THE EFFECT OF SUBORDINATE PERSONALITY ON PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR
EFFECTIVENESS: A POLICY CAPTURING APPROACH

Matthew L. First

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan
June, 2014

This thesis is dedicated to my family, whose love and encouragement each and every day motivates me and brings me happiness. And to my Mom, without your support from the beginning, none of this would be possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF SUBORDINATE PERSONALITY ON PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR
EFFECTIVENESS: A POLICY CAPTURING APPROACH

by Matthew L. First

Evaluations of performance within organizations play a critical role in determining a wide-range of personnel decisions and processes (e.g., talent development, pay and rewards). These evaluations are decisions that are affected by both personal and contextual factors. The current study utilized a policy capturing design to investigate the effect of subordinate personality on evaluations of supervisor effectiveness. Multiple regression was used to assess the relationship between employees' personality and their performance ratings of hypothetical supervisor vignettes. Results revealed tentative findings in support of the hypothesis that employees with high-trait elevations would place greater emphasis on trait-expressive behaviors when making overall ratings of supervisor effectiveness. Specifically, those with elevated trait levels of Extraversion and Agreeableness rated supervisors exhibiting supportive behaviors as more effective, conscientious individuals placed greater emphasis on behaviors aimed towards consulting with others as important for effectiveness, and individuals with higher trait elevations of Extraversion and Neuroticism placed more emphasis on inspiring supervisor behaviors when rating effectiveness. The current study provides a preliminary perspective on the concept of personality effects on performance ratings which has both practical applications to organizations and implications for future research investigating situational effects of personality on performance ratings across job types.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCITON

Evaluations are an essential component to developing an effective organizational strategy. Individuals within an organization make evaluations based on their perceptions of such organizational factors as employee attitudes and engagement, the status of the organization, and employee job performance. Formal performance evaluations provide the basis upon which important organizational decisions are frequently made; such as determining promotions, lay-offs and terminations, competencies required for training and development, and the development of structures for fair compensation. These evaluations have a positive impact on organizational functioning through fostering organizational commitment, employee satisfaction, and positive co-worker relationships (Levy & Williams, 1998).

Performance evaluations provide a sentiment of fairness and understanding to employees (Bartol, Durham, & Poon, 2001). However, they have been under intense scrutiny, occasionally found at the center of litigation due to what individuals perceive as inequities and biases influencing these high-stakes decisions (Cascio & Bernardin, 1981; Werner & Bollino, 1997). Research on performance evaluation biases has reached differing conclusions regarding sources and types of bias (e.g. Bowen, Swim, & Jacobs, 2000; Turban & Jones, 1988).

This study will examine the role of raters' personality as a contributing factor in evaluative decision making. From a practical perspective, knowledge about how subordinate personality affects perceptions of effective supervisor behavior can assist leaders in identifying their non-preferential behavior. Supervisors will be able to benefit through synchronizing the behavioral preferences of their subordinates with their own behavior, improving interpersonal relationships and performance.

Research has provided little insight into the mechanism underlying biases in performance evaluation. In their meta-analysis investigating the role of gender bias, Bowen et al. (2000) found little evidence of overall gender bias in performance appraisals. Studies on the effects of behavioral anchors in performance appraisal conclude that the presence of behavioral anchors that closely matched behaviors actually observed by raters biased the recall of ratee behaviors (Murphy & Constans, 1987). Murphy and Constans suggested that the behavioral anchors did not, however, bias the observation or coding of performance ratings.

One common claim for bias is that raters are motivated by preserving their self-interests, thus biasing their evaluations of others and systematically rating individuals higher or lower than their peers. Research from the domain of implicit leadership theory (ILT) suggests an alternative explanation for the perceived bias in evaluations beyond motivations of self-preservation. That is, evaluations of job behavior may be guided by implicit beliefs of what is important for success at work. Implicit leadership theories are cognitively derived prototypes of ideal leaders, and include those traits and behaviors which can be used to classify an individual as a "leader" (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). Implicit knowledge about leadership is influenced by emotions, preferences, the structure of beliefs, and personality traits (Werth, Markel, & Förster, 2006). These individual differences all vary greatly between raters. ILTs may guide evaluations of behavior on the job, and differences in interrater ILTs may result in perceived biases in evaluations.

Research in job analysis has shown that subject matter experts (SMEs) rate the effectiveness of work behaviors indicating personality traits in agreement with their own personality profiles (Cucina, Vasilopoulos, & Sehgal, 2005). A motivational self-serving bias has been viewed as the catalyst of these preferences. For instance, behaviors which an individual

2

regularly engages in are viewed as more important than other behaviors or attributes relevant to the successful performance of a job. The alternative ILT perspective places emphasis on the interplay between personality and cognitive appraisal. ILT posits that personality has a strong impact on what people evaluate as effective or ineffective behavior. Therefore any self-serving, ego-protective motivation may play a much smaller role in the development of such judgments than previously considered.

Purpose of Study

Interrater differences in performance evaluations may be unbiased representations of raters' implicit theories of employee behavior, with these ILTs being influenced strongly by their respective personality traits. The purpose of this study is to provide evidence for the relationship between individuals' personality and their evaluative judgments of effective leadership behavior. Through applying effectiveness weighting to leadership behaviors exemplifying various personality traits, it can be determined to what degree employees' personality relates to their evaluations about effective leadership behavior.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Personality and Behavior

The basis of individual behavior has been the subject of lively debate for several

generations (Stewart & Barrick, 2004). Trait theorists believe that personality is described in

terms of an individual's traits, and that behavior can be explained and predicted in terms of traits

(i.e., an individual's actions can be considered a manifestation of an individual's personality)

(Hogan, 2004). Trait theorists posit that a person's actions may be predicted by their respective

personality traits across situations. To the contrary, behaviorists argue that individuals' behavior

is determined by the situation that a person is in, and not by the characteristics which comprise

that person (Watson, 1930). Behaviorists would agree that motivational forces may drive a

person's behaviors in order to perform effectively in a situation, and that their behavior would be

less likely to be predicted across independent situations.

Individuals' personalities are in part derived from past experiences, and are considered by

most researchers to be stable across situations. Nevertheless, personality traits continue to

develop throughout adulthood (McCrae & Costa, 1999). Research has found cross-cultural

decreases in the traits of neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience; and increases in

agreeableness and conscientiousness throughout adulthood (McCrae, Costa, Lima et al., 1999).

Individuals' actions may best be considered manifestations of their personality driven by

learning from past actions and experiences. This interactionist perspective of the trait and

behavioral approaches may more accurately explain the origin of behavior (Mischel & Shoda,

1995). The interactionist perspective suggests that the behaviors which we engage in, we do so

because we have developed cognitive schemata based on our previous experiences, emotions,

4

and perceptions that outline when particular behaviors are most effective. These schemata are developed and reaffirmed over time with our interactions in various situations. This is similar to the view of researchers in the domain of implicit leadership theory. Reviewing research on ILTs and self-serving motivations will provide insight into the relationship between individuals' personality and their explicit behaviors and evaluations of others' behavior.

Self-Serving Bias

A commonly held explanatory link between individuals' personality and their evaluations of effective behavior is that individuals are motivated to act in an ego-protective manner (Baumeister, 1999). Individuals possess an overwhelming desire to reaffirm their positive self-worth and avoid or alter information that hurts their self-image. This ego-protective behavior is a form of self-serving bias, in which the individual looks to prevent dissonance between the perceptions of effective behavior and his/her own actions by increasing the perceived importance of the individual's actual behavior. Accordingly, individuals place a greater importance on behaviors which they perform regularly because they desire to believe such behavior is beneficial and important.

Job analysis literature has shown that subject matter experts rate the effectiveness of work behaviors exemplifying personality traits in accordance with their own personality profiles (Cucina et al., 2005). Cucina et al. had individuals rate how important behaviors linked to traits from the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality were to effective job performance. The researchers found significant correlations between Agreeableness and behaviors from the Personality Position Requirements Form (PPRF; Raymark, Schmit, & Guion, 1997) scales of Sensitivity to the Interests of Others ($r = .28$) and Cooperative Work Tendency ($r = .33$). They also found significant correlations between Conscientiousness and the PPRF scales of Ambition

($r = .23$) and Thoroughness and Attentiveness to Details ($r = .28$). Cucina et al. (2005) attributed

these strong relationships to a motivational self-serving bias, such that individuals attribute

positive outcomes to themselves while attributing negative outcomes to external causes.

Accordingly, those behaviors which an individual regularly engages in may be viewed as more

important than other behaviors or attributes to the successful performance of a job. This study

demonstrates how effectiveness perceptions may be influenced by personal motivations. The

aforementioned effects of personality traits on beliefs and actions imply that subject matter

experts' personality has strong effects on the cognitive structuring of what they believe is

effective behavior (i.e. implicit leadership theories). Thus, the raters' ILTs may have

overshadowed the role of any self-serving, ego-protective motivation.

<div align="center">Personality and the Cognitive Structuring of Belief Systems</div>

Two postulates of the Five-Factor Theory (FFT) of personality are viewed as common

beliefs among personality psychologists (McCrae & Costa, 1999). First, all adults can be

distinguished by their respective personality traits, and these traits systematically affect an

individuals' pattern of cognitions, emotions, and behavior. Secondly, over time all adults react in

situations based upon their evolving patterns of cognitions, emotions, and behavior which is

consistent with their personality traits; suggesting that personality is a driving force behind a

person's belief system. The FFT implies that personality affects not only what people believe,

but even how they feel and react based upon those beliefs.

Conditional Reasoning

James and colleagues (1998; James, McIntyre, Glisson, Bowler, & Mitchell, 2004)

developed a research methodology to measure the implicit cognitive judgments driven by two

personality traits, namely achievement motivation and aggressiveness. He acknowledged that "in attempts to justify their behaviors, people rely often on reasoning processes whose purpose is to enhance the logical appeal of their behavioral choices" (p. 131). These reasoning processes were termed *conditional reasoning*, because the use of different cognitive justifications was conditional on the disposition of the individual. The underlying belief is that individuals with particular traits (i.e. aggressive, achievement oriented) justify their behavior through implicit biases (i.e. hostile attribution bias) (LeBreton, Barksdale, Robin, & James, 2007). These implicit biases are known as justification mechanisms because they are the basis from which individuals justify their behavior (i.e. working long hours on an assignment). For instance, an individual with a strong motivation to achieve may hold beliefs of "personal responsibility" along with a positive view of achievement striving, such that individuals should move forward with decisions and strategies and be held personally accountable for the success and failures of their decisions (James, 1998). Justification mechanisms have been likened to implicit personality theories (LeBreton et al., 2007) because they assist in the rationalization of behaviors and beliefs based upon the observed patterns of traits and behaviors of individuals similar to oneself.

Implicit Leadership Theory

Implicit theories of personality refer to the perceived patterns of personality traits and behavior that have been observed over time by individuals (Phillips & Lord, 1986). Weiss and Adler (1981) note that past research has found variation in the perceived independence and differentiation of traits within implicit personality theories, such that individuals who perceive a higher degree of covariation between traits have less differentiated structures of implicit personality theories. This research illustrates the variations in complexity of individuals' beliefs (Wegner & Vallacher, 1977) and implies that some characteristics are weighted more heavily

when making evaluations and categorizing others. Implicit theories assist with classifying cognitive categories, and when applied to the domain of leadership can help distinguish between categories of "leaders" and "non-leaders" (Phillips & Lord, 1986). Implicit leadership theories help to categorize individuals based upon observers' perceptions of the most relevant traits and behaviors. ILTs also provide a basis from which expectations of behavior can be translated into evaluative decisions of behavioral ratings (Phillips & Lord, 1986).

The premise that non-behavioral information contributes to the categorization of leaders has been of concern to some researchers because of the implication that extraneous information may systematically bias behavioral ratings on performance questionnaires (Phillips & Lord, 1986). The broader context of work groups also includes interpersonal interactions that play a factor in ratings of performance. Research on perceived supervisor effectiveness found significant relationships between perceived in-group/out-group status of subordinates and perceived supervisor effectiveness in 31 supervisor-subordinate dyads (Dodson, 2006).

Weiss and Adler (1981) were inspired by pioneering research on implicit leadership theories (e.g. Eden & Leviatan, 1975; Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977) that found students' ratings of imaginary leaders using traditional leadership scales resulted in replications of the factor structure of real employees' descriptions of actual leaders. The conclusion drawn from this research was that ILTs questioned the validity of traditional leadership scales, and that traditional leadership scales may tell us more about respondents' leadership constructs than about the actual behavior of leaders in the organization. Weiss and Adler tested the accuracy of this assumption and found implicit leadership theories were unrelated to differences in cognitive complexity and that leadership dimensions showed great stability across subgroups of respondents. These findings concluded that implicit leadership theories, while comprising of cognitive inferences

8

based upon perceptions of individuals, may accurately depict actual leader behavior. This finding assisted in alleviating some concern over the contribution of non-behavioral information to judgments on behavioral effectiveness.

The similarity hypothesis, the idea that individuals hold positive opinions about others resembling themselves, has been likened to the formation of individuals' implicit leadership theories (Keller, 1999). It has also been found to affect the outcomes of performance evaluations (e.g., Ogunfowora, Bourdage, & Lee, 2010; Turban & Jones, 1988). Ogunfowora et al., adapted research on mate/friend selection to the performance evaluation domain. This literature suggests that individuals who illustrate "Openness-like" traits were more likely to describe characteristics of their ideal friend in similar terms of openness. The results of the Ogunfowora et al. (2010) study found that student raters who were higher in the trait of Openness rated hypothetical university professors who illustrated adaptive performance behaviors more positively than students with lower levels of Openness.

Keller (1999) measured college students' personality and their perceived prototypical leadership traits finding strong empirical support for the similarity hypothesis. The personality traits of subordinates' were significantly related to their respective perceived prototypical leadership traits. The results of Keller's study illustrate how an individual's personality affects the cognitive structuring of the traits for an ideal leader. The implication is that as individuals' personality contributes to their ILT; their personality profile also affects how they evaluate others' leadership behaviors.

Recently, Motowidlo, Hooper, and Jackson (2006a) have studied and expanded on the concept of implicit leadership theories in order to generalize to all workplace behavior. They have coined the term *implicit trait policies* (ITP), or the interpersonal differences of how much

value is placed on traits for work behaviors. Motowidlo and Peterson (2008) posit that "people differ in their implicit policies about the importance of various personality traits for effectiveness in a job" (p. 398). The current study aims to test the general idea that individuals have differing personality profiles which cause them to have implicit policies about which traits are important for effective workplace behavior.

Implicit Trait Policies

Implicit Trait Policies are implicit beliefs about the relationship between personality and behavioral effectiveness, specifically how a person values a behavior varying on that behavior's demonstration of a certain trait (Motowidlo, Hooper, & Jackson, 2006b). ITPs are said to evolve from an *accentuation effect* (Tajfel, 1957) where differences in stimuli are accentuated based upon the value attributed to them. This value is affected by judgments on both a focal dimension (e.g., effectiveness ratings) and a peripheral dimension (e.g., personality). Motowidlo et al. (2006b) theorize that such belief systems are cognitive in nature and may reflect the underlying values that give rise to the behavioral consistencies commonly ascribed as traits. The value placed on traits that are clearly expressed in a certain behavior make that behavior much more salient to the individual possessing those traits. In the case of the present study, an individual is more likely to value behaviors that are associated with his or her personality.

The concept of ITPs stemmed from the development of a theory to explain why the results of situational judgment tests were correlated with scores on personality measures (Motowidlo et al., 2006a). Motowidlo et al. (2006b) hypothesized that during situational judgment tasks, situations in which the best response involves behaviors expressing high levels of a trait (e.g., the most appropriate solution to a situation involves a highly agreeable action) would be rated as more important by subjects with elevated trait levels, as opposed to those with

low trait-elevation. Results supported their hypothesis with average correlations of .31 and .37 across two independent samples between agreeableness and extraversion respectively with the associated ITP.

In order to measure ITPs, independent ratings of differing trait levels must be obtained. Motowidlo et al. (2006b) note that ITPs are represented by the difference score calculated between effectiveness ratings of 'high-level' trait responses and 'low-level' trait responses. The current study employs a policy capturing methodology that is ideal for obtaining IPTs because the measured workplace behaviors are manipulated in such a way that an equal number of responses are independently obtained for each trait level implicit in the behavioral cues.

Few researchers dispute the predictive relationship between personality and behavior. Personality has been found to contribute to the development of implicit leadership theories, and because of its strong ties to emotions, behaviors, and beliefs, personality also has influences on decision making processes. This influence may result in the unconscious contribution of non-behavioral information to evaluations of leader performance. Following the understanding of personality's role in the explicit actions and perceptions of individual behavior, the relationship between personality and effective supervisory behaviors are discussed.

<div align="center">Personality and Supervisory Effectiveness</div>

Managerial Practices

Confusion and disagreement occurs when discussing who in an organization is a good leader, versus who is an effective supervisor. Organizational supervisors find themselves in a position of power, and often these managers are viewed as effective when they correctly use their position of power to direct others in order to meet team goals (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). This

differs greatly from leaders who typically have power over others because of their ability to influence and inspire them, regardless of position of authority. However, the act of influencing has often been viewed as a managerial behavior (Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990) and the perceived effectiveness of supervisors by members of their work group is often described in terms of their specific leadership behaviors. Thus, those who are effective supervisors are often viewed as good leaders as well.

Leadership behavior has historically been categorized into three broad dimensions of task-oriented, relations-oriented, and change-oriented behavior (Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002). These categories have allowed for an abundance of behavioral descriptions and unreliable measures of managerial effectiveness to be generated, causing great difficulty in the measurement of managerial effectiveness (Yukl, et al., 1990). The Managerial Practices Survey (MPS; Yukl, 1988) was developed in response to the difficult task of measuring managerial effectiveness (Yukl et al., 1990). The MPS has been thoroughly validated and contains 14 domains of behavior which span all three of the broadly defined leadership behavior categories, making it one of the most effective methods of measuring overall and/or specific areas of supervisor effectiveness. The current study focuses on four scales of the MPS for indicating managerial effectiveness because of the noticeable similarity of behaviors indicative of personality traits; (1) Clarifying Responsibilities, (2) Consulting, (3) Supporting, and (4) Inspiring Commitment. The scales and their items are included in Table 1.

Table 1. *MPS Dimensions of Supervisory Effectiveness*

Managerial Practices Survey Scale Dimensions and Corresponding Items

Clarifying Responsibilities

1. Explains work responsibilities and task assignments
2. Explains what results are expected for a task or assignment
3. Sets performance goals that are clear and specific
4. Explains the rules and standard procedures that must be followed

Consulting

1. Consults with members before making decisions that will affect them
2. Asks for ideas and suggestions when making decisions about the work
3. Encourages members to express any concerns they may have about a decision or plan they will have to implement
4. Modifies a proposal or plan to incorporate member suggestions and deal with their Concerns

Supporting

1. Is considerate and supportive with members of the team or unit
2. Shows concern for the needs and feelings of members
3. Is sympathetic and supportive when a member is worried or upset
4. Provides encouragement and support when there is a difficult and stressful task

Inspiring Commitment

1. Develops enthusiasm for an activity or project by appealing to member pride in accomplishing a difficult objective, being the best, or doing something never done before
2. Describes a proposed change with great enthusiasm and conviction
3. Is confident and optimistic when describing a difficult activity or mission for the unit
4. Describes in an inspiring way what the unit could accomplish or become in the future

Task-oriented behavior consists of those behaviors which increase the efficient use of personnel and the reliability and functionality of team operations and departmental services (Yukl et al., 2002). The Clarifying Responsibilities scale of the MPS lies within this category. Supervisors who score high in clarifying responsibilities thoroughly explain tasks and assignments, as well as the deadlines and expected results of them. They communicate the expectations of each team members' role by explaining the policies and procedures that must be maintained. Clarification of roles and objectives is an instrumental part of the leadership factor Initiating Structure from the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Fleishman, 1953). Clarifying is also descriptive of the behavior defining the Inspirational Motivation dimension of transformational

leadership described by Bass and Avolio (1994). In a study of 291 lower- and mid-level hotel managers Clarifying Responsibilities was found to correlate .68 with Inspirational Motivation (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998).

Relations-oriented leadership behavior provides support and empowerment to group members (Yukl et al., 2002). These behaviors improve group commitment through consultation and the development of group members' skills and abilities. The MPS scales of Supporting and Consulting fall within this domain of leadership behavior. Supervisors rated high in supporting are considerate and sympathetic to group members, providing encouragement and support when team members are faced with difficult tasks. Supporting is a core element of Consideration (Fleishman, 1953) and has been found to correlate .78 with the individualized consideration dimension of transformational leadership (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998).

The focus of the Consulting scale of the MPS is the inclusion of individual contributors during the decision making process. This is similar to participative leadership by including team members' opinions when making decisions that will affect them or the work that they are responsible for (Yukl et al., 2002). Supervisors who use consulting in their work group may benefit from an increased acceptance of their decisions from their team members.

The change-oriented leadership behavior domain includes the subcategories of external monitoring, encouraging innovative thinking, taking personal risks, and envisioning change, which describe various aspects of transformational and charismatic leadership (Yukl et al., 2002). The Inspiring Commitment scale of the MPS contains behavioral descriptions of supervisors who have a vision for their team and great enthusiasm for what their team can accomplish. Inspiring supervisors are optimistic and confident of the possible accomplishments for their work group, and they communicate this with enthusiasm and conviction.

Supervisory effectiveness and good leadership tend to be discussed as distinct domains, but similarities abound between them to the extent that determining differences between them may be unfounded. Research on managerial practices illustrates that supervisory effectiveness is an overt display of good leadership.

Five-Factor Model of Personality and the MPS

In the realm of personality research there exist an abundance of specific traits, each with their own set of measurement instruments. Historically, personality psychologists desired a general taxonomy which could be used to begin categorizing and understanding the many identified personal attributes as broad domains of personality. The emerging taxonomy that appeared to address the concerns of previous researchers was that of the Five-Factor Model (FFM). The FFM is hierarchically structured, and best suits the needs of researchers when developing new theoretical frameworks because of its breadth at the highest level of traits (John & Srivastava, 1999). The purpose of the FFM was not to reduce all personality traits into five domains, but to provide an umbrella under which many personality traits could be classified. The five traits of the FFM are commonly known as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. Four of the five broad dimensions were identified as being descriptive of the behaviors in the aforementioned Managerial Practices Survey dimensions used in the study.

Conscientiousness. Individuals with elevated trait levels of conscientiousness are described as organized, achievement oriented, and concerned with the following of rules and company policies. Behaviors which are consistent with this trait are punctuality, dedication, maintaining an organized workspace, and perfectionism. Two facets of Conscientiousness are regularly measured, achievement striving and dependability. Individuals who strive for

15

achievement are thorough and self-disciplined. Supervisors who score high on the MPS scale of Clarifying Responsibilities thoroughly explain tasks and assignments, as well as their deadlines and the expected results. They communicate the expectations of each team members' role by explaining the policies and procedures that must be maintained. For this reason it is hypothesized:

H1: Conscientiousness will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving Clarifying Responsibilities in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

Conscientious individuals' actions are deliberate and organized and they also believe that formal rules serve a purpose of creating order. Conscientious supervisors may feel the need to consult with their team members in order to gain acceptance of their decisions. Supervisors who consult with their work group can create an organized plan that allows for a sense of control over the work that they are responsible for. For this reason it is expected that individuals with high trait levels of Conscientiousness will perceive behaviors from the domain of Consulting to be effective. The focus of the Consulting scale of the MPS is the inclusion of individual contributors during the decision making process. It is hypothesized:

H2: Conscientiousness will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving Consulting in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

Agreeableness. Agreeableness best describes individuals who are affectionate, have an altruistic nature, and are generally good-natured across situations. This trait lends itself nicely to the Supporting domain of supervisory behavior which requires a high level of sympathy and altruism on the part of the supervisor. Supervisors rated high in supporting are considerate and

16

sympathetic to group members, providing encouragement and support when team members are faced with difficult tasks. It is hypothesized:

H3: Agreeableness will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving

Supporting in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

Individuals with elevated trait levels of Agreeableness are trusting of others, modest, and not demanding; but cooperative, tolerant, and forgiving. For this reason it is expected that individuals high in Agreeableness will perceive behaviors from the domain of Consulting to be effective. The focus of the Consulting scale of the MPS is the inclusion of individual contributors during the decision making process. Supervisors who participate in Consulting behaviors must trust their employee's opinions and be cooperative in order to work with team members on an equal plane.

H4: Agreeableness will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving

Consulting in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

Extraversion. Individuals with high trait levels of Extraversion are characterized as energetic, outgoing, assertive, and those who harbor positive feelings toward others and the world around them. Extraverts are also adventure-seeking individuals who face challenges and risks with optimism. Individuals high in Extraversion, in particularly the lower-level traits of Warmth and Gregariousness, are likely to maintain close relationships at work, showing compassion for those individuals they work with. This behavior is synonymous with the manner in which supervisors rated high in Supporting manage their work group. These individuals are considerate and sympathetic, and provide encouragement and support to team members. It is hypothesized:

17

H5: Extraversion will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving Supporting in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

The tendency for extraverts to be assertive and ambitious, taking on new challenges with optimism and conviction is exemplary of the inspiring supervisory behavior measured by the MPS dimension Inspiring Commitment. This MPS scale contains behavioral descriptions of supervisors who have a vision for their team, and have great enthusiasm for what their team can accomplish. Inspiring supervisors are optimistic and confident of the possible accomplishments for their work group, and communicate this with enthusiasm and conviction. For this reason it is hypothesized:

H6: Extraversion will be positively related to the importance of behaviors involving Inspiring Commitment in the context of evaluations of effective work performance.

Neuroticism.   Individuals labeled "neurotic" often display attributes associated with Neuroticism. A lack of self-confidence and heightened anxiety are key elements to this trait. Individuals with high trait levels of Neuroticism are viewed as angry and hostile, depressed, impulsive, or any combination of the previous attributes. These individuals tend to hold a negative view of the world around them and do not seek out information to prove otherwise. For this reason it is hypothesized:

H7: Neuroticism will be negatively related to the importance of Inspiring Commitment behaviors for supervisory effectiveness.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants for the current study were recruited through two methods. First, undergraduate students from a large mid-western university participated for class extra credit ($n = 190$). Secondly, participants were recruited anonymously via e-mail through StudyResponse ($n = 37$, Stanton & Weiss, 2002), a service that facilitates research by pairing researchers with adult participants who are interested in completing surveys. Across both participant pools, completed measures were initially obtained from 374 participants from multiple organizations, with broad work experience across several organizational functions (e.g., customer service, administration). Seventy eight participants (20.9% of sample) were removed from analyses due to not meeting the minimum requirements for participation (e.g., did not establish previous work experience). Various checkpoints were established to safeguard against non-purposeful responding. For example, online participants were timed to ensure that they participated faithfully. Another 69 participants (18% of sample) were removed from the final sample due to various non-purposeful responding metrics. The final sample size for analyses was 227 participants.

Forty three percent of the sample was male ($n = 98$) and the mean age of participants was 23.56 years ($SD = 9.37$). The sample was 87.2% Caucasian, 6.6% Hispanic, 2.6% Asian, 1.8% Native American, and 1% each African American and more than one race. One criticism of policy capturing designs is that participants have not previously developed the relevant knowledge or judgment schema for which they are asked to make decisions. To alleviate this issue several variables were assessed to ensure that the population had the relevant working

experience that would provide sufficient context for which to base schema about effective

supervisor performance. All participants were employees with a minimum 20 hours per week of

work experience who also had previous experience in a subordinate role. Participants worked an

average 33.89 hours per week ($SD = 10.74$). Fifty three percent of the participants were

currently employed, with a mean job tenure of nearly 2 years ($M = 23.49$ months) and a mean

organizational tenure of two years and nine months. The average duration of time that

participants worked with their immediate supervisor was 20.92 months, with 65.5% responding

that they interacted with their supervisor a minimum of once daily. Forty five percent of

responding participants ($n = 88$) also had previous managerial experience.

Policy Capturing Design

This study utilized a policy capturing methodology to assess the relative importance of

different managerial behaviors in determining judgments of supervisor effectiveness. Policy

capturing is a judgment analysis methodology which allows for decision making processes to be

evaluated indirectly. The method has been used in various domains of organizational research

including person-organization fit (Kristof-Brown, Jansen, & Colbert; 2002), performance

appraisal (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Greguras, Ford, & Brutus, 2002), selection fairness

(Dineen, Noe, & Wang, 2004), compensation decisions (Zhou & Martocchio, 2001), and the

perceived fairness of layoff practices (Hemingway & Conte, 2003). Past research has utilized

and compared the use of both objective and subjective ratings to compute policy weights (e.g.

Cook & Stewart, 1975; Schmitt, 1978).

The typical objective rating methodology requires participants to read a series of

hypothetical profiles consisting of within-subject factors which are manipulated on various

levels. In the current study, profiles of hypothetical supervisors were created using behavioral

cues descriptive of supervisory performance that differed to varying degrees. The orthogonal manipulation of the behavioral cues provides a scientific rigor akin to experimental control (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). By controlling the information presented in the profiles researchers of human judgment can make causal inferences regarding hypothesized relationships by ruling out extraneous confounding variables that may lead to decision making (Aiman-Smith, Scullen, & Barr, 2002). The participants' ratings of the dependent variable are obtained and within-person statistical procedures allow for the capture of a "judgment policy" that illustrates the unique contribution of each behavioral factor to participants' decisions. In the current study, the relationship between raters' personality and their judgments of supervisor effectiveness was assessed by correlating the judgment policies attributed to each behavioral factor with participants' scores on different personality traits.

There exist several methodologies for subjective weighting (see Cook & Stewart, 1975, for a review). The most frequently used method of subjective weighting is to gather participant ratings of each individual dimension, such that the highest rating represents the most important dimension to making judgments relative to the others. In order to scale the ratings the sum of all ratings are forced to equal 100. This study employed both objective and subjective methods of policy capturing. Past research has found nominal differences between objective and subjective weighting techniques (Cook & Stewart, 1975; Schmitt, 1978).

<center>Measures</center>

Supervisor Ratings - Profile Development

The procedure employed for the development of the policy capturing instrumentation in the current study was modified from the methodology previously described by Rotundo and

<center>21</center>

Sackett (2002) for developing profiles for policy capturing. This procedure involves a 3-step process. First, items for each behavioral dimension are developed; secondly, items are piloted and modified to determine content and external validity; lastly, the profiles are constructed from the finalized item pool.

Step 1. Development of Behavioral Cues. The independent variables of interest in this study constitute various domains of supervisor behavior. Behavioral cues for five factors of supervisor behavior were derived from subscales of the Managerial Practices Survey Form TG-10/40; (1) Clarifying Responsibilities, (2) Supporting, (3) Consulting, (4) Inspiring Commitment, and (5) Developing. Thirty years of theoretical research literature from the domains of leadership and managerial effectiveness contributed to the development of the MPS. The MPS has been thoroughly validated and was designed to be as parsimonious as possible without sacrificing generalizeability to a large variety of work contexts (Yukl et al., 1990). The Managerial Practices Survey provides a broad, solid basis for measuring effective supervisory behavior across a range of leadership perspectives (Yukl et al., 2002). The MPS is regularly used in 360-degree feedback sessions (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998), and thus it allows researchers to effectively gauge the perceived effectiveness of supervisors from multiple sources.

The techniques emphasized by best-practice in judgment analysis research focus efforts on increasing the external validity of the research instrumentation (Karren & Barringer, 2002). Following this rationale, behavioral cues were developed such that there were two levels, high and low, of each of the five dimensions of leader behavior (see Appendix A for the final list of behavioral cues). Cues for each dimension were designed to represent moderately low and moderately high exemplars of realistic behavior that participants might encounter in an actual organizational setting.

22

The exclusion of extreme behaviors provides two benefits. First, from a research design perspective the exclusion of extreme behavioral examples allows for all behavioral cues to be combined without replacement or omission. In the current study this method alleviates the concern that behaviors which are incompatible in realistic situations will be combined to describe a single hypothetical supervisor (e.g., Supervisor XXXX always provides support and compassion to his team members without hesitation. This supervisor also neglects to ever provide recognition or appreciation to his team members when they achieve their goals.). This allows for a more cohesive description of realistic supervisor behavior. Secondly, the exclusion of extreme behavioral cues increases external validity, and in turn allows for higher-quality responses from participants as they are able to make better judgments of supervisor effectiveness through analyzing realistic comparisons.

Step 2. Piloting of Behavioral Cues. Research has found that the variation in factor levels may result in a difference of the judgment weighting attributed to factors (Rynes, Schwab, & Heneman, 1983; Highhouse, Luong, & Sarkar-Barney, 1999). The range variation of attributes may bias effectiveness weighting when the extremities of factor levels are not equal across factors. This bias may result from the creation of cues that represent the attribute's observed distribution in real organizational settings. In this case, a desire for increased external validity may result in a reduction of internal-construct validity (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). It is necessary to prevent artifactual study results stemming from deviations in attribute range variation thus factor cues were piloted to obtain measurements of factor cue difference scores such that the range variation is nominal across factors. After the ranges between factor cues have been determined to be similar across factors they can be combined into research stimulus materials.

23

For the current study, behavioral attribute cues were piloted with a sample representative of the intended study sample (i.e. working undergraduate students) in order to assess the variation of cue levels across factors. The pilot included 118 undergraduate students recruited from psychology classes. Participants were provided a measure of the eight generic behavioral cues (4 x 2; dimension by strength). The cues were developed to exclude names, job titles, and occupational industry information so as to direct the focus of ratings toward the behavioral information within each cue. Participants were informed that the list of behaviors were descriptions of supervisory behaviors that are common across work situations. Next they were instructed to read each set of the behaviors and rate how desirable each set of behaviors would be in a work setting on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at All Desirable*; 7 = *Extremely Desirable*).

The pilot study consisted of three iterations of gathering data and correctly scaling the behavioral cues to minimize the mean difference variability between cue levels across behavioral dimensions. Adjustments to the behavioral cues generally consisted of rewriting the language to consist of adjectives that did not describe extremes, and choosing behaviors that would not generate a consistently excessive reaction from the respondents that would be unrelated to their implicit beliefs about effective supervisory behavior. These adjustments had to strike a balance with the technique of developing cues indicative of realistic job behavior. The final behavioral cues can be found in Table 2. The pilot resulted in behavioral cues selected for inclusion with a mean difference *SD* of 1.48 with a range from 1.42 to 1.59. The pilot results of the mean difference and standard deviation scores for each dimension can be found in Table 3.

Table 2. *Final Policy Capturing Behavioral Cues from MPS Dimensions*

Final Behavioral Dimensions and their Corresponding Cues	
Clarifying Responsibilities	
High	When handing out tasks the supervisor makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.
Low	Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling the supervisor's work assignments because of his brief descriptions of what is expected. He expresses the effort he desires, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.
Supporting	
High	The supervisor is considerate and supportive with all members of her team. She always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work she will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.
Low	In the workplace, the supervisor is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.
Consulting	
High	The supervisor consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings the supervisor embraces ideas from others. He welcomes feedback and suggestions from employees.
Low	When it comes to business decisions the supervisor occasionally acts without getting input from others. He will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.
Inspiring Commitment	
High	The supervisor has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.
Low	When facing new team projects the supervisor concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistic Results for Supervisor Performance Dimensions from Pilot Study*

Performance Dimension	M	SD	Range
Clarifying Responsibilities	4.10	1.42	6
Consulting	4.33	1.59	6
Supporting	4.08	1.43	5
Inspiring Commitment	3.19	1.50	6

Note. $N = 48$; possible range scores were 0 - 6.

Step 3. Development of Supervisor Profiles. The final step was to construct the hypothetical supervisor profiles. Similar to the pilot study, occupational industry information was removed and only generic job titles were provided as descriptors of the supervisors' positions. The goal of this was twofold. First, this would direct the focus of respondents' ratings towards the behavioral information within each cue to increase the validity of the effectiveness ratings and decrease the opportunity for interference from study artifacts. Secondly, the use of generic job titles and no occupational-specific information allows for respondents across occupation types to provide ratings based on their general implicit beliefs of what constitutes effective supervisor behavior without qualifying the context within which the behavior occurred; benefiting the generalizeability of the study results.

In building the profiles a single behavioral cue (i.e., moderately high or moderately low) representative of each of the four supervisor behavior domains were grouped together. Completely crossing the factor cues (e.g., $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$) resulted in 16 unique profiles of hypothetical supervisors which were orthogonal in nature. This is a feature of the current study that is uncommon in most policy capturing studies due to the incompatible nature common to differing behavior cue levels. No two profiles appeared twice in the study materials with the exception of two profiles which were repeated at the end of the study to assess rater reliability.

An example profile is provided in Table 4. The complete set of policy capturing stimulus

materials included 16 different profiles, and can be found in Appendix B.

Table 4. *Example Supervisor Profile and Corresponding MPS Dimension Behavioral Cues*

Example Supervisor Profile and Corresponding MPS Dimension Behavioral Cues

Supervisor: *Dana*
Division: *Management*
Observations:

➢ When handing out tasks Dana makes some effort to explain what it is that she expects from her employees. For each assignment she expresses the desired performance that is expected.

➢ In the workplace, Dana is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

➢ Dana consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Dana welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

➢ When facing new team projects Dana concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

Dimension	Dimension Strength	Behavioral Cue
Clarifying Responsibilities	High	When handing out tasks the supervisor makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.
Supporting	Low	In the workplace, the supervisor is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.
Consulting	High	The supervisor consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings the supervisor embraces ideas from others. He welcomes feedback and suggestions from employees.
Inspiring Commitment	Low	When facing new team projects the supervisor concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

Broad Factor Personality

The FFM traits of, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism were measured. Each scale was comprised of 20 items from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). Each IPIP measure has shown acceptable internal consistency in past studies; α = .93, .88, .92, .88, respectively (http://ipip.ori.org/, 2008). In the current study, each of the personality measures achieved reliabilities greater than .84 (*Extraversion*, α = .93; *Agreeableness*, α = .85; *Conscientiousness*, α = .90; *Neuroticism* α = .91; see Table 5 for reliabilities and correlations). Participants rated each item by agreement of how much each item describes themselves on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 5 = *Strongly Agree*). The IPIP domain personality scales were developed conjointly by researchers around the world and display good convergent validity with their respective scales of the NEO-PI-R (reliability range from .85 to .91).

Objective Supervisory Effectiveness

Objective effectiveness was assessed by participants' weights of supervisory effectiveness attributed to hypothetical profiles of supervisors. Each profile described a hypothetical supervisor and their behavior at work as described by one of their subordinates. Participants rated how effective they perceived each supervisor to be on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Not at All Effective*, 7 = *Very Effective*).

Subjective Supervisory Effectiveness

Subjective supervisory effectiveness was measured through a procedure described by Schmitt (1978). Participants were provided definitions of each supervisory behavioral performance dimension and asked to rate each supervisory dimension individually in comparison

to the other cues made available to them. The behavioral dimension given the highest rating represented the most important dimension to supervisor effectiveness relative to the others, and the sum of all ratings were scaled when forced to equal 100 points.

Procedure and Analysis

Participants were first presented with the FFM personality measure. The hypotheses were tested using a policy capturing methodology. Sixteen hypothetical supervisor profiles were created with varying combinations of the supervisory behavior dimensions. A sample of employed students were provided a packet containing all 16 of the supervisor profiles, with the additional 2 duplicate profiles. Participants were asked to read each profile and evaluate the supervisor in each profile on their overall effectiveness. Participants were informed that each supervisor profile was a summarized description taken from a first-hand account of one of the supervisor's direct reports. Participants were informed that the summary does not contain all possible information about each supervisor, but that their decisions about each supervisor's performance must be based on the information provided. The purpose of this was to direct participants' attention towards the specific behaviors of the profiles and away from non-purposeful responding or other study artifacts. The decision-making policy weight of each dimension in regards to the overall effectiveness rating was estimated for each rater. Subjective ratings were also collected at this time. Multiple regression was used to investigate the relationship between the dimension weights and each raters' personality.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Two of the stimulus profiles were repeated at the end of the participant research materials to assess the reliability of responses for the policy capturing methodology. The ratings of supervisor performance for each repeat profile were used to compute the reliability across raters. The reliability indices for each set of repeated profiles was sufficient for establishing reliability of the policy capturing measure (set one, $r = .72$; set two, $r = .75$).

Descriptive statistics for the objective and subjective weights were reviewed to assess the relative importance and variability of each behavioral dimension to ratings of supervisor effectiveness (see Table 5). Two observations of the mean weights are noteworthy. The range of weights were more variable across dimensions for the objective weights (derived from the policy capturing design) than for the subjective ratings of each dimension. For the objective method, weights ranged from .30 for Clarifying Responsibilities to .49 for Consulting. For the subjective method three of the weights had nominal differences (M range $= .19 - .23$) with the only outlier being Clarifying Responsibilities ($M = .35$), which had a wider range than the others. The similarities of the policy weights suggest that when participants were asked to review the dimensions they believed each should be given similar emphasis towards their ratings of effective supervisor behavior.

The behavior describing the domain of Clarifying Responsibilities was generally weighted as a more important factor in the decision of rating supervisor effectiveness across participants for the subjective method. Policy capturing weights from the objective method were contradictory, determining that comparatively this dimension of behavior was not deemed as important a factor when rating supervisory effectiveness.

30

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations between Personality Traits and Performance Factor Dimensions*

	M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. CON	77.38	10.98	-					
2. AGR	74.29	9.83	.31***	-				
3. EXT	75.02	13.51	.17**	.26***	-			
4. NEU	49.61	13.36	-.38***	-.44***	-.34***	-		
5. Obj – CLAR	.30	.21	-.01	.06	-.05	-.11	-	
6. Obj – CONS	.49	.17	.03	.10	-.05	-.07	-.09	-
7. Obj – SUPP	.40	.20	.00	.09	.14*	.03	-.04	-.10
8. Obj – INSP	.39	.20	.01	.05	.20**	-.02	-.13	-.23***
9. Sub – CLAR	.35	.11	.02	.06	-.01	-.03	.13	.05
10. Sub – CONS	.23	.07	.16**	-.01	-.09	-.06	.00	.15*
11. Sub – SUPP	.19	.09	-.12	-.04	-.01	.18**	-.13	-.16*
12. Sub – INSP	.22	.08	-.04	-.02	.11	-.12	-.03	-.01

Note. $N = 227$; CON = Conscientiousness, AGR = Agreeableness, EXT = Extraversion, NEU = Neuroticism, Obj = Objective policy capturing method, Sub = Subjective policy capturing method, CLAR = Clarifying Responsibilities,, CONS = Consulting, SUPP = Supporting, INSP = Inspiring commitment; *p* < .05, **p* < .01, ***p* < .001.

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations between Personality Traits and Performance Factor Dimensions (continued)*

	M	*SD*	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. CON	77.38	10.98						
2. AGR	74.29	9.83						
3. EXT	75.02	13.51						
4. NEU	49.61	13.36						
5. Obj – CLAR	.30	.21						
6. Obj – CONS	.49	.17						
7. Obj – SUPP	.40	.20	-					
8. Obj – INSP	.39	.20	-.04	-				
9. Sub – CLAR	.35	.11	-.01	-.02	-			
10. Sub – CONS	.23	.07	-.07	-.03	-.35***	-		
11. Sub – SUPP	.19	.09	.13	.00	-.57***	-.20**	-	
12. Sub – INSP	.22	.08	-.08	.05	-.40***	-.18**	-.23***	-

Note. $N = 227$; CON = Conscientiousness, AGR = Agreeableness, EXT = Extraversion, NEU = Neuroticism, Obj = Objective policy capturing method, Sub = Subjective policy capturing method, CLAR = Clarifying Responsibilities,, CONS = Consulting, SUPP = Supporting, INSP = Inspiring commitment; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

The standard deviations of the behavioral dimensions remained in close proximity to the other values across the dimensions, ranging from .17 to .20 for the policy capturing weights and .07 to .11 for the subjective weights. These similarities across dimensions attenuate unintended influence of the stimulus material design on the study results (e.g., more weight being attributed to one behavioral dimension over the other). The higher variability of weights in the policy capturing design over the subjective method is consistent with the measurement methodology. That is, that the subjective method is a more direct measurement of the policy weights of each dimension compared to the policy capturing design utilizing the supervisor profiles. The subjective method allows for greater transparency when making comparisons of the behavioral domains for evaluating supervisory effectiveness.

The next step of analyses was to compute four regression equations, regressing the dimension weight for each participant onto their scores on the four personality traits. This procedure was performed for each policy capturing method (see Table 6 for summarized regression results, see Appendix B for full results). For the objective weights, four of the seven hypothesized relationships were in the predicted direction. Conscientiousness scores were found to be nominally related to policy weights for Clarifying Responsibilities [$\beta = -.06$, $t(221) = -.78$, *ns*], albeit in the opposite direction than was hypothesized, and unrelated to Consulting [$\beta=.00$, $t(221) = -.05$, *ns*] behaviors' importance for supervisor effectiveness. Agreeableness scores were moderately related in the predicted direction to both Consulting [$\beta=.09$, $t(221) = 1.21$, *ns*] and Supporting [$\beta=.11$, $t(221) = 1.41$, *ns*] policy weights. Extraversion scores were significantly and positively related to both Supporting [$\beta=.17$ $t(221) = 2.26$, $p < .05$] and Inspiring Commitment [$\beta=.17$, $t(221) = 3.00$, $p < .01$] behaviors' importance for supervisor effectiveness. Finally, Neuroticism scores were nominally related to Inspiring Commitment [$\beta=.05$, $t(221) =.63$, *ns*]

policy weights in the direction opposite than expected. The results from the objective policy methodology provides strong support for hypotheses 5 and 6 and partial support for hypotheses 3 and 4.

Table 6. *Summarized Results of Hypothesized Analyses of Objective and Subjective Weights onto Personality Traits*

Performance Dimension	Descriptive Statistics		Regression of Performance Dimension Weights onto Personality Traits			
	M	*SD*	CON β	AGR β	EXT β	NEU β
Objective Weights						
Clarifying Responsibilities	.30	.21	-.06			
Consulting	.49	.17	.00	.09†		
Supporting	.40	.20		.11†	.16*†	
Inspiring Commitment	.39	.20			.21**†	.05
Subjective Weights						
Clarifying Responsibilities	.35	.11	.00			
Consulting	.23	.07	.17**†	-.07		
Supporting	.19	.09		.05†	.06†	
Inspiring Commitment	.22	.08			.09†	-.15*†

Note. $N = 227$; CON = Conscientiousness, AGR = Agreeableness, EXT = Extraversion, NEU = Neuroticism; * $p < .05$,** $p < .01$; † result is in hypothesized direction.

For the subjective weights, five of the seven hypothesized relationships were in the predicted direction. Conscientiousness scores were found to be unrelated to policy weights for Clarifying Responsibilities [$\beta = .00$, $t(221) = .05$, *ns*], , and significantly related to Consulting [$\beta=.17$, $t(221) = 2.38$, $p < .01$] behaviors' importance for supervisor effectiveness. Agreeableness scores were nominally related to Consulting [$\beta=-.07$, $t(221) = -.87$, *ns*] in the direction opposite to what was expected, and positively related to Supporting [$\beta=.05$, $t(221) = .69$, *ns*] policy weights. Extraversion scores were positively related to both Supporting [$\beta=.06$, $t(221) = .82$, *ns*] and Inspiring Commitment [$\beta=.09$, $t(221) = 1.27$, *ns*] behaviors' importance for supervisor effectiveness. Finally, Neuroticism scores were significantly related to Inspiring Commitment

[β=-.15, $t(221)$=-1.95, *ns*] policy weights in the hypothesized direction. The subjective

methodology provided strong support for both hypotheses 2 and 7, while providing partial

support for hypotheses 3, 4, and 5.

Past research has found gender differences in self-report personality traits (e.g., Feingold,

1994). To determine the impact of gender differences in the current study, a series of post hoc

analyses investigating gender differences in personality and effects on policy weights for

performance were performed. A series of independent samples t-tests found significant

differences between men and women on three of the four self-reported personality scales (see

Table 7 for results). Women reported higher scores than men for conscientiousness, $t(225) = -$

2.07, $p < .05$; agreeableness, $t(225) = -3.04$, $p < .05$; and neuroticism, $t(225) = -2.07$, $p < .05$; but

not extraversion, $t(225) = -.12$, *ns*.

Table 7. *Descriptive Statistics and Gender Difference Analysis Results for Personality*

Personality Trait	Male (*n = 98*)		Female (*n = 129*)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Conscientiousness	75.66	10.32	78.69	11.32	-2.07*
Agreeableness	72.05	9.94	75.99	9.44	-3.04*
Extraversion	74.89	12.52	75.11	14.26	-.12
Neuroticism	47.50	12.51	51.21	13.80	-2.09*

Note. $N = 227$; *$p < .05$

Further analyses were performed to determine if the observed gender differences across

personality traits translated into gender difference effects on performance policy weights. A

series of independent samples t-tests found no significant differences between men and women

on ratings across the four performance dimensions, in either the objective or subjective policy

capturing methods (see Table 8 for results). Furthermore, consistent with the performance rating

regression analyses, differentiated results were found across the two methodologies. These

results do not support any observed gender differences in the ratings of performance dimensions.

Table 8. *Descriptive Statistics and Gender Difference Analysis Results for Performance Ratings*

Performance Dimension	Male (*n* = 98)		Female (*n* = 129)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Objective Weights					
Clarifying Responsibilities	.30	.22	.31	.21	-.21
Consulting	.47	.19	.51	.16	-1.92
Supporting	.37	.21	.43	.20	-1.93
Inspiring Commitment	.39	.20	.39	.20	-.12
Subjective Weights					
Clarifying Responsibilities	.34	.10	.36	.11	-1.69
Consulting	.23	.07	.23	.07	.14
Supporting	.20	.09	.19	.09	.72
Inspiring Commitment	.23	.08	.22	.08	1.37

Note. $N = 227$

Implicit Leadership Theory posits that individuals' experiences and observations of

behavior influence their ILT (Phillips & Lord, 1986). Individuals with previous work experience

in a supervisory role gain the perspective of specific behaviors that are effective in a managerial

position within organizations. Post hoc analyses were conducted to determine if direct supervisor

experience resulted in differences in implicit trait policy scores for supervisory effectiveness

when compared to individuals without experience in this role. A series of independent samples t-

tests found only one significant difference between individuals with previous managerial

experience and those without on ratings across the four performance dimensions (see Table 9 for

results). The current study found that individuals who had not previously held a managerial role

rated Supporting behaviors as more important for supervisory effectiveness than did individuals

with managerial experience; $t(193) = -2.66$, $p < .01$. This result was only found in the objective

policy capturing measure.

Further analyses were conducted to determine if this finding was a translation of differences in personality between these two groups on Agreeableness or Extraversion per the rationale of hypotheses 4 and 5 from the core study. Independent samples t-tests found no significant differences between individuals with previous managerial experience and those without self-reported personality scales (see Table 10 for results). These results do not support any further link between personality and performance ratings.

Table 9. *Descriptive Statistics and Group Difference Analysis Results for Performance Ratings: Previous Work Experience*

Performance Dimension	Previous Supervisors (*n = 88*)		Non-Supervisors (*n = 108*)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Objective Weights					
Clarifying Responsibilities	.31	.22	.31	.21	-.15
Consulting	.48	.19	.49	.16	-.17
Supporting	.35	.23	.43	.19	-2.66*
Inspiring Commitment	.38	.23	.41	.18	-1.07
Subjective Weights					
Clarifying Responsibilities	.35	.10	.36	.11	-.38
Consulting	.24	.07	.22	.07	1.52
Supporting	.18	.09	.19	.10	-.87
Inspiring Commitment	.23	.08	.23	.08	.26

Note. $N = 196$; *$p < .01$

Table 10. *Descriptive Statistics and Group Difference Analysis Results for Personality: Previous Work Experience*

Personality Trait	Previous Supervisors (*n = 88*)		Non-Supervisors (*n = 108*)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Conscientiousness	78.18	11.92	76.76	10.26	.90
Agreeableness	73.54	9.99	74.77	9.99	-.86
Extraversion	74.57	13.09	75.39	14.01	-.42
Neuroticism	47.57	13.23	50.48	13.65	-1.50

Note. $N = 196$

The combined regression results of the two policy capturing methods provide adequate support for the relationship between employee personality and their ratings of supervisor effectiveness. Strong correlations were found for 4 of the 7 hypothesized relationships with partial support being demonstrated for 2 other hypotheses. Post-hoc analyses found gender differences in ratings of personality, however no significant differences were found in ratings of performance. A discussion of the study results, its limitations, and the implication for future research of personality and judgments of performance follow.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Based on previous work on implicit trait policies, the present study further explored the theory that personality influences perceptions of behavior within organizations. Specifically, it was posited that subordinates' judgment policies for rating hypothetical supervisors' effectiveness would be related to their own personality traits. The current study established results adequate in supporting this research question, determining that subordinate personality was related to the importance given to trait-expressive work behaviors during the performance appraisal process.

Of the seven predicted relationships between domains of supervisor work behavior and subordinate personality traits, six found some support across two policy capturing designs. Strong support was found for behaviors involving Inspiring Commitment. These were negatively and significantly related to Neuroticism and positively, but not significantly, to Extraversion. Consistent support was found for the positive relationship between ratings of Supporting behaviors and both traits of Agreeableness and Extraversion. Strong support was also found for the relationship between Conscientiousness and Consulting behaviors in one of the study designs. To an extent, those with a higher trait-elevation of Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness used cues describing trait-expressive behavior to a greater degree when rating the overall effectiveness of target supervisors.

This study provides support to a growing body of literature that recognizes the idiosyncrasies differentiating raters' perceptions in the performance appraisal process. The observed differences in performance ratings between raters can be partially explained by the raters' implicit trait policies that are a manifestation of their implicit leadership theories. A strength of the current study was the elimination of many of the extraneous factors that are

39

threats to external validity. This feature generates positive benefits including the raters' focused attention towards the behavioral cues to drive their effectiveness ratings. By controlling for contextual information, the current study illustrates clearly how rater personality influences implicit beliefs of how effective supervisors behave through their explicit ratings of perceived effectiveness. This finding has practical implications for organizational practitioners that can be applied to performance appraisal processes.

The study results illustrate the need for organizations to remain attentive to overall, or broad, performance ratings and the context in which they are used. Unintentional biases in ratings due to personality-based influences may lead to erroneous conclusions regarding performance. This is particularly important in cases where performance ratings are used to provide performance-based awards or other uses other than developmental purposes. Organizations can help minimize this concern through providing training that sets clear performance-based expectations, and also through requiring varying types of information from raters regarding traits, behaviors, and competencies that supplement an overall rating of performance. Compiling these data across a supervisor's team can assist with pin-pointing strengths and areas for improvement relative to the entire team.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

The pattern of the results across policy weighting formats provides some clarification to the general concept of personality's affects on perceptions of behavioral effectiveness. However, the observed relationship between personality traits and judgments of effectiveness attributed to trait-expressive behaviors was only partially supported in the present study; with effects in the hypothesized direction, but not of considerable magnitude. Past research has found mixed results supporting a 'similar-to-me' effect (Strauss, Barrick, & Connerley, 2001). The belief is that

perceived similarities between raters and their target subjects may inflate ratings in performance. Much of the research regarding this phenomenon are field studies with 'live' subjects. The possibility exists that the use of 'paper people' in this study may have decreased the strength of any perceived similarities between raters and the hypothetical supervisors, thus leading to the reduced effect sizes. Of course, in the policy capturing design the raters have little choice but to give the presented cues weight in their decisions since they are the only information they have available to provide judgments upon.

Future Research

Research is needed to answer why some traits seem to bias evaluations of trait-expressive behaviors whereas others do not. One possibility is that the Conscientiousness hypothesis is supported because the trait is more value-laden than other traits, directly arising from a belief system related to work ethic. Conscientiousness has been found to be a stable predictor of performance across criteria and occupations (Barrick & Mount, 1991). This may be due to the proclivity of conscientious individuals to prioritize tasks and be goal-oriented in nature. Similarly, Extraversion may involve a value system where sociable and charismatic individuals are considered inherently superior to quiet individuals. In these cases, personality is related to belief systems to a greater extent than might be the case for other traits. Future research on implicit trait policies is needed to understand how personality, values, and beliefs about behavioral effectiveness are related.

The current policy capturing study addresses the general interaction between personality traits and perceptions of performance through the investigation of five higher-order traits in a benign, hypothetical context. This is in contrast to the use of performance ratings in an organizational context that are high-stakes decisions with an impact on a range of personal, team,

41

and organizational issues. Future research is needed that replicates the impact of personality on perceptions of performance within a context that exhibits a closer approximation to a real performance rating situation. Further, research is also needed that will extend this line of study across job types to address issues of situational specificity. The situational-specificity hypothesis states addresses differences in the predictive validity of personality traits across job types (Tett & Burnett, 2003). Employees performing roles requiring frequent trait-expressive behaviors to be effective may act as moderators interacting between employee personality and perceptions of effective behavior. For example, employees with higher trait-elevations of Agreeableness may place greater weight on the effectiveness of Supporting behaviors when working in a customer service role versus on an assembly line in a manufacturing plant.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOR RATING INSTRUMENT FOR RESEARCH PILOT

Listed below are descriptions of <u>supervisory behaviors</u> that are common in work situations. These behaviors determine how well a <u>supervisor</u> performs at their job. Please read each set of behaviors and rate how desirable each set of behaviors would be in a work setting.

	Not at All Desirable		Somewhat Desirable			Extremely Desirable	
When handing out tasks, the supervisor makes considerable effort to thoroughly explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he clearly expresses the desired performance that is expected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
In the workplace, the supervisor is considerate to those she is close with. When a problem is brought to her attention, the supervisor shows concern and is typically supportive. However, it's usually only for those employees she knows well, and only when they seem genuinely upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisor has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence in her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling the supervisor's work assignments because of his vague descriptions of what is expected. He attempts to express the effort of performance he desires, but typically doesn't clarify the tasks clearly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisor always looks for opportunities to better his subordinates. He encourages membership in training programs and acts as a coach for employee development. When his employees commit mistakes, he views it as an opportunity for improvement rather than a personal failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When it comes to making business decisions, the supervisor acts on her own accord. She also makes decisions on issues that affect her coworkers without consulting them, while discouraging their suggestions and concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisor is considerate and supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

with all members of her team. She always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home, or is upset about work, she will sit down with a sympathetic ear.							
When facing new team projects, the supervisor describes the difficulty of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisor discusses issues with coworkers before making decisions that concern them. At weekly meetings he embraces ideas from others, and welcomes feedback and suggestions on any topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisor doesn't take an active role in employee development. She informs coworkers of opportunities to attend training programs when she is asked, but seldom pushes them to pursue these occasions. Still, she attempts to correct subordinate mistakes when it is needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

COMPLETE REGRESSION RESULTS FROM HYPOTHESES TESTING

Full Results of Regression Analyses of Objective and Subjective Weights onto Personality Traits

Performance Dimension	Descriptive Statistics		Regression of Performance Dimension Weights onto Personality Traits			
	M	*SD*	CON β	AGR β	EXT β	NEU β
Objective Weights						
Clarifying Responsibilities	.30	.21	-.06	.04	-.10	-.14*
Consulting	.49	.17	.00	.09	-.09	-.06
Supporting	.40	.20	-.02	.11	.16*	.12
Inspiring Commitment	.39	.20	-.02	.02	.21**	.05
Subjective Weights						
Clarifying Responsibilities	.35	.11	.00	.06	-.03	-.02
Consulting	.23	.07	.17**	-.07	-.13*	-.07
Supporting	.19	.09	-.07	.05	.06	.20**
Inspiring Commitment	.22	.08	-.09	-.08	.09	-.15*

Note. $N = 227$; CON = Conscientiousness, AGR = Agreeableness, EXT = Extraversion, NEU = Neuroticism; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

HYPOTHETICAL SUPERVISOR PROFILES FOR OBJECTIVE POLICY CAPTURING

1.

Supervisor: Danielle

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Danielle's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- Danielle's is considerate and supportive with all members of her team. She always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work she will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- When it comes to business decisions Danielle's occasionally acts without getting input from others. She will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- Danielle's has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

2.

Supervisor: John

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling John's work assignments because of his brief descriptions of what is expected. He expresses the effort he desires to his employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- John is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- When it comes to business decisions John occasionally acts without getting input from others. He will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- When facing new team projects John concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>
1   2   3   4   5

3.

Supervisor: Steven

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Steven makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- In the workplace, Steven is considerate to those that he is close with. If an employee that he does not have a special relationship with comes to him with a problem, he will listen to their concerns. However, he may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- Steven consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings Steven embraces ideas from others. He welcomes feedback and suggestions from employees.

- Steven has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from his employees. If a difficult task is presented, he raises his workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

4.

Supervisor: Mary

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Mary's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- Mary is considerate and supportive with all members of her team. She always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work she will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- Mary consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Mary welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

- Mary has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?

<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>

     1   2   3   4   5

5.

Supervisor: Caleb

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- When handing out tasks Caleb makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- Caleb is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- Caleb consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings he embraces ideas from others. Caleb welcomes feedback and suggestions from his employees.

- When facing new team projects Caleb concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team. Caleb looks for opportunities to better his subordinates.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>

   1   2   3   4   5

6.

Supervisor: Lisa

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Lisa's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- In the workplace, Lisa is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- When it comes to business decisions Lisa occasionally acts without getting input from others. She will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- When facing new team projects Lisa concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

7.

Supervisor: Derek

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Derek's work assignments because of his brief descriptions of what is expected. He expresses the effort he desires to his employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- Derek is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- Derek consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings he embraces ideas from others. Derek welcomes feedback and suggestions from his employees.

- When facing new team projects Derek concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

8.

Supervisor: William

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- When handing out tasks William makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- William is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- William consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings he embraces ideas from others. William welcomes feedback and suggestions from his employees.

- William has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from his employees. If a difficult task is presented, he raises his workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>
1   2   3   4   5

9.

Supervisor: Dana

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Dana makes some effort to explain what it is that she expects from her employees. For each assignment she expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- In the workplace, Dana is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- Dana consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Dana welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

- When facing new team projects Dana concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?
Poor   Adequate   Excellent
         1   2   3   4   5

10.

Supervisor: Marcus

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Marcus makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- Marcus is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- When it comes to business decisions Marcus occasionally acts without getting input from others. He will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- When facing new team projects Marcus concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

11.

Supervisor: Linda

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Linda makes some effort to explain what it is that she expects from her employees. For each assignment she expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- In the workplace, Linda is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- When it comes to business decisions Linda occasionally acts without getting input from others. She will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- Linda has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?

Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

12.

Supervisor: Angela

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Angela's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- In the workplace, Angela is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- Angela consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Angela welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

- When facing new team projects Angela concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>
1   2   3   4   5

13.

Supervisor: Seth

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Seth makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- In the workplace, Seth is considerate to those that he is close with. If an employee that he does not have a special relationship with comes to him with a problem, he will listen to their concerns. However, he may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- When it comes to business decisions Seth occasionally acts without getting input from others. He will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- When facing new team projects Seth concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. He explains his desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?
Poor   Adequate   Excellent
            1   2   3   4   5

14.

Supervisor: Sandra

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Sandra's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- In the workplace, Sandra is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- Sandra consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Sandra welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

- Sandra has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?

<u>Poor</u>		<u>Adequate</u>		<u>Excellent</u>
1	2	3	4	5

15.

Supervisor: Rachel

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Rachel's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- In the workplace, Rachel is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- When it comes to business decisions Rachel occasionally acts without getting input from others. She will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- Rachel has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from her employees. If a difficult task is presented, she raises her workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>

1   2   3   4   5

16.

Supervisor: Paul

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Paul makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- Paul is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- When it comes to business decisions Paul occasionally acts without getting input from others. He will decide on issues that affect the organization without consulting others, at times not taking into account their suggestions and concerns.

- Paul has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from his employees. If a difficult task is presented, he raises his workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?
Poor		Adequate		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

17.

Supervisor: Nathan

Division: Management

_____

Observations:

- When handing out tasks Nathan makes some effort to explain what it is that he expects from his employees. For each assignment he expresses the desired performance that is expected.

- Nathan is considerate and supportive with all members of his team. He always finds time to show concern when any co-worker is troubled. If someone is having problems at home or is upset about work he will make time to sit down with a sympathetic ear.

- Nathan consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings he embraces ideas from others. Nathan welcomes feedback and suggestions from his employees.

- Nathan has been described as an enthusiastic leader and inspires confidence from his employees. If a difficult task is presented, he raises his workers' expectations and makes them believe that they can accomplish the goal.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed his job?
Poor   Adequate   Excellent
    1   2   3   4   5

18.

Supervisor: Samantha

Division: Management

_____

<u>Observations:</u>

- Subordinates often have difficulty fulfilling Samantha's work assignments because of her brief descriptions of what is expected. She expresses the effort she desires to her employees, but doesn't always clarify the tasks clearly.

- In the workplace, Samantha is considerate to those that she is close with. If an employee that she does not have a special relationship with comes to her with a problem, she will listen to their concerns. However, she may not make an extra effort to resolve their issue.

- Samantha consults with members before making decisions that will affect them. At weekly meetings she embraces ideas from others. Samantha welcomes feedback and suggestions from her employees.

- When facing new team projects Samantha concentrates on the difficulties of completing them. She explains her desires, but doesn't typically work alongside the members of the team.

_____

Overall, how well do you believe this manager has performed her job?
<u>Poor</u>   <u>Adequate</u>   <u>Excellent</u>
1   2   3   4   5

REFERENCES

Aiman-Smith, L., Scullen, S. E., & Barr, S. H. (2002). Conducting studies of decision making in organizational contexts: A tutorial for policy-capturing and other regression-based techniques. *Organizational Research Methods, 5*(4), 388-414.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.

Bartol, K. M., Durham, C. C., & Poon, J. M. L. (2001). Influence of performance evaluation rating segmentation on motivation and fairness perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1106-1119.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baumeister, R. 1999. The self. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*: Vol.1, 680–740. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, C., Swim, J. K., & Jacobs, R. R. (2000). Evaluating gender biases on actual job performance of real people: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(10), 2194-2215.

Cascio, W. F., & Bernardin, H. J. (1981). Implications of performance appraisal litigation for personnel decisions. *Personnel Psychology, 34*(2), 211-226.

Cook, R. L., & Stewart, T. R. (1975). A comparison of seven methods for obtaining subjective descriptions of judgmental policy. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 13*(1), 31-45.

Cucina, J. M., Vasilopoulos, N. L., & Sehgal, K. G. (2005). Personality-based job analysis and the self-serving bias. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20,* 275-290.

Dineen, B. R., Noe, R. A., & Wang, C. (2004). Perceived fairness of web-based applicant screening procedures: Weighing the rules of justice and the role of individual differences. *Human Resource Management. Special Issue: E-HR: The Intersection of Information Technology and Human Resource Management, 43*(2-3), 127-145.

Dodson, M. R. (2006). Relationship of manager-subordinate MBTI similarity to subordinates' perceptions of manager effectiveness and leader-member exchange relationships. Unpublished Dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University.

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(6), 736-741.

Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(3), 429-456.

Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 37*, 1-6.

Greguras, G. J., Ford, J. M., & Brutus, S. (2003). Manager attention to multisource feedback. *Journal of Management Development, 22*(4), 345-361.

Hemingway, M. A., & Conte, J. M. (2003). The perceived fairness of layoff practices. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(8), 1588-1617.

Highhouse, S., Luong, A., & Sarkar-Barney, S. (1999). Research design, measurement, and effects of attribute range on job choice: More than meets the eye. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*(1), 37-48.

Hogan, R. (2004). Personality psychology for organizational researchers. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds), *Personality and Organizations* (pp. 3-23). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

International Personality Item Pool: A Scientific Collaboratory for the Development of Advanced Measures of Personality Traits and Other Individual Differences (http://ipip.ori.org/). Internet Web Site.

James, L. R. (1998). Measurement of personality via conditional reasoning. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(2), 131-163.

James, L. R., McIntyre, M. D., Glisson, C. A., Bowler, J. L., & Mitchell, T. R. (2004). The conditional reasoning measurement system for aggression: An overview. *Human Performance, 17*(3), 271-295.

John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big-five trait taxonomy: History, Measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.

Karren, R. J., & Barringer, M. W. (2002). A review and analysis of the policy-capturing methodology in organizational research: Guidelines for research and practice. *Organizational Research Methods, 5*(4), 337-361.

Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(4), 589-607.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 985-993.

LeBreton, J. M., Barksdale, C. D., Robin, J., & James, L. R. (2007). Measurement issues associated with conditional reasoning tests: Indirect measurement and test faking. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 1-16.

Levy, P. E., & Williams, J. R. (1998). The role of perceived system knowledge in predicting appraisal reactions, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*(1), 53-65.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & de Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 34*(3), 343-378.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.) *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. (pp. 139-153). New York: Guilford.

McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T. Jr., de Lima, M. P., Simoes, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Marusié, l., Bratko, D., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Chae, J. H., & Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: Parallels in five cultures. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 466-477.

Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review, 102*(2), 246-268.

Motowidlo, S. J., Hooper, A. C., & Jackson, H. L. (2006a). A theoretical basis for situational judgment tests. In J. Weekley & R. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests* (pp. 57–81). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Motowidlo, S. J., Hooper, A. C., & Jackson, H. L. (2006b). Implicit policies about relations between personality traits and behavioral effectiveness in situational judgment items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 749–761.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Peterson, N. G. (2008). Effects of organizational perspective on implicit trait policies about correctional officers' job performance. *Human Performance, 21(4)*, 396-413.

Murphy, K. R., & Constans, J. I. (1987). Behavioral anchors as a source of bias in rating. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(4), 573-577.

Ogunfowora, B., Bourdage, J., & Lee. K. (2010). Rater personality and performance dimension weighting in making overall performance judgments. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 465-476.

Phillips, J. S., & Lord, R. G. (1986). Notes on the practical and theoretical consequences of implicit leadership theories for the future of leadership measurement. *Journal of Management, 12*(1), 31-41.

Raymark, P. H., Schmit, M. J., & Guion, R. M. (1997). *Development of an instrument to identify personality-related position requirements*. Unpublished manuscript. Ohio State University, Newark Campus.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 66-80.

Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 20*(1), 93-110.

Rynes, S. L., Schwab, D. P., & Heneman, H. G. (1983). The role of pay and market pay variability in job application decisions. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 31*(3), 353-364.

Schmitt, N. (1978). Comparison of subjective and objective weighting strategies in changing task situations. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 21*(2), 171-188.

Stanton, J. M. & Weiss, E. M. (2002). Online panels for social science research: An introduction to the StudyResponse project. Technical Report #13001, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.

Stewart, G. L. & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Four lessons learned from the person-situation debate: A review and research agenda. In B. Schneider & D. B. Smith (Eds), *Personality and Organizations* (pp. 61-85). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Strauss, J. P., Barrick, M. R., & Connerley, M. L. (2001). An investigation of personality similarity effects (relational & perceived) on peer and supervisor ratings and the role of familiarity and liking. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, *74*, 637-657.

Tajfel, H. (1957). Value and the perceptual judgment of magnitude. *Psychological Review*, *64*, 192-204.

Tett, R. P. & Burnett, D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 500-517.

Tracey, J. B. & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group and Organization Management, 23*, 220-236.

Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: Types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(2), 228-234.

Watson, J. B. (1930). *Behaviorism (rev. ed.)*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Wegner, D. M. & Vallacher, R. R. (1977). *Implicit psychology: An introduction to social cognition.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1981). Cognitive complexity and the structure of implicit leadership theories. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*(1), 69-78.

Werner, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (1997). Explaining U.S. courts of appeals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(1), 1-24.

Werth, L., Markel, P., & Förster, J. (2006). The role of subjective theories for leadership evaluation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(1), 102-127.

Yukl, G. A. (1988). Development and validation of the Managerial Practices Questionnaire.

Technical report, State University of New York, Albany.

Yukl, G. A., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*, 15-32.

Yukl, G. A., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp. 223-238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Zhou, J., & Martocchio, J. J. (2001). Chinese and American managers' compensation award decisions: A comparative policy-capturing study. *Personnel Psychology, 54*(1), 115-145.