

5-2013

Power, Likeability, and Perception: Evaluating Men and Women in High and Low Power Positions

Daria A. Bakina
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: http://surface.syr.edu/psy_etd



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bakina, Daria A., "Power, Likeability, and Perception: Evaluating Men and Women in High and Low Power Positions" (2013).
Psychology - Dissertations. Paper 178.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology - Dissertations by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Abstract

When asked, it is relatively easy to come up with an example of a position of high power (e.g., president) or low power (e.g., intern). One can imagine the types of tasks or behaviors each of those positions entails. The theories of social power detail how power is attained, the behaviors of individuals in power, and the consequences of those behaviors (e.g., French & Raven, 1959; Fiske & Depret, 1996; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Most of the studies on behaviors of high power individuals have found that no differences exist between the behaviors of high power men and women. One closely related area of research to social power is leadership, which can be thought of as an example of a position of power. Although the research has found negligible style differences between men and women, the largest gender differences are found in how leaders are evaluated. Women tend to be evaluated more negatively in leadership positions, as compared with men (Eagly & Karau, 2002). The goal of the present research was to demonstrate that although high power men and women exhibit similar behaviors, women are evaluated more negatively as compared with men. The first study attempted to replicate research that demonstrates high power individuals' propensity toward self-serving behaviors (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001). Neither gender nor power significantly predicted self-serving behaviors. The second study asked participants to evaluate an ostensible participant from the first study. Here it was predicted that high power women would be evaluated negatively (compared with men) on a series of evaluation items including liking and hostility. Although no gender effects for targets were found, power condition did significantly predict differences on evaluations of high and low power targets. Possible explanations and future directions are discussed.

Power, Likeability, and Perception:
Evaluating Men and Women in High and Low Power Positions

Daria A. Bakina
BA, Purdue University, 2007
MS, Syracuse University, 2010

DISSERTATION

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Social Psychology
in the Graduate School of Syracuse University

May 2013

Copyright © Daria A. Bakina 2013
All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

As I look back at developing the idea for and writing my dissertation, it is not a lone undertaking. I would be remiss if I did not extend a sincere thank you to many people who have supported me throughout this process. First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Leonard S. Newman for his guidance, support, and assistance in not only the dissertation process, but also helping me grow into a better researcher, writer, and social psychologist. I could not have asked for a more enthusiastic or encouraging advisor. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Richard Gramzow, Dr. Laura VanderDrift, Dr. Kris Byron, Dr. Kate Min, and Dr. Makana Chock. Your advice and critique only served to improve the project and help me think of future research.

I want to thank my fellow social psychology graduate students, in particular Lindsay Kraynak who has shared multiple offices, conference hotel rooms, meals, coffee breaks, and countless hours consulting on research, data analyses, and life in general. Without “social socials” I do not think we could have survived graduate school. To my roommate and friend, Marketa Krenek, thanks for all of the statistics help and overall emotional support you have offered me over the last five years.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance and support of my family members: my grandma Tamara Bakina, my grandparents Raisa and Valentin Stourman who inspired me to pursue a PhD, my parents Dr. Nina Stourman and Dr. Andrei Bakin who told me there was no way but pursuing a PhD, and to my wife Ciara Poolman who had to deal with my pursuit of a PhD. Ciara’s love and encouragement got me through the toughest times and she has been my cheerleader since I began graduate school. Although I warned her it would be hard, she stuck it out and I am eternally grateful for that. Thank you to the

Poolman clan for their encouraging words and support throughout graduate school. Thank you to everyone who has offered an ear or shoulder throughout this journey – I would not be here without you.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Study 1	
Participants	19
Materials	19
Procedure	21
Results	21
Discussion	25
Study 2	
Participants	28
Materials	28
Procedure	29
Results	31
Discussion	35
General Discussion	37
Conclusion	41
Future Directions	42
Appendices	43
Tables	57
References	73

List of Illustrative Materials

Table 1. Demographic Information, Study 1.	64
Table 2. Task Allocation Minutes for High Power and Low Power Conditions; Men and Women.	65
Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Personal Sense of Power Scale, Communal Orientation Scale, and Exchange Orientation Scale.	66
Table 4. Correlations Among Personal Sense of Power Scale, Communal Relationship Orientation and Exchange Relationship Orientation	67
Table 5A. Hierarchical Regression, Communal Relationship Orientation and Personal Sense of Power Scale Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.	68
Table 5B. Hierarchical Regression, Exchange Relationship Orientation and Personal Sense of Power Scale Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.	69
Table 6. Frequency of Positive and Negative Emotion Words for High and Low Power Primes.	70
Table 7A. Hierarchical Regression, Communal Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.	71
Table 7B. Hierarchical Regression, True Communal Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.	72
Table 8A. Hierarchical Regression, Exchange Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Minute Allocations.	73
Table 8B. Hierarchical Regression, True Exchange Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Minute Allocations.	74
Table 8. Demographic Information, Study 2.	75
Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations for Interpersonal Hostility Items, Competence Items, Likeability, Leadership Skills, and Personal Sense of Power Scale.	76

Table 10. Correlations Among Interpersonal Hostility, Competence, Likeability, and Leader-Like Ratings.	77
Table 11. Hierarchical Regression, Likeability and Target Gender as predictors of Leadership Quality of Targets.	78
Table 12. Analysis of Variance for Differences Between High and Low Power Conditions for the Eight Interpersonal Hostility Items.	79

Power, Likeability, and Perception: Evaluating Men and Women in High and Low Power Positions

When thinking about what power is, many images come to mind: chief executive officers of corporations, kings and queens, presidents and dictators. Within our society, it is relatively easy to pick out examples of individuals with high and low power. Within social psychology however, trying to define “power” is slightly more difficult, especially while trying to differentiate it from status, influence, control, dominance, or authority. Many theories of power attempt to define what power is and how it is used. While calling to mind examples of high power, it is not hard to notice that many of these examples include leadership positions (e.g., presidents and CEOs). The concepts of social power and leadership are closely related in that high power individuals tend to be leaders and they share the characteristic of acting to achieve goals through influencing others.

It is also noticeable that the exemplars recalled of powerful people and leaders are most often men. Gender differences have emerged as important factors within the scholarship on leadership, especially in how leaders are *evaluated*. In the social power research literature, however, gender differences have very rarely emerged in how people in positions of high power behave. The two studies proposed here will first attempt to replicate the finding that men and women do not behave differently in positions of power, and second, demonstrate that gender nonetheless has an impact on how men and women in power positions are evaluated. More specifically, it was predicted that women would be evaluated more negatively than men even when they engage in the identical power-related behaviors.

Theories of Social Power

Social power is defined broadly as the ability to influence others in order to achieve a goal. There have been many theories of power developed to predict the behavior of high power and low power individuals. Most of these theories refer to the control of rewards and punishments high power individuals can administer to others. The following is an overview of where power comes from (or how it develops) and the different kinds or types of power researchers have defined. Many of the studies examined for this paper are based on the theories developed by French and Raven (1959), Fiske and Depret (1996) and Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson (2003), among others. Since each of the theories conceptualized social power differently, the major theories are briefly summarized here. Further, the theories make distinct predictions as to how people in power will behave and therefore, the research on power outcomes is also reviewed. This will help to illustrate the breadth of research that has been conducted within social power and where the gaps still exist.

In most societies, a social power hierarchy exists, such that one group has more power than another. One theory of social power suggests that when individuals control resources, groups form, and ultimately, some groups have control over others. The three-process theory proposed by Turner (2005) posits that leaders emerge first and then gather individuals under one similar mission. Turner (2005) suggests that the three processes by which groups gain power are persuasion, control through authority, and control through coercion. Groups can persuade others that a certain set of beliefs is correct and through authority enforce those beliefs because the members of the in-group are persuaded (Turner, 2005). Turner suggests that coercion is a tactic used by individuals without power

in an effort to cause conflict. Once there is conflict, another individual or group can attempt to achieve power and thus control of resources.

Other theories of power presume an established societal hierarchy, instead of group formation. For example, the first assumption for social dominance theory is that all human societies are structured as systems of group-based social hierarchies (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Social dominance theory focuses on how the societal hierarchies affect individual and institutional behavior. This theory is typically used to describe relations among unequal groups and phenomena such as racism and sexism.

Fiske and Depret (1996) state that individuals have high power if others are dependent on them for resources. Therefore, high power individuals can influence the actions of others and distribute resources accordingly. This theory of social power suggests that resources controlled by an already established group are an indicator of high power. The control over resources by a group shapes the relationships with others and is indicative of the kinds of social power one can possess.

Researchers have divided types of power based on how individuals (or groups) relate to others. Thibaut and Kelley (1959) proposed two kinds of power, fate control and behavior control. With fate control power, an individual controls the outcomes for another individual, regardless of how the individual behaves. Behavior control refers to one individual punishing or rewarding the behavior of another in order to benefit the first individual. This theory is based on the dependence one individual has on another; so not only does the high power individual have control of the low power individual, but the low power individual can also exhibit behaviors that either help or hurt the high power individual's goals.

French and Raven (1959) proposed a five-fold theory of social power, including reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent power. In some cases, these categories of power can overlap; however, French and Raven do not make direct predictions about the relationships among the five categories of social power. Reward power is in place when the individual in power can influence another's behavior through administering rewards for behavior (or removing a negative stimulus). Through coercive power, an individual can ensure that another behaves in a certain way by threatening punishment if the task is not performed appropriately. Legitimate power is the type of power in which the individual with power has achieved it based on norms and this individual has the right to influence others. An individual has expert power if the knowledge he or she has is greater than others. Finally, an individual has referent power if another perceives him- or herself to be similar to that individual and acts in accordance with those similarities. Fate control (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and these bases of power are similar in that one individual (or group) has the ability to influence others' outcomes.

The social power literature describes characteristics typical of high power individuals, which includes being less invested in subordinates, less likely to perspective take, more likely to rely on stereotypes, and more likely to be goal oriented and view subordinates as tools to achieve goals (Bakina, unpublished manuscript).

The recent theories of social power can be placed on a continuum, where some describe relationships between individuals and others describe the power structure guiding interactions between different groups. There is still a theoretical debate on whether groups are formed when individuals control resources, thus establishing a power hierarchy, or whether power is gained after groups are formed and then take resources

from others. Overall, theories of power all have a common thread – that some individuals have influence over others by providing or withholding resources, or administering punishments (Fiske & Depret, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003; Turner, 2005, Simone & Oakes, 2006). The influence that powerful people exert over others is the most important aspect of power for the hypotheses tested in the studies presented here.

Social Power Manipulations and Outcomes

In the empirical social power literature, social power has been both measured and manipulated. Many studies use existing power relationships by recruiting subordinates and bosses or managers to participate in studies (e.g., Guinote & Phillips, 2009). Some simply assign participants into roles such as a “judge” or a “worker.” Other experimental manipulations of power involve informing participants that they are in control of other students’ outcomes (e.g., Anderson & Galinsky, 2006, Study 5), or that they should think about a time where they had control over someone else (high power) or someone had control over them (low power) (e.g., Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006). Others use a variety of semantic tasks (word fragment completion or word search) with power related words (e.g., Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001). It is important to note here that social power primes can activate the psychological state of power in people (both men and women) unconsciously and automatically (Smith & Galinsky, 2001).

Social psychologists have studied the *outcomes* of social power (whether manipulated or measured) based on a variety of theories. For example, based on the theory of approach and inhibition (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003), high power individuals are more likely to have an approach orientation and take action, especially if it is toward

goals. High power individuals also act in ways to benefit themselves or their own goals and high power individuals are also likely to be optimistic. Fiske and Depret's asymmetrical dependency theory posits that dependent individuals (low power) attend to the most informative, expectancy consistent information, whereas non-dependent individuals (high power) rely on heuristic information. According to Fiske and Depret (1996), low power individuals are more likely to anticipate needs of supervisors because these individuals depend on the high power individuals for resources. Because high power individuals do not need to look to others for resources, they are more likely to rely on stereotypes and not be as invested in subordinates.

Consistent with those theories, a number of studies have supported the notion that high power individuals are more likely to be optimistic and express positive emotions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002, Study 2; Anderson & Galinsky, 2006, Studies 1 & 2; Berdahl & Martorana, 2006; Weick & Guinote, 2010). Further, individuals with high power are more likely to use stereotypes or heuristic information (Guinote & Philips, 2010; Guinote, Willis, & Martellotta, 2010; Lammers, Stoker, & Stapel, 2009, Study 1). Nonetheless, some studies have demonstrated contradictory findings, in which high power individuals pay attention to more individuating information about targets or subordinates and are more likely to help in conflict resolution (Chen, Ybarra, & Kiefer, 2004; Handgraaf, van Dijk, Vermun, Wilke, DeDreu, 2008; Lammers, Stoker, & Stapel, 2009, Study 2; Schmid Mast, Jonas, & Hall, 2009; Seeley-Howard, Gardner, & Thompson, 2007).

High power individuals are also less easily influenced by others, whether in terms of emotions during negotiations or ratings of tasks by hypothetical peers (van Kleef et al., 2006; Galinsky et al., 2008). This is perhaps explained by the lack of ability of high power

individuals to perspective take or take subordinates' points of view into account (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Galinsky, et al., 2006; van Kleef et al., 2008).

Work on the decision-making processes of high-powered individuals demonstrates a pattern of self-serving behaviors (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001; Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). When high power individuals are faced with a moral dilemma, they are more likely to be hypocritical. In other words, high power individuals feel that certain behaviors (cheating, speeding) are appropriate for themselves, but hold others to different standards (Lammers & Stapel, 2009; Lammers, Stapel, & Galinsky, 2010). Research also suggests that individuals with power are more likely to make risky decisions, but this is qualified by legitimacy and stability of power. Although few studies looked at these interactions, the pattern is consistent; when individuals feel that the power possessed is either illegitimate or unstable, the kinds of decisions made are less risky and more conservative (Maner, Gailliot, Butz, & Peruche, 2007, Study 3).

Finally, another self-serving behavior of high power individuals is that these individuals tend to assign less work for themselves and more work for others. Chen and colleagues hypothesize that the need to attain goals in high power individuals is closely related to the exchange relationship orientation (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001). The researchers predicted that individuals primed with power who are invested in the needs and interests of others would act in socially responsible ways, whereas individuals motivated to keep a tally of the exchanges in a relationship would behave in a way to benefit themselves (Chen et al., 2001). Across three studies, Chen and colleagues found that individuals with high power and exchange oriented are more likely to exhibit self-serving

behaviors and take on less work themselves. High power individuals are also more likely to have exchange, rather than communal relationships with their subordinates.

The findings reviewed here demonstrate that high power individuals are motivated to work toward their own goal, using resources and subordinates in order to achieve that goal. Noticeably absent are gender differences. In a recent review of social psychological studies conducted analyzing behaviors of high power individuals found that most studies did not find or report gender differences (Bakina, unpublished manuscript). The self-serving aspect of power is investigated in the studies presented here.

Social Power and Related Concepts

Several researchers point out that social power had long been a neglected variable within social psychology, citing problems with operationalizing and defining it (as opposed to influence, status, or dominance), and because the focus of social psychological research has been on intra-personal cognitive processes rather than group processes (Fiske & Depret, 1996; Turner, 2005).

Although related, there are distinctions between social power, status, and influence. Social power has been differentiated from status, where status is a “valued social position associated with the group (Spears, Greenwood, de Lemus, & Sweetman, 2010).” Social power has been slightly more difficult to define, but two characteristics that all theories share is that there is some degree of social influence and control (one group over another). Social influence contributes to power in terms of the administration of rewards and punishments (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Although social influence is necessary for social power, it is not sufficient; it is reasonable to think that individuals with low power can have some degree of influence (especially in terms of production of a

resource needed by the high power group). Social control is related to social power in that it is the ability to give and take resources or affect outcomes (Fiske & Depret, 1996; Turner, 2005; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Unlike social power, though, the social control of resources and outcomes is not necessarily goal related. Therefore, if a group or individual is able to administer rewards, punishments, and resources affecting outcomes of others, one can say that the group or individual has power.

Leadership

Leadership Styles

One concept that seems to be the closest in relation to social power is leadership. Leadership research assumes that typically one individual emerges in a group as the one with the most social influence in order to achieve a group goal (Hogg, 2010). The scholarship on leaders has a long history within social psychology and has emerged as its own field (Guinote & Vescio, 2010; Hogg, 2010). Early research on leadership explored the way individuals influence others (leadership style). The research on leaders within the last thirty years has shifted to studying the evaluations and effectiveness of leaders. Leaders are evaluated on many traits and behaviors, including how efficiently a group attains a set goal and how subordinates feel about their leader.

Along with style and effectiveness, gender has emerged as an important factor in what makes a good leader. Research has demonstrated that the prototypical representation of a leader is a male, with agentic qualities such as assertiveness, directness, and competence (Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Mahkijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Traditional gender roles do not ascribe these characteristics to women, and thus the literature has documented a backlash effect toward women leaders, such that women are

evaluated negatively for exhibiting prototypical leadership behaviors (Hoyt, 2010; Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Fairchild, 2005).

Because people with power are able to influence others, many times these individuals are perceived to be leaders. Much of the work on leadership describes characteristics of leaders and the way leaders are perceived. Early leadership research distinguished between task- and interpersonally oriented leaders (Bales, 1950; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Task-oriented leaders tend to turn attention to completing tasks at hand, whereas interpersonally oriented leaders are more concerned with maintaining interpersonal relationships. Additional distinctions for leadership characteristics were made between autocratic and democratic leadership styles. According to Gastil (1994), democratic leaders delegate work to other group members, are invested in subordinates (helping develop skills and abilities), and assist groups in the decision making process. Autocratic leaders are more likely to direct subordinates into jobs rather than delegating and are less invested in subordinates (Kushell & Newton, 1986).

As research on leadership progressed, theories of leadership encompassed more than relationships between the leaders and subordinates. The current dominant perspectives in leadership styles emerged within the last thirty years, delineating between transformational and transactional leaders (Bass, 1998). Transformational and transactional styles incorporate democratic and autocratic dimension of leadership and emphasize that subordinates are a necessary component of an organization.

Transformational leaders motivate subordinates by emphasizing higher order goals, being interpersonally supportive, and by stressing the mission and values of the group (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003).

Transformational leaders challenge and encourage subordinates to think independently. As a result of an open and supportive environment, subordinates are motivated to perform well on tasks assigned. Transactional leaders emphasize the task or goal at hand and provide rewards only after the goal is met. Transactional leaders make sure that goals are being accomplished and/or only intervene when a subordinate gets off task. Leaders with a transactional style provide rewards for satisfactory performance and provide feedback when subordinates are not performing well or not meeting standards set forth by the leader (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Eagly, 2007).

Gender and Leadership

Gender emerged as an important factor within leadership research when research began to shift to how leaders affect subordinates (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Some researchers have found that women tend to adopt a more democratic style of leadership, allowing for subordinates to participate in decision-making (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Men, on the other hand are more likely to adopt an autocratic and more directive style of leadership. This is true of men and women across laboratory studies and organizational settings.

Men and women also exhibit some differences in transactional and transformational leadership styles. Transformational leadership involves four subcomponents (taken from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire): *idealized influence* (how well leaders hold subordinates' trust, maintain faith and respect), *inspirational motivation* (leaders provide a vision and make others feel their work is significant), *intellectual stimulation* (create creative environment, subordinates are able to challenge own beliefs and values), and *individualized consideration* (show interest in others' well-being). Transactional leadership

involves *contingent rewards* (leaders tell others what to do to be rewarded), *management by exception – active* (leaders are monitors of mistakes), and *management by exception – passive* (leader intervenes when standards for accomplishing tasks are not met). A meta-analysis conducted by Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) found that women scored higher than men on all subcomponents of transformational leadership and on the contingent rewards subcomponent of transactional leadership. Men scored higher than women on management by exception (both active and passive) than women. Additionally, research on effective leaders demonstrates that subordinates evaluate leaders more positively when the transformational leadership style is adopted (Hoyt, 2010).

Women, compared to men, tend to adopt and exhibit more effective leadership styles (the transformational leadership style and the reward contingent portion of the transactional leadership style). As reliable as these differences are, however, a meta-analysis conducted by Eagly and Johnson (1990) demonstrated the differences in leadership styles between men and women are actually rather slight (small effect sizes and relationship moderated by setting). A field study supported these findings; no differences were found between the leadership styles of men and women in an investigation of leadership in four department stores (van Engen, van der Leeden, & Willemsen, 2001).

Although women are actually more likely than men to exhibit effective styles of leadership, overall, the literature shows mixed findings and minimal gender differences. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) presented a review of transformational and transactional leadership styles comparing men and women. The results of a survey of nearly 9,000 managers (men and women) showed relatively small effect sizes ($d = -.23 - .26$) and were mixed in favoring men versus women (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

As leadership styles are moving away from authoritarian styles and toward more inclusive styles, the differences in styles adopted by men and women are shrinking. The literature on *evaluations* of leaders, on the other hand, shows greater gender differences in evaluations of leaders.

Evaluations of Leaders

Although leadership style is one important area in the study of leadership, evaluation of leaders is just as important. A leader can embrace an effective leadership style, yet be evaluated negatively, thus impeding progress toward goals. Even though women may be more likely to have effective leadership styles, women leaders continue to be evaluated negatively (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992). Traditional gender roles and social role theory partly explain this discrepancy. Traditional gender roles have been categorized into two dimensions: communal and agentic (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). Agentic qualities (e.g., independence, assertiveness) are most often associated with men, whereas communal qualities (e.g., friendliness, concern with others) are associated with women. Agentic qualities can also resemble the automatically activated behaviors of powerful individuals (e.g., active pursuit of goals).

For example, one study asked participants in an organization to monitor and record interactions with subordinates, co-workers, and supervisors. The study found that all individuals, regardless of gender, exhibited more agentic behaviors when interacting with subordinates and behaved less agentially with a boss or supervisor (although women exhibited more communal behaviors when interacting with other women than when interacting with men; Moskowitz, Suh, & Desaulniers, 1994).

According to Eagly and colleagues' social role theory (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Eagly & Karau, 2002, Eagly, Johannesssen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003), leaders are evaluated more positively when leadership style aligns with traditional gender roles. Therefore, when women lead in a more communal way, others will perceive them as good leaders. Women in leadership positions are rewarded for exhibiting more democratic or transformational styles, as these styles are more closely related to traditional gender roles ascribed to women. Because there are different expectations for men and women (i.e., different roles ascribed to them), the same actions are perceived differently when performed by men and women. When women exhibit autocratic or transactional leadership styles, they face negative evaluations, otherwise known as "backlash" (Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004). These negative evaluations of leaders are further exacerbated when women are leaders in traditionally masculine domains (e.g., military or engineering).

Another aspect of the negative evaluations of women leaders is that the prototypical representation of a leader is a male (Ridgeway, 2001; Heilman, 2001). As a result, men are perceived to have a higher potential for leadership. Leaders are often characterized as being decisive, independent, and objective. These qualities are more closely related to agentic characteristics and traditional masculine gender roles. Because women are expected to be emotional and caring, women are often evaluated as having less potential for leadership. Related to potential for leadership, men are also viewed as having more influence in groups (Carli, 2001). This research has demonstrated that both men and women dislike women who frequently disagree with group members. Additionally, women who communicate in an assertive manner exert less influence within a group.

Research has found only a few differences between men and women's leadership styles; the similarities in the behavior of male and female leaders are more notable than the differences. However, gender affects the differences in evaluations of leaders. In other words, the expectation is that men are better qualified to be leaders than women. As Eagly and colleagues have suggested, women are caught in a double bind – if a woman tries to behave like a prototypical leader, she faces negative evaluations as a result of breaking gender norms. But the research on the effects of power reviewed above, revealing the kinds of behaviors automatically activated by power, suggests that *that is exactly how women in power will behave*.

Social Power and Leadership

One parallel between theories of social power and leadership is that a group needs to exist in order for an individual to rise to power or a leadership position. The individual who rises to power must have certain characteristics such as establishing goals and organizing others to work toward that goal. From the leadership literature, it has been clear that a leader needs to be assertive, goal-oriented, and able to motivate subordinates to work toward the mission of the group. Related to that point, high power individuals exhibit similar characteristics, especially in terms of working toward goals. It is also important to note that agentic qualities in leaders are similar to how individuals in power behave. So, not only are prototypical leaders men, but it would also seem that a prototypical person in power would also be male. Although studies have examined how effective leaders are and how leaders are evaluated, studies on social power have yet to look directly at whether perceptions of people exhibiting the kinds of behaviors that power has been shown to trigger differ by gender.

Current Study

The leadership and social power literatures have developed rather independently of one another. Leadership research has focused on the styles and evaluations of leaders, whereas social power research has focused on the behaviors and traits exhibited by people in high power. For this reason, it is difficult to directly compare gender differences in evaluations of high power individuals to gender differences in evaluations of leaders. To my knowledge, there is no published study of social power that attempts to measure how men and women exhibiting the kinds of behaviors found to be triggered by power (and presumably, leadership positions) are perceived. The studies presented here were designed to help fill that gap. First, a partial replication of Chen, Lee-Chai and Bargh (2001, Study 1) was conducted in order to establish that high power individuals exhibit self-serving behaviors and that—importantly—these differences are not moderated by gender. The study by Chen et al. (2001, Study 1) was chosen because it produced a relatively rich behavioral stimulus from which participants would be able to form an impression of an individual in Study 2. Second, in Study 2, participants evaluated the behavior of male and female high and low power individuals—specifically, the kind of high-power behavior that Study 1 was designed to elicit (and that one would expect to observe among leaders).

Participants in Chen et al. study expected to participate in a study with another participant, but the participants were told he was running late (in reality, there was no other participant). Participants were then asked to allocate surveys from a list (which included an ambiguous name, the length of the survey, and the lab the survey came from). The experimenter asked participants to select five surveys from the list for themselves and indicated that the rest of the list would remain for the later participants. As stated earlier,

Chen et al. (2001) were interested in how power was activated in individuals, based on how these individuals approach relationships. Chen and colleagues administered an individual difference measure of relationship orientation (Clark & Mills, 1979) in order to test how relationship orientation affected behaviors of high and low power individuals on a work allocation task (Chen et al. 2001, Study 1). Participants were first prescreened in order to determine their relationship orientations, either exchange or communal.

Individuals with a communal orientation do not expect to receive anything in return for their actions, whereas individuals with an exchange orientation will respond with the expectation that the favor will be returned in the future (Clark & Mills, 1979). Participants were selected if their scores indicated that they were strictly exchangers or communals.

Chen and colleagues found that among participants in the high power condition, communals assigned themselves more tasks and exchangers assigned themselves fewer tasks. More specifically, individuals who were high on the communal orientation acted in more socially responsible ways, assigning themselves tasks with the longest completion time. Participants identified as exchange oriented, on the other hand, assigned themselves tasks that took a shorter amount of time to complete (communals, $M=18.33$ minutes; exchangers, $M=15.00$ minutes, $F(1, 21)=4.71, p=.04$). As for the neutral prime condition, communally orientated participants assigned themselves tasks equaling 16.86 minutes to complete and exchange oriented participants assigned tasks totaling 17.67 minutes (no significant difference). Based on these results, the currently proposed study will also take into account relationship orientation as an individual difference measure.

Unlike the Chen et al. (2001) study, participants were not preselected for relationship orientation because the focus of the current study was on behaviors of

powerful individuals. Based on converging evidence for self-serving behaviors (Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010), it was predicted that high power individuals would assign themselves tasks that take less time and leave tasks that take longer for others. Across three studies, Rus, van Knippenberg, and Wisse (2010) found that high power individuals were likely to allocate more resources for themselves than others, especially when they believed that they were outperforming subordinates. This evidence, for self-serving behaviors, as well as consulting Serena Chen on the main effect prediction (Chen, personal communication), led to the prediction that high power individuals will assign themselves tasks that are shorter to complete than low power individuals.

In an effort to replicate the results of Chen et al. Study 1, however, participants were given the communal and exchange relationship orientation scales. Just as in that study, it was predicted that high power individuals high in exchange relationship orientation would allocate even fewer surveys to themselves than individuals high in communal relationship orientation.

The goal of these two studies was first to partially replicate the Chen et al (2001) study in demonstrating that priming participants with high power would lead to exhibiting self-serving behaviors (in assigning fewer minutes of tasks to themselves) and that relationship orientation would moderate the relationship between power and task allocations. The second study aimed to show that behaviors exhibited by high power individuals would be evaluated differently based on the gender of the actor. The task allocation minutes from Study 1 were to be used in the evaluation materials in Study 2, such that it would more directly show that the behaviors that were elicited by priming power were the same behaviors being evaluated in Study 2.

Methods

Study 1

Participants

One hundred and fifteen introductory psychology students were recruited to participate in the study in exchange for course credit. One person failed to complete the primary dependent measure in the study; therefore data for 114 participants (48 men and 66 women) were retained for analyses. Fifty eight participants self identified as White, nineteen as Asian-American or Pacific Islander, thirteen as African-American, twelve as Latino/a or Hispanic, two as American Indian, and ten as other. The mean age for participants was 19.46 ($SD = 3.14$, range 18-46).

Materials

Power prime. The power prime developed by Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003) was used to manipulate power. This manipulation asked participants to write about a time in which they had power over someone (powerful) or a time in which they were in a position when someone had power over them (powerless) (See Appendix A). Participants were given a page with the prompt description and lines for writing. The instructions were to not go beyond the lines provided and participants were allowed 5 minutes to write about their event.

Survey allocation task. All participants were asked to choose five tasks from a set of ten ostensible tasks to complete (See Appendix K). Each task was listed with an ambiguous name (e.g., PA-95), the name of the research lab that submitted the survey, and the amount of time (2-6 minutes) it should take to complete. There were a total of 40 minutes available for allocation. To add to the authenticity of the page, one exercise was

crossed out and marked “cancelled” in hand-written print. This is similar to the task described by Chen et al. (2001).

Background information. Participants completed a demographics questionnaire including major, age, activities on campus, ethnicity, native language, country of origin, and gender (See Appendix E).

Personal Sense of Power Scale. This scale assessed an individual’s self-reported feelings of power (e.g., “I can get people to listen to what I say”). It is a series of 8 items rated on from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly)(Anderson, John & Keltner, 2011; Anderson & Galinsky, 2006) (See Appendix B). The eight item scale was highly reliable in this sample, $\alpha=.81$.

Communal Orientation Scale. The measure assessed communal orientation; meaning how responsible one feels for other people’s welfare (Clark & Mills, 1994). This scale consisted of 14 descriptive statements which participants rate as uncharacteristic or characteristic of them (e.g., “I believe people should go out of their way to be helpful.”) (See Appendix C). The scale was highly reliable for this sample, $\alpha=.69$.

Exchange Orientation Scale. This measure assessed a relationship orientation that contrasts with the communal orientation. People who are exchange oriented are focused on equal giving and receiving in a relationship (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001; Clark & Mills, 1994). It is a 9-item scale with descriptive statements assessing the extent to which people keep track of the contributions of other people in relationships (e.g., “When I give something to another person, I generally expect something in return.”). The statements were rated as characteristic or uncharacteristic of an individual (See Appendix D). The scale was moderately reliable for this sample, $\alpha=.64$.

Procedure

Participants were brought into the lab one at a time and given the informed consent. Another informed consent form was sitting on the table for the ostensible second participant. Participants were then told that the other participant was running late to the experiment, after which they were primed with either low or high power (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003). After the priming procedure, participants were provided with a list of ten tasks and asked to choose five tasks to complete themselves. In order to reinforce the high power prime, the remaining five tasks, the participant understood, were to be left for the late participant to complete. In the low power prime, participants were asked to select five tasks to complete and to not worry about the remaining five.

The experimenter then told participants that the other participant was not able to make it to the study and asked them to complete a packet of surveys (including the personal sense of power scale, relationship orientation scales, and a demographic information page). Participants were then given a funneled debriefing in order to probe for suspicion about the cover story. The experimenter then explained the true intent of the study, assigned credit to participants, thanked them, and dismissed them.

Results

The communal and exchange relationship orientation scales were summed for each participant and treated as continuous variables and individual predictors of task allocation minutes. The personal sense of power scale was converted into a sum score for each participant and treated as a manipulation check (see Table 3 for means). Correlations among personal sense of power scale, communal and exchange relationship orientations are listed in Table 4.

Hypothesis 1

To test the first hypothesis, that there would be a main effect of power, a 2X2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine differences between high and low power primed participants on task allocation. No main effect of gender was found, $F(1, 110) = 1.53, p=.22, \eta_p^2=.01$ and gender did not interact with power, $F(1, 110) = .17, p=.68, \eta_p^2=.01$. However, the predicted main effect of power was also not significant, $F(1, 110) = .59, p=.44, \eta_p^2=.01$.

A slight positive skew was found for the task allocation data (.43, $SE=.23$). A log10 transformation was applied to the data in order to correct for the skewness = .14 ($SE = .23$). An ANOVA was conducted with the corrected task allocation minutes, $F(1, 112) = .75, p=.39$. Again, no differences were found between the high and low power condition on allocation minutes.

In light of some of the differences found in the leadership literature in the ways men and women lead, a post-hoc comparison was conducted between men and women's allocations in the high power condition. No differences between men and women within the high power condition, $t(60) = -1.17, p=.25$ ($M_{men} = 17.37; M_{women} = 18.31$) were found. A comparison between men and women in allocations in the low power was also conducted. Again, no differences were found for gender, $t(50) = -.59, p=.56$ ($M_{men} = 18.05; M_{women} = 18.52$).

Hypothesis 2

It was also predicted that relationship orientation would moderate the relationship between power and task time allocations (thus replicating Chen et al., Study 1). The results of the study by Chen and colleagues showed that communally oriented participants primed

with power assigned more task time for themselves rather than leaving more of the tasks to others. On the other hand, exchange oriented participants were found by Chen et al. to allocate less task time for themselves and more for others. To test for relationship orientation effects, two hierarchical linear regressions were conducted. Because exchange orientation and communal orientation are orthogonal, each was tested individually. Each relationship orientation scale was centered. The relationship orientation and condition were entered in the first step and the interaction was entered in the second step. Relationship orientations did not moderate the relationship between power condition and task time allocations for the communal scale, $F(3, 110) = .26, p = .86$ or for the exchange scale, $F(3, 110) = .34, p = .80$ (See Tables 5A and 6A for Beta weights).

The null findings were less surprising in light of the manipulation check data. Analysis of the Personal Sense of Power Scale did not yield a main effect of power ($F(1, 110) = .57, p = .45$), gender ($F(1, 110) = .31, p = .58$) or an interaction between power condition and gender, $F(1, 110) = .06, p = .80$.

Personal Sense of Power was also tested as a predictor of task allocation, along with relationship orientation. The Personal Sense of Power scale was mean centered as well as communal and exchange relationship orientations. The Personal Sense of Power scale and relationship orientation was entered in the first step of the hierarchical regression, and the interaction was entered in the second step. Neither relationship orientation nor the Personal Sense of Power scale were significant in predicting task allocation. The interaction between personal sense of power and relationship orientation did not significantly predict task allocation, $F(3, 110) = .64, p = .59$ (See Table 5A for Beta weights). The same pattern

emerged for communal relationship orientation, $F(3, 110) = .14, p=.93$ (See Table for Beta weights).

Additional Analyses

In an effort to further explore the effects of the manipulation and to determine whether the prime was interpreted correctly by participants, the open-ended responses were reviewed. Two independent raters blind to the hypothesis coded the open-ended responses for content and number of negative and positive emotion words used. The events participants described were grouped into type (e.g., being captain of a sports team). Then, the responses were coded for the number of positive and negative emotion words associated with each event. There is evidence to suggest that individuals in high power positions express more positive emotions, relative to low power individuals. If the prime was interpreted correctly, participants in the high power condition should express more positive emotions and fewer negative emotions, as compared to the participants in the low power condition. This comparison could also serve as a very indirect assessment of the manipulation. The relationship was moderately high between the raters for the positive emotions, $r=.69, p<.001$ and for negative emotion, $r=.70, p<.001$. Therefore, the number of positive emotions and negative emotions were averaged across raters and the average of each was used in the analyses.

For the high power condition, most often the topics written about included being a group leader ($N=17$), captain of a sports team ($N=9$), or a supervisor ($N=10$). Additionally, experiences as a camp counselor or babysitter ($N=11$) and manipulating someone ($N=4$) also appeared in the responses. Topics for the low power condition were more varied with interviews (with participants as the interviewees) being the most frequently occurring

topic. Others included arguments with family, inability to have an opinion heard, and college applications. Thus, the content of what participants wrote seemed to be consistent with the instructions.

There were significant differences between the power conditions in the number of positive ($t(111) = 6.64, p < .001$) and negative ($t(111) = -6.45, p < .001$) emotions listed. For the high power condition, more positive (than negative) emotion words were used ($M_{\text{high}} = 1.66$ vs. $M_{\text{low}} = .43$). For the low power condition, the opposite pattern was observed, with more negative emotion words being used ($M_{\text{high}} = 1.15$ vs. $M_{\text{low}} = 2.89$). These findings are consistent with previous research on power and emotions, as individuals in high power positions tend to be more optimistic than those in low power positions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Berdahl & Martorana, 2006; Weick & Guinote, 2010).

Discussion

The hypotheses for Study 1 were not supported. Although no gender differences were revealed, differences in task allocation minutes between high and low power conditions were also not found. Additionally, relationship orientation did not moderate the effects.

In the Chen et al. (2001) study, participants were preselected for extremely high communal or exchange orientations, but in the present study relationship orientation was treated as a continuous individual difference measure. Neither the communal nor the exchange orientation was a significant predictor of task minute allocations. In an effort to more closely replicate Chen et al.'s findings for extreme groups, a median split was applied to the communal and exchange relationship orientation scales. Then, analyses were

conducted using only participants who scored above the median on the communal relationship orientation scale and below the median on exchange relationship. The same was done for participants high on exchange and low on the communal scale, thus creating groups similar to those preselected in the Chen and colleagues (2001) study. These analyses, however, did not yield any significant effects or interactions for time allocation (see Tables 5B and 6B).

In the present study, it is possible that because participants were asked to select tasks for themselves and for others to complete, the participants all felt high power and the prime for low power was negated. Although the instructions for the study were taken from Chen and colleagues and modified to emphasize participants' high power ability to assign tasks to others (and lack of power for the low power condition), low power participants could have still felt powerful. This was further supported in the lack of significant difference on the Personal Sense of Power scale between the low and high power conditions. Anderson, John, and Keltner (2011) suggest that there are four distinct levels at which Personal Sense of Power can be measured – specific momentary setting, long-term dyadic, long-term group, and generalized. In Study 1, it was hypothesized that the Personal Sense of Power would address the specific momentary setting. Although no differences were found between conditions, it is important to note that the items on the measure of generalized Personal Sense of Power were phrased in general terms. Therefore, the version of the Personal Sense of Power scale used was possibly not the most sensitive manipulation check. Perhaps had the instructions for completing the Personal Sense of Power scale asked participants to rate their power as they felt in relation to the current scenario, the power differences between conditions would have emerged. In addition, Anderson and colleagues

also suggest that power is affected by sociocultural factors (Anderson, John, & Keltner, 2011) and because this study was conducted with a largely White population at a private University, students may start at higher levels of power.

Although a number of previous studies have found differences in power using the same manipulation used in Study 1, asking participants to write about a time in which they either felt powerful or powerless, yet no differences were found between the high and low power condition in Study 1. Previous research using this power prime found significant differences across a variety of study designs and outcome variables (e.g., abstract processing; action orientation; self-serving behaviors—Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2012; Schmid-Mast, Jonas, & Hall, 2009; Fast & Chen, 2009; Galinsky, Magee, Inesi & Gruenfeld, 2006; Smith & Trope, 2006). The failure to find significant differences in Study 1, thus, does not mean that one would not expect such effects. Therefore, Study 2 could still be run independently. Although the initial plan was to utilize findings from Study 1—specifically, to operationalize “high power behavior” as the mean level of allocation in the high power condition of Study 1, and “low power behavior” as the mean level of allocation in the low power condition of Study 1—the central aim of Study 2 was to investigate evaluations of male and female targets who engage in the kind of behavior that could be expected from high and low power individuals. Thus, as an alternate strategy, the task allocations for high power in Study 2 were set to be the highest time assigned to participants in Study 1 (26 minutes out of 40), and the allocations for low power were set to be the lowest time assigned to participants in Study 1 (14 minutes out of 40).

Study 2

Participants

One hundred and thirty five introductory psychology students were recruited to participate in the study for course credit. After eliminating participants who failed the manipulation check, 108 participants' data (42 men, 66 women) was retained for analyses. Sixty nine identified as White or European American, seventeen as Black or African American, nine as Asian American or Pacific Islander, eight as other, and five as Hispanic or Latino/a. Most participants were first year students (65.7%). The mean age for this sample was 19.14 ($SD=1.31$).

Materials

Participant information and allocation sheet. Participants received a packet describing an ostensible participant from a previous session of the study. The participant's gender, age, year in school, and activities were handwritten on a demographics page. The task list from Study 1 was distributed in the packet along with a description of the first study. In the description, participants were told that they were either assigned 14 or 26 minutes of surveys by the previous participant (leaving 26 or 14 minutes for the previous participant respectively).

Evaluation items. Parks-Stamm and colleagues (2008) found that women in power tended to be evaluated as more interpersonally hostile and unkind than were men in power (Parks-Stamm, Heilman, & Hearn, 2008). Thus, eight items assessing interpersonal hostility were used for the ratings of the other (fictional) participant, each paired with a 9-point bipolar scale (e.g., kind-unkind, unselfish-selfish) (See Appendix F).

Competence ratings. Parks-Stamm, Heilman, and Hearn (2008) found there to be no difference between male and female leaders' competence. However, because the present study tested perceptions of people in power and not leadership, three items measuring competence were used (incapable-capable; incompetent-competent; unskillful-skillful). Because power is conceptually distinct from leadership, differences between high and low power conditions could be found on competence.

Liking and leadership ratings. Likeability is another facet on which men and women leaders are evaluated. Ratings of two items were completed, one assessing how likeable the target is and one whether the target would make a good leader (Appendix H).

Power ratings. Because the intent of this study was to measure if evaluations of high power individuals differ by those individuals' gender, six items assessing how powerful the target was, adapted from the Personal Sense of Power Scale (Appendix I) were administered. This served as a check to make sure that there were no perceived gender differences in power. Fourteen participants failed to complete the Personal Sense of Power Scale appropriately.

Demographic information. Participants reported gender, major, age, native language, and race/ethnicity (Appendix J).

Procedure

Participants were run in small groups of up to four, in individual cubicles. Participants were told they were to form an impression of a previous participant. The experimenter told participants in the current study that they would receive a randomly assigned participant from a previous study to form an impression of. Participants received a "Participant Information Packet" which contained a description of Study 1 (listed with

task minutes assigned), the task allocation sheet from Study 1, and a sheet with demographic information about the previous participant (which included gender, year in school, major and on campus activities). Participants were not informed of the power prime completed in Study 1. The description of the study contained the time allocation, where participants were informed that they were either to complete 26 out of the 40 minutes assigned of surveys (for the high power behavior condition) or 14 out of 40 minutes (for the low power behavior condition). During the verbal instructions, the experimenter told participants in the current study they would be completing the surveys assigned to them by the previous participant. Therefore, participants expected to do a lot of work during the study session or a little work during the study session, and it was clear to them that how much work they had to do was determined by the previous participant.

The "Evaluation Packet" was provided after participants finished reading the information about the target. These packets included the evaluation, competence, likeability and leadership items, as well as the personal sense of power scale from the perspective of the target, and the participant demographic information page. Participants were then asked to complete a memory check about the target's gender, year in school, and the number of minutes assigned to them. Participants who failed to accurately provide the gender of the target and/or the number of minutes assigned were dropped from analyses ($N = 27$). Participants were then thoroughly debriefed as to the true intention of the experiment, assigned credit, thanked, and dismissed.

The hypothesis for Study 2 was that women would be evaluated more negatively than men when their behavior was consistent with the predicted behavior for high power participants in Study 1, but there would be no difference between evaluations of men and

women when their behavior was consistent with the behavior predicted for the low power condition of Study 1. In order to test this hypothesis, a 2 (Target gender: male or female) X2 (Target behavior: self-serving or not) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze impressions of the target individuals.

Results

In order to test for differences in evaluations, first tests of the omnibus effects were conducted for the evaluation items, competence items, liking, and leadership. Then, more focused analyses were conducted to compare between and within self-serving behavior conditions.

Interpersonal Hostility Items

An ANOVA was conducted to test the effects of gender and power behavior on the average of the eight interpersonal hostility items, $\alpha=.86$ (see Table 9 for means). There was no effect of gender ($F(1, 104) = 1.81, p=.18, \eta_p^2=.02$) on the composite interpersonal hostility score, nor was the interaction of gender and target behavior significant ($F(1, 104) = .38, p=.60, \eta_p^2=.00$). There was a main effect of power for the average of the interpersonal hostility items ($F(1, 104) = 22.47, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.18$). Subsequently, each of the eight items as analyzed individually and only main effects of target behavior were observed (see Table 12 for ANOVA results).

Next, analyses were conducted within the self-serving behavior conditions in order to probe for gender differences. No differences were found for gender in the self-serving behaviors condition. In other words, men and women were not evaluated differently if they were exhibiting self-serving behaviors. Similarly, no differences were found in evaluations of men and women in the condition where self-serving behaviors were not exhibited (with

the exception of kind-unkind, $t(53) = 2.16, p=.04$). Here (although inconsistent with the hypotheses), women were rated as kinder ($M = 7.15$) than men ($M = 6.36$).

Competence Items

The omnibus ANOVA for the average of competence items ($\alpha=.86$) showed a similar pattern to the interpersonal hostility items (see Table 8 for means). There was no main effect of gender ($F(1, 104) = .57, p =.45, \eta_p^2=.01$), nor was there an interaction between gender ($F(1, 104) = .01, p =.91, \eta_p^2=.00$) and target behavior. There was a significant main effect of target behavior for the composite score ($F(1, 104) = 9.05, p <.01, \eta_p^2=.08$). Next, each of the competence items was analyzed individually. There was a main effect of target behavior for ratings of competent ($F(1, 104) = 9.54, p<.01$) and skillful ($F(1, 104) = 8.87, p<.01$). The difference in ratings for the capable item was not significant, but in the expected direction, with targets exhibiting self-serving behaviors being rated as less capable than targets who did not exhibit self-serving behaviors ($F(1, 104) = 3.36, p=.07$).

Liking and Leadership Items

An omnibus ANOVA was conducted for both likeability and leadership (see Table 8 for means). There was no main effect of gender nor was there an interaction between gender and target behavior for likeability ratings (gender, $F(1, 104) = .58, p=.45, \eta_p^2=.01$; interaction between gender and target behavior, $F(1, 104) = .01, p=.91, \eta_p^2=.00$). A similar pattern was found for leadership ratings (gender, $F(1, 104) = 1.38, p=.24, \eta_p^2=.01$ and interaction between gender and target behavior $F(1, 104) = .22, p=.64, \eta_p^2=.00$). There was however, a main effect of target behavior for both likeability and leadership ratings. Participants rated the targets not exhibiting self-serving behaviors as more likeable ($M_{\text{high}} =$

4.58; $M_{low} = 5.13$; $F(1, 104) = 9.68, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .09$) and as better leaders ($M_{high} = 4.62$; $M_{low} = 5.38$; $F(1, 104) = 13.36, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .12$) than targets who exhibited self-serving behaviors.

In testing the hypothesis that women exhibiting self-serving behaviors would be perceived more negatively than men exhibiting those same behaviors, there were no differences between the ratings of men and women in the self-serving condition for the single item likeability ($M_{men} = 4.50$; $M_{women} = 4.65$) or good leader ($M_{men} = 4.54$; $M_{women} = 4.69$).

Additional Analyses

There were differences in evaluations for women who either did or did not exhibit self-serving behaviors. Women exhibiting self-serving behaviors were found to be less kind ($t(54) = 2.89, p < .01$), accommodating ($t(54) = 2.89, p < .01$), and gentle ($t(54) = 2.63, p < .01$) and more abrasive ($t(54) = 2.18, p < .05$), manipulative ($t(54) = 2.36, p < .05$), and selfish ($t(54) = 3.39, p < .01$). No differences were found for sensitive, warm, capable or competent. These women were also found to be less skillful ($M = 6.38$) than low power women ($M = 7.41$), $t(54) = 2.39, p < .05$. Similar differences emerged for men, however. Differences between perceptions of self-serving behaviors emerged on four of the interpersonal hostility items (accommodating: $t(50) = -2.60, p < .01$, sensitive: $t(50) = -2.17, p < .05$, selfish $t(50) = -3.77, p < .001$, and warm: $t(50) = -2.12, p < .05$). There was also a difference in perceptions for men either exhibiting or not exhibiting self-serving behaviors for the competent item, $t(50) = 2.51, p < .05$.

When comparing women who exhibited self-serving behaviors to women who did not, differences were found for both likeability ($t(54) = 2.48, p < .05$) and for good leader ratings ($t(54) = 3.72, p < .01$). Women who did not exhibit self-serving behaviors were

judged to be more likeable and better leaders than women who did exhibit self-serving behaviors. For men the same pattern emerged, where men who did not exhibit self-serving behaviors were rated as more likeable ($t(50) = 2.12, p < .05$) and better leaders ($t(50) = 2.06, p < .05$) than men who did exhibit self-serving behaviors.

Additionally, likeability ratings were tested as a predictor of leadership ratings. There is evidence in the leadership literature that for women, likeability is negatively related to leadership ability. Therefore, it is possible in this study that women would be evaluated as less leader like, if they were liked less for behaviors exhibited. Likeability ratings and target gender were entered in the first step of the hierarchical regression, and the interaction between likeability and target gender was entered into the second step. Likeability (but not target gender; $\beta = -.07; t(107) = -.17, p = .86$) was a significant predictor of leadership ratings ($\beta = .52; t(107) = 4.83, p < .001$). The interaction between gender and liking was not significant ($\beta = .14; t(107) = .31, p = .76$).

A second hierarchical regression was conducted to also take into account the target behavior condition. The predictors (likeability, target gender, and target power) were entered into the first step of the regression, the interaction between likeability and target gender was entered into the second step and the interaction between likeability, target gender, and target behavior was entered third. When the predictors and the interaction between target likeability and target gender were used, likeability and target behavior were significant predictors of leadership rating. After entering the interaction between likeability, target gender, and target behavior, target behavior was no longer a significant predictor of likeability. The interaction between target likeability, target gender, and target

behavior was not significant. This left only the likeability ratings as the only significant predictors of leadership ratings in the full model ($\beta = .49$; $t(107) = 4.46$, $p < .001$).

The eight items of the Personal Sense of Power Scale were averaged into Personal Sense of Power score ($\alpha = .78$). As expected, no gender differences were found across conditions for the Personal Sense of Power Scale ($F(1, 92) = .29$, $p = .59$). However, there was no main effect of target behavior condition ($F(1, 92) = .06$, $p = .81$) and no interaction between target behavior and gender, ($F(1, 92) = .11$, $p = .74$).

Discussion

The hypothesis for Study 2 was not supported. Women exhibiting self-serving behaviors were not evaluated more negatively than men exhibiting self-serving behaviors. However, overall, individuals exhibiting behaviors consistent with low power (not self-serving) were evaluated more favorably than individuals exhibiting self-serving behaviors. These results could be explained through the leadership literature predictions for leaders exhibiting democratic or transformational leadership styles (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Although in Study 2 the targets were not engaging in leadership behavior, they were engaging in the kind of behavior that the power literature suggests one would expect in leaders. Leaders who show concern for subordinates are evaluated more favorably than leaders who are more task-oriented. Because participants in this study were asked to evaluate previous participants based on the number of task minutes allocated to them, it could be that the manipulation was actually showing self-serving behaviors were more closely related to task-oriented and authoritative managerial styles. Thus, these individuals were liked less and found to be less leader-like. Just as in the study by Aguinis and Adams (1998) where managers using indirect influence were evaluated more positively, the

behaviors exhibited by low power men and women were evaluated more positively in the present study. This demonstrates a preference for an indirect management style, where leaders take on a fair share of work – similar to task-oriented leaders being disliked when compared with interpersonally oriented leaders (e.g., Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

At least one other study conducted has also found that evaluations of leaders did not differ based on gender, but rather the type of power used toward subordinates (Aguinis & Adams, 1998). In that study, men and women using direct influence (e.g., “assertive when making requests from subordinates”) and coercive power (e.g., “give subordinates undesirable job assignments”) were evaluated equally negatively when compared with individuals using indirect influence (Aguinis & Adams, 1998). Similarly, in the current research, it can be said that the targets were using both direct influence and coercive power by directing current participants to complete a series of tasks that would take almost half an hour to complete.

When comparing women exhibiting self-serving behaviors (or not), the backlash pattern was found (Hoyt, 2010; Rudman & Glick, 2001; Rudman & Fairchild, 2005). Women in who exhibited self-serving behaviors were rated to be more abrasive, manipulative, and selfish than women who acted in a more unselfish manner. However, the pattern for women being evaluated more negatively in leadership positions than men did not emerge. The order of the information presented could have affected the perceptions of the behaviors. The demographic information sheet was presented after the description of Study 1 and the assigned surveys. It is possible that if the gender of the target was presented before the behaviors, the gender would have been more salient and behaviors would have been perceived in context of the gender of the target.

Studies on gender and evaluations of leaders have found that evaluations of women leaders are more negative when women are in traditionally masculine domains (e.g., sports coaches, military). The setup of this study did not specify the domain in which targets were evaluated, which could have affected participants' perceptions of the interpersonal qualities of the target. In other words, if the domain was made more salient to participants, the ratings of the individuals in high power might have differed based on gender.

General Discussion

In the present studies, the relationship between power and evaluations of powerful individuals was investigated. The failure to replicate power effects in Study 1 and failure to support the Study 2 hypothesis leave many questions unanswered.

In Study 1, the hypothesis regarding power behaviors of men and women was partially supported – there were no differences in behaviors of high power men and women. However, it was also found that there were no behavioral differences between participants primed with high power and those primed with low power. Although the power prime did not result in behavioral differences on the survey allocation task, there was indirect evidence that the prime effectively triggered feelings of high and low power. This was demonstrated by high power individuals were more likely to express positive emotions than low power individuals. Participants in Study 1 believed the cover story, in which their interaction partner was running late to the study (as per the surprise they expressed that there was no other participant and the lack of suspicion revealed during the funneled debriefing). However, the lack of differences on the survey allocation task could be attributed to feeling empathy toward the participant – since the interaction partner was running late, the participants in the study did not want to assign a lot of work to them.

The lack of significant differences in Study 1 also demonstrates that the positive relationship between power and self-serving behaviors will not always be detected. The experimental social psychological literature particularly has focused on power leading to self-serving and other behaviors (e.g., less willing to listen to subordinates; treating subordinates as tools) that could be construed as negative. However, some studies have found that having power can also lead to positive effects, especially depending on the way that having power is framed. For example, Overbeck and Park (2001; 2006) showed across multiple studies that individuals in high power positions attended to individuating information and were more focused on individuals if the task required it. These studies demonstrate that there are other variables that moderate the relationship between power and behavior that could positively affect others. Another series of studies showed that power can also increase empathetic accuracy if prosocial orientation was induced (Cote, Kraus, Cheng, Oveis, van der Loewe, Lian, & Keltner, 2011). Finally, in the original Chen, Lee-Chai, and Bargh, 2001 study communal relationship orientation moderated the relationship between power and task allocations, such that participants high in communal orientation acted altruistically and assigned themselves more task minutes to complete. In order to investigate moderators of self-serving behaviors in high power leaders, Rus, van Knippenberg, and Wisse (2012) conducted a series of studies. The researchers found that accountability moderates the relationship between power and self-serving behaviors, in that when powerful leaders were asked to justify resource allocations, they behaved in a more group-serving fashion. Therefore, although the outcomes of power in the experimental social psychology literature are skewed toward negative ones, there are caveats to the relationship between power and self-serving behavior.

In addition, a large portion of the students in the introductory psychology participant pool are first or second year undergraduate students who may not have experienced high power in the same ways that business students working toward MBAs or professionals experience power. This led participants to write about experiences such as being left in charge of younger relatives, which would not allow them to dole out punishments, for example. Furthermore, several participants wrote about feeling hesitant in using their influence when in a high power position. Therefore, the conclusions reached in the first study may lack generalizability.

In future work on this topic, adjustments for the power prime should be made to take into account the age of the participants. Using a different manipulation such as sitting in a professor's chair (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001, Study 3) or a lexical decision task with power related words (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Chen, Ybarra, & Kiefer, 2004) could serve as a better power prime for undergraduate students. Additionally, asking participants to select surveys for themselves to complete could have communicated high power that could have negated the low power prime, since the participant was in control of the task allocations (although the results of the Chen et al. study did not suggest that this would be a fatal problem).

In Study 2, participants evaluated unselfish targets (regardless of gender) more positively than targets exhibiting self-serving behaviors. It is possible this is because of the documented preference of the type of leadership the behaviors are associated with. It is also possible that the high power individuals' behavior was perceived as selfish, a negative trait to possess. The failure to support the hypothesis in Study 2 can also be attributed to the stimulus materials. Although participants were given the true description of Study 1

along with a demographic information sheet that was hand written, it is possible that a richer stimulus (e.g., video recordings of a group activity) could have elicited differences in evaluations.

It is also possible that despite the fact that leaders engage in the kinds of behaviors engaged in by powerful people, the differential perception of male and female leaders derives from other factors (not manipulated in Study 2). The behaviors themselves, however, are perceived similarly. Building upon evidence provided in research by Aguinis and Adams (1998), the results of the second study showed differences between the evaluations of high and low power individuals. Even though all participants were told that they would complete work distributed by the targets, the less selfish targets received positive evaluations. Therefore, it is possible that the behaviors associated with high power, particularly assigning tedious tasks or exhibiting self-serving behaviors are equally disliked in both men and women.

Finally, the two studies reported here fit into a broader literature of leadership and high power behaviors. For example, Rus, van Knippenberg, and Wisse (2010) found that leaders endorsing self-serving effective leadership beliefs claimed more points for themselves than those endorsing group-serving effective leadership beliefs. The study by Rus and colleagues demonstrates an interaction between leadership and power (in this instance in the case of self-serving behaviors). The type of power the leader believes he or she possesses moderates the behavior exhibited by the leader. Both leaders and high power individuals tend to be goal-oriented and the type of goal (self-serving or group-serving) seems to also influence the behaviors exhibited (Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010; 2012). The findings of the second study extend the findings of Rus and colleagues

(2010) by demonstrating that self-serving behaviors are evaluated negatively by others. Even if leaders believe that they have adopted an effective leadership style that helps achieve goals, subordinates may perceive those goals as self-serving, and thus evaluate the leader negatively. It may be that negative female leader evaluations are rooted in the perception of women working toward self-serving goals (as opposed to group-serving goals). Future research should ask subordinates whether the goal type (self- vs. group-serving) varies by gender.

Conclusions

Issues of gender, power, and leadership are gaining more attention in society as women like Marissa Mayer (of Yahoo!) and Sheryl Sandberg (of Facebook) are becoming more prominent. Despite the null results in these two studies, the issues motivating this research are steadily emerging with more women moving into the workforce and asking for a seat at the table (Sandberg, 2013). The distinctions made between leadership and power will continue to affect how supervisors and subordinates interact, as well as workplace outcomes such as promotions and success of both individuals and organizations. Future research needs to focus on perceptions of powerful individuals, not only continuing work on the outcomes of having (or not having) power. In addition to anecdotal evidence, the leadership literature shows that women leaders are perceived more negatively than men in leadership positions. The research presented here demonstrates the need to develop better stimuli to test whether perceptions of powerful individuals do differ by gender. And if the same pattern holds for women in power as women in leadership, it is necessary to work toward changing negative perceptions and expectations for women.

Future Directions

These results could also point to generational differences in perceptions of power. Some research conducted on Generation Y (individuals born between 1982 and 1998) has revealed that members of that generation have a different perspective in how leaders or managers should behave, when compared with Generation X (individuals born between 1965 and 1981) (e.g., Twenge, 2010). Exhibiting power over others, as the targets had in this study, could trigger Gen Yers to dislike leaders with high power characteristics more than leaders with low power characteristics. Generation Y (or Millennials) are looking for a more inclusive work environment that provides challenging assignments combined with frequent feedback (Lester, Standifer, Schultz, & Windsor, 2012; Lowe, Levitt, & Wilson, 2008; Twenge, 2010) as well as a greater emphasis on work/ life balance. Men and women are equally looking to provide a better family environment for their children (Lester, et al., 2012; Lowe, Levitt, & Wilson, 2008). With the rapidly changing dynamics of the workplace, reevaluating theories of leadership and power is necessary to accommodate new attitudes of the current and future workforce. Taking into consideration generational issues as well as gender can lead to productive research avenues with real applications for the current work environment. Eventually, one can hope that when asked about power, both men and women will equally come to mind with positive associations.

Appendix A

Power Primes (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003)

Powerful Prime:

Please recall a particular incident in which you had power over another individual or individuals. By power, we mean a situation in which you controlled the ability of another person or persons to get something they wanted, or were in a position to evaluate those individuals. Please describe this situation in which you had power – what happened, how you felt, etc.

Powerless Prime:

Please recall a particular incident in which someone else had power over you. By power, we mean a situation in which someone had control over your ability to get something you wanted, or was in a position to evaluate you. Please describe this situation in which you did not have power – what happened, how you felt, etc.

Appendix B

Generalized Sense of Power Scale (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006)

In rating each of the items below, please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree	Strongly Agree

In my relationships with others . . .

- ___ I can get people to listen to what I say.
- ___ My wishes do not carry much weight.
- ___ I can get others to do what I want.
- ___ Even if I voice them, my views have little sway.
- ___ I think I have a great deal of power.
- ___ My ideas and opinions are often ignored.
- ___ Even when I try, I am not able to get my way.
- ___ If I want to, I get to make the decisions.

Appendix C

Communal Orientation Scale

Please rate the items on the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely uncharacteristic of me				Extremely characteristic of me

1. It bothers me when other people neglect my needs.
2. When making a decision, I take other people's needs and feelings into account.
3. I'm not especially sensitive to other people's feelings. *
4. I don't consider myself to be a particularly helpful person. *
5. I believe other people should go out of their way to be helpful.
6. I don't especially enjoy giving others aid. *
7. I expect people I know to be responsive to my needs and feelings.
8. I often go out of my way to help another person.
9. I believe it's best not to get involved taking care of other people's personal needs. *
10. I'm not the sort of person who often comes to the aid of others. *
11. When I have a need, I turn to others I know for help.
12. When people get emotionally upset, I tend to avoid them. *
13. People should keep their troubles to themselves. *
14. When I have a need that others ignore, I'm hurt.

* Indicates reverse scored items.

Appendix D

Exchange Orientation Scale

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely uncharacteristic of me				Extremely characteristic of me

1. When I give something to another person, I generally expect something in return.
2. When someone buys me a gift, I try to buy that person as comparable a gift as possible.
3. I don't think people should feel obligated to repay others for favors. *
4. I wouldn't feel exploited if someone failed to repay me for a favor. *
5. I don't bother to keep track of benefits I have given others. *
6. When people receive benefits from others, they ought to repay those others right away.
7. It's best to make sure things are always kept "even" between two people in a relationship.
8. I usually give gifts only to people who have given me gifts in the past.
9. When someone I know helps me out on a project, I don't feel I have to pay them back. *

* Indicates reverse scored items.

Appendix E

Demographic Information, Study 1

What is your gender?

Male
Female

Year in school?

Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior

Age: _____

Major: _____

Where you born in the USA?

Yes
No
If not, at what age did you come to the USA? _____

Is English your first language?

Yes
No
If not, at what AGE did you start speaking English Fluently? _____

What is your race/ ethnicity?

American Indian/
Asian American/ Pacific Islander
African American/ Black
Latino(a)/ Hispanic
Caucasian/ White
Other. _____

Please tell us about your campus involvement (organizations, clubs, sports, other campus involvement).

Appendix H

Likeability and leadership ratings.

1. How much do you think you would like this individual?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all			Neither like nor dislike			Very much

2. Do you think this individual would make a good leader?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very much disagree			Neither agree nor disagree			Very much agree

Appendix I

Adapted items, Generalized Sense of Power Scale (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006)

Please answer the following items as the person you read about:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree	Strongly Agree

In my relationships with others . . .

____ I can get people to listen to what I say.

____ My wishes do not carry much weight.

____ I can get others to do what I want.

____ Even if I voice them, my views have little sway.

____ I think I have a great deal of power.

____ My ideas and opinions are often ignored.

____ Even when I try, I am not able to get my way.

____ If I want to, I get to make the decisions.

Appendix J

Demographic Information, Study 2

What is your gender?

Male
Female

Year in school?

Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior

Age: _____

College major: _____

Where you born in the USA?

Yes
No

If not, at what age did you come to the USA? _____

Is English your first language?

Yes
No

If not, at what AGE did you start speaking English Fluently? _____

What is your race/ ethnicity?

American Indian/
Asian American/ Pacific Islander
African American/ Black
Latino(a)/ Hispanic
Caucasian/ White
Other. _____

Appendix K

Researcher/ Lab Name	Name of Survey	Time to Complete
Social Relations Lab	RH-25	4 min
Self Research Lab	Self Survey A	4 min
Self Research Lab	Self Survey B	5 min
SoAtt Lab	Attitudes toward Out-groups	2 min
Social Relations Lab	Dyadic Interactions	5 min
SPSR Lab	Personality Assessment	6 min
SPSR Lab	Interpersonal Interactions	2 min
Person Perception Lab	Person Perception	6 min
Person Perception Lab	Impression Formation A-1	5 min
SPSR Lab	Relationship Survey	3 min
SoAtt Lab	In-Group Beliefs	3 min

Appendix L

In the previous study, participants were asked to select 5 tasks for a future participant to complete, and 5 tasks for themselves. The participant you are evaluating has assigned you **to complete a total of ____ minutes of tasks**, leaving themselves ____ minutes of tasks. In your packet, you'll find the list of tasks selected for you by the previous participant along with demographic information. Please review this carefully and then complete the evaluation of the participant in the second packet.

Appendix M

Target Demographic Information

What is your gender?

Male

Female

Year in school?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Age: _____

Major: _____

Please tell us about your campus involvement (organizations, clubs, sports, other campus activities).

Appendix N

Memory Check

Select the gender of the individual you evaluated:

Male

Female

What was their year in school?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

How many minutes did this individual assign you to complete?

Table 1. *Demographic Information, Study 1*

Gender		
	Women	66
	Men	49
Age		
		19.46 (3.14)
Ethnicity		
	White or European American	58
	Asian American or Pacific Islander	19
	Black or African American	13
	Latino/a or Hispanic	12
	American Indian	2
	Other	10
Year in School		
	Freshman	65
	Sophomore	29
	Junior	11
	Senior	9
Born in the United States		
	Yes	81
	No	33
Native Language English		
	Yes	83
	No	31

Note. N=114. Age ranged from 18-46 years of age.

Table 2. *Task Allocation Minutes for High Power and Low Power Conditions; Men and Women*

	High Power	Low Power
Men	17.37 (2.95)	18.05 (3.12)
Women	18.31 (3.28)	18.52 (2.59)
Total	17.90 (3.15)	18.33 (2.80)

Note. N=114. Mean task allocation minutes for each condition and gender. Standard deviations are listed in parentheses.

Table 3. *Means and Standard Deviations for Personal Sense of Power Scale, Communal Orientation Scale, and Exchange Orientation Scale*

	High Power	Low Power
Personal Sense of Power Scale	5.10 (.80)	5.02 (.78)
Communal RO	54.91 (6.64)	54.62 (5.38)
Exchange RO	29.92 (5.39)	26.94 (4.50)

Note. N=114. Personal Sense of Power Scale is rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) – 7 (strongly agree) Likert Scale, where higher numbers indicate higher personal sense of power (range: 2.25-6.75). Communal Orientation Scale is a composite score of 14 items, measured on a 1 (uncharacteristic of me) – 5 (characteristic of me) Likert scale, (range: 38-70). Exchange relationship orientation scale, measured on a 1 (uncharacteristic of me) – 5 (characteristic of me) Likert scale, is a composite score of 9 items (range: 14-41).

Table 4. *Correlations Among Personal Sense of Power Scale, Communal Relationship Orientation and Exchange Relationship Orientation*

	Communal	Personal Sense of Power Scale
Personal Sense of Power Scale	.03	
Exchange	.08	-.09

Note: N=114. All *ps* are not significant.

Table 5A. *Hierarchical Regression, Communal Relationship Orientation and Personal Sense of Power Scale Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Communal RO	-.01	.05	-.02	-.21	.84
Personal Sense of Power	.18	.36	.05	.50	.62
Communal RO	-.00	.05	-.01	-.09	.93
Personal Sense of Power	.17	.37	.04	.46	.65
PSP by Communal Interaction	.03	.07	.04	.38	.71

Note. N=113. Model 2: $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 110) = .14$, $p=.70$, indicating that adding the interaction does not significantly change model fit.

Table 5B. *Hierarchical Regression, Exchange Relationship Orientation and Personal Sense of Power Scale Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Exchange RO	.04	.06	.07	.68	.50
Personal Sense of Power	.20	.36	.05	.55	.58
Exchange RO	.05	.06	.08	.80	.43
Personal Sense of Power	.30	.37	.08	.80	.43
PSP by Exchange RO Interaction	.09	.08	.11	1.10	.27

Note. N=113. $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 110) = 1.21$, $p=.27$, indicating that adding the interaction term does not significantly change model fit.

Table 6. *Frequency of Positive and Negative Emotion Words for High and Low Power Primes*

	High Power	Low Power
Positive Emotion Words	1.66 (1.17)	.43 (.68)
Rater 1	1.87 (1.35)	.67 (1.00)
Rater 2	1.45 (1.22)	.19 (.56)
Negative Emotion Words	1.15 (1.32)	2.89 (1.53)
Rater 1	1.40 (1.58)	2.83 (1.75)
Rater 2	.90 (1.39)	2.94 (1.63)

Note. N=112. The correlation between raters for positive emotions was $r=.69$, $p<.001$ and for negative emotions, $r=.70$, $p<.001$. For positive emotions, the inter-rater reliability for the raters was found to be $K=.43$, $p<.001$ and for negative emotions, the inter-rater reliability for raters was found to be $K=.33$, $p<.001$. The average ratings were used in analyses.

Table 7A. *Hierarchical Regression, Communal Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Power Condition	.42	.57	.07	.75	.46
Communal	-.01	.05	-.02	-.18	.86
Power Condition	.42	.57	.07	.75	.46
Communal	-.06	.14	-.13	-.46	.65
Condition by Communal Interaction	.04	.10	.12	.42	.67

Note. N=114. $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 110) = .18$, $p = .67$ indicating that adding the interaction term did not significantly change model fit. Communal Relationship Orientation was treated as a continuous predictor of task allocation minutes.

Table 7B. *Hierarchical Regression, True Communal Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Allocation Minutes.*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Power Condition	-.07	1.25	-.01	-.05	.96
Communal	.18	.20	.20	.93	.37
Power Condition	-.82	2.65	-.14	-.31	.76
Communal	-.02	.64	-.02	-.03	.98
Condition by Communal Interaction	.17	.51	.25	.33	.75

Note. $N = 24$. $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 21) = .11$, $p = .75$, indicating that adding the interaction term did not significantly change model fit. Participants were selected if above the median (CRO = 55) on the communal relationship orientation scale and below the median (ERO = 27) on the exchange relationship orientation scale.

Table 8A. *Hierarchical Regression, Exchange Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Minute Allocations*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Power Condition	.42	.57	.07	.74	.46
Exchange RO	.04	.06	.06	.63	.53
Power Condition	.42	.57	.07	.74	.46
Exchange RO	.08	.17	.13	.45	.66
Condition by Exchange Interaction	-.03	.12	-.07	-.25	.80

Note. N=114. $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 110) = .06$, $p = .80$, indicating that adding the interaction term did not significantly change model fit. Exchange Relationship Orientation was treated as a continuous predictor of task minute allocations.

Table 8B. *Hierarchical Regression, True Exchange Relationship Orientation and Power Condition Predicting Task Minute Allocations*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Power Condition	-.22	1.08	-.04	-.20	.84
Exchange RO	-.46	.22	-.45	-2.07	.05
Power Condition	-2.16	1.93	-.43	-1.12	.28
Exchange RO	-1.35	.77	-1.33	-1.75	.10
Condition by Exchange Interaction	.55	.45	1.01	1.21	.24

Note. N=19. $\Delta R^2 = .07$, $F(1, 16) = 1.47$, $p = .24$, indicating that adding the interaction term did not significantly change model fit. Participants were selected for analyses if the exchange relationship orientation was above the median (ERO = 27) and below the median for the communal relationship orientation scale (CRO = 55).

Table 8. *Demographic Information, Study 2*

Gender	Women	66
	Men	42
Age		19.14 (1.31)
Ethnicity		
	White or European American	69
	Asian American or Pacific Islander	9
	Black or African American	17
	Latino/a or Hispanic	5
	American Indian	0
	Other	8
Year in School		
	Freshman	71
	Sophomore	21
	Junior	12
	Senior	4
Born in the United States		
	Yes	95
	No	13
Native Language English		
	Yes	96
	No	12

Note: N=108. Age range for this sample was 18-26.

Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations for Interpersonal Hostility Items, Competence Items, Likeability, Leadership Skills, and Personal Sense of Power Scale.

	High Power	Low Power
Interpersonal Hostility		
Abrasive/Non Abrasive	5.35 (1.00)	6.00 (1.33)
Pushy/ Accommodating	5.32 (1.61)	6.56 (1.66)
Insensitive/ Sensitive	5.04 (1.49)	5.78 (1.64)
Tough/ Gentle	4.89 (1.59)	5.80 (1.60)
Unkind/Kind	6.00 (1.51)	6.75 (1.40)
Manipulative/ Nonmanipulative	5.15 (1.63)	6.05 (2.01)
Selfish/ Unselfish	4.87 (2.01)	6.62 (1.63)
Cold/Warm	5.62 (1.48)	6.42 (1.54)
Total	5.28 (1.01)	6.26 (1.15)
Competence		
Incapable	6.42 (1.75)	6.98 (1.46)
Incompetent	6.23 (1.75)	7.13 (1.25)
Unskillful	6.28 (1.91)	7.22 (1.32)
Total	6.31 (1.58)	7.11 (1.18)
Likeable	4.58 (1.01)	5.13 (.79)
Would make a good leader	4.62 (1.16)	5.38 (.99)
Personal Sense of Power	5.13 (.72)	5.16 (.70)

Note. N= 108. Interpersonal hostility items were rated on a 1-9 bipolar Likert scale. The items were recoded so that the lower numbers indicate negative traits (e.g., 1= Abrasive vs. 9 = Nonabrasive). For the competence items, the lower the number the lower the competence trait. The likeability and good leader items were measured on a 1 (not at all)-7 (very much) Likert scale, where higher numbers indicate more positive evaluations. Total denotes composite score for interpersonal hostility and competence items. The Personal Sense of Power Scale was rated on a 1 (strongly disagree)-7 (strongly agree) Likert scale with eight items forming the average Personal Sense of Power score.

Table 10. *Correlations Among Interpersonal Hostility, Competence, Likeability, and Leader-Like Ratings*

	Competence	Likeable	Leader-Like
Interpersonal Hostility	.55**	.48**	.51**
Leader-Like	.53**	.54**	
Likeable	.47**		

Note. N=108. ** Indicates $p < .001$. Interpersonal hostility is the average of the 8-item scale. Competence is the average of the 3 competence items (incapable, incompetent, & unskillful). Likeability is a single item measure, "How much do you think you would like this individual?" Leader-like item was phrased, "Do you think this individual would make a good leader?"

Table 11. *Hierarchical Regression, Likeability and Target Gender as predictors of Leadership Quality of Targets.*

	Unstandardized		Standard β	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Likeability	.65	.10	.54	6.56	.00
Target Gender	.14	.19	.06	.73	.47
Likeability	.63	.13	.52	4.83	.00
Target Gender	.14	.19	.06	.73	.47
Likeability by Target Gender	.06	.20	.03	.31	.76

Note. N=107. Model 1: $\Delta R^2 = .30$, $F(2, 105) = 22.10$, $p < .001$; Model 2: $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(1, 104) = .10$, $p = .76$. Adding the interaction term did not add to the model. Likeability is a single item measure, "How much do you think you would like this individual?" Leader-like item was phrased, "Do you think this individual would make a good leader?" Likeability was the only significant predictor of leadership ability.

Table 12. *Analysis of Variance for Differences Between High and Low Power Conditions for the Eight Interpersonal Hostility Items*

Item/ Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Abrasive					
Between Groups	11.11	1	11.11	7.95	.01
Within Groups	148.19	106	1.40		
Total	159.30	107			
Accommodating					
Between Groups	41.69	1	41.69	15.50	.001
Within Groups	284.07	106	2.69		
Total	327.77	107			
Sensitive					
Between Groups	18.82	1	18.82	7.61	.01
Within Groups	262.03	106	2.47		
Total	280.85	107			
Gentle					
Between Groups	22.51	1	22.51	8.83	.01
Within Groups	270.12	106	2.55		
Total	292.63	107			
Kind					
Between Groups	15.00	1	15.00	7.08	.01
Within Groups	224.44	106	2.12		
Total	239.44	107			
Not Manipulative					
Between Groups	22.04	1	22.04	6.53	.01
Within Groups	357.63	106	3.37		
Total	379.67	107			
Unselfish					
Between Groups	82.68	1	82.68	24.82	.001
Within Groups	353.06	106	3.33		
Total	435.74	107			
Warm					
Between Groups	17.08	1	17.08	7.49	.01
Within Groups	241.84	106	2.28		
Total	258.92	107			

Note. N=108.

References

- Aguinis, H. & Adams, S.K.R. (1998). Social roles versus structural models of gender and influence use in organizations: A strong influence approach. *Group & Organization Management, 23*, 414-446.
- Anderson, C. & Berdahl, J.L. (2002). The experience of power: Examining the effects of approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1362-1377.
- Anderson, C. & Galinsky, A.D. (2006). Power, optimism, and risk-taking. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 511-536.
- Baldwin, A.S., Kiviniemi, M.T., & Snyder, M. (2009). A subtle source of power: The effect of having an expectation on anticipated interpersonal power. *Journal of Social Psychology, 149*, 82-104.
- Berdahl, J.L. & Martorana, P. (2006). Effects of power on emotion and expression during a controversial group discussion. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 497-509.
- Brauer, M. & Bourhis, R.Y. (2006). Social power. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 601-616.
- Bugental, D.B., Beailieu, D.A., Schwartz, A., & Dragosits, R. (2009). Domain-specific responses to power based interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 386-391.
- Carli, L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues, 47*, 725-741.
- Chen, S., Langner, C.A., Mendoza-Denton, R. (2009). When dispositional and role power fit: Implications for self-expression and self-other categories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 710-727.

- Chen, S., Lee-Chai, A.Y., & Bargh, J.A. (2001). Relationship orientation as a moderator of the effects of social power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 173-187.
- Chen, S., Ybarra, O., & Kiefer, A.K. (2004). Power and impression formation: The effects of power on the desire for morality and competence information. *Social Cognition, 22*, 391-421.
- Cote, S., Kraus, M.W., Cheng, B.H., Oveis, C., van der Loewe, I., Lian, H., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social power facilitates the effect of prosocial orientation on empathetic accuracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 217-232.
- DeWall, C.N., Baumeister, R.F., Mead, N.L., & Vohs, K.D. (2011). How leaders self-regulate their task performance: Evidence that power promotes diligence, depletion, and disdain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 47-65.
- Eagly, A.H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 1-12.
- Eagly, A.H. & Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 781-797.
- Eagly, A.H. & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 233-256.
- Eagly, A.H. & Karau, S.J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M.G., Klonsky, B.G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*, 3-22.
- Fast, N.F. & Chen, S. (2009). When the boss feels inadequate: Power, incompetence, and aggression. *Psychological Science, 20*, 1406-1413.

- Ferguson, A.J., Ormiston, M.E., & Moon, H. (2010). From approach to inhibition: The influence of power on responses to poor performers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 305-320.
- Fiske, S.T. (2010). Interpersonal stratification. In S.T. Fiske, D.T., Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 2*, (pp. 941-982). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Galinsky, A.D., Gruenfeld, D.H., & Magee, J.C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 453-466.
- Galinsky, A.D., Magee, J.C., Gruenfeld, D.H., Whitson, J.A., & Liljenquist, K.A. (2008). Power reduces the press of the situation: Implications for creativity, conformity and dissonance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1450-1466.
- Galinsky, A.D., Magee, J.C., Inesi, M.E., Gruenfeld, D.H. (2006). Power and perspectives not taken. *Psychological Science, 17*, 1068-1074.
- Gastil, J. (1994). A definition and illustration of democratic leadership. *Human Relations, 47*, 953-975.
- Gruenfeld, F.H., Inesi, M.E., Magee, J.C., & Galinsky, A.D. (2008). Power and the objectification of social targets. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 111-127.
- Guintoe, A. (2007a). Power and goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1076-1087.
- Guinote, A. (2007b). Power affects basic cognition: Increased attentional inhibition and flexibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*, 685-697.

- Guinote, A. (2008). Power and affordances: When the situation has more power over powerful than powerless individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 237-252.
- Guinote, A. & Phillips, A. (2010). Power can increase stereotyping: Evidence from managers and subordinates in the hotel industry. *Social Psychology, 41*, 3-9.
- Guinote, A., Judd, C.M., Brauer, M. (2002). Effects on power on perceived and objective group variability: Evidence that more powerful groups are more variable. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 708-721.
- Guinote, A. & Vescio, T.K. (Eds.).(2010). *The Social Psychology of Power*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Guinote, A., Willis, G.R., & Martellotta, C. (2010). Social power increases implicit prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 299-307.
- Haines, E.L. & Kray, L.J. (2005). Self-power associations: The possession of power impacts women's self-concepts. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 643-662.
- Handgraaf, M.J.J., Van Dijk, E., Vermunt, R.C., Wilke, H.A.M., & DeDreu, C.K.W. (2008). Less power or powerless?: Egocentric empathy gaps and the irony of having little versus no power in social decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1136-1149.
- Heilman, M.E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 657-674.
- Howard, E.S., Gardner, W.L., & Thompson, L. (2007). The role of the self-concept and the social context in determining the behavior of power holders: Self-construal in

- intergroup versus dyadic dispute resolution negotiations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 614-631.
- Hoyt, C.L. (2010). Women, men, and leadership: Exploring the gender gap at the top. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*, 484-498.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D.H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, *110*, 265-284.
- Kray, L.J., Reb, J., Galinsky, A.D., & Thompson, L. (2004). Stereotype reactance at the bargaining table: The effect of stereotype activation and power on claiming and creating value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 399-411.
- Kushell, & Newton, (1986). Gender, leadership style, and subordinate satisfaction: An experiment. *Sex Roles*, *14*, 203-209.
- Lammers, J., Galinsky, A.D., Gordijn, E.H., & Otten, S. (2008). Illegitimacy moderates the effects of power on approach. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 558-564.
- Lammers, J. & Stapel, D.A. (2009). How power influences moral thinking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 279-289.
- Lammers, J., Stapel, D.A., & Galinsky, A.D. (2010). Power increases hypocrisy: Moralizing in reasoning, immorality in behavior. *Psychological Science*, *21*, 737-744.
- Lammers, J., Stoker, J.I., & Stapel, D.A. (2009). Differentiating social and personal power: Opposite effects on stereotyping, but parallel effects on behavioral approach tendencies. *Psychological Science*, *20*, 1543-1549.
- Lammers, J., Stoker, J.I., & Stapel, D.A. (2010). Power and behavioral approach orientation in existing power relations and the mediating effect of income. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 543-551.

- Lester, S.W., Standifer, R.L., Schultz, N.J., & Windsor, J.M. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 19*, 341-354.
- Lowe, D., Levitt, K.J., & Wilson, T. (2008). Solutions for retaining Generation Y employees in the workplace. *Business Renaissance Quarterly, 3*, 43-57.
- Magee, J.C. (2009). Seeing power in action: The roles of deliberation, implementation, and action in inferences of power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 1-14.
- Maner, J.K., Gailliot, M.T., Butz, D.A., Peruche, B.M. (2007). Power, risk, and the status quo: Does power promote riskier or more conservative decision making? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 451-462.
- Maner, J.K. & Mead, N.L. (2010). The essential tension between leadership and power: When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 482-497.
- Mills, J. & Clark, M.S. (1994). Communal and exchange relationships: Controversies and research. In *Theoretical Frameworks for Personal Relationships*, R. Erber and R. Gilmour, Eds. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Overbeck, J.R., & Park, B. (2001). When power does not corrupt: Superior individuation process among powerful perceivers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 549-565.
- Overbeck, J.R. & Park, B. (2006). Powerful perceivers, powerless objects: Flexibility of powerholders' social attention. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*, 227-243.

- Poppe, M. (2003). Preferences for changing power positions and power distances: A social value orientations approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 177-193.
- Ridgeway, C.L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 637-655.
- Rudman, L. A. & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743-762.
- Rudman, L.A. & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*, 157-176.
- Rus, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. (2010). Leader power and leader self-serving behavior: The role of effective leadership beliefs and performance information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 922-933.
- Rus, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. (2012). Leader self-concept and self-interested behavior: The moderating role of power. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11*, 40-48.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work and the will to lead*. New York: Random House.
- Sassenberg, K., Ellmers, N. & Scheepers, D. (2012). The attraction of social power: The influence of construing power as opportunity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 550-555.
- Schmid Mast, M., Hall, J.A., & Ickes, W. (2006). Inferring power-relevant thoughts and feelings in others: A signal detection analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 469-478.
- Schmid Mast, M., Jonas, K. & Hall, J.A. (2009). Give a person power and he or she will show interpersonal sensitivity: The phenomenon and its why and when. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 835-850.

- Slabu, L. & Guinote, A. (2010). Getting what you want: Power increases the accessibility of active goals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 344-349.
- Smith, P.K. & Trope, Y. (2006). You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: Power priming and abstract information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 578-596.
- Stillman, T.F., Baumeister, R.F., & DeWall, C.N. (2007). What's so funny about not having money?: The effects of power on laughter. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1547-1558.
- Twegne, J.M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology, 25*, 201-210.
- van Dijke, M. & Poppe, M. (2003). Preferred changes in power differences: Effects of social comparison in equal and unequal power relations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 149-160.
- van Dijke, M. & Poppe, M. (2006). Striving for personal power as a basis for social power dynamics. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 537-556.
- van Dijke, M., de Cremer, D., Mayer, D.M. (2010). The role of authority power in explaining procedural fairness effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 488-502.
- van Kleef, G.A., DeDreu, C.K.W., Pietroni, D., & Manstead, A.S.R. (2006). Power and emotion in negotiation: Power moderates the interpersonal effects of anger and happiness on concession making. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 557-581.
- van Kleef, G.A., Oveis, C., van der Loewe, I., LuoKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D. (2008). Power, distress, and compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others. *Psychological Science, 19*, 1315-1322.

- Van Wart, M. (2004). A comprehensive model of organizational leadership: The leadership action cycle. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior*, 6, 173-208.
- Vescio, T.K., Gervais, S.J., Snyder, M., & Hoover, A. (2005). Power and the creation of patronizing environments: The stereotype-based behaviors of the powerful and their effects on female performance in masculine domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 658-672.
- Vescio, T.K., Snyder, M., & Butz, D.A. (2003). Power in stereotypically masculine domains: A social influence strategy by stereotype match model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1062-1078.
- Weick, M. & Guinote, A. (2008). When subjective experiences matter: Power increases reliance on the ease of retrieval. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 956-970.
- Weick, M. & Guinote, A. (2010). How long will it take?: Power biases time predictions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 595-604.
- Willis, G.B., & Guinote, A. (2011). The effect of social power on goal content and goal striving: A situated perspective. *Social Psychology and Personality Compass*, 10, 706-719.

Biographical Information

Name of Author: Daria Andreevna Bakina

Place of Birth: Moscow, Russia

Date of Birth: June 28, 1985

Graduate Education:

Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
Master's of Science, Social Psychology, 2010

Undergraduate Education:

Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, 2007
Bachelor of Arts in Women's Studies, 2007

Awards and Honors:

Outstanding Teaching Assistant, Syracuse University, 2013
Phi Beta Kappa, 2006
Psi Chi, 2005

Professional Experience:

Course Instructor, Syracuse University 2007-2013
Social Psychology Researcher, Syracuse University, 2007-2013