status associated with these positions that is driving these findings?

The Interplay of Power, Status, and Gender

Both power and status are variables used in comparing, and therefore rank-ordering individuals against others (i.e., one’s power or status is defined in relation to another person’s power or status). Being similar relational constructs, they can often form a causal relationship—attainment of one can lead to attainment of the other (Thye, 2000). For example, managers with control over resources are often afforded some amount of respect from subordinates. Likewise, well-respected individuals are frequently given priority for privileged access to resources, formal leadership, or may be consulted before decision-making (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).
Conversely, there are instances in which power and status do not follow one another. For example, one who is held in high regard may not have control over resources or subordinate outcomes. Or, individuals with formal authority are not respected or admired by their subordinates, such as in the case of poor or abusive supervisors (Tepper, 2000). This instances of disparity between power and status serve as justification for examining the two as separate and orthogonal constructs. Although in real world circumstances both power and status are perceived on their own continua, most research (including this study) simplifies these variables into states of high and low (Lammers, Galinsky, Gordijn, & Otten, 2008; Magee & Galinsky, 2008;). These dichotomies have allowed researchers to categorize the interaction of power and status into four combinations of power/status attainment. Two empirical studies in particular contrasted the perceptions toward, and behaviors of these four groups: Fast, Halevy, and Galinsky (2012) and Fragale, Overbeck, and Neale (2011).

High power, low status (HPLS) individuals are those who have formal authority but lack the respect or willing deference of others. These individuals are most often judged as dominant and interpersonally cold (Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011). Additionally, others view high power/low status individuals as having some level of influence, but expect to have negative interactions with such a person. Further, high power/low status individuals are the most likely of the four categories to display demeaning and aggressive behavior towards others (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012). This is thought to stem from the resentment that high power individuals might have if given authority but not respect, as this is a threat to self-concept.

High power, high status (HPHS) individuals are those who possess both formal authority and the respect of others. These individuals are typically judged to be the most influential of the four categories, to be interpersonally warm, and others expect to have generally positive
interactions with them (Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011). High power, high status individuals are also less likely than their low-status counterparts to display aggressive behavior towards others, likely because their high-status standing is not threatening (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012).

Low power, low status (LPLS) individuals are those who are not in any position of formal authority and hold no particular respect or esteem in the eyes of others. These individuals are typically viewed as the least influential group and are seen as less dominant (and more submissive) and more warm than high power individuals. However, observers do expect to have somewhat positive interactions with these individuals (Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011). Low power, low status individuals were also less likely to behave aggressively toward others (compared to high power individuals), presumably because their lack of power does not leave them feeling empowered to do so (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012).

Low power, high status (LPHS) individuals are those who have the respect and esteem of others but do not hold any formal control or influence over outcomes. These individuals are judged as influential and dominant by observers but also interpersonally warm, as their lack of formal power poses no threat to others (Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011). Overall, observers expect to have the most positive interactions with this group. These individuals also were less likely to behave aggressively toward others again because their high status is not threatening (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012).

The above studies did not find gender interaction effects across the four combinations of power and status, at both the observer and actor level. However, they did find a main effect of gender, such that women generally engaged in fewer power behaviors than men. Further, there are a few limitations that should be noted and are addressed in the current studies. Firstly,
research is yet to deeply explore status as a possible driver of these inconsistent gender effects. There is a possible other explanation: that the internal experiences of possessing either high power/status or low power/status differ between men and women and drive them to engage in similar behaviors with different underlying motivations. For example, men are generally more status seeking than women, but women are particularly sensitive to threat in high power positions compared to men. Thus a combination such as high power and low status—typically distressing according to the literature—might incite dominance in displays based in different motivations: for men, as backlash for losing status they normally assume and, in women, as a way to maintain newfound, tenuous status. Participants’ perceptions of their own power and status would shed some light on this nuanced distinction. Further, studies that have intersected power and status like those previously discussed have yet to measure power behaviors in non-laboratory, realistic, and workplace settings. The current study aims to constrain participant reactions to a common work context, in an effort to examine how power and status interplay in organizations where hierarchies—and therefore power differentials—are an inherent and standard occurrence.
CHAPTER 3

PRESENT STUDY

The aim of the present study is to incorporate the literature on power, gender, and status. Given the previous discussion, one can hold a few assumptions about the effects of these variables. First, power is the asymmetrical ability to control resources over other individuals or parties and is inherent in most organizational structures. In the case of workplace contexts, power is afforded to the individual in higher hierarchical standing than others, e.g., a manager in comparison to direct reports. Power that is allocated within a formal hierarchy is role power and enables the powerful to hold legitimate power over non-powerful others. Secondly, men and women differ with regard to power attainment and exercise. Behaviors that are associated with masculinity tend to overlap with demonstrably power-holding behaviors, e.g., speaking more, being assertive, taking risks, disinhibited behavior, not attending to the non-powerful. Likewise, stereotypically feminine behaviors are often associated with non-powerful displays, e.g., interpersonal sensitivity, withholding one’s true opinions, taking fewer risks, exhibiting communal (rather than agentic) behavior. There are a number of reasons for this gendered difference in behavior. Historically, women have been granted less social agency to attain formal power and can face denigration, repercussions, and even punishment in seeking power and in exercising it once attained. Therefore, prescriptive gender norms may influence women to inhibit their power behaviors. However, women’s tendency to engage in behaviors that signal low power (in comparison to men’s behavior) is tenuous, inconsistent (depending upon factors such as job
industry and task; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980), and grants further exploration. Third and lastly, individual general social status can help to further explicate the gender differences we observe in power behaviors. Status can temper the relationship between power and power use, such that power without status leads to increased powerful behaviors (while the reverse relationship can lead to feelings of impotence and dejection). Further, low social status is an aversive state that motivates one to engage in behaviors that might elevate one’s status. In fact, some researchers have argued that the pursuit of status (i.e., esteem in the eyes of others) is a fundamental drive (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015; Maslow, 1943). Using an online experimental design, the following two studies aim to intersect these three variables and understand their underlying relationship. It is my prediction that the many of the effects of gender on power behaviors can be attributed to the internal experiences of social status. That is, women and men are expected to have different internal reactions to their own power, due to social status differences, which may explain why power behaviors have been found to vary between women and men throughout extant literature.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

With this direction, the present study operates with a few broad questions in mind:

- Do men and women hold different (self-perceived) general social status?
- Given the same power resources, do men and women exhibit the same power behaviors?
- Given the same power resources, will high status and low status individuals equally engage in power behaviors?
This study’s area of interest in the intersection of gender, power, and status is within the workplace. Power has an especially pertinent place within work structures, as authority (equated to legitimate power) is inherent to complex effort distribution. That is, where tasks are delegated, supervision is held, and decision-making is unequally distributed, there exists power structures (Dubin, 2017). Accordingly, the current study aims to understand the power structure experiences of individuals with workplace experience. To explore the above questions, I conducted a two-part study. Together, these experiments are designed to measure between-person effects of power and status on power behaviors. In the first study, an online scenario was administered to male participants and female participants. Participants were asked to indicate their general self-perceived social status before then be presented with a workplace scenario. In the scenario, participants were randomly assigned to either a low-power position (team lead) or a high-power position (department manager). They were then provided with an organizational chart that allow them to view their position in the organization hierarchy. After being given a situation in which another employee is exhibiting performance issues, they had the opportunity to reprimand said employee (i.e., engage in a power behavior). In the second study, another set of participants were randomly assigned to one of the four categories, intersecting power and status (high power/high status, high power/low status, low power/high status, and low power/low status) before engaging in a power behavior. This study investigates not only the effects of gender on the relationship between power and behavior, but also the effects of situational status on the relationship between power and behavior. Given the argument that status is highly correlated to, and may arise from, gender, I expected that any gender differences found in the first study would not be present in the second, as status will be randomly assigned (and situationally derived) rather than left up to the experiences of the participant (i.e., general social
status). Further, as this study uses a common leadership behavior as an outcome (i.e., addressing subordinate performance issues), it has the ability to gauge gendered behavioral differences that previous laboratory studies may have been unable to capture. This experimental design was created for the purpose of testing the following hypotheses:

H1: Gender will moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors, such that the relationship between power and power behaviors will be stronger (i.e., linear) for men than for women (Figure 1).

H2: General social status will moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors, such that the relationship between power and power behaviors will be stronger for individuals with high general social status than those with low general social status (Figure 1). That is, high status individuals will display a positive relationship between power and power behaviors. This pattern is not expected for low status individuals.

H3: General social status will statistically mediate the moderator effect of gender on the relationship between power and power behaviors such that the inclusion of general social status would diminish the effect of gender. In other words, men and women have different reactions to power assignment (gender moderation effect), which can be explained by men and women’s differential levels of general social status (Figure 1).

H4: Situational status will moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors, such that the relationship between power and power behaviors will be stronger for individuals with high situational social status than those with low situational social status (Figure 2). That is, individuals with high situational status will exhibit a positive relationship between power and power behaviors. This pattern is not expected for individuals with low situational status.
Figure 1. General Social Status Mediating the Initial Moderator Gender

Figure 2. Organizational Social Status as Moderator

Figure 3. Situational Social Status, General Social Status, and Gender as Moderators
Given the context of the experimental manipulation (i.e., within a formal hierarchy contained in a business organization), is it conceivable that male and female participants will assume typical “think manager, think male” (Schein & Davidson, 1993) behavior. That is, the longstanding pattern of predominantly male leaders at the top make it so that men are equated with power and women with non-power. This phenomenon, in addition to typical gendered power behavior differences found between men and women, offer support for both a main effect of gender on self-perceptions of general social status, as well as a moderating effect of gender on the relationship between power and power behaviors. Further, keeping in mind that low status behaviors are typically associated with stereotypical feminine behaviors (and high behaviors with masculine), we can confidently posit that general social status and gender will have similar effects on the relationship between power and power behaviors. Specifically, the relationship between power and power behaviors differs between high general social status holders and low general social status holders. Importantly, in testing social status as the underlying mechanism behind gendered power behavioral patterns, we can expect general social status to moderate this relationship, accounting for gender.

Additionally, this study posits that the underlying pattern of gender differences in power behaviors can be accounted for by individual self-perceived status. Women engage in low-power, female patterns to conform with descriptive stereotypes and avoid backlash for violating expectations. Low power behaviors are consequently related to perceptions of having low status. This pattern is self-reinforcing (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), thus women engage in patterns that display low status, thereby experiencing low social status, and continue to engage in low status behavior. However, there are notable exceptions to this pattern in women’s behavior; for example, women in academia may exhibit fewer low status behaviors than women in other
industries, and many power and status laboratory manipulations have failed to uncover stable
gendered differences (Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; Snodgrass, 1985). One possibility is that
women in particular fields (e.g., academia) or positions feel contextual status that supersedes the
generally-held low status of women in society. To further test the ideas that status: a. can be
generally held or situationally derived, and b. is the differentiating factor that drives these
apparent (or not apparent) gender differences, status is manipulated and included in analyses as a
moderator.

Finally, in accordance with existing power research regarding the internal experiences of
power that drive power behaviors there are a number of exploratory measures included in the
current study:

Exploratory research questions: (1) In keeping with London’s (1995) theory of feedback,
will participants assigned to high-power roles report a more control-dominant relationship
than participants in low-power roles? (2) Referencing complementarity theory, will
participants evaluate a fictitious other more favorably when in a complementary position to
the other individual (i.e., when in the higher power condition, with notable power distance
from the subordinate)? (3) With dyadic power theory in mind, will participants experience
greater personal sense of power when in a high-power condition versus a low power
condition? (4) As proposed by Keltner, Greunfeld, and Anderson (2003), will participants
with high power exhibit more behavioral activation (and less behavioral inhibition) than
participants with low power, and vice versa? (5) Finally, as tested in the second study, do
men and women have the same internal status-relevant reactions to power assignment?
That is, will men and women report the same felt status across equivalent power and status
conditions?
In workplace contexts especially, there are behavioral norms and formal restrictions on acting in overt aggression (such as assigning other to do demeaning tasks) (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Past studies in this area have used laboratory manipulations to measure power behaviors, which are often in the form of aggressive behavior (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012). However, a more realistic workplace scenario, such as the one presented in this study, still has the potential to yield significant gender differences in behavior. It may be the case that women in past laboratory studies were not inhibited by the social norms and hierarchies that one might encounter at work. As a leader in an organization, where prescriptive norms, gender stereotypes, and real-world consequences are active, individual behavior is likelier to follow the gendered patterns of behavior, a phenomenon dubbed gender-role spillover (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Thus, it is worth exploring whether some theoretical power behavior patterns hold in workplace contexts. For example, dyadic power theory would expect that possessing high power results in increased personal sense of power—but whether this remains true for both men and women at work is an area for exploration. Furthermore, given the real-world context of work (in which gendered behavior is likelier to arise than in laboratory settings) it is reasonable to expect that women’s inhibitory responses will be more active than men’s, and men’s behavioral activation responses will be more active than women’s.

Further, although previous research (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012) found no gender effects in actor tendency to engage in aggressive behavior, there is still a need to explore the internal experiences status through the lens of gender. Given men’s and women’s differential reactions to status attainment (Gilligan, 1996), it is possible that men and women can engage in similar displays of power that are driven by different internal motivations. Given the tendency
for women to fall into the low-status role (by both self- and other-perceptions), it stands to reason that even a manipulation of power resources will not equalize men’s and women’s perceptions of their own status, thus we would expect that internal felt status would not be equal for men and women across equivalent power and status conditions.
CHAPTER 4
STUDY METHODOLOGY

Pre-Testing

As a measure of power behaviors in this study, participants were given a behavioral indicator scale aimed at gauging their responses to the underperforming subordinate employee. This scale acts as behavioral parallel; in other words, it serves as a gauge of the strength of the participant’s power behavior. It is designed to mimic a real workplace decision, in which gendered prescriptive norms would be more likely (than laboratory settings) to affect men’s and women’s behaviors. In this scale, the participant was presented with a number of workplace leadership options that range from less severe (e.g., “Have a casual conversation addressing this subordinate’s underperformance”) to very severe (e.g., “Terminate this subordinate’s employment”) and asked to indicate the course of action that they realistically would choose in this scenario (Appendix A).

Participants and Procedure

This scale was created for this study and pre-tested for the strength (severity) of power behavior. Each of the scale options represent a different level of power behavior. In two rounds of pretesting, participants were presented with the leadership courses of action in random order and
then asked to rank order and then rate each item’s perceived strength as a behavior. In both rounds of pre-testing, items were shown to participants in random order; participants in studies 1 and 2 were shown the stimulus in the finalized, consistent rank ordering. Participants for this pretest and the following three studies were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk and screened to meet particular criteria before being included in analyses. This screening includes being located in the United States, having employment experience, and answering a test question correctly (i.e., needed to pass manipulation checks to be included in analyses). This is a measure taken to ensure the quality of data collected. Mechanical Turk was chosen for the diversity of its participant pool. On the whole, the average Mechanical Turk worker is young (median age 30), college-educated (two-thirds holding college degrees), has employment in other venues beyond Mechanical Turk, and are “representative of the U.S. internet-using population” (Ross, Irani, Silberman, Zaldivar & Tomlinson, 2010). Participants included for analyses in this study had to be: located in the US, fluent in English, identify as either male or female, and have had work experience that involved working with others.

This pre-test was developed using similar procedures as those common for developing behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS). BARS were originally developed for use in performance evaluations, as they facilitate interpersonal ratings while attempting to control for individual, idiosyncratic rater interpretation that leads to rating error (Kell et al., 2017; Smith & Kendall, 1963). Using a BARS format in this study offers a unique solution to the issue of outcome measurement. Without a real-time workplace sample (where power behaviors can be observed and measured), gauging participants power behavior reactions to a given scenario relies on their own self-report and thus, is fraught with measurement error if left open to a highly subjective rating scale.
In keeping with BARS development procedures, participants first rank ordered each item in order of severity. These ordered rankings will be tested for agreement—ideally to retain items with high percent agreement. Further, participants then rated each item on a five-point scale designed to measure the perceived strength of the behavior. Items’ means and standard deviations both informed item scoring as an outcome and also helped to further refine items—for example, items with too great standard deviation (<1.50) were considered for removal.

Study 1

The purpose of the first study is manipulate power (high versus low) in male participants and female participants, and then to measure their power behaviors (i.e., the pre-tested outcome). This study is designed to measure the effect of power on power behaviors, leaving status open to (i.e., dependent upon) the individual participant’s own interpretation.

Participants

Participants were be recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. As with the pre-test recruitment, participants were be screened to ensure data quality (i.e., must meet location, employment, and test question requirements). A previous meta-analysis examining average effects in self-perception when manipulating power found a mean effect size of r = 0.45 (Georgesen & Harris, 1998). Given this expected effect size, a G*Power analysis indicate this study required a minimum of 92 participants.
**Procedure**

Before any power manipulation, I first measured participant’s general social status (Appendix I). Then, participants’ sense of power was manipulated through a scenario and illustration. Participants were given an organizational chart (Appendix C) in which they were shown their standing in the simulated organization (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). In the high power condition, participants were assigned to—and shown—a higher level position (manager). In the low power condition, participants were again assigned to, and referenced, a lower-level position (team-lead). Participants were then given a job description, outlining who they report to and who reports to them. In their job role description, their power and access to resources is broadly outlined, with managers in charge of guiding multiple team leads and team leads charged with supervising the day-to-day operations of their individual team. This manipulation was chosen as it closely mimics the hierarchical events of a real organization. It is crucial that participants are tasked with addressing an individual below their standing, as this induces the asymmetrical properties of power in an interpersonal situation. In each scenario, the participant is tasked with addressing the underperformance of an individual one level below them. This outcome is in the form of the pre-tested power behavior scale, designed to measure the strength of the participant’s intended behavioral reaction to the scenario. Finally, participants responded to three additional measures aimed at addressing exploratory research questions. The measures are as follows:
Measures: Moderator of Interest

General Social Status.

To measure participants’ feelings of their social standing, I used Cantril’s (1965) graphic scale of subjective social status (Appendix I). In it, participants are asked to imagine that the ladder is representative of one’s standing relative to others, on a scale from lowest rung (1) to highest rung (10). For this study, the wording of the original prompt will be modified slightly to fit the purpose of this study. Here, the general social status measure is administered before the scenario manipulation. Participants were asked to think of the ladder as representing where people stand in society: “At the top of the ladder are people who are the best off…At the bottom are the people who are worst off…The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the bottom.” Then they are asked to select the rung that best represents where they think they stand. This measure is included to get a sense of participants’ baseline status and is predicted to have a moderating effect on the relationship between power and power behaviors.

Measures: Outcome

Measure of Power Behavior.

Participants’ power behavior is measured in the form of action taken to address the performance issue of a subordinate. This scale was taken from the aforementioned pre-test. As an
outcome, it serves as a measure of participants’ display of power and consequently serves as an indicator of the felt power that participants feel enabled to act upon (Appendix A).

**Measures: Exploratory Outcome**

**Motivation for Power Behavior.**

To investigate the motivation behind participants’ power behavior, I employed London’s (1995) model of feedback motivation, given that participant reactions to their subordinate are a form of performance feedback (Appendix F). London’s model suggests that rater (i.e., participant) motivation for providing feedback depends on the dominant theme of the dyadic interaction, which are rooted in rater needs. London identified three main themes in feedback-endemic relationships: control-dominated, in which the rater holds a position of clear authority (e.g., greater expertise, connections, or experience) over the subordinate; reward-dominated, in which one party is dependent upon the other (e.g., deliverables that feed into a larger work system) for rewards and results; and affiliation-dominated, in which the two parties operate as equals (e.g., coworkers, partners). By gathering participant (i.e., rater) motivation to provide feedback (i.e., reaction) to their subordinate, we can examine the underlying explanation behind their power behaviors. To this end, I am employing a survey from London’s (1995) relationship themes in which the participant rates the importance of 13 themed goal items (e.g., “My goal was to evaluate my subordinate’s performance”; “My goal was to encourage the subordinate’s career development”) on a scale from 1 *not at all important* to 7 *extremely important*. Study 1 found
relatively strong internal consistency: control-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.77$, reward-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.57$, affiliative-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.60$.

**General Evaluations.**

Saucier’s (1994) general evaluative items were included as an exploratory outcome related to the workings of complementarity theory. These are a set of 12 personality-relevant adjectives on which the participant will rate the scenario’s subordinate employee (e.g., reasonable, alert, considerate) on a scale from *very little or not at all* (1) to *very much* (5) ($\alpha = 0.96$; Appendix H). This measure was chosen for its evaluative neutrality. These items were developed to inform interpersonal perceptions while attempting to remove the biases that often color highly-evaluative descriptor ratings, e.g., smart, conscientious, etc. Rather, these items are descriptive in nature and allow for the participant to make evaluations of the subordinate in the scenario without the more overt implications of “good” or “bad” evaluations, as is possible in the measure of power behavior.

**Personal Sense of Power.**

Participants’ sense of power was measured as a gauge of the internal experience of power—including for its relation to dyadic power theory. The personal sense of power scale (Anderson, John, & Keltner, 2012) was used to gauge participant’s felt power (Appendix G). This scale is highly correlated with both true hierarchical standing and behavioral displays of power (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). The scale consists of eight items (e.g., “I think I have a great deal of
power”; “I can get others to do what I want”) that begin with a customizable stem, dependent upon context. In this study, the stem will read, “As a leader in this scenario…” Items are scored on a seven-point scale from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (7). Two items are reversed scored (e.g., “My wishes do not carry much weight”; “Even if I voice them, my views have little sway”) (α = 0.70). Although not a direct outcome, felt-power will be used as an exploratory variable, much like felt-status, aimed at understanding the internal experiences of power or status on participants.

**Behavioral Activation System/Behavioral Inhibition System.**

In keeping with Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson’s (2003) connection between power and behavioral activation/inhibition, the BAS/BIS scales are included as possible covariates (Carver & White, 1994; Appendix J). This scale asks participants to respond to 20 items on a four-point agreement scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Scale items fall into one of four dimensions: behavioral inhibition (α = 0.84), behavioral activation: fun seeking (α = 0.76), behavioral activation: reward responsiveness (α = 0.77), and behavioral activation: drive (α = 0.71). According to Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson (2003), individuals with power should display higher levels of behavioral activation; individuals without power should display higher behavioral inhibition. This scale is included as it has been found to correlate with power behaviors; that is, participants’ behavioral activation/inhibition responses will aid in understanding the internal experience of having and using power (Lammers, Galinsky, Gordijn, & Otten, 2008).
Manipulation Check.

As a power manipulation check, participants were asked to identify their position and the position of their direct report. They further identified whether the colleague in question was of higher rank or lower rank than themselves (i.e., should be “lower” in all conditions) (Appendix E). This question was asked at the conclusion of the study, before demographics. Only participants who were able to identify their relative level (compared to the subordinate in the scenario) were included in data analyses.

Study 2

The purpose of the second study is manipulate both power and status (high versus low for both) simultaneously, in male participants and female participants, and then to measure their power behaviors (i.e., the pre-tested outcome). Unlike the previous study that controlled power in isolation, study 2 is intended to examine the possible effects of congruent states (e.g., high power, high status) as well as incongruent (e.g., high power, low status) on men’s and women’s power behaviors.

Participants

A different sample of participants were recruited through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. In keeping with previous studies, participants were screened to ensure data quality (i.e., must meet location, employment, and test question requirements). Previous empirical studies examining
self-perceptions of both power and status after manipulating both found an effect size of $r = 0.60$ (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012). Given this expected effect size, a G*Power analysis indicates this study requires a minimum of 184 participants.

**Procedure**

Much like the previous study, participants were shown an organization chart intended to randomly assign them to a high or low power condition. They were then randomly assigned to a high or low status condition—for this, they were given the status manipulation prompt (Appendix D). The same power manipulation used in study 1 was used for study 2. Given their power and status, participants were presented with the same behaviorally-anchored rating scale (outcome), in which they must decide on the hypothetical course of action they would take. Unlike study 1, participants then indicated their perceived felt status, i.e., the status that we can assume arises from their situational status manipulation (Appendix I). This measure uses the same rating scale and a similar prompt as the general social status measure in study 1, but is administered after the manipulation rather than before. Participants also completed the same exploratory measures as in study 1.

**Measures: Outcomes**

Study 2 utilized the same power behavior outcome as study 1. Study 2 also employed the same exploratory outcome and measures from study 1 (i.e., control-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.77$; reward-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.58$; affiliation-dominant relationship, $\alpha = 0.62$; general evaluations, $\alpha = 0.93$; personal sense of power, $\alpha = 0.84$; behavioral inhibition, $\alpha = 0.82$;
behavioral activation: fun seeking, $\alpha = 0.78$; behavioral activation: reward responsiveness, $\alpha = 0.78$; behavioral activation: drive, $\alpha = 0.75$). However, study 2 differs in how self-perceived status is measured. In addition to exploring general social status in study 1 (as a moderator of the relationship between power and power behaviors), situationally-derived status (manipulation) was analyzed as influential variable on the relationship between power and power behaviors in study 2. Also, participants completed a measure of felt-status (i.e., their reactions to the situationally-derived status manipulation). This measure was given after the power and status manipulations (rather than before, as in study 1).

**Measures: Outcomes**

**Felt Status**

Again, Cantril’s (1965) graphic scale of subjective social status serves as the foundation for this measure (Appendix I). However, rather than ask participants for their feelings of their social status in society, they were instead asked about their standing within the organization they have been given in the scenario. The prompt will mirror that of study 1 but will instead ask participants to think of the ladder as representing where people stand in *this organization*, after they have seen their standing in the organization and have responded to the power behavior rating scale. This measure is included to understand how participants feel about their own status, after the status manipulation.
Manipulation Check

As in study 1, participants will be asked to identify their position and the position of their direct report, then identify whether the colleague in question was of higher rank or lower rank than themselves (Appendix E). This manipulation check is designed to verify the effectiveness of the power manipulation. Again, this question is asked at the conclusion of the study, before demographics. Participants must be able to identify their relative level (compared to the subordinate in the scenario) to be included in data analyses.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS
Pre-testing

The pre-tests were designed to check two stimuli: the organization chart to be used in the study and the power behaviors scale outcome. For the organizational chart pre-tested, I collected surveys from 74 participants, 57 of which remained after data cleaning (17 cases removed because of incomplete data (<80%) or incorrect answer to attention check i.e., identifying the name of the fictitious company). Power ratings for the Manager position were significantly higher (M= 6.97) than power ratings for the Team Lead position (M=6.17; F(1,65) = 11.92, p = .001). Thus, the Department Manager position is perceived as having more power than the Team Lead 1 position. Also, Department Managers were rated as having significantly higher power over their subordinates than were Team Leads, F(1,67) = 6.85, p = .011. Thus, participants were able to recognize that, in the organizational chart, power associated with job role increased as one moves up the organizational ladder.

For the scale outcome, I tested participants’ reactions to the ascending strength of reaction to the power behavior prompt, ranging from least strong (“do nothing”) to most strong reaction (“terminate their employment”). To ensure that these items are listed in the appropriate order of strength, two waves of participant survey responses were collected to refine items. In both rounds of pre-testing, items were presented to participants in randomized order. In the first
round, 48 participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk and asked to complete the one item questionnaire. Eight participants who did not complete at least 80% of the questionnaire were removed from analyses, resulting in a final N of 40. In the survey, participants were asked to rank order the courses of action from least to most severe, as well as rate each item on a scale of strength from least (1) to most (5) strong behavioral reaction. Ratings on eight managerial behaviors found that three items (ignore issue, issue write-up, terminate employment), had average scores on the extreme ends of the scale (1.98, 3.93, and 4.07, respectively). Further, “issuing a write-up” had a rather low (<1) standard deviation, lending more confidence to its position on the higher end of the scale. Another two items had mid-range averages (face to face meeting to provide discipline, putting employee on PIP), with low (<1) standard deviations. Three items (note below) are both close in average ratings, with high standard deviations (>1). Thus, they are among the top items for elimination. In ranking the items, participants again had relatively high consensus (>50%) on items ranked 1 (ignore issue) and 8 (terminate employee). There was also relatively high consensus (43%) on item Issue write-up. Items ranked 2 through 6 had much less agreement (<35%).
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore Issue</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to ask questions*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to provide discipline*</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face meeting to provide feedback*</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face meeting to provide discipline</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting employee on PIP</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing permanent record write-up</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate employee</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *indicates flagged for review/removal

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Most Common Rank</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore Issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to ask questions*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to provide discipline*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face meeting to provide feedback*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face meeting to provide discipline*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting employee on PIP*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing permanent record write-up</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate Employee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *indicates flagged for review/removal

After reviewing questions flagged for removal, two courses of action were decided. The first, was to remove the least performing items (i.e., with the least agreement and largest standard deviations). This led to the removal of *email to ask questions, email to provide discipline,* and *face-to-face meeting to provide feedback/discipline.* The second was to include items that capture
the mid-range strength of the removed items. To this end, the mode of communication (i.e., email, face-to-face) was neutralized to simply “have a meeting…” Thus the three additions tested in the second round of data collection are have a meeting to ask questions, have a meeting to offer feedback, and have a meeting to implement penalties. In the second round of data collection, I collected 48 participants’ responses from Amazon Mechanical Turk. Forty of those participants were included in analyses after data cleaning. Eight cases removed because of incomplete data (<80%). Ratings on seven managerial behaviors found that three items (ignore issue, terminate employment), had average scores on the extreme ends of the scale (1.85 and 4.08, respectively). Low-middle items (having meeting to ask questions, having meeting to offer feedback) scored in the mid-range of the scale (2.03 and 2.58).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore Issue</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to ask questions</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to offer feedback</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to implement penalties</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting employee on PIP</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing permanent record write-up</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate employee</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In ranking the items, participants again had relatively high consensus (~50%) on items ranked 1 (ignore issue) and 7 (terminate employee). There was also relatively high consensus (43%) on item Have a meeting to offer feedback. Items ranked 2 through 6 had lower agreement.
(25-38%) but agreement was higher than in previous pre-tests. Thus these final 7 items were used as the outcome of interest in the main studies. Next, Fleiss’ $\kappa$ statistic was adapted as a measure of inter-rater agreement across multiple raters on a categorial (in this case, ordinal) outcome (Fleiss, 1971). The test was chosen for both its intended purpose and for its fit with the data; the survey data comfortably met assumptions for a Fleiss’ $\kappa$ analysis: the response variable is categorial, ranking categories are mutually exclusive, all raters receive the same number of categories into which they rank each item, raters were randomly selected. As a modification of Cohen’s $\kappa$, Fleiss’ statistic provides both an item-level proportion of agreement statistics (see table 4) as well as an overall agreement statistic for the full scale. Landis and Koch (1977) provided general guidelines for the interpretation; by their estimation, $\kappa$ statistics between 0.21-0.40 indicate “fair agreement.” All individual proportion of agreement statistics fell within the fair agreement range, as well as the full scale ($\kappa = 0.24$). Although acceptable, this outcome is generally lower than ideal. However, it is worth noting that number of subjects, rating items, and categories affect the magnitude of $\kappa$, such that a higher number of categories typically lowers Fleiss’ $\kappa$. Table 4 shows the final list of behaviors, with their finalized ranking. This order was used in presenting the stimuli to participants in studies 1 and 2.
Table 5

Power Behavior Rankings (Second Round)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Most Common Rank</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Proportion of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore Issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to ask questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to offer feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a meeting to implement penalties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting employee on PIP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing permanent record write-up</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate employee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 1

Responses were collected from 167 participants, ranging in age from 20 to 62 ($M = 32.3$, $SD = 8.2$). After an initial round of data cleaning, in which participants were required to complete all hypothesis-relevant measures (and 95% of total measures), the sample size was left at 158 participants. Finally, another 15 participants were excluded from analyses for failing an attention check (i.e., were unable to correctly identify their role in the fictitious organization), resulting in a final count of 143 participants. The final sample comprised 72 women and 71 men; 83.9% of this sample were currently employed and 69.2% have held a leadership position at a place of employment. Full sociodemographic breakdown and interitem correlations can be found in Tables 10 and 11 in the appendices.

Prior to analysis, relevant assumptions for multiple regression were tested. Of this statistical analysis were tested. The assumption of singularity was met as the independent variables (gender, condition, social status) were not a combination of other independent variables. An examination of correlations revealed that the predictor condition was not correlated
with either gender or social status. Gender and social status were correlated with each other \((r = 0.24, p = .01)\). However, this is both theoretically anticipated and, since collinearity statistics (i.e., Tolerance and VIF) were within accepted limits, the proper guidelines for the assumption of multicollinearity were met. Data screening did not find outliers that were necessary to remove from analyses. Further, residual and scatter plots met the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

**Hypothesis Tests**

Data from the first study was used to test hypotheses one through three. Hypotheses one and two centered around the potential moderating effects of gender and general social status. Gender and general social status were individually (and then combined) entered into a hierarchical linear regression to test whether they moderate the relationship between power condition and power behaviors. According to predictions, gender alone should moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors such that the relationship is stronger for men than for women. Thus, we would expect that the inclusion of gender as a moderator would show an improvement in model variance accounted for \((R^2)\) beyond the power-to-power behavior model. Also, general social status alone should moderate the relationship between power and displays such that the relationship is stronger for individuals with higher status than those with lower status. Again, we would expect that the inclusion of general status as a moderator would show an improvement in model variance accounted for \((R^2)\) beyond the power-to-power behavior model.
In keeping with the hypotheses, three linear multiple regression analyses were conducted. In the first, power condition was regressed on power behaviors \((F(1, 141) = 5.35, \ p = .02, R^2 = 0.03)\) and found a significant, inverse effect of manipulation condition on the outcome, such that participants in the high power condition \((M = 3.70, SD = 1.30)\) engaged in stronger power behaviors than participants in the low power condition \((M = 3.20, SD = 1.25; B = -0.49, p = .02)\). The second regression analysis tested hypothesis one, that gender has a moderating effect on the relationship between power and behaviors. In this regression analysis, there was non-significant interaction between power and gender \((p = .10)\), thus gender did not act as a moderator on the relationship between power and power behaviors and hypothesis one is not supported. However, in the same analysis, there was a trending simple effect of gender on the dependent variable, accounting for power condition \((B = -1.30, p = .05)\). Further analysis found that women reported significantly lessened power behaviors than did men \((M = 3.31, SD = 1.23; M = 3.58, SD = 1.35, \) respectively). The third analysis tested for the moderating effect of social status on the relationship between power and behaviors, per hypothesis two. There was again a non-significant interaction effect of power and social status on power behaviors \((p = .13)\), thus hypothesis two was not supported. As before, there was a trending simple effect of social status on power behaviors \((B = 0.39, p = .05)\). This effect was positive indicating that every unit increase in social status coincided with a 0.39 increase in power behaviors (i.e., for high power condition participants).

To test hypothesis three, that social status mediates the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between power and power behaviors, I used a three-step hierarchical regression analysis that mirrored steps from the previous hypothesis tests. In the full model, power, gender, and social status were regressed on the behavioral outcome, as well as their two-way and three-
way interaction terms. First, we analyze the moderating effect of the initial moderator, gender. We would expect that the power x gender interaction to have a significant relationship on the outcome power behavior (in this case, high power is associated with increased power behavior, more so for men than for women); thus gender would moderate the relationship between power and power behavior. Next, we analyze the moderating effect of general social status, such that we would expect status to moderate the relationship between power and power behavior, even when the gender x power interaction effect is included in the model. The next stage of evidence for a mediated moderation is to examine whether the moderating effect of gender is diminished (i.e., becomes non-significant) with the inclusion of the moderating effect of general social status. The last analysis needed to support mediated moderation is to examine if gender has a significant effect on general social status (and strongly correlated). Without this last step, general social status may have a spurious moderating effect of general social status. If met, we can conclude that general social status mediates the moderating effect of gender on the power-power behavior relationship. That is to say that general social status is the true moderator and the effect of gender can be explained through status. Figure 1 represents this proposed analysis, in which the moderating effect of gender is attenuated by the inclusion of the moderating effect of social status.

In accordance with hypotheses, a three stage hierarchical regression analyses was used to test the effects of three predictors on power behaviors. Power condition was entered at stage one, followed by gender at stage two, and finally social status at stage three. Gender and status were added in this order as it fit chronologically with testing social status as the true underlying moderator. The full model revealed non-significant three-way and two-way interactions between power condition, gender, and status. As there were no significant interaction effects, the third
hypothesis—that social status would mediate the moderating effect of gender—is not supported. However, the addition of social status and its interactions effects in the third step did diminish the simple effect of gender \( (B = -1.30, B = -0.89, \text{ in models 2 and 3, respectively}) \). There was a small increase in total variance accounted for \( (\Delta R^2 = 0.03) \) between the second and third model, however this change was not significant \( (\Delta F p = .31) \).

Removing the non-significant three-way interaction, regression results did not find any of the four two-way interactions to be significant. Again, neither gender nor general social status moderated the relationship between power and power behaviors. That being said, this analysis did find a main effect (and conditional effects) of power across all three models. Further, gender had a nearly significant conditional effect on power behaviors (accounting for power condition) in the second model, mirroring the regression analysis conducted for hypothesis 1. Once added into the third model, social status had a trending effect on power behaviors \( (B = 0.51, p = .05) \). Lastly, once interaction effects were removed from the regression analysis, only power condition had a significant effect, accounting for gender and social status \( (B = -0.44, p = .04) \). (Results of hierarchical regression can be found in Table 5).
Table 6

**Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Predictors on Power Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gender: 0 = Men, 1 = Women; Power: 0 = High, 1 = Low

**Exploratory Research Questions**

T-test analyses were used to test the four exploratory questions, that: (1) high power participants will report a more control-dominant relationship than participants in the low-power condition. (2) high power participants will rate their subordinate more favorably than low power participants, (3) high power participants will experience greater personal sense of power than low power participants, and (4) high power participants will experience greater behavioral activation than low power participants (who in turn will experience greater behavioral inhibition than high power participants).
These analyses found that (1) there were significant differences in the type of relationship reported by high and low power participants. First, there was no difference in responses to control-dominant relationship items, thus the first exploratory question is unsupported. However, low power participants \((M = 3.19, SD = 0.77)\) were more likely to endorse a reward-dominant relationship than were high power participants \((M = 2.94, SD = 0.77)\) and this difference trended toward significance \((t(141) = -1.96, p = .05)\). Additionally, low power participants \((M = 4.46, SD = 0.47)\) were significantly more likely than high power participants \((M = 4.22, SD = 0.56)\) to endorse affiliation-dominant relationship items \((t(141) = -2.76, p = .01)\). Next (2), high power participants \((M = 2.88, SD = 0.83)\) did in fact rate their subordinate more favorably than did low power participants \((M = 2.50, SD = 0.82; \ t(141) = 2.71, p = .04)\). Also (3), high power participants \((M = 5.18, SD = 0.74)\) did experience greater personal sense of power than did low power participants \((M = 5.01, SD = 0.72)\); however, this difference was non-significant \((p = 0.18)\). The last (4) exploratory question can be broken down into four outcome measures, according to the behavioral activation subscales and single behavioral inhibition subscale. Behavioral activation fun seeking, reward seeking, and drive did not evidence significant differences between power condition groups. Behavioral inhibition also did not exhibit a significant difference between power conditions. Full t-test results can be found in Table 6.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SE Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size (Cohen’s d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Evaluation</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Drive</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Fun Seeking</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Reward Seeking</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Power: 0 = High, 1 = Low; df = 141

Further, 2 (power condition) x 2 (gender) ANOVA was run on each exploratory measure to find potential differences between men and women (in either power condition) on each outcome. There were no significant interaction effects between gender and power on any exploratory outcome. Further, gender had a significant effect on only two outcomes: behavioral activation (reward) and behavioral inhibition. Women were significantly \((M = 4.53, SD = 0.47)\) more likely than men \((M = 4.34, SD = 0.560)\) to endorse reward-seeking behavioral activation items. Also, women were significantly \((M = 3.93, SD = 0.79)\) more likely than men \((M = 3.43, SD = 0.79)\) to endorse behavioral inhibition items. Full group means for all outcomes, broken down by gender and power, can be found in Table 7.
Table 8

*Group Means by Gender & Experimental Condition in Study 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>High Power</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Power</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>6.38 (1.75)</td>
<td>5.56 (1.65)</td>
<td>6.03 (1.66)</td>
<td>5.23 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Behavior</td>
<td>3.97 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.25 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploratory Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Evaluation</td>
<td>2.93 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.81 (0.85)</td>
<td>2.58 (0.77)</td>
<td>2.43 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>5.26 (0.76)</td>
<td>5.09 (0.71)</td>
<td>4.99 (0.82)</td>
<td>5.03 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>4.50 (0.60)</td>
<td>4.49 (0.52)</td>
<td>4.36 (0.49)</td>
<td>4.58 (0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>2.95 (0.78)</td>
<td>2.93 (0.77)</td>
<td>3.12 (0.73)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>4.24 (0.59)</td>
<td>4.19 (0.55)</td>
<td>4.40 (0.50)</td>
<td>4.51 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Drive</td>
<td>3.47 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.47 (0.67)</td>
<td>3.65 (0.61)</td>
<td>3.44 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Fun Seeking</td>
<td>3.43 (0.84)</td>
<td>3.55 (0.81)</td>
<td>3.52 (0.80)</td>
<td>3.41 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Reward Seeking</td>
<td>4.39 (0.47)</td>
<td>4.49 (0.51)</td>
<td>4.27 (0.52)</td>
<td>4.56 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>3.53 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.84)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.82)</td>
<td>3.91 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Study 1 was designed to manipulate power (high versus low) in male participants and female participants, and then to measure their power behaviors (i.e., the pre-tested outcome).

This study is designed to measure the effect of power on power behaviors, leaving status open to (i.e., dependent upon) the individual participant’s own interpretation. Study 1 was to serve as the baseline for study 2, in that the first should have established the feasibility of a mediated
moderation model. Although there were interesting findings that seem to keep with the logic of the literature review, it failed to establish either gender or social status as moderators on the relationship between power and power behaviors.

There were main and conditional effects that are in line with past research. For example, participants in the high power condition were more likely (than those in low power) to engage his stronger power behaviors. This finding can serve as both a manipulation check as well as support for past research that suggests that individuals in power feel more entitled or are more willing to exercise their power (Kipnis, 1976). In terms of the workplace, this study used an outcome stimulus designed to mimic the real choices that leaders face every day regarding talent management and performance feedback. According to feedback researchers, being in a position of power allows the individual more freedom to provide performance feedback to another, especially when they hold relatively more power than the target individual (London, 1995). With this in mind, it follows that a participant in the high power condition feel more able to provide stronger feedback (i.e., power behavior) than someone in the low power condition.

Furthermore, the effects of gender and status are reassuring in a sense they too coincide with previous research. In this study, men tended to choose stronger power behaviors than did women. Again, past research on feedback has found that female leaders are generally more likely to provide positive feedback and more likely to delay performance evaluations (thus exercising fewer power behaviors, i.e., feedback) than are men (Pulakos, White, Oppler, & Borman, 1989). Both in past research and in this study, women are less likely to engage in power behaviors (or, more accurately, do not engage in the same level of power behaviors as men do on average).

Social status functioned in a similar way to gender, which fits with the proposed theory. Participants who reported feeling lower status were less likely to endorse strong power behaviors
than were participants who reported feeling high status. In other words, low status individuals were less able to exercise their power behaviors—which, according to past research, can stem from the heightened interpersonal sensitivity, increased sense of submissiveness, and overall lessened aggression toward others (Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2012; Snodgrass, 1985;). Given the previous connection made between women and historically low social status (and men with historically high social status), finding gender and status—though not moderators—to have significant conditional effects on the outcome and will similar patterns is consistent with past research.

In the exploratory analyses, we find that participants in the low power condition were more likely to endorse reward-dominant and affiliation-dominant relationships (compared to high power participants). Although it was originally predicted that power condition would significantly predict the control-dominant relationship scale, these other two styles of relationships are telling as well. The reward-dominant relationship items are motivations that would arise when one does not feel in a position of authority to instruct or educate another. Rather, the reward-dominant relationship is one that hinges upon the exchange of goods or information (i.e., is driven by reward or withdrawal; London, 1995). The affiliation-dominant items suggest that the rater encourages and guides the target individual through their performance feedback; it takes a partnering approach (e.g., “my goal was to build trust with this subordinate”). As we would predict, these behaviors coincide with low power behaviors, and were more likely to be endorsed by individuals in the low power condition compared to the high power condition. Together, this suggest that individuals in low power positions are more likely to use indirect methods of performance feedback rather than direct.
In terms of gendered differences, there were two exploratory measures with significant t-test results. In one, we found that women are more likely than men to endorse behavioral activation (reward-seeking items). Although not predicted it does, in a small way, support past literature. Unlike behavioral activation (drive) or (fun seeking), reward responsiveness is a more passive and reactive activation system. Whereas drive involves pursuing goals and fun seeking relates to being eager to experience new things, reward-responsiveness is the measure of how reactionary one is to outside, pleasurable stimuli. Thus it requires less initiative and more sensitivity to outside stimuli. It follows then that women were slightly more likely than men to report being reward-responsive (as opposed to another activation system). Further, women were significantly more likely than men to endorse behavioral inhibition items, suggesting that women are more likely to feel self-criticism, self-doubt, or fear negative repercussion. These findings support past literature that suggest women are more likely to engage in low power behaviors such as these.

According to complementarity theory, we theorized that participants in the high power condition would rate their subordinate more positively than would low power participants. This was confirmed by current data—high power individuals rated their employee higher (compared to low power participants) on a scale of general evaluations. Thus, there is some credence to the idea that high power people not only feel more entitled to act on their power, but they are also unlikely to be threatened by low-power others. Thus they are free to rate those low power individuals favorably. In contrast, low power individuals do not feel sufficiently distant from their subordinate and could therefore feel threatened—and rate them less favorably, as we see in this study.
Lastly, as another point of confirmation for the effectiveness of this experimental design, high power people reported feeling higher personal sense of power than did low power people. Although this finding bordered on significance, it is important to note that the means were trended in the anticipated direction. In previous research, the Sense of Power scale was highly correlated with both true hierarchical standing and behavioral displays of power (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). Therefore, we can see this as another piece of evidence that high powered and low powered participants differed in the level of power they felt they had, as well as how they chose to exercise it.

Study 2

As with study 1, relevant assumptions for multiple regression were tested. The assumption of singularity was met as the independent variables (gender, power, status) were not a combination of other independent variables. An examination of correlations revealed that the predictor condition was not correlated with either gender or social status. None of the predictors were intercorrelated and collinearity statistics were within accepted limits. Further, residual and scatter plots further met the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity.

Responses were collected from 299 Amazon Mechanical Turk Workers, ranging in age from 19 to 64 ($M = 34.2$). After an initial round of data cleaning, in which participants were required to complete all hypothesis-relevant measures (and 95% of total measures), the sample size was left at 281 participants. Finally, another 11 participants were excluded from analyses for failing an attention check (i.e., were unable to correctly identify their role in the fictitious organization), resulting in a final count of 270 participants. The final sample comprised 145
women and 125 men; 78.3% of this sample were currently employed and 71% have held a leadership position at a place of employment. Full sociodemographic breakdown and inter-item correlations can be found in Tables 12 and 13 in the appendices.

**Hypothesis Tests**

Data from the second study was used to test hypothesis four, aimed at examining the possible moderating effect of situational (organizational) status on the relationship between power and power behaviors. According to the previous argument, we would expect that situational status will have a similar effect to general social status. Thus, the relationship between power and power behaviors will be stronger for individuals assigned to the high situational status condition than individuals assigned to the low situational status condition. A moderated regression analysis examined the effect of power condition and status condition on power behaviors. In the full model, there was a significant interaction between status condition and power condition on power behaviors ($B = 0.72, p = .014$). Analysis of marginal means found a stronger relationship between power and power behaviors for high status individuals than for low status individuals (*see Figure 4*). Full regression analyses results can be found in Table 8; full group means between can be found in Table 9.

To ensure that this finding accurately supported hypothesis four, the regression analysis was again conducted but with the inclusion of gender, status, and their interactions effects in the model. There was a non-significant three-way interaction between power, status, and gender, thus this term was removed from the analysis. Of the three two-way interactions, the only significant interaction term was again the power by status effect, ($B = 1.16, p = .017$). Thus,
status statistically moderated the relationship between power and power behaviors, accounting for the effect of gender and hypothesis four was generally supported. However, given the design of study 2 (in which status was manipulated) compared to study 1 (where status was measured), social status cannot be said to mediate the moderating effect of gender, even if there was a significant interaction effect between status, gender, and power behaviors (i.e., social status cannot be tested as a mediating mechanism underlying the effect of gender in previous studies).

![Figure 4](image-url)

**Figure 4** Marginal Means of Power Behaviors
Table 9

Moderated Regression Analysis of Predictors on Power Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>&gt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power x Social Status</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Power: 0 = Low Power, 1 = High Power; Status: 0 = Low Status, 1 = High Status
Table 10

*Group Means by Gender & Experimental Condition in Study 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>Low Status</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>Low Status</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>Low Status</th>
<th>High Status</th>
<th>Low Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Behavior</td>
<td>3.86 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.97 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.94 (0.95)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.26 (1.15)</td>
<td>3.51 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Status</td>
<td>7.64 (1.25)</td>
<td>7.68 (1.75)</td>
<td>6.09 (1.83)</td>
<td>4.79 (1.67)</td>
<td>6.33 (1.40)</td>
<td>6.28 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.11)</td>
<td>4.92 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Evaluation</td>
<td>2.92 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.84 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.67)</td>
<td>2.32 (0.74)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.75)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.56 (0.70)</td>
<td>2.42 (0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Power</td>
<td>5.29 (0.96)</td>
<td>5.42 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.47 (0.71)</td>
<td>5.51 (0.78)</td>
<td>5.30 (0.79)</td>
<td>4.25 (0.70)</td>
<td>4.35 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>4.59 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.56 (0.52)</td>
<td>4.46 (0.50)</td>
<td>4.51 (0.48)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.59)</td>
<td>4.58 (0.58)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.48)</td>
<td>4.46 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>3.21 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.78)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.83)</td>
<td>2.89 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.99)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.81)</td>
<td>3.06 (0.61)</td>
<td>2.94 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation-Dominant Relationship</td>
<td>4.52 (0.48)</td>
<td>4.24 (0.58)</td>
<td>4.30 (0.52)</td>
<td>4.35 (0.50)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.61)</td>
<td>4.38 (0.57)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.55)</td>
<td>4.31 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Drive</td>
<td>3.91 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.47 (0.81)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.89)</td>
<td>3.62 (0.69)</td>
<td>3.39 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.62 (0.70)</td>
<td>3.45 (0.80)</td>
<td>3.54 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Fun Seeking</td>
<td>3.82 (0.80)</td>
<td>3.24 (0.92)</td>
<td>3.36 (0.72)</td>
<td>3.31 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.46 (0.95)</td>
<td>3.58 (0.81)</td>
<td>3.50 (0.79)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Reward Seeking</td>
<td>4.56 (0.43)</td>
<td>4.39 (0.54)</td>
<td>4.26 (0.66)</td>
<td>4.49 (0.47)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.66)</td>
<td>4.47 (0.43)</td>
<td>4.38 (0.57)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIS</td>
<td>3.37 (0.68)</td>
<td>3.73 (0.81)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.68)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.83)</td>
<td>3.39 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.76 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.61 (0.82)</td>
<td>3.60 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Power: 0 = Low, 1 = High; Status: 0 = Low, 1 = High*
Exploratory Research Questions

The same four exploratory questions were tested in study 2: (1) high power participants will report a more control-dominant relationship than participants in the low-power condition. (2) high power participants will rate their subordinate more favorably than low power participants, (3) high power participants will experience greater personal sense of power than low power participants, and (4) high power participants will experience greater behavioral activation than low power participants (who in turn will experience greater behavioral inhibition than high power participants).

To this end, a 2 (power) x 2 (status) x 2 (gender) factorial ANOVA was conducted using SPSS GLM function to examine the combined effects of three predictors on each exploratory outcome measure. Of these analyses, there was only two outcomes with significant three-way interaction effects: behavioral activation subscales (BAS) drive \( (F(1,263) = 4.98, p = 0.03) \) and reward-seeking \( (F(1,263) = 4.81, B = -0.58, p = 0.03) \). A follow-up examination of marginal means found that the interaction of power and status on behavioral activation drive was significant for men \( (F(1,122) = 4.68, p = 0.03) \) but not so for women \( (F(1,141) = 0.80, p = 0.37) \). Similarly, there was a significant interaction between power and status on behavioral activation reward-seeking for men \( (F(1,122) = 4.15, p = 0.04) \) but not for women \( (F(1,142) = 0.81, p = 0.37) \). Graphs of the three-way interactions found in Figures 5 and 6. Follow-up pairwise comparisons found that, within low status men, there were no significant differences between power conditions, for either BAS drive or reward-seeking. However, within high status men, BAS drive was significantly higher in the high power condition \( (M = 3.91, SD = 0.72) \) than in the low power condition \( (M = 3.39, SD = 0.85; p = 0.02) \). Similarly, within high status men,
BAS reward-seeking was significantly higher in the higher power condition ($M = 4.56 \ SD = 0.43$) than in the low power condition ($M = 4.23 \ SD = 0.66; \ p = .04$). Marginal means and pairwise comparisons of BAS subscales for men are in Table 10.

Figure 5  3-Way Interaction Marginal Means
Table 11

Men’s Marginal Means of Behavioral Activation Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Low Status</th>
<th>High Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Power</td>
<td>High Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Drive</td>
<td>3.45 (0.80)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS Reward Seeking</td>
<td>4.38 (0.57)</td>
<td>4.26 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Power: 0 = Low, 1 = High; Status: 0 = Low, 1 = High
In the same factorial ANOVA, there were no significant two-way interactions between any predictors for any outcome. However, there was a significant effect of gender on the behavioral inhibition subscale ($F(1,263) = 6.71, p = 0.01$), such that women were significantly more likely ($M = 3.71, SE = 0.07$) than men ($M = 3.46, SE = 0.07$) to endorse behavioral inhibition items. There was also a significant effect of status on participants’ sense of power and general evaluations of their subordinate. An examination of marginal means found that individuals in the low status condition reported significantly less ($M = 4.38, SE = 0.08$) feelings of personal power than did high-status participants ($M = 5.38, SE = 0.08; F(1,263) = 88.49, p < .001$). Also, participants in the high status condition reported significantly higher perceptions ($M = 2.73, SE = 0.07$) of their subordinates than did low status participants ($M = 2.50, SE = 0.06; F(1,264) = 6.39, p = 0.01$).

The last exploratory question (whether men and women have similar internal felt status across power and status conditions) was again tested with a factorial 2 (power) x 2 (status) x 2 (gender) ANOVA using SPSS GLM. In this analysis, the outcome was perceived organizational status. There was not a significant three-way interaction between power, status, and gender. However, there was a significant two-way interaction effect between power and status ($F(1,259) = 4.16, p = .042$), such that the effect of power on perceptions of organizational status was stronger for high status participants that for low status participants. A graph of marginal means of organizational status can be found in Figure 7. Lastly, there were significant effects of both power and status on perceived organizational status, ($F(1,259) = 22.97, p < 0.001; F(1,259) = 83.82, p < 0.001$). Individuals in the high power condition reported significantly higher ($M = 0.49, SE = 0.14$) perceived organizational status than did participants in the low power condition ($M = - 0.46, SE = 0.14$). Also, individuals in the high status condition reported feeling
significantly higher \((M = 0.93, SE = 0.14)\) perceived organizational status that did participants in the low status condition \((M = -0.89, SE = 0.14)\).

**Figure 7. Marginal Means of Organizational Status**

**Discussion**

Having established in the first study that neither gender nor social status served as moderators on the relationship between power and power behaviors, it is surprising that study 2 found evidence that status condition acted as a moderator. Especially given that, in the full model, status condition did not have a significant conditional effect on power behaviors. This is at odds with findings from the first study, in which status significantly predicted power behavior decisions. Although study 1 failed to find support for the theorized mediated moderation model, study 2 found evidence for hypothesis 4, that social status moderates the relationship between power and power behaviors. Thus, there is partial support for the overarching theory that status account for power behaviors above and beyond gender.
According to exploratory analyses, we should see similar patterns to those expected for the first study, but with the inclusion of a status condition variable. Perhaps the most intriguing finding, there were significant three-way interactions between power, status, and gender on the behavioral activation drive and fun-seeking subscales. Further examination found that the power x status interaction slope for men, differed from that of women. For example, the effect of power on behavioral activation (drive) was strongest for men in the high status group. This could be interpreted as this group having greater sensitivity to power assignment that the other groups. Low status men on the other hand, have a relatively flat slope, thus power condition did not affect their responses as much as it did for higher status men. It is an interesting pattern—one that suggests women are less likely to experience a difference in motivation depending on their perceived level power. Men on the other hand, experience a significant increase in drive when they are low status but perceive a favorable change in power. The same pattern emerges for behavioral activation (fun-seeking), in which high status men exhibit a stronger reaction to, or relationship with power. Again, this can be rooted in the historical places of men and women in society. Throughout history, men are more often given leadership position sat work, are overrepresented in many industries and fields, and are free to act on their desires. Logically, we would expect men to more often endorse drive behaviors, or allow themselves to engage in fun-seeking endeavors, if given the chance.

Relatedly, we also found a main effect of gender, such that women were more likely to endorse behavioral inhibition items than were men, which is consistent with findings in the first study and with past literature. Further, there was a main effect of status on both personal sense of power and general evaluation. As we would expect, higher status was related to higher personal sense of power and higher evaluations of their subordinate. Thus, high status mimics the effect of
power we found in study 1. This supports previous research that has found status and power to be related and similar constructs that can influence behavior in similar ways.

To this last point, in testing organizational social status as an exploratory outcome, we find that both power and status have significant and expected main effects of feelings of contextual status. That is, in comparison to low power participants, high power participants were more likely to report higher feelings of perceived organizational status. Similarly, compared to low status participants, high status participants were more likely to report higher feelings of perceived organizational status. From this we can conclude a few things. First, that the manipulations (i.e., vignette and organization chart) were robust enough to influence individual feelings of perceived status. Secondly, that both overt power structures and nuanced social status can affect inner felt organizational status.

Lastly, there was an interesting two-way interaction between power and status on perceived organizational status. An examination of simple slopes found that the effect of power on organizational status was greater for individuals in the high status condition. In other words, low status participants did not show the same increase in perceived organizational status when they were assigned to the high power condition. On the surface, this finding seems predictable: assigned status has a greater effect on feelings of perceived status than assigned power does. However, the implications of this are unique. In suggesting that status has a greater effect than power of self-perceived status (combined with the findings that status condition predicts personal sense of power and evaluations of others) we can conclude that status may have a greater influence on behaviors and cognitions than power. Distilled even further, the suggests that perceptions of social constructs like respect, likeability, and social esteem are more influential to our behaviors than having actual unequal access to resources.
CHAPTER 6  
GENERAL DISUSSION

Taken together, studies 1 and 2 shed some light on the impact of power, status, and gender on vignette-driven leader behaviors. We know from previous research that individuals in high power positions or high status positions typically engage in stronger power behaviors than individuals in low power or low status positions. Historically, and where work is related, men have more often held these high status and power roles. As this trend is not always consistent (i.e., unique instances in which women engage in more high power behaviors), these studies aimed to understand the potentially moderating effect of social status and gender on the relationship between power and behavior. Unfortunately, few of the above findings support hypotheses—in particular, the study 1 failed to establish either status or gender as viable moderators. Accordingly, a mediated moderation did not yield significant, expected results. However, study 2 found a significant moderator effect of status, accounting for the effect of gender. Therefore, there was partial support for that main prediction, i.e., that status can act as a moderator underlying the moderating effect of gender in extant literature. Further, numerous smaller findings do help do support much of the thinking behind the hypotheses and were in accordance with past literature.

Unfortunately, the proposed mediated moderation model is not fully supported by the data. Gender did have a significant effect on power behaviors, but it did not moderate the relationship between power and power behaviors. This would suggest that men and women react similarly to power. This is surprising; however, previous literature has also found inconsistent
gender interaction effects on behavior. For example, in some experimentally-controlled power research, women do not engage in the same power behaviors as men given the same power level (Carli, 1999). Women in power are often less directive, more democratic, less self-promoting, use more indirect communication then men in similar positions. Thus the typical connection between possessing power and exercising power does not always manifest in men and women equally. However, other research (Snodgrass, 1985; Moskovitz, Suh, & Desaulniers, 1994) suggests that gender is not as strong a moderator of leader behaviors as factors such as task, organizational standing, and group context. In some ways, the current study is neither consistent nor inconsistent with past research in not finding a moderating effect of gender. However, this again raises the question of whether past studies with significant moderator effects can be attributed solely to gender. Although this study did not find evidence that social status was the true underlying moderator behind gender, there was evidence that social status could moderate the relationship between power and behaviors.

Social status also had a significant effect on power behaviors, such that higher status was related to increased power behaviors. This echoes the general effect of power standing on behavior, and is consistent with previous research finding that the attainment of status positively predicts more overt leader behaviors (Dovidio, Brown, Heltman, Ellyson, & Keating, 1988). Taken a step further, study 2 also found evidence that organizational status moderated the relationship between power and behavior, such that the relationship between these variables was stronger for individuals in the high status condition. This is a telling finding that supports the current theoretical model. It is also echoed in past research; for example, managers of similar power standing are often given a wider latitude to act on and power behaviors (i.e., influence tactics) by their subordinates when they are also perceived as having high status, compared to
low status (Bruins, Ellemers, & de Gilder, 1999) thereby reinforcing power behaviors. Social status is therefore a key moderating player in understanding power dynamics.

Analyses of exploratory variables typically followed expected directions. For example, in study 1, high power participants reported higher Sense of Power and rated their subordinates more favorably than low power participants. However, there were some unexpected findings centered around the type of relationship endorsed by participants in different power conditions. It was expected that high power participants would endorse control-dominant relationships, as this would suggest they see themselves in a position of clear authority. The data did not reflect this conjecture; however, low power participants were significantly more likely to endorse affiliation-dominant relationships. This suggests that low power participants saw themselves as somewhat closer to equals with their colleagues, i.e., endorsed behaviors that suggest they are more likely to take a partnering approach than a dominant approach with their subordinate. Although not hypothesized, this is in line with our thinking: low power participants likely feel more compelled to approach their subordinate with low power behaviors than high power participants.

Additionally, it was predicted that high power participants would have greater behavioral activation than low power participants. This was not supported by the data, however, women were significantly more likely than men to endorse reward-seeking and behavioral inhibition items. This is similar to previous gender research that suggests women are more likely than men to act with caution, increased vigilance, and risk mitigation (i.e., behavioral inhibition), across different contexts (e.g., romantic relationships, finance, substance abuse; Rubin, Peplau, & Hill, 1981; Badunenko, Barasinska, & Schafer, 2010; Nolen-Hoeksema, 2004). Further, neuroanatomical research has found that women tend to have stronger reactions to reward and punishment feedback than men (Ding et al., 2017). Though the current finding is unexpected, it
also aligns with literature that suggests women are more reward-sensitive and punishment-sensitive than men.

Relatedly, study 2 found that the interaction of power and status on behavioral activation (drive and reward-seeking) was significant for men, but not for women. High status men had a stronger reaction to power (compared to low status men) when responding to behavioral activation items. This suggests that, for men, status and power combined contribute to approach-motivated tendencies. For women however, where this pattern was not significant, their approach-motivation did not differ based on the interaction of status and power. Generally, men and women (of any status condition) had similar BAS-Drive means in the low power condition; in the high power condition, women of any status had lower BAS-Drive than high status men. BAS-Reward-Seeking was modestly higher for women (of either status) than men, in the low power condition. However, high status men had higher reward-seeking means than women of either status, when in the high power condition. Given the previous finding that women reported higher behavioral inhibition than men, this pattern suggests that behavioral inhibition could curb the effect of status and power in women’s behavioral activation, where no such tempering is exhibited in men.

Contributions to Theory

Many of the current findings support past research in power, status, and gender. For example, study 1 found that both power and status were effective predictors of power behaviors, and in the expected direction (i.e., high power and status = higher power behavior). This suggests that the current study is theoretically aligned with extant literature on power and status. Power
also predicted general evaluations which, according to past research, indicates that high power individuals felt less threatened (than low power individuals) by their subordinate and likely enjoy the social distance. As the powerful tend not to be concerned with the powerless (Snodgrass, 1985), this finding is another data point of support past research. Further, study 1 found significant main effects of gender, also in a predicted direction (i.e., women endorsed behavioral inhibition items more than men). Again, this suggests alignment with previous research in gender research that would suggest women are more likely to be self-critical and cautious (analogous to low power behaviors).

Given the unique and separate variance accounted for by both power and status, there is also evidence to support the practice of studying these two constructs separately and with definite boundaries. Unlike early literature in this area, the current study took after Fast, Halevy, and Galinsky, 2012 by isolating the two variables. As uncovered in the results, there is evidence-backed reason to do so. Were power and status equal or redundant constructs, we might have expected them to behave in the same way. Rather, we found that, for some outcomes, status was a significant predictor and for others, power was the more effective predictor. They are distinct enough social constructs that participants are able to grasp their nuance and respond to them individually. At the same time, although they were unique predictors, they often predicted in the similar directions. For example, both power and status were significantly and positively related to power behaviors. This is perhaps why power and status literature so often confounded the two in early research. Although not redundant, they have the potential to predict some behaviors in similar patterns.

That being said, there is the interesting (non)finding in the current studies that status, power, and gender rarely evidenced significant interaction effects. This suggests that our
previous predictions and model are not supported by the data. However, the only novel moderator in this equation is social status—gender, according past research, could have still moderated the relationship between power and behaviors. Why it did not is up for speculation. In some literature, women were less likely than men to engage in power behaviors; however, this pattern did not hold true across all studies. Some researchers found that industry or task at hand to confound the typically gendered pattern of behavior. As with those findings, the current studies did not find evidence that men and women had different relationships between condition and behavior. The reason with this may lie in what was not included in the current vignettes. Past research found that women followed “typical” gendered behaviors in certain fields (e.g., female-dominated)—but exhibited opposite patterns in academia and business. In the current study, industry and field were not expressly specified, so as to minimize the possibility of these effects. However, without significant moderating effects of gender or status, it is logical that industry was a true moderator in those past studies and that we would not uncover a moderating effect here. Taken together, this suggests that gender and perceived social status are perhaps not the ideal moderating variables—instead, a more nuanced, context-dependent variable (e.g., industry, gender distribution, tenure) may be more effective at predicting relationships between power and behaviors.

Contributions to Practice

One important conclusion from the current studies is that, as in past research, some behavioral differences can be found even among spontaneously-generate and virtual power/status groups (Huang, Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Guillery, 2011; Lippitt, Polansky, & Rosen, 1952). This
is heartening for two reasons: the first, is that it is possible to observe significant participant reactions to contrived or virtual situations. Thus, these experimental designs are robust enough to elicit hypothesized results in participants. This is advantageous when designing a study aimed at manipulating (and isolating) multiple variables that might not be otherwise possible in real-world data collection. For example, collecting data of this scale and precision within an actual organization would not have been possible—individuals in an established workplace come with pre-existing notions about their power, status, and others’ influence over them. Secondly, the significant effects of power and status were also applicable to outcomes that were closely related to real world outcomes. For example, Sense of Power scale has been found to highly correlate with both true hierarchical standing and behavioral displays of power (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). Therefore, there is support that the current vignette-study is robust enough to infer real-world results from their findings.

Furthermore, status and power acted as independent (though theoretically similar) predictors, which supports previous research aimed at deconstructing the power-status confound that plagued early research. There is data here to support that the two constructs are not only distinct but also act as unique predictors on various outcomes (i.e., general evaluation of their subordinate was predicted by power in study 1 but status in study 2). Consequently, these studies support the idea that, in experimental designs, power and status should be isolated, manipulated separately, and examined separately, as first asserted by Fast, Halevy, and Galinsky, 2012).

Similarly, within the current study, status is both measured and manipulated. Measured status (as in study 1) is designed to tap into participants feelings of general value in comparison to others in society, and thus could be influenced by a wide range of commodities (e.g., wealthy, attractiveness, likability). On the other hand, manipulated organizational status (as in study 2)
instead serves as a function of a specific status commodity: respect and esteem within work contexts. Given the differences in results across studies 1 and 2, there is evidence to suggest that these types of status are deserving of further investigation and delineation. Organizational social status in study 2 did serve as a significant moderator on power behaviors—which was not observed in study 1. It may be the case that status, as a diffuse social property, needs to be more salient to inform behaviors that it was in study 1. When participants are given a specific and context-relevant social standing, status has a significant effect on reported behaviors. Therefore, context-relevant status versus diffuse general social status is an important distinction for future research.

Another individual-level construct that deserves further investigation is the effect of self-monitoring on both internal feelings of status and external perceptions of status. This construct is of particular interest given the baseline gender differences research has found between men and women (i.e., women are typically higher in self-monitoring than men and more effective at emulating emotional states than men; Hall, 1990). It stands to reason then that we can expect that women are more likely than men to attune to others emotional presentation cues, as well as monitor their own cues—both skills that past literature says leads to effectively navigating social work contexts and consequently (Furnham & Capon, 1983, Kilduff & Day, 1994). Further, high self-monitors have been found more accurate as estimating social status differences between people (compared to low self-monitors; Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006). Even more compelling, research has found a strong positive connection between self-monitoring behaviors and effective social networking; that is, high self-monitors (compared to low self-monitors) were better at managing the flow of workplace information (i.e., who to talk to and how; Fang & Shaw, 2009). Social networks have long been theorized as one method
of attaining social status (as they facilitate greater knowledge sharing, indicate likability and social value, and increase individual influence over others; Knoke & Burt, 1983), thus self-monitoring can serve an avenue by which individuals can seek and attain status. With its indirect influence on workplace status, men’s and women’s self-monitoring is a worthy explanatory variable for future research.

Limitations

As with many survey- and vignette-based studies, there is a limitation to the generalization of these behaviors to the real world. In an effort to isolate the effects of power and status in vignette design, the study may have yielded stronger or in some cases, more significant results if conducted in person. On a positive note, both power and status were predictive of power behaviors, thus the vignettes were robust enough to elicit significantly different responses from participants. Further, power and status significantly predicted a number of exploratory measures in the way we originally predicted and consistent with past research. However, participants responses were captured online and therefore may be a greater reflection of power and status effects on cognition rather than behavior. Only a controlled experimental design can confirm that these situations elicit similar power behaviors in real-world contexts.

Relatedly, the differentiation between “low power” participants and “high power” participants is a limitation to the operationalization of power. In pre-testing the organizational chart, participants rated the department manager as having significantly more power than the team lead. However, in comparing their mean ratings, the results do not indicate that the team lead is entirely without power. In fact, the team lead averaged only 0.8 points lower on a power
rating pre-test scale than the department manager position. This suggests that, although the chart operated in the way intended (i.e., by differentiating these positions based on power level), participants may not have experienced their position as categorically “low” or “high” power, but rather as comparatively “lower” or “higher” than others in the organization (e.g., a team lead participant may view themselves as simultaneously “lower” than the department manager and “higher” than a team member). Although this has the advantage of mimicking a real-world organizational setting, it does suggest that results should be interpreted with caution. For example, lower power participants engaged in lower power behaviors (compared to higher power participants), but that does not indicate that they would engage in categorically low power behaviors. Rather, the magnitude with which they would demonstrate power is simply smaller than that of higher power participants, when addressing an underperforming direct report.

Additionally, gender was the originally demographic moderator of choice, as this is the most common and often easiest to capture in comparison to other demographic data (e.g., race, ethnicity, industry of employment). However, this is limiting in that it does not capture the full scope of demographic variables that contribute to, or influence, internal and external social status. For example, women in general have historically held positions of lower power and status than men in the Western world. However, the implications of this can differ between Caucasian, African-American, Asian, and Latino women in the US. For example, study 2 did not find main effects of gender on any outcome, suggesting that power and status were more relevant predictors; however, this pattern may not have held true across various minority groups (e.g., the effects of power and status could be true of one ethnic group and not another). Unfortunately, both studies had an overwhelming majority of Caucasian participants, followed by African-American and then Latino. Group sizes were not large enough to study this group with both
nuance and statistical strength. This is admittedly an area that deserves further attention in the future to fully understand the impact on socially salient characteristics (beyond gender) than impact one’s felt status and observed behaviors in the workplace. Given the virtual format of the current study, participants were unable to react to the gender, race, and demographic distribution of their fictitious organization—all of which form the expectations we hold of others in real-world environments (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Future studies in this vein should account for these demographic factors both in a replicated, controlled environment, as well as in field research where social interactions are less contrived.

Another possible future direction for this research is to further investigate the effect of gender on power behaviors in a variety of contexts. The current study did not find evidence that gender moderated the relationship between power and power behavior, although a moderating effect has been a tentative finding in the past. Additionally, social status did seem to moderate the relationship between power and behavior—but did not seem to statistically mediate the effect of gender. This leads to the conclusion that gender and social status, though related, do not account for the same variance in the power to behavior relationship. Rather, they each contribute unique and worthwhile predictive validity to the study of power. Perhaps then, in line with role congruity research, we should aim to explore a wider array of contextual moderating factors outside of social status (e.g., industry, role, expectations of leaders in their organization, social group, etc.; Eagly & Karau, 2002). This research would be especially valuable to study in-field, where organizational- and role-level factors can be accounted for. Similarly, to fully capture the effect of social status on power behaviors (and re-test its relationship with gender), future research would be best conducted in field contexts. This would allow for the examination of contextual factors that influence status, e.g., organizational culture and norms, perceptions of
politics, behavioral expectations (Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris, & Zivnuska, 2011). There is still the possibility that, once these variables are controlled for and incorporated into social status, it can serve as a better proxy for the gender as a moderating construct.

Lastly, it should be noted that this study aimed to maintain neutrality around the value placed on differing levels of power behavior. That is, whether participants were in the low power or high-power condition, the level of power behavior they exhibited was never deemed either appropriate or inappropriate. This is an important distinction and suggestion for future research: although there was not an “ideal” level of power behavior in the stimuli used in the current study, there is likely an ideal magnitude of power behavior in the workplace, dependent upon actor and situation. For example, research in organizational justice have found a positive and significant relationship between employees’ perceived justice and employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors (Levanthal, 1980; Moorman, 1991). All types of justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, interpersonal, informational) are both rooted in supervisory- and peer-level interactions, as well as impact organizational and individual outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, commitment, employee performance, evaluations of supervisory others; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). The next step using a power behavior stimulus such as the one in this study is to then understand the behavioral range that is considered acceptable or conducive to positive employee outcomes, such as perceptions of organizational justice. Often, when either women or lower power individuals are said to exhibit categorically low power behaviors (e.g., interpersonal sensitivity, democratic leadership), there is an implication that these professionals are not as effective or strong in leading others. Holding aside prescriptive gender stereotypes, this is not an assumption that this study makes; power behaviors should not be described as advantageous to leaders across situations and interactions. Rather, the appropriateness of power behaviors (depending on
context) and their effect on social outcomes in the workplace is an area that needs a more nuanced approach.

Conclusions

This two-part study explored the impact of power, status, and gender on virtual leader behaviors and found only partial support that status can disrupt the typical relationship between power and power behaviors. Generally, and in line with past research, higher power participants engaged in stronger power behaviors than lower power participants. The first study did not find that either status or gender moderated the relationship between power and power behaviors. The second study did find a significant moderator effect of status; however, the manipulated nature of status in the second study limits the conclusions that we can draw from its significant effect (i.e., status cannot be an “underlying moderator” as hypothesized. This area is deserving of future focus and study, particularly as these constructs relate to the workplace. Historically, men occupy more high-power roles than women and there is past evidence to suggest that leadership is equated to masculine traits. Given the closely related nature of power and status, we must further investigate women’s internal felt status (and its subsequent behavioral outcomes), compared to men, at different levels of power. This would serve to better understand the unique reactions and challenges of women in power, as well as the prescriptive assumptions placed upon women in leadership roles.
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APPENDIX A

PRE-TEST MEASURE OF POWER BEHAVIORS
Measure of Power Behavior

The following items are actions that could be taken by a manager in a workplace setting. Think of them as disciplinary actions that can be used when addressing an underperforming subordinate. Imagine that an employee had exhibited poor performance and their manager has the following options to take to address their performance issues.

Please rank the following actions in terms of least strong (1) to most strong (8) reaction.

- Ignoring the performance issue; doing nothing.
- Emailing the subordinate to ask questions about their performance issue.
- Emailing the subordinate to offer correction about the performance issue.
- Engaging in a face-to-face conversation with the subordinate to provide feedback on their performance.
- Engaging in a face-to-face conversation with the subordinate to issue discipline for their performance.
- Issuing a write-up regarding performance issues that will be reflected on the subordinate’s official record.
- Placing the subordinate on a Performance Improvement Plan that outlines a timeline in which the employee must improve, or otherwise face termination.
- Terminating the subordinate’s employment due to performance issues.

Now, please rate each item on the strength of the action, on a scale from a not at all strong (1) to an extremely strong (5) reaction.

How strong of a reaction is each of the following behaviors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Not at all strong</th>
<th>2 Slightly strong</th>
<th>3 Moderately Strong</th>
<th>4 Very Strong</th>
<th>5 Extremely Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Ignoring the performance issue; doing nothing.
- Emailing the subordinate to ask questions about their performance issue.
- Emailing the subordinate to offer correction about the performance issue.
- Engaging in a face-to-face conversation with the subordinate to provide feedback on their performance.
- Engaging in a face-to-face conversation with the subordinate to issue discipline for their performance.
- Issuing a write-up regarding performance issues that will be reflected on the subordinate’s official record.
- Placing the subordinate on a Performance Improvement Plan that outlines a timeline in which the employee must improve, or otherwise face termination.
- Terminating the subordinate’s employment due to performance issues.
APPENDIX B

SURVEY PROMPT WITH REVISED ITEMS
Imagine that you are (department manager 1/team lead 1) in the operations department of a large company.

(Insert power/status manipulation.)

You notice that over the past month, one of your direct reports (team lead 1/team member 1) has consistently not met their operations goals. In reviewing their file, you find that this same report has been cited previously for underperformance—before you assumed the role of (department manager 1/team lead 1). You do not want this performance issue to continue. What steps would you take as the leader in this position?

- Ignore the performance issue; do nothing.
- Have a meeting to ask questions about their performance issue.
- Have a meeting with the subordinate to provide feedback on their performance.
- Have a meeting to implement penalties.
- Placing the subordinate on a Performance Improvement Plan that outlines a timeline in which the employee must improve, or otherwise face termination.
- Issuing a write-up regarding performance issues that will be reflected on the subordinate’s official record.
- Terminating the subordinate’s employment due to performance issues.
APPENDIX C

POWER MANIPULATIONS AND SCENARIO
Imagine that you are the Department Manager/Team Lead in an organization. Below you will find a partial organizational chart that illustrates your standing and position within the business hierarchy. (As a partial chart, assume that the Regional Manager and Department Manager 2 have other direct reports and supervisors not captured in this graphic.)

(a) As **Department Manager 1**, you are hold a great deal of control over organizational resources in your department. You have influence over employees below you because of your access to these resources and your ability to impact their outcomes (e.g., you conduct performance evaluations, promotions, pay raises, etc.). The Team Lead reports to you and, in turn, your report to a regional manager.

(b) As **Team Lead 1**, you do not hold a great deal of control over organizational resources in your department. You have some influence over the employees below you because of you act as liaison between them and higher-level management. However, you do not decide their work outcomes (e.g., performance evaluations, whether they receive promotions, pay raises, etc.). The team members report to you and, in turn, you report to the Department Manager.

*Organizational Chart*
APPENDIX D

STATUS MANIPULATION
Imagine that you are the department manager/team lead of a team in an organization. The organizational chart below illustrates your standing and position within the organizational hierarchy.

(a) As a department manager/team lead, you are held in high esteem in your department. You find that you are highly respected; others admire you. You also hold a great amount of influence because others value your opinion.

(b) As a department manager/team lead, you are generally not held in any special regard by others in your department. Although not disrespected, you also do not find that you are highly respected; others would not say that they admire you. You also do not hold a great deal of influence because others do not go out of their way to seek your opinion.
APPENDIX E

MANIPULATION CHECK
In the previous scenario, you were given a hypothetical role within an organization. What was that role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You were also presented with the role of another employee. What was their role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keeping in mind the colleague in the previous scenario, would you consider them higher in rank or lower in rank than you?

1. Higher
2. Lower
APPENDIX F

MOTIVATION FOR POWER BEHAVIOR (LONDON, 1995)
Keeping in mind the action you took with the underperforming employee:
Rate the importance you placed on the following goals for your course of action.

In addressing my employee’s performance issue, my goal was to…
1. ...evaluate this subordinate’s performance.
2. ...direct this subordinate’s future efforts.
3. ...educate the subordinate with procedural knowledge.
4. ...instruct the subordinate in proper performance.
5. ...monitor the development of this subordinate.
6. ...criticize this subordinate for their poor performance.
7. ...push my subordinate to meet performance expectations.
8. ...demonstrate my authority over the subordinate.
9. ...suggest ways of improving their performance.
10. ...encourage this subordinate’s career development.
11. ...persuade the subordinate to improve their performance.
12. ...build trust with this subordinate.
13. ...create a win-win situation for the subordinate and myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>importance</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

SENSE OF POWER SCALE (ANDERSON, JOHN, & KELTNER, 2012)
In rating the items below, please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a leader in this scenario:

2. I can get him/her to listen to what I say.
3. My wishes do not carry much weight. (r)
4. I can get him/her/them to do what I want.
5. Even if I voice them, my views have little sway. (r)
6. I think I have a great deal of power.
7. My ideas and opinions are often ignored. (r)
8. Even when I try, I am not able to get my way. (r)
9. If I want to, I get to make the decisions.
APPENDIX H

GENERAL EVALUATIVE ITEMS (SAUCIER, 1994)
In rating the items below, please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little or not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the extent to which you think each adjective describes the employee in the previous scenario.

1. Self-controlled
2. Mature
3. Reasonable
4. Broad-minded
5. Wise
6. Alert
7. Clear-headed
8. Understanding
9. Optimistic
10. Purposeful
11. Considerate
12. Generous
APPENDIX I

SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL STATUS (CANTRIL, 1965)
For the following prompt, please refer to the image of the ladder, with each rung representing a different selection.

**Status in society (General Social Status)**
Think of this ladder as representing where people stand in society. At the top of the ladder are people who are the best off—those who have the most money, most education and the best jobs.

At the bottom are the people who are worst off—who have the least money, least education and the worst jobs or no job.

The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the bottom. Where would you put yourself on the ladder? Please select the rung corresponding to where you think you stand.

**Status at work (Situational Status)**
Now think of this ladder as representing where people stand in an organization. At the top of the ladder are people who are the most respected—those who are most well-liked, possessing an admirable education and are generally held in high regard by those around them.

At the bottom are the people who are not particularly respected—who are not especially liked, may not possess an admirable education, and are not held in any special regard by those around them.

The higher up you are on this ladder, the closer you are to people at the very top; the lower you are, the closer you are to the bottom. Where would you put yourself on the ladder? Please select the rung corresponding to where you think you stand.
APPENDIX J

BEHAVIORAL ACTIVATION SYSTEM/BEHAVIORAL INHIBITION SYSTEM SCALES
(CARVER & WHITE, 1994)
In rating the items below, please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

**BAS Drive**
1. I go out of my way to get things I want.
2. When I want something, I usually go all-out to get it.
3. If I see a chance to get something I want, I move on it right away.
4. When I go after something I use a “no holds barred” approach.

**BAS Fun Seeking**
5. I’m always willing to try something new if I think it will be fun.
6. I will often do things for no other reason than they might be fun.
7. I often act on the spur of the moment.
8. I crave excitement and new sensations.

**BAS Reward Responsiveness**
9. When I’m doing well at something I love to keep at it.
10. When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized.
11. When I see an opportunity for something I like, I get excited right away.
12. When good things happen to me, it affects me strongly.
13. It would excite me to win a contest.

**BIS**
14. Even if something bad is about to happen to me, I rarely experience fear or nervousness. (r)
15. Criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit.
16. I feel pretty worried or upset when I think or know somebody is angry with me.
17. If I think something unpleasant is going to happen, I usually get pretty “worked up.”
18. I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at something important.
19. I have very few fears compared to my friends. (r)
20. I worry about making mistakes.
APPENDIX K

DEMOGRAPHICS
Please complete the following:

1. Age
2. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other ____ (please specify)
3. Employment status
   a. Unemployed
   b. Employed part-time (1-34 hours/week)
   c. Employed full-time (35+ hours/week)
4. How long have you been employed, in any job?
   a. >5 years
   b. 5-14 years
   c. 15-24 years
   d. 25+ years
5. If currently employed, how often do you interact with colleagues, in either a formal or informal capacity?
   a. Daily
   b. Weekly
   c. Monthly
   d. Rarely
   e. N/A (unemployed)
6. Have you ever held a position of leadership in your employment? (Yes/No)
   a. Do you currently? (Yes/No)
7. How would you describe the position you currently hold?
   a. Entry level
   b. Intermediate or experienced level (work without supervision)
   c. First-level management (first line supervisors)
   d. Middle-level management (manage supervisors)
   e. Senior, executive, or top-level management (oversee mid-level managers)
8. How would you describe the gender distribution of the organization for which you work?
   a. Overwhelmingly male
   b. Mostly male
   c. Evenly split between men and women
   d. Mostly women
   e. Overwhelmingly women
   f. N/A (unemployed)
9. In what industry do you currently work?
   a. Accommodation and Food Services
   b. Administrative and Support Services
   c. Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting
   d. Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation
   e. Construction
   f. Educational Services
   g. Finance and Insurance
   h. Government
   i. Health Care and Social Assistance
   j. Information
   k. Management of Companies and Enterprises
   l. Manufacturing
   m. Mining, Quarrying, and Oil & Gas Extraction
   n. Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
   o. Real Estate, Rental, and Leasing
   p. Retail Trade
   q. Transportation and Warehousing
   r. Utilities
   s. Wholesale Trade
   t. Other ___ (please specify)
   u. N/A (unemployed)

10. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. Hispanic/Latino (Yes/No)
   b. White/Caucasian
   c. Black/African-American
   d. Asian
   e. American Indian or Alaska Native
   f. Middle Eastern or North African
   g. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   h. Biracial
   i. Multiracial
   j. Other ____ (please specify)

11. Please indicate your highest level of education received:
   a. Some high school
   b. High school diploma
   c. Some college
   d. College degree (associate or undergraduate)
   e. Advanced degree (such as M.A., M.S., M.B.A., J.D., Ph.D.)

12. Please indicate your marital status
   a. Divorced
   b. Cohabitating
   c. Married
   d. Separated
   e. Single
   f. Windowed
   g. Prefer not to answer