THE IMPACT OF LEADER-FOLLOWER REGULATORY FOCUS CONGRUENCE
ON REGULATORY FIT AND RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Samantha A. Ritchie

August, 2009
THE IMPACT OF LEADER-FOLLOWER REGULATORY FOCUS CONGRUENCE
ON REGULATORY FIT AND RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

Samantha A. Ritchie

Dissertation

Approved:  
Advisor  
Dr. Aaron M. Schmidt

Accepted:  
Department Chair  
Dr. Paul E. Levy

Committee Member  
Dr. Robert G. Lord

Dean of the College  
Dr. Chand Midha

Committee Member  
Dr. Rosalie J. Hall

Dean of the Graduate School  
Dr. George R. Newkome

Committee Member  
Dr. Joelle D. Elicker

Date

Committee Member  
Dr. Young Lin
ABSTRACT

The present study incorporates regulatory focus theory with leader-member exchange (LMX) theory in order to investigate the impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on expected relationship quality. Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci were found to have an indirect interactive effect on expected relationship quality, defined as LMX quality and trust. This effect was found to take place by way of various mediating processes. Specifically, congruence in regulatory focus had a direct, positive impact on the experience of regulatory fit, defined in the present study as improved social interaction wherein individuals are better able to “act as they naturally would.” The experiences of “feeling right,” enjoyment, ease of interaction, and comfort also served to further characterize the phenomenology of regulatory fit in this context. Subsequently, regulatory fit then demonstrated direct effects on both value from fit, characterized by perceptions of liking and value of the supervisor, as well as expected relationship quality. Coincidentally, value from fit also demonstrated a direct, positive effect on expected relationship quality. Relatedly, value from fit partially mediated the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. These findings contribute to the regulatory focus literature by demonstrating the profound impact of regulatory focus congruence on relational phenomena. As well, these findings contribute to the LMX literature by detailing the process by which supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci impact expected relationship quality.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The impact of self-regulatory processes in the workplace has long been a topic of interest to organizational researchers and practitioners alike (Kanfer, 2005). Self-regulation is “the process involved in attaining and maintaining goals, where goals are internally represented desired states” (Vancouver & Day, 2005, p. 158). In the workplace, self-regulation is typically drawn upon to understand the processes that impact employee goal-setting, goal attainment (or lack thereof), and goal revision (Diefendorff & Lord, 2007; see also Vancouver, 2000). With a focus mainly on intra-individual concepts, the impact of self-regulatory processes on inter-individual phenomena in the workplace (e.g., relationships) has not readily been investigated by organizational researchers. Nonetheless, it is likely that self-regulation plays a pivotal role in work interactions and relationships in that various phenomena integral to human social functioning (e.g., cognition, emotion, behavior) are all guided by self-regulatory processes. Research is needed to rectify the “under-appreciation” of self-regulation in interpersonal research (Vohs & Ciarocco, 2004).

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998), a theory of self-regulation, is poised and ready to be applied to investigations of social phenomena in the workplace. The present study does just this, drawing heavily from regulatory focus theory as well as leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen &
Cashman, 1975) in order to investigate the impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on expected relationship quality. To begin, I will first outline the basic tenets of regulatory focus theory of interest to this aim. Next, I will look to the LMX literature to provide a better understanding of the context herein as well as to explicate the aspects of this literature wherein regulatory focus theory may provide significant contributions. Finally, I will incorporate these literatures in order to describe the process by which supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus congruence may positively impact expected relationship quality.

Regulatory Focus Theory

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) posits that there are two discrete regulatory orientations: promotion focus and prevention focus. A promotion focus is guided by the ideal self (i.e., who one aspires to be), and as such, the need for nurturance (i.e. growth or development) and the absence or presence of positive outcomes are most salient. Individuals with a promotion focus tend to pursue advancement and thus prefer an eager means of goal pursuit in attaining goals (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). On the other hand, a prevention focus is guided by the ought self (i.e., who one feels obligated to be) and the need for safety and security along with a concern for the presence or absence of negative outcomes are most salient. Individuals with a prevention focus tend to be more careful and cautious, preferring a vigilant means of goal pursuit.

Regulatory focus theory ties together cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral aspects that differentiate individuals with disparate regulatory orientations, or foci. Therefore, the theory provides a comprehensive perspective on motivation and self-regulation, making it easy to incorporate with theories of workplace phenomena such as
leadership (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2008). Moreover, the literature on regulatory focus has
gained significant research attention over the past few years – especially concerning the
concept of regulatory fit. That is, the theory posits that individuals experience regulatory
fit, or they “feel right” (Camacho, Higgins, & Luger, 2003) and benefit from a host of
other positive work-relevant outcomes (e.g., increased motivation, performance, task
persistence, and task enjoyment) when pursuing goals and using goal strategies that are
relevant to their motivational orientations ( Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Freitas &
Higgins, 2002; Higgins, 2000a, 2002; Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2004; Shah, Higgins,
& Friedman, 1998). Encountering regulatory fit also increases the value (e.g., monetary
or otherwise) of what a person is doing, a concept known as value from fit (Higgins,

Despite its applicability, research examining the role of regulatory focus, namely
regulatory fit, in the workplace is relatively sparse. Though there has been a recent surge
of interest in regulatory focus by organizational researchers (e.g., Paine & Taylor-Bianco,
2008), the relation of organizational variables and regulatory focus processes is an area in
need of continued empirical investigation (Brockner & Higgins, 2001). Research on the
function of regulatory focus in social interactive contexts, specifically, is also lacking.
Those few investigations that do venture in this direction typically fail to incorporate
actual social interactions into the research design (see Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen,
& Mussweiler, 2005). Though empirical work heeding this limitation has begun (e.g.,
Lake et al., in revision), many questions remain concerning the manner in which
individuals’ regulatory foci interact to determine relational outcomes. The present study
contributes to the literature by investigating the inter-individual function of regulatory
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gained significant research attention over the past few years – especially concerning the
concept of regulatory fit. That is, the theory posits that individuals experience regulatory
fit, or they “feel right” (Camacho, Higgins, & Luger, 2003) and benefit from a host of
other positive work-relevant outcomes (e.g., increased motivation, performance, task
persistence, and task enjoyment) when pursuing goals and using goal strategies that are
relevant to their motivational orientations ( Förster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Freitas &
Higgins, 2002; Higgins, 2000a, 2002; Idson, Liberman, & Higgins, 2004; Shah, Higgins,
& Friedman, 1998). Encountering regulatory fit also increases the value (e.g., monetary
or otherwise) of what a person is doing, a concept known as value from fit (Higgins,

Despite its applicability, research examining the role of regulatory focus, namely
regulatory fit, in the workplace is relatively sparse. Though there has been a recent surge
of interest in regulatory focus by organizational researchers (e.g., Paine & Taylor-Bianco,
2008), the relation of organizational variables and regulatory focus processes is an area in
need of continued empirical investigation (Brockner & Higgins, 2001). Research on the
function of regulatory focus in social interactive contexts, specifically, is also lacking.
Those few investigations that do venture in this direction typically fail to incorporate
actual social interactions into the research design (see Galinsky, Leonardelli, Okhuysen,
& Mussweiler, 2005). Though empirical work heeding this limitation has begun (e.g.,
Lake et al., in revision), many questions remain concerning the manner in which
individuals’ regulatory foci interact to determine relational outcomes. The present study
contributes to the literature by investigating the inter-individual function of regulatory
focus in true social interaction and the resulting impact on work relationships, specifically the supervisor-subordinate relationship. In order to better understand the processes by which regulatory focus may function to impact this relationship, I turn next to leader-member exchange (LMX) theory.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Work relationships can have a profound impact on individuals – especially when one considers the potential emotional impact of such relationships (Waldron, 2000). One relationship of great interest, claimed by some to be the most important organizational relationship (Harris, Harris, & Eplion, 2007; Manzoni & Barsoux, 2002), is that which exists between an individual (subordinate) and his or her leader (supervisor). This relationship is most often studied via leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Scandura, 1987). LMX theory posits that both the leader (e.g., supervisor) and follower (e.g., subordinate) jointly determine the quality of the relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). High quality leader-member relationships are characterized by trust, respect, and emotional support; whereas low quality LMX relationships lack such characteristics (Dienesch & Liden, 1986).

Having a high quality relationship with one’s supervisor can positively impact an employee’s overall work experience (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Research has demonstrated that LMX quality is tied to a wide array of organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction (Schriesheim, Neider, & Scandura, 1998), organizational commitment (Liden & Maslyn, 1998), organizational citizenship behaviors (Wat & Shaffer, 2005; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997), and performance ratings (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). Though substantial research has focused on the outcomes of strong LMX relationships,
much less attention has been devoted to understanding how such relationships develop (House & Aditya, 1997; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005). The present paper proposes that attending to self-regulatory strategies of both the leader and follower (e.g., namely those beget by discrete regulatory foci) is a unique perspective that may address this deficit in the literature.

Previous research has found that various forms of congruence or similarity between supervisors and subordinates are positively related to the quality of LMX relationships. Examples include value congruence (Ashkanasy & O’Connor, 1997; Liden et al., 1993), attitude congruence (Engle & Lord, 1997; Phillips & Bedeian, 1994; Turban, Jones, & Rozelle, 1990), and positive affect congruence (Bauer & Green, 1996). The current study goes beyond extant literature by attending to the importance of congruent regulatory foci. Regulatory focus theory has seldom been applied in the context of leadership research (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2007), and only a few studies have considered social-cognitive constructs such as regulatory focus in the supervisor-subordinate relationship (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lapidot, Kark, & Shamir, 2007; Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999; Medvedeff & Lord, 2005). Bringing these literatures together provides a perspective new to LMX theory and elucidates potential underlying processes describing how self-regulatory structures of supervisors and subordinates may interact to elicit different qualities of relationships.

Regulatory Focus Congruence, Regulatory Fit, and the Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Traditionally, investigations of regulatory fit have not attended to the impact of congruence between the strategic orientations of two individuals. Rather, the fit of one
individual’s strategic orientation in relation to the demands of a task or situation is most often the operationalization of choice. The perspective herein posits that regulatory fit effects are more widespread than traditional treatments have afforded. As such, regulatory fit effects should be “observed with more frequency and regularity” (Aaker & Lee, 2006, p. 16) in various manifestations, such as in the social context of leader-member exchanges. The present study applies the concept of regulatory fit in a new fashion, proposing that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence will have profound effects on regulatory fit experiences, and subsequently, expected relationship quality (i.e., LMX, trust).

Recent theoretical work by Kark and Van-Dijk (2008) has similarly attended to the potential bearing of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on LMX quality. Only one study of which I am aware, however, has empirically investigated the effect of regulatory fit between supervisor and subordinate on the expected quality of the LMX relationship (see Medvedeff & Lord, 2005). The present study seeks to continue to refine conceptual thought in this direction as well as to provide empirical evidence of the hypotheses therein. By and large, regulatory focus theory will serve as the guiding framework and as the backdrop informing the organization of the theoretical model proposed (see Figure 1.1).
Sassenberg, Jonas, Shah, and Brazy (2007) demonstrated that individuals prefer to interact with others whose self-regulatory strategies are in line with their own, thus eliciting regulatory fit. Specifically, prevention-focused individuals preferred low-power groups as such groups require that members focus on vigilant (e.g., goal-congruent) strategies; whereas promotion-focused individuals preferred high-power groups that provided the opportunity to enact eager strategies. Camacho et al. (2003) found that when the manner of conflict resolution determined by an authority figure was in concert with an individual’s regulatory focus (e.g., vigilant resolution for prevention focus, eager resolution for promotion focus), he or she described the resolution as more “right.” Additionally, Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002) provided evidence that role models who encourage strategies that match (vs. contrast) an individual’s regulatory concerns tend to enhance (vs. deter) that individual’s motivation.

This work highlights the contention of the present study – that regulatory focus congruence between individuals has implications for regulatory fit and other outcomes. It
also suggests that individuals are not only able to determine the regulatory inclinations of others, but perhaps, may also be able to compare another’s inclinations to one’s own (Vohs & Ciarocco, 2004). The findings of Camacho et al. (2003) as well as Lockwood et al. (2002) specifically underscores the notion that congruence of regulatory foci between an individual and a superior (whether an authority figure or a role model) facilitates the sustainment of one’s natural regulatory inclinations, which itself underlies fit effects. However, these studies do not elucidate how these regulatory fit effects would unfold when an encounter ensues between an individual (e.g., a subordinate) and a superior (e.g., a supervisor), such as in social interaction.

In the present paper, a match between supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus is proposed to engender more “automatic, intuitive social interactions” (Engle & Lord, 1997, p. 991). This is due in part to the fact that engaging with others who espouse similar regulatory strategies allows individuals to engage in natural tendencies (Sassenberg et al., 2007) that “feel right” (e.g., elicit regulatory fit). Specifically, individuals are better able to display the non-verbal behaviors in line with their strategic inclinations (see Cesario, 2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008), which also tend to “match” those of their interaction partner. Research has shown that behavioral similarity during an interaction causes greater liking and allows smoother, more natural interactions to unfold (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Chartrand, Maddux, & Lakin, 2005; Pugh, 2002). The experience of regulatory fit is proposed to be embodied in these interactions that “feel right,” are more natural, easy, comfortable, and enjoyable. Subsequently, more positive interactions with one’s supervisor have a profound influence on supervisor-subordinate relationship quality (Bauer & Green, 1996).
Additionally, it is posited that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence will impact value from fit. As stated in the regulatory fit literature, a supervisor’s inherent “value” is increased in the subordinate’s eyes, given his or her ability to sustain the subordinate’s inherent regulatory focus concerns. Research supports the argument that compatibility between leader and follower tends to be associated with greater liking and relationship quality (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden et al., 1993). Liking itself is also an established antecedent of LMX (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden et al., 1993; Turban et al., 1990; Wayne & Ferris, 1990; Wayne et al., 1997). In the current study, perceived value and liking serve as indices of value from fit as both of these variables reflect a valuation of the supervisor. Subsequently, value from fit is predicted to have a direct positive impact on supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality (e.g., trust and LMX).

Summary

In summary, the purpose of the present study is manifold. The overarching goal, however, is to extend the literature on regulatory focus and regulatory fit in a unique way. First, I will bring regulatory fit into the arena of social interaction, specifically that which takes place between supervisor and subordinate. Second, I will elucidate the processes by which supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence impacts regulatory fit experiences and resulting expected relationship quality by drawing from extant studies of regulatory fit. I will also look to research from the social mimicry literature that speaks to the importance of congruent non-verbal displays in social interaction (e.g., Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). This will allow an explication of the nature of the regulatory fit experience (e.g., feeling right, enjoyment, ease of interaction, comfort, natural non-verbal displays).
The nature of value from fit will also be further defined in the present context as liking and perceived value. Third, I will incorporate research from regulatory focus theory with LMX theory (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975), thus bringing together diverse and well-established bodies of literature. As a result, I will investigate constructs that have not traditionally been incorporated in the regulatory focus literature including liking, supervisor value, trust, and LMX quality. Finally, I will continue efforts to extend regulatory focus theory, specifically regulatory fit, into the work context where it is ever so pertinent.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study incorporates regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998), particularly the concept of regulatory fit (Higgins, 2000a, 2002, 2005), and leader-member exchange (LMX) theory (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975) to investigate the impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on expected relationship quality. In addition to a proposed direct, positive impact of regulatory focus congruence on supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality, various mediating processes are also posited. Congruence between supervisor and subordinate in predominant regulatory focus is proposed to facilitate social interaction by allowing individuals to enact their strategic inclinations when interacting, thereby encouraging a more natural and/or automatic interaction. This ability to “act as one naturally would” is proposed to contribute to one’s sense of “feeling right” associated with regulatory fit in the regulatory focus theory literature. Other experiences such as enjoyment, ease of interaction, and comfort also serve to characterize the phenomenological experience of regulatory fit in this context.

As well, supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus congruence is posited to directly impact perceptions of liking and value (i.e., the value one ascribes to having an individual as one’s supervisor). Together, these concepts serve as an index of value from fit, in keeping with the regulatory focus theory literature. Coincidentally, both the
regulatory fit and value from fit experiences are posited to have direct positive effects on expected relationship quality, defined as subordinate trust in the supervisor and LMX quality. An indirect effect of regulatory fit on supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality through value from fit is also proposed.

Self-Regulation in the Workplace

Self-regulatory processes and their effects in the workplace have long been a topic of great interest to organizational researchers and practitioners alike. In fact, today’s work climate (e.g., characterized by current economic, technological, and legal trends) has arguably made it imperative for organizations to better understand how employees’ self-regulatory strategies impact job performance (Kanfer, 2005). Self-regulation is “the process involved in attaining and maintaining goals, where goals are internally represented desired states” (Vancouver & Day, 2005, p. 158). In the workplace, self-regulation is typically drawn upon to understand the processes impacting employee goal-setting, goal attainment (or lack thereof), and goal revision (Diefendorff & Lord, 2007; see also Vancouver, 2000). Though not traditionally the focus, recent work has begun to recognize the implications of self-regulatory processes in interpersonal interaction and social functioning (see Vohs & Baumeister, 2004; Vohs & Ciarocco, 2004). Due to the inherently social nature of the workplace, understanding the impact of self-regulatory processes is an essential aspect of understanding workplace functioning.

Self-regulation is a general term referring to the process proposed to subsume most, and potentially all processes pertinent to human functioning (e.g., cognition, motivation, emotion, behavior). Self-regulation has also been described as the process used by individuals to regulate their thoughts, emotions, impulses, task performances,
and attention (Vohs & Baumeister, 2004). The pervasive nature of self-regulation in such a wide array of human activities has made interest in this area quite appealing to organizational researchers. Karoly (1993) noted that self-regulation “implies the modulation of thought, affect, behavior, or attention via deliberate or automated use of specific mechanisms and supportive meta-skills” (p. 25). The latter portion of Karoly’s comment also points to another appealing aspect of self-regulation in that it can take place both consciously as well as sub-consciously. One area of research that ties together all of the central aspects of self-regulation into one overarching theory is regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998). This theory serves as the framework largely driving the hypotheses of the present paper.

**Regulatory Focus Theory**

Individuals may pursue the same goal with quite disparate motivational orientations and in very different ways (e.g., utilizing different strategies of self-regulation). For instance, contrast the employee who engages in mentoring activities in order to achieve a career goal such as a promotion in comparison with the employee who does so in order to avoid getting passed over for such a promotion. These two individuals are engaging in the very same activity for important reasons, though the specific reasons are inherently different – the former acts to approach a positive end state whereas the latter acts to avoid a negative end state. This example also illustrates the hedonic principle, a concept that has greatly influenced most theories of motivation, stating that individuals are innately motivated to approach pleasure and avoid pain (Freud, 1920/1952). Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) extends this principle and posits that self-regulation operates differently, depending on the fundamental needs
underlying goal pursuit. These fundamental needs – nurturance and security – are guided by disparate self-views and give rise to discrete regulatory orientations.

Two regulatory orientations exist according to regulatory focus theory: a promotion focus and a prevention focus (Higgins, 1997). The promotion-focused individual is concerned with the discrepancy between the actual self and ideal self (i.e., who one aspires to be), and as such, the need for nurturance (i.e. growth or development) is most salient. The promotion-focused individual is also most concerned with the absence and presence of positive outcomes, which inevitably translates into a focus on accomplishment, advancement, and aspiration. On the other hand, the prevention-focused individual is concerned with the discrepancy between the actual self and the ought self (i.e., who one feels obligated to be). The need for safety and security is most salient to this individual. Additionally, a prevention-focused individual is concerned with the absence and presence of negative outcomes. It is therefore characteristic of the prevention-focused individual to be most concerned with protection, safety, and responsibility. In the next few sections, I will further detail the major tenets of regulatory focus theory, attending to the concepts that differentiate prevention and promotion foci (for an overview, see Figure 2.1).

*Figure 2.1. Variables Related to Promotion/Prevention Foci (Higgins, 1997)*
Regulatory Focus as Both a Trait and State

Regulatory focus has been operationalized as both an individual difference as well as a situationally amendable trait. Due to the fact that both nurturance and security are necessary for survival, prevention and promotion foci are proposed to be present in all individuals, to some extent. Yet, it is common for individuals to display a dominant focus of either prevention or promotion, typically perceived as a trait or chronic individual difference (Higgins et al., 2001). An inclination toward a given focus is said to develop early in life as a result of caretaker-child interactions. That is, a focus on hopes and aspirations is ingrained in an individual to the extent that a parent or caretaker emphasizes a concern with advancement and accomplishment (Higgins, 1997, 1998, 2000b). On the contrary, a focus on safety and security is engendered to the extent that concern with protection and responsibility are emphasized.

Regulatory focus may also be situationally induced or primed, thus functioning as a temporary state. When viewed as situational, regulatory focus has been manipulated most often in one of two ways. The first approach previously used is framing a task goal and/or related task incentive as a gain or non-gain (promotion induction) versus a loss or non-loss (prevention induction) (e.g., Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Shah & Higgins, 1997; Shah et al., 1998). The second approach to situational induction of regulatory focus is to direct people’s attention to different types of standards or selves. This typically involves priming ideal or ought selves utilizing various methods such as directive written responses (e.g., asking participants to write about their hopes or aspirations, thus priming an ideal self) or word sorting tasks (e.g., asking participants to sort a list of words into a set number of categories – a specific subset of those words being tied to a given focus or
related self) (see Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994; Liberman, Molden, Idson, & Higgins, 2001). Interestingly, recent investigations provide evidence that regulatory focus may be “contagious” such that an individual’s focus can be primed by the focus of a significant other (Shah, 2003). This provides a new and unique means for priming regulatory focus.

*Regulatory Focus and Distinct Strategic Inclinations*

Promotion and prevention systems are also characterized by distinct strategic inclinations toward goal attainment. Though both promotion and prevention foci entail a motivation to approach or attain a goal, they differ in their attention toward how to successfully attain the goal. Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between two specific strategies to this end – an eagerness strategy or a vigilant strategy (Higgins, 1997, 1998; Crowe & Higgins, 1997). Individuals with a promotion focus tend to pursue advancement and thus prefer an eager means of goal pursuit in attaining goals. For instance, a promotion-focused organizational employee who perceives a job promotion as an accomplishment may approach matches to this desired end state by seeking out developmental opportunities and discussing promotional opportunities with his or her supervisor. On the contrary, individuals in a prevention focus tend to be more careful and cautious, preferring a vigilant means of goal pursuit. To illustrate, a prevention-focused employee who construes a job promotion as an expectation or responsibility may avoid mismatches to this desired end state by ensuring that he or she has met all of the experiential requirements and avoids engaging in assignments that might deter his or her chances for consideration.
As demonstrated by these two examples, vigilant versus eager strategic means each “fit” better with either a prevention or promotion strategy, respectively (Cesario, Grant, & Higgins, 2004; Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins et al., 2003; Shah et al., 1998). Engaging in strategies that provide such a fit facilitates one’s orientation. When operating under a prevention or promotion focus, individuals tend to pay greater attention to and rely more upon information that best enables them to attain their goal (Aaker & Lee, 2006). It is not surprising then, that when left to their own devices, individuals tend to use strategies of goal pursuit that inherently sustain their predominant focus, and avoid utilizing strategies that would disrupt their focus (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins et al., 2001; Higgins et al., 1994; see also Higgins & Spiegel, 2004).

**Regulatory Fit**

Higgins (2000a, 2005) proposed that people experience regulatory fit when the manner by which they complete an activity “matches,” and thus sustains their current motivational orientation. Coincidentally, engaging in an activity where the manner of goal pursuit does *not* match one’s motivational orientation elicits regulatory *non-fit*. Regulatory fit describes the “motivational, experiential, and evaluative consequences” that emerge when the means used to pursue a goal and the orientation of the individual engaging in the pursuit are compatible (Cesario, 2006, p. 4). Completing a goal in a manner that sustains one’s orientation elicits more positive subjective evaluations of the task at hand, including its felt importance (Higgins et al., 2003). As well, fit strengthens peoples’ engagement in what they are doing and makes them “feel right” about it; whereas non-fit engenders a feeling of “wrongness” (Higgins, 1997, 2005; Camacho et
Therefore, the same actions can be experienced more or less positively, purely as a function of their fit to an individual’s regulatory state (Higgins, 2008).

Regulatory fit effects have also been found to positively impact task enjoyment (Freitas & Higgins, 2002), motivation (Idson et al., 2004; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow, & Higgins, 2004), task persistence (Förster et al., 1998), and task performance (Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002; Shah et al., 1998). Interestingly, fit may also be instituted in ways other than by matching the means of goal pursuit to one’s regulatory orientation. For instance, framing task instructions (e.g., Bianco, Higgins, & Klem, 2003) or tailoring the consequences of goal pursuit (e.g., Förster et al., 1998; Shah et al., 1998) in such a way that is either compatible or incompatible with one’s task orientation also produces fit effects. Förster and colleagues (1998) found that individuals persisted longer in attempting to solve anagrams when the consequences of performance (e.g., gain or non-gain vs. non-loss or loss of $1 bonus) were framed in line with their strategic inclinations (e.g., gain/non-gain for promotion, non-loss/loss for prevention).

Engaging in an activity that elicits regulatory fit also increases the value of what a person is doing, independent of the consequences that may result from that goal pursuit. This perspective that the means of goal pursuit provide value is quite intuitive and can be found in other literatures. Consider a similar perspective from the organizational justice literature (see Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005). A wealth of research has supported the notion that procedural justice has a profound effect on the overall perceived fairness of a decision. That is, independent of the outcome or “ends” of a decision, the process or “means” utilized to arrive upon a decision has a unique and significant impact on subsequent justice perceptions (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Sweeney...
These findings underscore the oft cited adage, “The ends do not justify the means.”

Higgins (1998, 2000a) refers to this form of added value as value from fit, positing that when individuals utilize means of goal achievement that best fit their regulatory orientation, the inherent value of the task increases via the experience of regulatory fit. Higgins and colleagues (2003) showed that the monetary value ascribed to an object such as a mug was 40-60% higher when the strategy used to choose the object fit an individual’s regulatory orientation. Regulatory fit and related value from fit effects are posited to be independent of mood effects, a contention well supported by research (Avnet & Higgins, 2003; Camacho et al., 2003; Cesario et al., 2004; Higgins et al., 2003; Idson et al., 2004). Lastly, this value from fit may even be transferred to other value experiences that take place once the goal pursuit process has ceased (see Higgins, et al., 2003).

**Regulatory Fit and the Social Nature of the Workplace**

The majority of an employee’s time while at work is spent engaging in social interactions (e.g., with other employees or customers) (Waldron, 2000). Therefore, it is essential that researchers seeking to understand organizations first strive to understand social interactions and social relationships – especially the relationship between supervisor and subordinate. Considering the prevalent influence regulatory focus has on human thought, emotion, and behavior (Galinsky et al., 2005; see also Higgins, 1997, 1998), regulatory focus theory may provide a beneficial means to better understand the nature of supervisor-subordinate interactions and how they may impact relationship quality. Regulatory fit effects have been found in a wide array of “social influence”
situations (see Cesario, Higgins, & Scholer, 2007). However, little research has explicitly attempted to examine the role of regulatory fit in the workplace (for exceptions see Ritchie & Schmidt, 2006; Van-Dijk & Kluger, 2004) nonetheless in social interaction (Galinsky et al., 2005). This is unfortunate as self-regulatory processes such as regulatory fit likely play a pivotal role in interpersonal interactions (Brazy & Shah, 2006), especially those that transpire between supervisor and subordinate.

Recent work that has begun to draw regulatory fit constructs into the social arena provides important insight concerning how regulatory fit and related constructs may emerge in the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Lockwood and colleagues (2002) demonstrated that the degree to which individuals are motivated by negative or positive role models depends on individuals’ self-regulatory concerns. Individuals exposed to role models who highlighted strategies congruent with either their chronic or primed regulatory focus experienced enhanced motivation. That is, prevention-focused individuals were motivated by a negative role model driven by prevention goals; whereas promotion-focused individuals were more motivated by a positive role model driven by promotion goals. Where there was incongruence, role models actually deterred individuals’ motivation, implicating that a mismatch elicited a disruption in self-regulation. Though this work omitted any actual interactions between a role model and an individual, the studies by Lockwood and colleagues are the first to direct attention toward the importance of regulatory fit between an individual and a superior.

Camacho et al. (2003) investigated whether regulatory fit effects transfer to moral evaluations. Individuals were asked to recall conflict resolutions in the past where an authority figure determined the manner of resolution. When the manner of resolution
determined by the authority figure was in concert with an individuals’ regulatory focus (e.g., vigilant resolution for prevention focus, eager resolution for promotion focus), he or she described the resolution as more “right.” These results were also found to be independent of procedural justice (e.g., having been treated fairly) and the valence of the resolution (e.g., whether it was pleasurable or painful). More importantly for the present study, these findings illustrate that the experience of regulatory fit can develop based upon judgments of another person’s actions – specifically, an authority figure’s actions.

How individuals evaluate groups has also been clarified by regulatory fit effects (Sassenberg et al., 2007). Sassenberg and colleagues found that groups that allow for the fulfillment of one’s regulatory needs appear more attractive. These authors note that their research highlights the importance of self-regulation for uncovering a “distinct determinant of group liking and identification – the group’s capacity to serve its members’ ongoing regulatory needs” (p. 266). Results also demonstrated that prevention-focused individuals preferred low-power groups as such groups entail a focus on safety and security through the use of vigilant strategies, thus eliciting regulatory fit. On the contrary, promotion-focused individuals preferred high-power groups, given that the characteristics of such groups provided the opportunity to enact eager strategies in service of striving for achievement. Interestingly, an individual’s perception of their fit relative to a group was based on the degree to which membership in that group would enable the individual to “behave as they would like to.” This insinuates that being able to engage in natural tendencies (e.g., behavioral, affective, and the like) when in the presence of others is an important reflection of fit in a social context.
Subsequently, Sassenberg and colleagues illustrated that the experience of group fit accounted for resulting perceptions of group value. In fact, “group value,” or the degree to which an individual valued becoming a member of a group, served as the proxy for value from fit. This research is pertinent to the present study as it is one of very few to apply regulatory fit in a social context, thus drawing on new and interesting methods for operationalizing central constructs such as regulatory fit and value from fit. This work also underscores the perspective espoused in the present paper – individuals prefer to interact with others whose self-regulatory strategies are in line with one’s own, the result of which is the experience of regulatory fit and value from fit. Taken together, these investigations provide an inclination of the impact regulatory focus may have in a social setting. As such, these studies have tremendous implications for individuals’ interactions with others in the workplace, especially those that take place between supervisor and subordinate.

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**

Leaders have a profound influence on followers, serving to guide followers’ social functioning and interpretation of various organizational events (Maitlis, 2005; Weick, 1995). Put differently, a subordinate’s relationship with his or her supervisor is “a lens through which the entire work experience is viewed” (Gerstner & Day, 1997, p. 840). Therefore, the relationship with a leader may be a key determinant driving the manner in which a follower perceives, and therefore, behaves toward the organization. Evidence to this fact may be drawn from the empirical work highlighting the effect of leader-member exchange quality on work outcomes. Research indicates that experiencing a high quality relationship with one’s supervisor can positively impact an employee’s
overall work experience (Gerstner & Day, 1997; see also Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). It has been widely recognized that the quality of the relationship between supervisor and subordinate impacts organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction (Erdogan & Liden, 2002; Harris et al., 2007; Schriesheim et al., 1998), organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Liden & Maslyn, 1998), organizational citizenship behaviors (Wat & Shaffer, 2005; Wayne et al., 1997), and performance (Kacmar, Witt, Zivnuska, & Gully, 2003; Liden et al., 1993), to name a few.

The relationship between leaders (i.e., supervisors) and followers (i.e., subordinates) is most often studied through the purview of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. Originally developed by Graen, Dansereau, and colleagues (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975), the predominant focus of LMX theory is on the quality of relationships between supervisors and subordinates and the subsequent effects of such relationships on important organizational outcomes. LMX theory emerged from early work in Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) research (Dansereau et al., 1975), which recognized that leaders develop different relationships with followers (i.e., subordinates are categorized as part of an in-group or an out-group), rather than treating all subordinates exactly the same. Over time, the details characteristic of high quality leader-member exchanges have gone through some conceptual iterations (Schriesheim et al., 1999). However, in general, the central aspects characteristic of high quality relationships, according to LMX theory, entail trust, respect, mutual obligation, and support. Low-quality LMX relationships, on the other hand, entail very low levels of these attributes.
Characteristics of both the leader and follower such as attitudes, experiences, personality, and values are said to reciprocally influence the quality of the leader-member relationship (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; House & Aditya, 1997). In other words, LMX theory posits that both the supervisor and subordinate jointly determine the nature of the relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Howell & Shamir, 2005). As such, LMX research typically investigates the “two-way, reciprocal exchanges between leader and follower” (Wang et al., 2005, p. 420). For example, a supervisor may initiate an exchange by delegating a task to a subordinate, in response to which the subordinate may choose to reciprocate by completing the task effectively and efficiently. In this exchange, both members make attributions about each other’s actions (e.g., whether they are malicious or well-intended), which further determine future actions as well as the ultimate quality of the LMX relationship. LMX conceives of the supervisor-subordinate or leader-member relationships in terms of social exchanges (e.g., wherein commodities, both tangible and intangible, are exchanged) in which both leaders and followers perform effectively in response to high-quality relationships.

The Role of Trust

Leadership and trust literatures have developed independently of each other, yet there are a considerable number of shared perspectives between the two (Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000). Though many definitions exist, trust has been defined as “the extent to which a person is confident in, and willing to act on the basis of, the words, actions, and decisions of another” (McAllister, 1995, p. 25). There is general consensus among researchers that trust is an integral aspect of the LMX relationship (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Indeed, supervisors are primary referents of trust for employees (Dirks &
Though, supervisors do not alone determine the level of trust, as characteristics of both the supervisor and subordinate determine the amount of trust apparent in the relationship (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

Despite consensus that trust is relevant to LMX relationships, the exact relationship between these constructs remains a subject of debate. Trust has been treated both as an antecedent (Gomez & Rosen, 2001), a correlate (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), an outcome (Wat & Shaffer, 2005), and a sub-facet of LMX (for a review, see Schriesheim et al., 1999). Brower and colleagues (2000) argued that trust between leader and follower in itself defines relationship quality. Therefore, rather than utilizing a traditional assessment of LMX, these authors treated perceptions of trust as a proxy for LMX. The inconsistent treatment of trust in this way is not entirely surprising, given the lack of agreement in the literature surrounding the specific sub-constructs said to comprise LMX (see Schriesheim et al., 1999). The present study views trust as a unique construct that describes the nature of the relationship developing between supervisor and subordinate. Thus, in line with previous research, trust serves as a correlate of LMX (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), and together, these constructs depict a larger perspective of individuals’ views of supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.

**Contributing to the LMX Literature**

Some have noted the LMX literature’s predominant focus on the outcomes of high-quality leader-member exchange, while much less attention has been devoted to the antecedents of such exchanges (House & Aditya, 1997; Wang et al., 2005). Given the impact that the leader-member relationship may have, it is important to uncover the processes that lead to the development of high quality relationships between supervisors
and subordinates (see Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker, 2007; Bauer & Green, 1996; Liden et al., 1993). However, of the relatively few studies investigating the antecedents of LMX, results have generally been inconsistent. Gerstner and Day (1997), in their meta-analysis, noted the dearth of cumulative knowledge available in the literature concerning antecedents of LMX. Therefore, there is a tremendous need for clarification of the processes by which relationships of divergent qualities are established (House & Aditya, 1997). The present paper presents leader-follower regulatory focus congruence and resulting fit experiences as a new avenue of exploration to this end.

Regulatory focus is said to play an important role in an assortment of psychological processes including affective reactions (Brockner & Higgins, 2001), motivation (Förster et al., 1998; Higgins, 1998), self-regulation (Higgins, 1997), information processing and persuasion (Aaker & Lee, 2001; Lee & Aaker, 2004), attributions (Liberman et al., 2001), and judgment and decision making (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). These psychological processes certainly play a pivotal role in the development and maintenance of LMX relationships. In fact, according to LMX theory, follower motivation is expected to impact the quality of the leader-member relationship. But, the theory falls short of clearly conveying the manner by which followers’ motivation, or leaders’ motivation for that matter, functions to impart such an influence (Howell & Shamir, 2005; see also Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

As well, despite broad acceptance of the basic tenets of LMX theory, concerns about the theory still remain. For example, Dienesch and Liden (1986) suggested that LMX investigations incorporate a larger domain of variables as part of the leader-follower interaction process. Yet, regulatory focus theory has seldom been investigated in
the larger context of leadership research (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2007), and only a few studies have even considered social-cognitive constructs such as regulatory focus in the supervisor-subordinate relationship (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lapidot et al., 2007; Lord et al., 1999; Medvedeff & Lord, 2005). Exploring regulatory focus theory in relation to supervisor-subordinate interactions and LMX is an avenue that requires exploration. To do so, the present paper proposes a new perspective on regulatory fit.

A New Perspective on Regulatory Fit

The manner in which regulatory fit is operationalized has assumed various forms throughout the literature (Lee & Aaker, 2004; Spiegel et al., 2004). For instance, fit has been enacted based on the “matching” of chronic orientation and strategy (e.g., eager vs. vigilant) used to select an object (Higgins et al., 2003). Fit has also taken the form of a match between an individual’s primed orientation and the type of choice made in a decision-making scenario (e.g., desirable vs. undesirable) (Idson et al., 2004). Thus, as illustrated by these examples, the type and even the level of fit (see Higgins, 2000a) can vary largely in any situation. Though operationalizations of regulatory fit abound in research, these approaches largely ignore the potential impact of fit between individuals. The present paper contends that regulatory fit effects “should be observed with more frequency and regularity than is currently reported” in extant literature (Aaker & Lee, 2006, p. 16). Thus, regulatory fit effects are expected to be more widespread than traditional treatments have afforded and these effects should be observable in the social context.

The present study serves to extend the notion of regulatory fit by focusing on the social interaction between supervisor and subordinate. I suggest that regulatory fit results
from the regulatory focus congruence between leader and follower. This fit can function by manifesting itself in the nature of the social interaction that takes place between these individuals. It is a major contention of the present paper that individuals’ tendencies to utilize certain strategies of goal attainment that “fit” their regulatory orientation (Higgins, 2000a) should also be apparent in social interaction. Displays of affect and other non-verbal tendencies are important tools utilized in social interaction and provide strategies that can enable or deter regulatory fit. For instance, following from the social functioning perspective, expressions, vocal tone, and posture are all important resources utilized in the effort to communicate one’s feelings (Lord & Kanfer, 2002). Emotions and related non-verbal expressions carry with them the capacity to impact the establishment, quality, and duration of social relationships (see Keltner & Gross, 1999; Keltner & Haidt, 2001). Promotion and prevention foci represent two “broad self-regulatory systems underlying both action and affect” (Carver, Sutton, & Scheier, 2000, p. 746; see also Carver, 2001). The present paper posits that each focus is associated with a unique subset of non-verbal and affective display strategies that serve to differentiate them from each other in a social context.

Non-Verbal Behavior

An individual’s regulatory focus should arguably predispose him or her to be more likely to display a discrete subset of non-verbal behaviors in line with his/her strategic orientation. This should hold true for both supervisor and subordinate in the work context. Non-verbal displays are important instruments one may utilize when engaging in social interaction. As different strategies of interaction are likely to take place in this context, it follows that discrete non-verbal displays may potentially be
described as prevention versus promotion focused. Recent work provides some preliminary evidence that different subsets of nonverbal behaviors can be organized to the extent they coincide with a given regulatory focus. Cesario (2006; see also Cesario & Higgins, 2008) posited two very specific sets of non-verbal behaviors that are associated with promotion and prevention strategies of eagerness and vigilance, respectively.

Non-verbal behaviors said to be associated with eagerness involve animated, broad opening gestures, hand motions with palms open and outwardly projected, a body position that is forward-leaning, relatively faster body movement, and raised eyebrows (see Cesario, 2006). On the other hand, behaviors associated with vigilance include precise gesturing, “pushing” hand motions that signal slowing down, a body position that is backward-leaning, relatively slower body movement, and a furrowed brow. A number of studies conducted by Cesario also provided evidence that when nonverbal behaviors are in concert (contrast) with one’s regulatory orientation, they have the ability to sustain (disrupt) an individual’s regulatory focus (Cesario, 2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008). These findings provide the first evidence that, if a supervisor strategically uses nonverbal behaviors to convey eagerness versus vigilance, this may produce regulatory fit for promotion focus versus prevention focus subordinates, respectively.

**Emotion Display**

The display of *emotions* through non-verbal behaviors, to the extent that they fit with a given orientation, may also provide a means for fit to take place between individuals. Emotion has been recognized as a momentary affective state with an identifiable cause or target (Russell & Feldman Barrett, 1999) that may occur as both a felt experience (internal) and as an expression (external). Emotions are a central part of
day-to-day organizational functioning (Arvey, Renz, Watson, 1998) and serve as an important aspect of employees’ relationships at work. As Waldron (2000) notes, organizational emotion is *relational* in that “emotion can be a resource through which organizational relationships are created, interpreted, and altered” (p. 65). The impact of emotion is particularly salient when greater cognitive functioning is required, such as when individuals are learning *new* information (Forgas, 1995; Forgas & George, 2001). Therefore, emotions are likely to impart substantial influence in initial leader-follower interactions, where individuals first begin to learn about one another.

Emotions may differ in a number of ways, including their valence (i.e., positive or negative) and activation (i.e., the effort or energy output associated with the emotion) (Feldman Barrett & Russell, 1998). Interestingly, unique affective tendencies provide an important means for differentiating between prevention and promotion foci. Regulatory focus impacts the phenomenological nature as well as the magnitude of individuals’ emotional experiences resulting from successes and failures (Brockner & Higgins, 2001; Higgins, Grant, & Shah, 1999; Higgins, 2000b). The promotion focused individual experiences emotions that range from cheerfulness (a high intensity, positive emotion) as a result of promotion success to dejection (a low intensity, negative emotion) as a result of promotion failure. These emotions are characteristic of the positive affectivity (PA) dimension (e.g., Watson, Wiese, Vaidya, & Tellegen, 1999). On the other hand, the prevention focused individual experiences emotions that range from quiescence (a low intensity, positive emotion) as a result of prevention success to agitation (a high intensity, negative emotion) as a result of prevention failure (see Table 2.1). These emotions are characteristic of the negative affectivity (NA) dimension. Therefore, the very same event
may elicit entirely different emotional reactions depending on an individual’s inclination to either approach pleasure (promotion-focus) or avoid pain (prevention-focus).

Table 2.1

Discrete Emotions as a Function of Self-Regulatory Effectiveness and Regulatory Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Focus</th>
<th>Self-Regulatory Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Success (Pleasure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Cheerfulness*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quiescence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Taken from Higgins (2000b). Asterisks represent high activation/intensity emotions.

Whereas the PA system appears to function as the structure guiding emotional experiences of a promotion focus, the NA system guides the emotionality of a prevention focus (Carver et al., 2000). Therefore, individuals with different regulatory foci construe the world in different emotional terms, and utilize separate continua of emotions to interact with and interpret the surrounding world (Brazy & Shah, 2006; Brockner & Higgins, 2001; Higgins, 1997). Given distinct emotional tendencies, the present study posits that regulatory focus also impacts individuals’ propensities to utilize and display specific emotions during social interactions. In support of this point, Higgins et al. (1997) found that a stronger promotion focus was associated with a greater frequency of cheerfulness (e.g., happy, satisfied) and dejection-related emotions (e.g., disappointed, sad); whereas a stronger prevention focus was associated with a greater frequency of acquiescence (e.g., calm, relaxed) and agitation-related emotions (e.g., on edge, tense). Recently, Shah and Higgins (2001) demonstrated that the efficiency with which individuals appraised an object in terms of how cheerful or dejected versus quiescent or agitated it made them feel depended on their regulatory focus.
The Experience of Regulatory Fit in Social Interaction

Cesario and Higgins (2008) proposed that regulatory fit can be a “useful framework for a more nuanced understanding of the effects of nonverbal cues in persuasion and impression formation” (p. 419). In line with this perspective, it is proposed herein that the non-verbal displays of a supervisor have the capability to sustain or deter the motivational orientation of the subordinate. The degree to which a supervisor’s interpersonal strategies sustain a subordinate’s orientation (e.g., match their natural inclinations), the greater regulatory fit an individual will experience. On the contrary, engaging in interpersonal strategies that are not preferred (e.g., run in contrast to one’s inherent inclinations) disrupts an individual’s orientation. This contention is based largely on the idea that interpersonal strategies, such as non-verbal displays, can be categorized as eager (promotion) or vigilant (prevention).

Non-verbal cues are social tools used as a means of communication in interactions (Keltner & Haidt, 2001). Research has shown that behavioral similarity during an interaction causes greater perceptions of liking and enables smoother, more natural interactions (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Chartrand et al., 2005; Lakin, Jefferis, Cheng, & Chartrand, 2003; Pugh, 2002). As Lakin and colleagues (2003) state, when two individuals work from a similar “repertoire of nonverbal behaviors,” this is likely to work as a “social glue” – drawing them together and increasing affiliation (p. 146). Together, this perspective along with the extant research on regulatory fit serves as the basis for the conceptualization of regulatory fit between supervisor and subordinate. Non-verbal and related emotional displays are an inherent component of social interaction and play an important role as well in relationships (Keltner & Gross, 1999). Individuals demonstrate
greater efficiency when appraising themselves and their environments along dimensions that are relevant to their self-regulatory concerns (Shah & Higgins, 2001). Where social interaction is concerned, this suggests that “the same person acting in the same manner may make entirely different first impressions on others, depending on the regulatory focus concerns of those he or she encounters” (Shah & Higgins, 2001, p. 703).

Individuals may more efficiently discern others’ displays of cheerfulness or dejection if promotion focused; whereas displays of calmness or anxiety are better discerned when one is prevention focused. Greater ability to discern an interaction partner’s display of emotion should translate into more effective and less taxing interactions, which can color individuals’ perceptions of each other. In support of this idea, Cesario (2006) found that individuals in a promotion (prevention) focus reported that it was easier to pay attention to a speaker when he delivered a message in an eager (vigilant) non-verbal style. The speaker was also perceived to be more intelligent and credible in these “fit” conditions in comparison to non-fit conditions (e.g., eager delivery and prevention focus or vigilant delivery and promotion focus).

To the extent that one’s interaction partner is similar to oneself in regulatory focus, and thus more likely to display a range of emotions characteristic to oneself, similarity in regulatory foci should elicit more enjoyable, easy, and comfortable interactions. These experiences should also be associated with “feeling right,” which is a classic characterization of the regulatory fit experience (Higgins, 2000a). Together with the ability to engage in characteristic or more natural non-verbal displays, these constructs depict the phenomenology of regulatory fit in this social, inter-individual framework.
Regulatory Focus Congruence, Regulatory Fit, and the Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship

Bernerth and colleagues (2007) suggested that dispositional similarity between supervisors and subordinates may provide the benefit of higher quality social exchanges. Following this logic, regulatory focus should prove to be an important “disposition” in this regard, given the distinct strategic orientations associated with each focus. The importance of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus similarity is likely to become especially evident in the social interactive context. In the next section, hypotheses are presented concerning the proposed impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on fit experiences, and subsequently, expected relationship quality.

*Supervisor-Subordinate Regulatory Focus Congruence and Fit Experiences*

The emerging literature, though quite sparse, supports the perspective that regulatory fit can take place at the interpersonal level (e.g., fit between *individuals*), having a profound impact on interpersonal interaction. Recent studies conducted by Santelli, Struthers, and Eaton (2009) provide evidence that regulatory fit between individuals does indeed have an impact on interpersonal issues – specifically, determining whether a victim forgives a transgressor. These authors found that when a victim’s regulatory focus was congruent with that of his/her transgressor (e.g., as demonstrated in the repentance of the transgressor), forgiveness was more likely than when there was incongruence. This work provides a unique perspective on one manner in which regulatory fit may facilitate social cohesion – in this case, forgiveness following wrongdoing – among two individuals.
In their work, Galinsky and colleagues (Galinsky et al., 2005) propose the notion of “interaction fit,” raising the question as to whether two individuals engaging in an interaction need to be of the same regulatory focus orientation in order to “increase social coordination and positive interpersonal consequences” (p. 1096). Unfortunately, these authors were unable to draw from their own research design to answer this question. Therefore, the processes that unfold in social interactions between dyadic partners operating under specific regulatory foci remain elusive. More broadly, researchers have noted that clarification is needed concerning the emotional and cognitive processes underlying regulatory fit effects (Lee & Aaker, 2004).

Lord et al. (1999) state that the nature of the initial supervisor-subordinate relationship is greatly influenced by affective information – especially that which results from actions taken on the part of the supervisor directed at the subordinate. Relatedly, Gaddis, Connelly, and Mumford (2004) argue that when followers look to their leaders, they seek out emotional information that corresponds with their goal focus. In their empirical work, Gaddis and colleagues presented evidence that when individuals adopt promotion goals, they are more receptive to demonstrations by their leader (e.g., information communicated, emotions exuded, interpersonal strategies enacted) that are relevant to pursuing success. On the other hand, when individuals pursue prevention goals, they are better attuned a leader’s emotional and communicative displays when such displays pertain to avoiding failures. Consequently, individuals’ perceptions of a leader are more positive to the extent that he or she communicates utilizing emotions that speak to (e.g., are commensurate with) an individual’s own regulatory focus.
Displays of emotion are greatly informative in that they may reveal an individual’s goals, intentions, and attitudes (van Kleef, De Dreu, & Manstead, 2004). It has been argued that, in comparison to what is explicitly said in conversation, emotional expressions may even be more revealing of an individual’s internal states (DePaulo, 1992). This coincides with the proposition that displays of emotion provide “powerful signals to receivers during interpersonal interactions” (Côté, 2005, p. 514). This functionality is especially pertinent to LMX theory as emotions are said to be at the “core of management practice and leader-member interactions in particular” (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002, p. 630). In social interactions, individuals have an implicit tendency to mimic each others’ non-verbal expressions leading to a synchronization of activities including hand gestures, posture, facial expression, and even vocal tone (Neumann & Strack, 2000). This tendency has proven to be both innate and functional, as it not only increases rapport, but can also smooth social interaction (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Chartrand et al., 2005; Pugh, 2002).

When considered together, these findings suggest that regulatory focus congruence enhances the smoothness of interaction in that non-verbal displays of each person coincide with the range of non-verbal displays akin to one specific regulatory focus strategy. This may be due to a number of mechanisms. First, the two interaction partners’ displayed behaviors are naturally in concert. As such, this may increase behavioral predictability, allowing individuals to more accurately and efficiently anticipate each others’ responses, thus easing the interaction (Bauer & Green, 1996; Engle & Lord, 1997). This may also enable individuals to arrive upon similar interpretations of the situation, given that two individuals “embody” a common means of
communication (see Barsalou, Niedenthal, Barbey, & Ruppert, 2003; O’Malley, Ritchie, Lord, Gregory, & Young, in revision). Additionally, where mimicry is concerned, mirroring another’s behaviors that are a “fit” to one’s natural inclinations facilitates and potentially strengthens one’s motivational orientation. On the other hand, when congruence does not exist, individuals’ preferred non-verbal display strategies are inherently different, causing difficulties in social interaction. Considering the inclination to mimic in social interaction, such a tendency may be experienced as somewhat uncomfortable, given that one is required to mimic non-verbal displays that contrast with one’s inherent strategy. These points, in concert, lead to the first hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1:* Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect regulatory fit (e.g., feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment, comfort, and natural non-verbal display). Specifically, greater regulatory fit will be experienced by the subordinate when his or her regulatory focus matches versus contrasts that of the supervisor.

*Figure 2.2. Hypothesis 1: Proposed Interactive Effect of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Focus on Regulatory Fit*

Though value from fit has traditionally been operationalized as the value ascribed to an inanimate object, the present study strives to apply this notion to perceptions of individuals. This approach is in line with recent work of Sassenberg et al. (2007) who
utilized individuals’ perceptions of “group value” as a proxy for value from fit in a social context. Value from fit may be perceived by some as an indicator of the larger regulatory fit experience, and thus it may be conceptually “lumped together” with related regulatory fit experiences (e.g., feeling right, enjoyment, etc.). The present paper also treats value from fit as an indicator of the larger fit experience, but views it as a construct that is conceptually separable from the operationalization of regulatory fit proposed. That is, whereas the aspects proposed to describe the experience of fit in the social interactive context tend to describe feeling states (e.g., feeling right, ease of interaction, comfort, natural non-verbal display), those implicated as indicators of value from fit (e.g., liking and perceived value) represent aspects more judgmental or evaluative in nature. Thus, these constructs are separated to further explicate the nature of the fit effects as they unfold between individuals. This perspective also coincides with previous treatments (e.g., Sassenberg et al., 2007) and is in line with Higgins’ conception of value from fit as an outcome of or a concept that may transfer from the regulatory fit experience.

From the perspective of LMX theory, similarity between leader and member has proven to be an important element contributing to liking and related evaluations. For instance, similarity between supervisor and subordinate in positive affectivity (Bauer & Green, 1996) has proven to be predictive of a leader’s judgments of a follower, as well as subsequent LMX quality. As mentioned previously, positive affectivity is empirically tied to a promotion focus. To borrow from Engle and Lord’s (1997) thinking concerning congruence of supervisor and subordinate implicit theories, congruence in regulatory focus between supervisor and subordinate may provide “a basis for common understanding,” thus eliciting greater liking (p. 991). Extending this idea, Lord et al.
(1999) contend that “salient self-views and chronic self-schemas may be good indicators of the relevant domains for defining similarity, serving as a basis for liking” and other relevant evaluations (p. 191). Therefore, the common perspective held between individuals of a similar regulatory focus may, in itself, translate into greater liking and perceptions of value characterizing the value from fit experience when applied to individual perceptions.

Individuals tend to pay greater attention to and ascribe greater value to aspects of their environment, including one’s supervisor, that contain characteristics also found in chronic self-regulatory structures (Engle & Lord, 1997; Medvedeff & Lord, 2005). Stated differently, when the situation or environment “fits” an individual’s regulatory concerns, he or she is likely to perceive the surrounding world (e.g., objects, people, actions) as more valuable. Santelli and colleagues (2009) likened this to the “rose colored glasses” effect. This is a process that may take place very quickly upon encountering one’s supervisor. In fact, research has shown that judgments of others occur quite rapidly and unwittingly, often based on only a “thin slice” of information (Ambady, Bernieri, & Richeson, 2000). This perspective is further supported by the now widespread recognition in social-cognitive research that the majority of social perception is automatic and non-conscious (cf. Bargh & Chartrand, 1999). People learn a great deal of information about one another within the first moments of interaction (i.e., namely within the first minute) and based upon a limited snapshot of expressive behavior. These initial perceptions, such as those of liking the other individual, are also quite resolute and even have the power to predict relationship perceptions many months later (Liden et al., 1993).
Thus, early interactions set a lasting tone that subsequently affects LMX development (Bauer & Green, 1996).

LMX theory is inherently built upon the recognition that value plays an important role in the supervisor-subordinate relationship. This attribute of LMX theory is likely due to the influence of social exchange theory, which serves as a key theoretical framework underlying LMX theory (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997; Wayne et al., 1997). Social exchange theory is based on the idea that individuals strive to find equality and reciprocity of resources exchanged in their interpersonal relationships. Resources exchanged may include economic resources (e.g., tangible resources that address monetary needs) and socio-emotional resources (e.g., intangible resources that address social needs) (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 881). The latter are of utmost interest in the present paper as the focus is mainly on the “social transactions” that lead to the social relationship between supervisor and subordinate.

Looking at LMX from the social exchange theory perspective, it becomes evident that the value of resources each individual brings to the relationship bears important implications. When the perceived value of the resource or “commodity” exchanged between leader and follower is greater, the result is a higher quality LMX relationship (Wayne et al., 1997). Therefore, both the equality and value of exchanged resources plays a role in determining the quality of the relationship. This point begs the question, “What determines perceived value of the commodity to be exchanged?” Lockwood et al. (2002) found that individuals with a prevention focus were more motivated by negative role models, while positive role models motivated individuals with a promotion focus. In this situation, congruence in regulatory focus between an individual and his or her role model
fostered increased motivation. In fact, incongruence undermined motivation. Congruent role models encouraged individuals to implement strategies already consistent with their regulatory focus. To the extent that other individuals can encourage one’s motivational concerns or fulfill one’s regulatory needs, such individuals may prove to be “preferred social companions” (Brazy & Shah, 2006, p. 1666). It follows that authority figures of congruent regulatory foci would also be better liked by subordinates, given that these figures provide the benefit of facilitating motivation – an added value to the subordinate.

This idea can also be found in House’s (1971, 1996) path-goal theory, which states that a leader’s function is to “clear the path” to a subordinate’s goal. Thus, the leader’s worth lies in his or her ability to guide individuals to utilize the most beneficial avenues of goal achievement. Leader behavior is perceived positively “to the extent that the subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of satisfaction or instrumental to future satisfaction” (House & Mitchell, 1974, p. 84). It stands to reason that individuals tend to like others who provide them with an avenue to achieve desirable outcomes, whether tangible or otherwise. Moreover, it is well established that individuals evaluate targets fitting their regulatory state more positively (Higgins, 2000). Research findings have demonstrated that regulatory fit elicits positive reactions to the source of the fit and these reactions have proven to take place automatically (e.g., Lee & Aaker, 2004). The degree to which a supervisor is of a similar regulatory orientation and as a result “speaks a language” that resonates with the subordinate (e.g., verbal and non-verbal displays are in line with the subordinate’s regulatory orientation) will likely determine his or her value in the eyes of the subordinate. These impressions may very well occur instantaneously.
Hypothesis 2: Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect value from fit (e.g., liking and perceived value). Specifically, greater value from fit will be experienced by the subordinate when his or her regulatory focus matches versus contrasts that of the supervisor.

Figure 2.3. Hypothesis 2: Proposed Interactive Effect of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Focus on Value from Fit

Research has shown that the experience of feeling right produced by regulatory fit can influence subsequent judgments and value perceptions (see Higgins, 2000, 2005). Regulatory fit can increase the attractiveness of a positive value target, whether that target is an object such as a mug (Higgins et al., 2003), a persuasive message (Cesario et al., 2004), or a social group (Sassenberg et al., 2007). That is to say, regulatory fit contributes to value through the experience of regulatory fit (Higgins, 2005, 2006, 2008). Drawing from the feelings as information effect (Schwarz & Clore, 1983), a person faced with providing a judgment (e.g., such as when providing a rating of his or her supervisor) may base this decision on his or her current feeling state. To inform their decision when answering the question, “How do I feel about this?” individuals draw from their current feelings, such as experience of feeling right (or wrong for that matter) associated with regulatory fit (or non-fit) (Cesario et al., 2004). This should be especially true when the feeling is perceived to be relevant to the evaluation, as in the present case.
Hypothesis 3: Regulatory fit will be positively related to value from fit.

Hypothesis 4: Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit.

Supervisor-Subordinate Regulatory Focus Congruence and Relationship Quality

Research has established that compatibility between leader and follower is an important precursor of leader-member exchange quality (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden et al., 1993). Compatibility has typically been construed as similarity between individuals on various individual and demographic characteristics. There is a lack of research, however, concerning how similarity (or even dissimilarity) of leaders’ and followers’ self-regulatory approaches contributes to relationship quality (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2008). The present study explores compatibility between supervisor and subordinate in regulatory focus as it translates into expectations of greater quality leader-member relationships (i.e., characterized by higher quality LMX and trust).

Bijlsma and van de Bunt (2003) noted that there is a dire need to uncover the behaviors that are most influential in determining subordinates’ trust in leaders. This is an especially important endeavor given the recognition that supervisors’ behaviors serve as the foundation for initiating trust (see Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Confidence and trust in a leader may be influenced in part by the extent to which the leader's behavior is relevant to the individual's needs and desires (Jones, James, & Bruni, 1975). This may be due in part to the importance of consistency and predictability of another’s behavior in determining perceptions of trust (Butler, 1991; Mayer et al., 1995). That is, an individual’s behaviors may appear to be more beneficial (e.g., functioning to provide positive outcomes) but also more predictable to the extent that they are in concert with one’s own concerns and behaviors (Bauer & Green, 1996). Predictable, positive
behavior reinforces the level of trust present in the supervisor-subordinate relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Individuals come to trust those who enable desirable events or prevent undesirable events, namely when such events are important to the individual (Weick, 1995). Subordinates focus on a few managerial behaviors that are highly relevant to them and these behaviors are used as a test of whether the superior can be trusted (Bijlsma & van de Bunt, 2003). Relevancy is an important aspect to point out here. Many have noted that, early in the relationship, when the leader and member have limited information about one another, perceptions of relationship quality will be based on salient characteristics (e.g., personality, attitudes, affective disposition) (Bauer & Green, 1996). A supervisor or subordinate’s regulatory focus likely serves as a highly salient characteristic in social interaction, easily discerned based on verbal and non-verbal communication tendencies. Following from Bauer and Green (1996), compatibility of salient characteristics is posited to drive the development of high quality leader-member exchange relationships.

Hypothesis 5: Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect expected relationship quality (e.g., trust and LMX). Specifically, greater relationship quality will be expected by the subordinate when his or her regulatory focus matches versus contrasts that of the supervisor.
Figure 2.4. Hypothesis 5: Proposed Interactive Effect of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Focus on Expected Relationship Quality

Social interaction is an important determinant of relationship establishment and maintenance. Research has found that greater frequency of social interaction is positively related to interpersonal trust (McAllister, 1995). Interpersonal interactions “not only create the foundation and frame on which relationships are built but supply the mortar that binds people together” (Burgoon, Stern, & Dillman, 1995, p. 3). Just as relationships are bolstered by effective communication, they are worn down as a result of ineffective communication. Insofar as regulatory focus compatibility elicits greater ease of social interaction, it follows that a positive impact on relationship quality should ensue.

Robins and Boldero’s (2003) relational discrepancy theory posits that as the levels of congruence between a leader and follower’s selves (e.g., ideal, ought, actual) increases, so does the level of intimacy, trust, and goal alignment between these individuals. The foundation for such trust is said to develop through the transparent and open communication of these individuals where the congruence of values and aspirations of both parties is revealed. Considering the explicit role of these selves in regulatory focus, this suggests that regulatory focus congruence impacts relationship quality (e.g.,
level of trust) by way of enhancing the regulatory fit experience (e.g., open and easy communication).

Trust has been described as an “attitude that is derived from the trustor’s perceptions, beliefs, and attributions about the trustee, based upon his or her observations of the trustee’s behavior” (Whitener et al., 1998, p. 513). For instance, research on antecedents of trust has established the importance of perceptions of another’s competence, benevolence, and integrity as critical conditions for trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Synonymously, researchers have noted that the interpretation of a leader’s behavior takes precedence over his or her actual behavior to impact leadership relationships (Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994). Cesario (2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008) demonstrated that regulatory fit (e.g., when a speaker presents information in a manner that is consistent with an individual’s focus) impacts individuals’ perceptions of a speaker’s credibility and intelligence. In general, research on regulatory focus and regulatory fit has demonstrated the profound impact the fit experience can have on perceptions and attributions (for a review, see Higgins 2005, 2006, 2008). It follows that regulatory fit effects may influence perceptions of a leader’s behaviors, and as a result, subsequent leader-follower trust relationships (Lapidot et al., 2007).

LMX is developed through interpersonal exchanges where individuals “evaluate the ability, benevolence, and integrity of the other” (Brower et al., 2000, p. 243). Lawler and Thye (1999) contend that emotions and the expression of such emotions (e.g., via non-verbal displays) provides a valuable commodity, independent of material goods, that plays an important role in social exchanges. This perspective is also found elsewhere in the literature wherein affect has been recognized as a valuable form of currency in social interactions.
exchange. In the context of social interaction, different forms of currency may be given differential preference by individuals, thus impacting relationship quality. In fact, Lawler and Thye propose that exchange relationships are more likely to endure if emotions that are both felt and expressed (e.g., by a supervisor) are consistent with a given individual’s (e.g., a subordinate’s) identity. As demonstrated by the work of Cesario (2006), regulatory fit results from the display of non-verbal behaviors that are congruent with an individual’s regulatory focus. Together, these points suggest that the experience of regulatory fit can have a direct, positive impact on the leader-member exchange relationship.

*Hypothesis 6:* Regulatory fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.

*Hypothesis 7:* Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.

Research support has now established liking as an important precursor of LMX quality (Engle & Lord, 1997; Liden et al., 1993; Wayne et al., 1997; Turban et al., 1990; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). In fact, Liden and colleagues (1993) found that perceptions of liking within the first two weeks of the relationship predicted LMX perceptions six months later. Liking was even more influential than perceptions of performance in determining the leader’s perspective of the LMX relationship. A similar perspective is presented in the literature concerning antecedents of trust. Research has demonstrated that relational concerns (e.g., fair treatment, respectfulness) are especially important determinants of subordinates’ trust in supervisors (see Bijlsma & van de Bunt, 2003). This suggests that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is qualified to a great degree by perceptions of more interpersonal phenomena such as liking and the degree to which one
values having an individual as a supervisor or subordinate. In fact, benevolence and caring, constructs tied to liking (Brower et al., 2000), have proven to be important antecedents of trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Trust is widely recognized as an individual perception that may be largely impacted by contextual or individual difference factors, rather than an objective metric based solely on hard fact (Mayer et al., 1995). This underscores the notion that social cognitions (e.g., attributions, perceptions, etc.) are a key mediating process determining perceptions of trust, and by association, supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality. The experience of value from fit, as an informative social-cognitive experience serving to inform one’s judgments, may determine an individual’s perceptions of expected levels of trust and LMX quality.

*Hypothesis 8:* Value from fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.

*Hypothesis 9:* Value from fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.

*Hypothesis 10:* Value from fit will mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality.
Table 2.2

Restatement of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect regulatory fit (feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment, comfort, natural non-verbal display).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect value from fit (liking and perceived value).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Regulatory fit will be positively related to value from fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect expected relationship quality (trust, expected LMX).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Regulatory fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Value from fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Value from fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Value from fit will mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5. Full Hypothesized Model

Note. Dashed lines represent mediated paths.
Building on Previous Investigations

A few recent studies have demonstrated the applicability of regulatory fit in the social context. However, the study design used in these cases generally does not involve actively engaging participants in an interaction while under the influence of one regulatory focus. For instance, in their study of the regulatory fit of individuals with groups, Sassenberg and colleagues (2007) did not actually have individuals engage in group interactions. Similarly, Lockwood and colleagues (2002) did not actively engage individuals in an interaction with a role model when assessing fit and its effects on subsequent motivation. Moreover, these studies did not directly investigate the role of regulatory fit between supervisor and subordinate, nor were they concerned with the outcomes of interest herein (e.g., liking, trust, LMX).

Recent work has begun to attend to the potential impact of regulatory focus congruence on LMX quality (see Kark & Van-Dijk, 2008). However, only one previous study, to my knowledge, has empirically investigated the effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus “fit” (e.g., regulatory focus congruence) on LMX. In this study, by Medvedeff and Lord (2005), regulatory focus congruence or “fit” was operationalized by means of a difference score, commensurate with other fit literatures such as person-organization fit and supervisor-subordinate fit. Medvedeff and Lord utilized a survey involving working students and their respective supervisors. This design, therefore, led to an investigation of existing LMX relationships of varying lengths and maturity levels. Unfortunately, these authors were unable to provide support for their hypotheses.
To add to the previous research, the present study follows in line with the notion that leader and member characteristics (as communicated via distinctive social behaviors) are likely to have the greatest influence on leader-member relationship quality in initial interactions (Bauer & Green, 1996; Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). To do so, a lab design is utilized that inherently focuses on regulatory fit effects experienced in the very first interaction between individuals in supervisor-subordinate dyads. As well, the present study investigates the phenomenological nature of the fit experience that results from congruence of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci. This is very different from Medvedeff and Lord’s approach. Also different from their approach, regulatory fit is investigated by means of an interaction effect between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci. Finally, the experimental approach taken in the present study also serves to contribute to extant literature by focusing more on the process by which supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus congruence impacts relationship quality.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Overview and Sample

The current study was a two (supervisor regulatory focus: promotion or prevention) by two (subordinate regulatory focus: promotion or prevention) between-subjects factorial design with multiple dependent variables. All participants were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses and received extra credit in return for their participation. Participants who arrived as scheduled and completed the entire study were also given the opportunity to take part in a drawing to win one of twenty $5 prizes. The purpose of the study communicated to participants was to investigate the manner in which newly acquainted individuals go about discussing a work-related topic. Two participants were scheduled at a time to participate in the study and to engage in a five-minute discussion, playing the role of either supervisor or subordinate. Only individuals who were previously unacquainted were allowed to complete the study in the supervisor-subordinate pairs.

In total, one hundred fifty-three (N = 153) participant pairs (e.g., supervisor-subordinate dyads) completed the present study. Two subordinate participants provided responses deemed aberrant enough to cause concern (see Chapter IV) and were thus removed from the sample, creating a final sample size of one hundred fifty-one (N=151) participant pairs. All participants were enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at a
Midwestern university and were randomly assigned to play either the subordinate or supervisor role in the present study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions – supervisor promotion/subordinate promotion, supervisor promotion/subordinate prevention, supervisor prevention/subordinate promotion, and supervisor prevention/subordinate prevention. Though data were collected from all participants, results were examined from the perspective of subordinate participants. To this end, supervisor participants were viewed as part of the study design to a large extent in that they were treated as “naïve confederates.” For instance, supervisors were provided with a clipboard displaying a list of questions phrased in promotion and/or prevention terms to utilize during the five-minute discussion. Unbeknownst to them, this provided supervisors with a script to use during the interaction to ensure they played the part as intended. Analyses focused solely on data provided by subordinate participants, though data provided by supervisor participants were utilized where appropriate (e.g., manipulation checks, cross-validation of measure factor structures).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from psychology courses to take part in the present study. Recruiting took place such that participant dyads were constituted solely of individuals from separate course sections, so as to increase the likelihood that individuals did not know each other prior to their arrival in the lab. At the time of recruitment, participants were asked to schedule themselves for a 55-minute session to take place in person in a designated lab space in the following weeks. They were informed that this session would involve a guided discussion activity that required them to play the role of supervisor or subordinate and to discuss a work-related topic with another participant.
Upon arriving at the lab for the study, each participant was escorted to a separate computer. The majority of the study, including collection of responses to all study scales, was conducted via computer. Explicit efforts were made to keep participants separate (i.e., via the use of space partitions) and to limit any interaction that might have taken place between them (i.e., participants were instructed not to talk). To begin, participants were asked to read and agree to a consent form, which described the ostensible purpose and an overview of the study. This consent form also requested participants’ consent to be videotaped during the discussion portion of the study. Details concerning the potential future uses of the videotaped discussions (e.g., presentation at conferences, viewing by additional researchers for coding purposes, etc.) were also provided. Following the provision of consent, participants then completed a demographic questionnaire and a measure of trait regulatory focus. This was followed by exploratory measures assessing trait affect, self-monitoring, emotional expressivity, neuroticism, extraversion, and mood.

Participants then encountered a regulatory focus prime. Both chronic and primed states have demonstrated regulatory fit effects in extant literature. In line with previous research, the present study randomly primed participants to encourage momentary prevention and promotion foci, respectively. In addition to adding to the experimental nature of the present study, this approach also aids in the balancing of experimental conditions. That is, researchers have pointed out that American college student populations tend to be comprised of a greater number of promotion-focused than prevention-focused individuals (see Higgins, Pierro, & Kruglanski, 2008). Previous research in the present student population has also found this to be true (e.g., Ritchie & Schmidt, 2006). Therefore, relying on individuals’ trait foci alone is likely to lead to an
oversampling of promotion-focused participants. The approach taken in the present study also serves to add to the literature as, interestingly, extant research typically attends to chronic versus primed states separately (e.g., individuals’ trait foci are not typically assessed when priming is utilized) when investigating regulatory fit effects. In contrast, the present study assessed trait regulatory foci in addition to utilizing priming techniques. This allowed for investigation of potential interaction effects between individuals’ trait foci and the priming manipulation.

Priming took place in three forms. First, priming was conducted by utilizing a technique that has proven effective in various prior studies (e.g., Freitas et al., 2002; Higgins et al., 1994; Liberman et al., 2001). Participants in the promotion priming condition were asked to do the following: “Please briefly describe something you ideally want to do. In other words, describe a current personal hope or aspiration.” Participants in the prevention priming condition were asked, “Please briefly describe something you think you ought to do. In other words, describe a current personal duty or obligation.” After the first regulatory focus priming, participants then received an introduction to the discussion activity that they subsequently completed (greater detail on the discussion activity is provided below). Supervisor and subordinate roles were randomly determined a-priori by the experimenter.

Participants were told that they would be participating in a discussion with another participant and that the discussion required they play either a supervisor or subordinate role. They were informed that the topic of the discussion would be to decide the location of a company two-day trip. Definitions for each role were provided (see Table 3.1). The random assignment of roles and the details of each role were thoroughly
explained. A second regulatory focus prime was presented once participants had been introduced to the experimental discussion activity. Specifically, a list of questions was presented to supervisors to use in guiding the discussion (presented both on computer and on a clipboard to use during the discussion activity as a memory aid). Subordinates were also given a list of questions to “think about” in preparing for the discussion (presented only on computer in advance of the discussion activity). For all participants, these questions were framed in either promotion or prevention terms (this priming procedure is described in greater detail later).

Table 3.1
Supervisor and Subordinate Role Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>An employee is a supervisor if they have the power and authority to: 1) Give instructions to subordinates. 2) Take charge of the work of subordinates. A supervisor’s main role is to oversee the work of subordinates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>An employee is considered a subordinate if they are subject to the authority of another, such as a supervisor. A subordinate’s main role is to take part in work activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A timer was provided to supervisors so that they could keep track of the five-minute discussion time. Supervisors were also asked to cease the discussion at the end of that time period. The researcher simultaneously monitored this time to ensure that the discussion did not continue beyond the allotted five minutes. Supervisors were asked to guide the discussion by asking useful questions, to utilize the full five minutes for discussion, and to ensure the focus of the discussion was on the topic at hand. Supervisors were also asked to determine the final outcome of the discussion in the event that a consensus could not be achieved, as the discussion itself required a decision be
made based on both participants’ input. Both supervisors and subordinates were asked to contribute their opinions and thoughts to the discussion, though no specific amount of contribution was specified.

After thorough explanation of the discussion activity and participant roles, individuals completed a brief questionnaire or “information check” (see Appendix A) to confirm their understanding of the discussion activity and their role in this activity. Subsequently, they completed the third and final regulatory focus priming. That is, modeling an approach used by Lockwood and colleagues (2002), participants in the promotion-prime condition were asked to “describe a positive outcome that you want to achieve from the discussion.” In the prevention-prime condition, participants were asked to “describe a negative outcome that you want to avoid resulting from the discussion.” Therefore, the latter two priming techniques are more context-relevant. Together, the use of three sequential priming techniques was intended to ensure the strength of the overall approach to instantiating state regulatory foci.

Participants were then placed into their supervisor-subordinate pairs. Pairs were either matched or mismatched in terms of their primed regulatory foci. To form the pairs, participants were asked to introduce themselves before being escorted to a separate room where they engaged in the guided discussion for a five-minute period. Participants were placed in chairs seated face-to-face. Supervisors were asked to sit in a newer, armed chair (vs. the subordinate’s older, armless chair) to further encourage perceptions of superiority and power that coincide with a supervisory role (Giessner & Schubert, 2007). Participants were informed that their discussions would be videotaped so that they could be viewed at a later time to investigate how individuals went about their discussion. It was emphasized
that participants had the right to stop their participation at any time without repercussion. The researcher then left the room during the five-minute discussion period to allow participants to engage in a distraction-free discussion (see Figure 3.1).

At the end of the five-minute period, the researcher promptly re-entered the room and escorted participants back into the previous room where they had initially arrived at the beginning of the study. Again, they were seated at separate computers divided by partitions to report on the outcome of their discussion and to complete various manipulation checks. Additionally, they completed measures assessing the focal dependent variables including regulatory fit (ease of interaction, feeling right, enjoyment, comfort, and natural non-verbal displays), value from fit (liking, value), and expected relationship quality (LMX, trust). Participants who played the role of subordinate also completed an exploratory measure assessing perceptions of the supervisor’s leadership. Additional exploratory measures of perceived interpersonal justice and perceived similarity were also provided to all participants. The confidentiality of participants’ responses, given that they were asked to evaluate their discussion partners, was emphasized. For exploratory purposes, participants were also asked to take five minutes to work on a set of 15 anagrams, purportedly part of a separate study. Performance on this task provided an indication of their self-regulatory strength (described in greater detail below). Finally, participants were fully debriefed and thanked for their participation.
Figure 3.1. Demonstration of the Five-Minute Discussion Activity

Table 3.2

Sequence of Procedures

(Participants arrive in room #1)
1. Consent Form & Introduction
2. Demographics, Trait Regulatory Focus Measure, Exploratory Measures (Trait Affect, Self-Monitoring, Emotional Expressivity, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Mood)
3. Regulatory Focus Priming #1
4. Roles Assigned & Defined, Discussion Activity Explained, Discussion Questions Presented (Regulatory Focus Priming #2)
5. Discussion Activity/Role Information Check
6. Regulatory Focus Priming #3
(Participants escorted to room #2)
7. Dyads Formed, Participant Introductions Conducted
8. 5-Minute Videotaped Discussion
(Participants escorted back to room #1)
9. Discussion Activity Outcome
10. Manipulation Check Measures (State Regulatory Focus, Perceived Non-Verbal Display)
11. Regulatory Fit Measures (Ease of Interaction, Feeling Right, Enjoyment, Comfort, Natural Non-Verbal Display)
12. Value from Fit Measures (Liking, Value)
13. Expected Relationship Quality Measures (LMX, Trust)
14. Exploratory Measures (Leadership Perceptions*, Interpersonal Justice, Perceived Similarity)
15. Self-Regulatory Strength (Anagram Task)
16. Debriefing

Note. Asterisk indicates measure is completed by subordinates only.
Experimental Discussion Activity

Participants were told that they would play a supervisor (subordinate) working for Company B, a small magazine publisher in Akron, Ohio with 15 employees. The scenario explained that the company had chosen to send employees on a company-sponsored two-day trip in order to allow employees to get to know each other better. Working together with their supervisor (subordinate), it was up to them to discuss their ideas and to decide where employees would go for this trip. They would be given five minutes for this discussion. They would be asked to use the entire five minutes to discuss this topic. Both supervisor and subordinate were expected to prepare for this discussion and to subsequently contribute to the discussion by providing their ideas and perspective on the issue. In the end, they would be asked to agree upon a final decision.

Supervisors were provided with a list of questions that were to be addressed during the discussion to help in gathering information and thinking about potential trip options. Supervisors were also encouraged to ask questions of their own choosing. Simultaneously, subordinates were presented with questions they were asked to “think about” in preparation for the discussion. For both supervisors and subordinates, these questions contained an additional regulatory focus prime (see Table 3.3). If time was running out and a decision had not been made, supervisors were asked to make the final decision as to where the trip would be located before the five-minute period ended. Supervisors were asked to explicitly communicate this decision to their subordinate before the five minutes expired, if applicable. After the discussion, participants were escorted back to the previous room to answer a few final questions about the discussion.
They were informed that, at that time, they could indicate the decision concerning the location of the company’s trip in addition to other details about the discussion.

Table 3.3

Discussion Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>What would be some benefits of this location?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would all employees be encouraged to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would this location be an exciting place to hold the trip?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What opportunities might be gained by traveling to this location?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>What would be some drawbacks of this location?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would all employees be required to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would this location be a safe place to hold the trip?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What risks might be avoided by traveling to this location?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Underlining added here only for emphasis of key promotion/prevention words. This emphasis did not appear in actual study materials.

Constructs and Measures

Unless otherwise noted, all variables were assessed from both the supervisor and subordinate perspectives. However, it is important to note that the present study is directed more toward uncovering the interactive effects of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on subordinate perceptions of key dependent variables. In support of this approach, meta-analytic findings of Gerstner and Day (1997) revealed that LMX is more reliably assessed from the member’s point of view than the leader’s. These authors also reported a very low correlation between leader and member perceptions of LMX (.29 uncorrected; .37 corrected). These findings are not altogether too surprising as research in other veins such as performance appraisal also purports low levels of agreement between supervisor and subordinate perceptions (e.g., Williams & Johnson, 2000). Therefore, the
present study places the greatest emphasis on assessing dependent variables of interest from the subordinate’s point of view.

**Measures of Key Variables**

In the next few sections, details are provided concerning the measures employed in the current study. Where appropriate, a series of factor analyses were conducted to verify the structure of newly developed and/or extensively modified measures (details of these analyses will be provided later in Chapter IV). A summary of constructs, measures, and measure authors is provided at the end of the current chapter in Table 3.4. Also, a complete list of scale items can be found in the Appendices. To begin, measures utilized to assess central study variables are described.

*Trait regulatory focus.* Limited options exist concerning measurement of regulatory focus, though new measures are presently being developed (e.g., Johnson & Chang, 2008). Given its use in previous studies of interest to the present work, and its establishment in the literature as a valid self-report measure of regulatory foci, participants’ regulatory foci were assessed using a measure created by Lockwood and colleagues (2002). This 18-item measure (see Appendix B) consists of two subscales designed to measure prevention (i.e., ‘In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life’) and promotion (‘I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future’) goals. Participants responded on a nine-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all true of me, 9 = Very true of me). A confirmatory factor analysis provided the following fit indices: $\chi^2_{(134, n = 151)} = 359.94, p < .001$; CFI = .73; RMSEA = .11; SRMR = .12. Despite demonstrating poor fit, all factor loadings for this measure were statistically significant and only a few modification indices were presented. Reliabilities for these subscales were
strong: *Promotion* $\alpha = .84$ and *Prevention* $\alpha = .78$. Finally, as would be expected based
upon the work of Lockwood et al. (2002), the confirmatory factor analysis also revealed
that there was a small, but non-significant correlation between the two subscales ($r = .14,$
$p = .08$).

*Regulatory fit.* The experience of regulatory fit was assessed using a battery of
scales attending to the degree to which participants felt the interaction was at *ease* or
went smoothly, the extent to which they *felt right* during the interaction, how much they
*enjoyed* the interaction, and how *comfortable* they were during the interaction. These
constructs were chosen based on previous research on regulatory fit experiences (see
Camacho et al., 2003; Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Lake et al., in revision). Additionally, a
measure was included to assess the degree to which individuals felt they could display
natural non-verbal behaviors during the interaction. This latter approach is similar to
recent work investigating regulatory fit experiences in a social context (see Sassenberg et
al., 2007). For all measures (see Appendix C), participants responded on a five-point
Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). Given that these measures were
assembled for the present study to reflect the construct of regulatory fit, factor analyses
were utilized to determine the factor structure for these measures (see Chapter IV).

Three items assessing *Ease of Interaction* ($\alpha = .85$) were developed for the present
study (e.g., ‘It was easy to talk with this supervisor’) to assess individuals’ perceptions of
how smoothly the interaction went. Recent work has begun to directly assess the degree
to which participants “*Feel Right*” as a means of measuring regulatory fit (see Camacho
et al., 2003; Cesario, 2006). Following suit with this approach, two items (e.g., ‘It felt
‘right’ to interact with this supervisor’ and ‘Interacting with this supervisor felt wrong’)
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developed for the present study were used to assess participants’ sense of feeling right \( r = .62 \). Freitas and Higgins (2002) assessed regulatory fit by means of measuring participants’ felt *Enjoyment* \( (\alpha = .85) \) utilizing a three-item measure. This measure was modified for the present study to assess the degree to which participants enjoyed interacting with their supervisor or subordinate (e.g., ‘It was enjoyable to interact with this supervisor’).

The degree of *Comfort* individuals felt during the interaction was assessed using three items (e.g., ‘I felt completely at ease with this supervisor’) adapted from a measure created by Butcher, Sparks, and O’Callaghan (2001). The alpha coefficient for this scale was .85. As well, three items were developed for the present study to assess *Natural Non-Verbal Display* (e.g., ‘I was able to behave as I wanted to when interacting with this supervisor’) modeled after the approach utilized by Sassenberg et al. (2007, p. 255). These items were developed to focus on the interaction between the supervisor and subordinate in terms of the degree to which an individual was free to “act as they desire” during the interaction \( (\alpha = .79) \). The alpha coefficient for the full composite Regulatory Fit scale was .93.

*Value from fit.* Perceptions of the degree to which subordinates like their supervisor/subordinate and would value having him/her as a supervisor/subordinate served as two indicators of value from fit in the present study. For both measures (see Appendix D), participants responded on a five-point Likert scale \( (1 = \text{Strongly disagree}; \ 5 = \text{Strongly agree}) \). Again, factor analyses were utilized to determine the factor structure for these measures (see Chapter IV). First, in keeping with previous research (e.g., Wayne et al., 1997), *Liking* was assessed using four items (e.g., ‘I like this supervisor
very much’)) adapted from the scale developed by Wayne and Ferris (1990; \(\alpha = .87\)). Second, four items were developed to assess *Perceived Value* based on a scale created by Sassenberg et al. (2007, p. 255) intended to assess group value. Four items (e.g., ‘I would value having this person as a supervisor’) were written to reflect perceptions of the degree to which an individual would value having their interaction partner as a subordinate or supervisor (\(\alpha = .87\)). The alpha coefficient for the full composite scale of *Value from Fit was \(\alpha = .91\).*

*Expected relationship quality.* The measurement instruments used to assess leader-member relationships in the context of LMX are continually changing, with different studies utilizing disparate measures to tap into this construct (Schriesheim et al., 1999); see also Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Gerstner and Day (1997) recently noted that, “despite claims of an apparently robust phenomenon, there is surprisingly little agreement on what LMX is or how it should best be measured” (p. 828). In the present study, theory serves as the basis for guiding the choice of how leader-member relationship quality was assessed. As such, a two-pronged approach was followed in order to assess expected leader-member relationship quality. First, a “traditional measure” of LMX was utilized to assess LMX quality as a unique construct depicting the social exchange relationship participants would expect to develop, given the opportunity. The specific measure utilized was chosen based on its applicability and clarity. Second, an assessment measuring perceptions of the degree to which one would trust one’s interaction partner was also included. Trust has proven to be an important aspect between supervisor and subordinate and provides insight into the form of relationship between these individuals.
Together, perceptions of expected LMX and Trust served as an indication of expected relationship quality. Both of these measures (see Appendix E) were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). Factor analyses were utilized to determine the factor structure for these measures (see Chapter IV). In line with Turban et al. (1990), four items (i.e., “I would expect to have an effective working relationship with this supervisor”) were used to assess LMX ($\alpha = .86$). These items reflect a modified and slightly abbreviated version of the often-utilized LMX-VII scale (Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Scandura & Graen, 1984). The degree of Trust in one’s leader or supervisor was measured using a five-item scale ($\alpha = .62$) developed by Mayer and Gavin (2005). Items were modified for the purpose of the present study, namely to reflect perceptions of one’s supervisor or subordinate. Examples of such items include: “I would be comfortable giving this supervisor responsibility for a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her actions” and “If I had my way, I wouldn't let this supervisor have any influence over issues that are important to me.” The alpha coefficient for the overall composite measure of Expected Relationship Quality was .82.

**Manipulation Checks**

A number of measures were employed for the purpose of assessing the merit of experimental manipulations utilized the in current study. These measures are described in the next section. As mentioned previously, measure items may be found in the Appendices.

**State regulatory focus.** The 18-item measure developed by Lockwood et al. (2002) was utilized as a basis to develop a measure reflecting regulatory focus state
during the discussion activity (i.e., ‘I was focused on preventing negative events in the discussion’ for prevention; ‘I focused on the success I hoped to achieve in the discussion’ for promotion).\footnote{The original version of this measure was also used in the present study to assess \textit{Trait Regulatory Focus}.} Participants responded on a nine-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all true of me, 9 = Very true of me). This version of the measure (see Appendix F) was presented immediately following the five-minute discussion activity in order to assess state regulatory focus, thus serving as a manipulation check. Based on exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (see Chapter IV), the number of items was reduced from 18 to 15. The resulting items were combined to create two scale scores indicating \textit{State Promotion} (9 items; $\alpha = .91$) and \textit{State Prevention} (6 items; $\alpha = .86$). In order to test the experimental manipulations in the present study, responses from both participants in each supervisor-subordinate dyad are used. Therefore, reliabilities for this measure based on supervisor participants’ responses were: \textit{State Promotion} ($\alpha = .91$) and \textit{State Prevention} ($\alpha = .83$).

Additionally, a lexical decision task (LDT) was developed for the present study to provide an additional (and implicit) assessment of participants’ state regulatory foci. This task was designed to measure the accessibility of promotion or prevention words via reaction times. The underlying notion guiding this approach is that if a goal (whether promotion or prevention) is activated, this should elicit greater accessibility of goal-relevant stimuli (see Förster, Liberman, & Higgins, 2005). The LDT therefore provides a complement to the aforementioned explicit measure. Words were chosen based on a review of the literature, with significant focus on the verbiage used in the Lockwood et al. (2002) self-report measure also employed in the present study. The reaction times of
participants’ responses to eight words that coincide with a promotion (i.e., ideal, hope) vs. prevention (i.e., ought, duty) dichotomy were averaged (the items used in the LDT can be found in Appendix G). These average reaction times represent the accessibility of promotion and prevention foci, respectively. Participants first encountered a practice trial containing a total of four words (two words unrelated to the present study and two non-words). Subsequently, the LDT consisted of a total of 32 words. Specifically, eight regulatory focus words (four prevention and four promotion) and 16 non-words were included. These words were presented to participants in random order (see Appendix G for a complete list).

Perceived supervisor/subordinate non-verbal display. A major premise of the present study is that individuals of a given regulatory focus will engage in distinct non-verbal strategies of interaction that are discernible and coincide with a given focus. Following the study interaction, and in line with the work of Cesario (2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008), participants were asked to describe the extent to which their supervisor or subordinate conveyed a certain feeling (e.g., anxiety, vigilance, happiness, eagerness) through their behaviors during the interaction (for all items, see Appendix H). Participants responded to 12 items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Very slightly or not at all; 5 = Extremely). Based on exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (see Chapter IV), the number of items was reduced from twelve to seven. The resulting items were

---

2 Eight words assessing relational versus individual identities – four pertaining to relational identity (i.e., couple, pair) and four to individual identity (i.e., single, person) – were also included in the LDT. Whereas an individual identity or self-concept is based on attributes that differentiate oneself from others, the relational identity is based on dyadic relationships with others (Lord & Brown, 2004; Selenta & Lord, 2005). It was expected that the extent to which individuals’ relational identities were activated, this could provide additional evidence as to whether or not synonymous regulatory foci were successfully primed. However, analyses did not reveal anything substantive to this end.
combined to create two scale scores indicating subordinate participants’ perceptions of their supervisor’s *Promotion-Oriented* (four items; \( \alpha = .84 \)) and *Prevention-Oriented* non-verbal displays (three items; \( \alpha = .64 \)). In order to test the experimental manipulations in the present study, responses from both participants in each supervisor-subordinate dyad were used. Therefore, reliabilities for this measure based on supervisor participants’ perceptions of the subordinate were: *Promotion-Oriented Displays* \( (\alpha = .85) \) and *Prevention-Oriented Displays* \( (\alpha = .54) \).

**Supervisor/subordinate interactions.** As noted previously, supervisor-subordinate interactions were videotaped. This allowed for additional exploration of the interactions that took place. A sub-set of videotaped interactions was randomly selected once all data had been collected. Behaviors in line with those ascribed by Cesario (2006) were coded in order to serve as a reflection of discrete behavioral displays used by each individual during the interaction (described in Appendix V).

**Measures of Exploratory and Control Variables**

Participants’ standing on various exploratory and control variables was also assessed in the current study. These measures are described in the next section. As noted previously, a complete list of items for all measures can be found in the Appendices.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked to provide demographic information including age, gender, ethnicity, college major, and work experience (see Appendix I). Participants’ cognitive ability was assessed based on ACT or SAT test scores obtained from university records, with participants’ permission. These scores have been found to be a valid and reliable indicator of general cognitive ability (Gully, Payne, Kiechel, & Whiteman, 1999). Grade point average (GPA) was also collected in the same fashion.
Extraversion and neuroticism. Extraversion and neuroticism were assessed with subscales from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) Big Five Factor Markers measure (Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg et al., 2006). Each of the subscales consists of ten items describing people’s behaviors (e.g., ‘Am the life of the party’ for the extraversion subscale and ‘Get stressed out easily’ for the neuroticism subscale). A complete list of items can be found in Appendix J. Participants responded to these items, indicating on a five-point Likert scale the accuracy of each statement in describing themselves (1 = Very inaccurate, 5 = Very accurate). Confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated poor fit for the Extraversion scale ($\chi^2_{(35, n = 151)} = 135.09, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .89; \text{RMSEA} = .14; \text{SRMR} = .06$), though all factor loadings were statistically significant. Fit for the Neuroticism scale was also poor ($\chi^2_{(35, n = 151)} = 205.40, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .76; \text{RMSEA} = .18; \text{SRMR} = .08$). Reliabilities for these subscales were: Extraversion $\alpha = .92$ and Neuroticism $\alpha = .87$.

Trait affect. Positive and negative affectivity were measured using the Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA) Scale Expanded Form (PANAS-X) developed by Watson & Clark (1994). Participants were asked to rate a list of adjectives (e.g., ‘excited’ for PA, ‘distressed’ for NA) by indicating on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Very slightly or not at all; 5 = Extremely) the extent to which the adjective describes the way they generally feel, on average (see Appendix K). A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated poor fit for a two-factor structure ($\chi^2_{(169, n = 151)} = 339.70, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .83; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{SRMR} = .07$). Reliabilities for these subscales were: Positive Affectivity $\alpha = .83$ and Negative Affectivity $\alpha = .86$.

Mood. Forgas and George (2001) note that moods provide an overarching affective context for many of our behaviors and thought processes. A 12-item measure
(see Appendix L) tapping both mood arousal (high versus low) and valence (positive versus negative) was utilized, adapted from Shah and Higgins (2001) and Naidoo (2005). These discrete emotions are directly in line with the recognition that promotion-focused individuals experience affect ranging from *Cheerfulness* (happy, elated, satisfied; $\alpha = .85$) to *Dejection* (sad, disappointed, discouraged; $\alpha = .87$); whereas prevention-focused individuals experience affect ranging from *Acquiescence* (relaxed, calm, carefree; $\alpha = .91$) to *Agitation* (tense, nervous, agitated; $\alpha = .84$). Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Very slightly or not at all}; 5 = \text{Extremely}$) concerning the extent to which the adjective describes the way they feel at the present moment. A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated good fit for a four-factor structure ($\chi^2 (48, n = 151) = 80.89, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .97; \text{RMSEA} = .07; \text{SRMR} = .06$).

*Emotional expressivity.* The Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ; Gross & John, 1997) was utilized to assess emotional expressivity in the present study. This measure is a 16-item questionnaire (see Appendix M) said to capture individual differences in *Negative Expressivity* (e.g., ‘Whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I’m feeling’; $\alpha = .76$), *Positive Expressivity* (e.g., ‘When I’m happy, my feelings show’; $\alpha = .69$), and *Impulse Strength* (e.g., ‘I have strong emotions’; $\alpha = .85$). Participants responded on a seven-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{Strongly Disagree}; 7 = \text{Strongly agree}$). A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated acceptable fit to a three-factor structure for this measure ($\chi^2 (101, n = 151) = 195.73, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .90; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{SRMR} = .06$).

*Self-monitoring.* To assess individuals’ levels of self-monitoring, an abbreviated version of the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) created by Gangestad and Snyder (1985; see
also Snyder & Gangestad, 1986) was utilized. The items used in this scale can be found in Appendix N. Participants responded to these items (e.g., ‘I’m not always the person I appear to be’) on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly agree; 2 = Strongly disagree). Two subscales for this measure have been identified (see Briggs & Cheek, 1988; John, Cheek, & Klohnen, 1996). The first (comprised of nine items) is said to denote Public Performing (e.g., ‘I have considered being an entertainer’; α = .74) and the second (comprised of six items) denotes Other-Directedness (e.g., ‘I’m not always the person I appear to be’; α = .55). Given the low reliability of the Other-Directedness subscale, only the Public Performing subscale was used in the present study as an indication of self-monitoring. This is in line with work by Snyder (1987), who noted that the first unrotated factor of the SMS (i.e., comprised of items corresponding to the Public Performance subscale) provides the best indication of the latent self-monitoring variable. A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated poor fit for this scale with a one-factor structure ($\chi^2 (27, n = 151) = 61.13, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .83; \text{RMSEA} = .10; \text{SRMR} = .07$).

Leadership perceptions. Kellett, Humphrey, and Sleeth (2002) noted that emotional displays may serve as a basis for leadership perceptions. Additionally, research indicates that people associate certain behaviors with leadership and may categorize others as more or less “leaderly” based on their behavior (e.g., Cronshaw & Lord, 1987). As such, it is possible that regulatory focus may impact subordinates’ perceptions of the degree to which the supervisor engaged in behaviors considered to typify those of a leader. The General Leadership Impression scale (GLI; Cronshaw & Lord, 1987) provided a measure of leadership perceptions of the supervisor (α = .91). This measure (see Appendix O) was only given to subordinates to complete in reference to the
individual who served as their supervisor during the study interaction. The GLI includes five items (e.g., ‘The supervisor engaged in leader behaviors’) rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated good fit for this measure ($\chi^2_{(5, n=151)} = 31.92, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .95; \text{RMSEA} = .19; \text{SRMR} = .03$).

*Interpersonal justice.* Camacho et al. (2003) found that when the strategy used by a superior to resolve a conflict fit with an individual’s regulatory orientation (e.g., regulatory congruence), this led to increased judgments of the “moral rightness” of the resolution. These results suggest that similar interpersonal phenomena such as interpersonal treatment or justice (i.e., being treated “right”) may also be impacted by regulatory focus congruence in the present study. To assess participants’ perceptions of interpersonal justice experienced during the discussion activity, a modified version of the interpersonal justice subscale of Colquitt’s (2001) organizational justice measure was utilized (see Appendix P). This subscale ($\alpha = .82$) consists of four items (e.g., ‘The supervisor treated me with respect’) to which participants responded on a five-point Likert scale (1 = To a small extent; 5 = To a large extent). A confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated good fit for this measure ($\chi^2_{(2, n=151)} = 2.18, p = .35; \text{CFI} = 1.0; \text{RMSEA} = .02; \text{SRMR} = .01$).

*Perceived similarity.* Similarity in regulatory focus may lead individuals to perceive themselves to be more similar in a broader sense, as is suggested throughout the current paper. To investigate this idea more directly, a measure developed by Liden et al. (1993) was used to assess participants’ perceptions of the degree of similarity they feel exists between themselves and the supervisor (or subordinate) with whom they interacted.
in the discussion activity (see Appendix Q). This measure consists of six items (e.g., ‘The supervisor and I are alike in a number of areas’) to which participants responded on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree). Reliability for this measure was $\alpha = .94$ and a confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated good fit for this measure ($\chi^2(9, n = 151) = 19.46, p < .05; \text{CFI} = .99; \text{RMSEA} = .09; \text{SRMR} = .02$).

**Discussion activity outcome.** Information was gathered to determine the outcome of the discussion activity performed by participants. Specifically, participants were asked to report whether or not they were able to arrive upon a final decision as to where the company should go on trip within the five-minute period. Participants were also asked to report the location, whether they agree with this decision, and the amount of input they felt they had concerning the final decision. Additionally, ratings of the extent to which participants were affected by being videotaped during the discussion activity were also gathered alongside this information. The specific items used to address these aspects can be found in Appendix R. The responses provided by participants to these items aided in the process of data cleaning.

**Self-regulatory strength.** The present study posits that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence engenders regulatory fit, and thus enables more “automatic, intuitive” social interactions (Engle & Lord, 1997, p. 991). As such, there is less need to draw from self-regulatory resources (referred to as one’s self-regulatory strength), which are understood to be limited and finite (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2004). Research has provided evidence that regulatory fit enhances self-regulatory strength, or alternatively, that regulatory non-fit diminishes regulatory strength (see Aaker & Lee, 2006). Relatedly, recent work by Finkel et al. (2006) demonstrated that social coordination during
interaction in dyads impacts self-regulatory success in subsequent, unrelated tasks (e.g., anagrams).

To explore this notion in the present study, participants were asked to solve a set of 15 anagrams (see Appendix S) at the end of the present study, ostensibly part of a separate study. The anagrams used in the present study are those used by Finkel et al. (2006) and reflect a moderate level of difficulty (see Gilhooly & Johnson, 1978). Participants were given five minutes to solve as many of the 15 anagrams as they could, though they could elect to quit working on the anagrams whenever they felt they had done well enough. Participants were informed that they should use all of the letters in each anagram when providing solutions. They were also told that there was only one correct solution for each anagram. Lastly, participants were reminded that, once they were done working on the anagrams, they would be finished with the study and could complete the drawing for one of twenty $5 prizes. This reminder was intended to add to the temptation to quit early, the avoidance of which requires additional self-regulatory strength. Performance, or the number of correctly solved anagrams, served as an indication of individuals’ self-regulatory strength following the discussion activity. Participants’ persistence, or time spent working on the anagram task, was also recorded (e.g., in the case that some participants elect to quit early).

*Pilot Study: Review of the Experimental Discussion Activity*

An initial pilot study was conducted with graduate students to verify the clarity and review the details of the experimental discussion activity and supervisor/subordinate role assignment. Graduate students (N = 22) in Industrial-Organizational Psychology at a large Midwestern University were randomly assigned to one of 11 supervisor-subordinate
pairs representing each of the four possible combinations of regulatory foci. Participants first read the discussion activity directions and role assignment materials and then engaged in the 5-minute discussion activity. Finally, participants then completed the discussion activity outcome questionnaire (described previously) and provided their feedback on various aspects of the discussion activity by completing a number of open-response questions (for the full questionnaire, see Appendix T). This led to a final refinement of the discussion activity and related materials.

Statistical Analysis Strategy

The hypothesized model was tested using path analysis, implemented via structural equation modeling (SEM). The Mplus v. 5.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2007) software was used, employing maximum likelihood estimation. The use of SEM allows for the simultaneous estimation of multiple variable relationships, in contrast to a piecemeal approach to hypothesis testing (Kline, 2005). As a result, SEM affords a comprehensive examination of the proposed model herein. Model fit was evaluated using the approach outlined by Hu and Bentler (1999), who recommend using the standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) supplemented with the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) or root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA). To this end, good overall model fit is demonstrated by an SRMR of .08 or less and a CFI greater than .95 or an RMSEA of .06 or less. Hypotheses were tested by examining relevant path coefficients. Additionally, as part of the analytical approach, a series of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses (where appropriate) were conducted in Mplus on various measures used in the present study. These analyses were performed in order to provide an in-depth
investigation of factor structures for newly developed measures and substantially altered existing measures. These analyses are described in detail in Chapter IV.

Table 3.4

*Constructs, Measures, and Measure Authors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Authors of Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait Regulatory Focus</td>
<td>Promotion / Prevention Scale</td>
<td>Lockwood, Jordan, &amp; Kunda (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Interaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Developed for present study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Right</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Based on Camacho et al. (2003); Cesario (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Freitas &amp; Higgins (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Social Comfort</td>
<td>Butcher, Sparks, &amp; O’Callaghan (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Non-Verbal Display</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Based on Sassenberg et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wayne &amp; Ferris (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Based on Sassenberg et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Turban, Jones, &amp; Rozelle (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mayer &amp; Gavin (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Regulatory Focus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1) Measure based on Lockwood et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) LDT developed for present study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Display Perceptions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Based on Cesario (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion, Neuroticism</td>
<td>International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)</td>
<td>Goldberg (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Affect</td>
<td>PANAS-X</td>
<td>Watson &amp; Clark (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Based on Naidoo (2005); Shah &amp; Higgins, (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Colquitt (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Liden et al. (1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* LDT = Lexical Decision Task. Asterisk indicates a measure completed by subordinates only. All other measures are completed by all participants.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Initial Data Screening

To begin, data were examined for potential outliers or influential data points using procedures described by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001).\(^3\) Based on self-report data, two subordinate participants were flagged as potential outliers concerning large studentized residual values on responses for two or more key dependent variables in addition to relatively larger Cook’s D values. Notes recorded during data collection were also referenced and indicated some concerns with one of the cases (i.e., lack of fluency in the English language). Omission of these two cases demonstrated an impact on results of preliminary hypothesis tests. Therefore, these two cases were removed, resulting in a final sample of one hundred fifty-one (N = 151) pairs of participants.

Participants

For the 151 subordinate participants in the final sample, the mean age was 20.4 years (SD = 5.41) and 11.9% of participants identified themselves as psychology majors. Approximately 91% of the sample reported some form of work experience, ranging from

---

\(^3\) Other information considered in the data screening process included participants’ indication of whether or not they came to a decision in the discussion, the absence of which may have indicated that participants did not pay attention to directions. In total, six subordinates indicated that they had not come to a decision in the discussion. However, review of video footage indicated that participants appeared to understand the directions, but simply may have lost track of time or agreed to “have employees vote on a location.”
0 to 27 years with a mean of 3.92 years (SD = 5.04). Concerning gender, 36.4% of participants were male and 63.6% were female. Most participants were Caucasian (72.2%), followed by African American (19.2%), Asian/Pacific Islander (4%), two or more races (3.3%), and Hispanic/Latino (1.3%). The dispersion of demographics across experimental conditions for subordinate participants is provided in Table 4.1.  

Table 4.1  

| Subordinate Participant Demographics across Experimental Conditions | Experimental Condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Super Promotion/ Sub Promotion | Super Promotion/ Sub Promotion | Super Prevention/ Sub Promotion | Super Prevention/ Sub Prevention |
| Gender | 65.8% Female | 55.3% Female | 62.2% Female | 71.1% Female |
| | 34.2% Male | 44.7% Male | 37.8% Male | 28.9% Male |
| Age (SD) | 19.5 (2.91) | 21.7 (7.22) | 20.2 (5.19) | 20.2 (5.40) |
| Work (SD) | 3.31 (3.36) | 4.93 (6.60) | 3.79 (5.03) | 3.62 (4.71) |
| Ethnicity | 78.9% Caucasian | 71.1% Caucasian | 73% Caucasian | 65.8% Caucasian |
| | 13.2% African Am | 26.3% African Am | 16.2% African Am | 21.1% African Am |
| | 2.6% Asian/Pacific | 0% Asian/Pacific | 2.7% Asian/Pacific | 10.5% Asian/Pacific |
| | 2.6% Two or More | 0% Two or More | 8.1% Two or More | 2.6% Two or More |
| | 2.6% Hispanic/Latin | 2.6% Hispanic/Latin | 0% Hispanic/Latin | 0% Hispanic/Latin |
| N | 38 | 38 | 37 | 38 |

Note. N = 151; Demographics based on participants assigned to the subordinate role only; Super = Supervisor; Sub = Subordinate; African Amer. = African American.

A cursory review of Table 4.1 revealed possible discrepancies across conditions, especially considering participants’ age and years of work experience. However, results of analyses of variance indicated that, across all conditions, there was not a significant difference in participants’ age ($F(3,147) = 1.10, p = .35$). Tukey post-hoc comparisons further revealed no significant differences in participants’ age between any two conditions.

---

4 Information describing the demographics of supervisor participants, as dispersed across experimental conditions, is provided in Appendix Z, Table Z.1. Additionally, information is also provided concerning the joint demography of participant pairs in Appendix Z, Table Z.2.
conditions. Results also revealed that, across all conditions, there was not a significant
difference in participants’ years of work experience ($F(3,147) = .75, p = .53$). Again,
Tukey post-hoc comparisons further revealed no significant differences in participants’
years of work experience between any two conditions.

Factor Structures and Development of Scale Scores

As described in Chapter III, scale scores were created for all of the variables
assessed in the current study. However, two measures were developed herein to serve as
manipulation checks. The first was intended to assess participants’ perceptions of their
interaction partner’s non-verbal behaviors (e.g., *Perceived Non-Verbal Displays*) and the
second was developed to assess *State Regulatory Focus*, modeled after the measure by
Lockwood et al. (2002). As well, the measures of key dependent variables – *Value from
Fit, Regulatory Fit*, and *Expected Relationship Quality* – were created specifically for the
current study, based on an amalgam of established and newly developed subscales.

Therefore, before scale scores could be created for these measures (as reported in Chapter
III), additional analyses were required. Given that the substantive focus of this study was
on subordinates’ perceptions, factor analyses were conducted based on subordinate data,
although supervisor data was utilized for cross-validation, as described below.

The factor analysis strategy was as follows. To start, when an *a-priori* structure
based on extant research was available for a given measure, items were submitted to a
confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation (Mplus
5.2; Muthén & Muthén, 2007). Fit was then compared to that of a plausible alternative
factor solution. When fit proved to be poor based on an initial CFA, an exploratory factor
analysis (EFA) using ML estimation was then conducted. As well, for measures where an
a-priori structure had not yet been established (e.g., measures created for the present study), such measures were first submitted to an EFA. Recall that these aforementioned analyses were conducted utilizing data provided by subordinate participants only. However, to provide cross-validation, confirmatory factor analyses of the final factor structures were conducted for all measures using responses provided by supervisor participants. The procedures involved in determining the factor structures and, subsequently, creating scale scores for these measures are described next.

State Regulatory Focus

The State Regulatory Focus measure utilized herein was developed based on the established measure of trait regulatory focus, developed by Lockwood et al. (2002). This measure was designed to reflect two factors reflecting state prevention (nine items) and state promotion foci (nine items), respectively. Therefore, to determine the underlying structure, all 18 items in this measure were first submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation, specifying the a-priori two-factor structure. This analysis resulted in the following fit indices: \( \chi^2(134, n = 151) = 444.50, p < .001; \) CFI = .79; RMSEA = .12; SRMR = .13. A number of items presented low factor loadings (e.g., < .40) and, overall, the measure demonstrated poor fit to the data based upon a-priori theory. Therefore, items were subsequently submitted to an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation with orthogonal (e.g., Varimax) rotation in order to verify the factor structure and identify means to improve fit. Several indices were considered in the process of determining the number of factors inherent in the data. This included review of item loadings, eigenvalues using the Kaiser criterion (e.g., a rule of thumb stating that eigenvalues \( \geq 1 \) represent
meaningful factors), Scree analysis, and Velicer’s (1976) minimum average partial (MAP) method. The MAP method was conducted in SPSS (see O’Connor, 2000; Velicer, Eaton, & Fava, 2000).

Factor solutions of various numbers (e.g., one through four) were requested in the aforementioned EFA. From these initial analyses, there appeared to be between one and three factors present in the data, with eigenvalues of 5.85, 4.16, and 1.54. Item loadings were reviewed and considered in lieu of a-priori reasoning. An EFA using ML estimation with an oblique rotation (e.g., Geomin) was also conducted and produced very similar results, thus the results of the EFA with Varimax rotation were interpreted given greater parsimony. Review of all aforementioned indices revealed a two-factor solution provided the most interpretable and best-fitting solution. Any items that demonstrated low factor loadings (e.g., < .40; three items) were removed. This resulted in a 15-item measure, with nine and six items tapping State Promotion and State Prevention orientations, respectively. The remaining 15 items were submitted to an additional exploratory factor analysis investigating one through four factors. A two-factor solution appeared to be the most interpretable and best-fitting solution ($\chi^2_{(76, n = 151)} = 187.10, p < .001; \text{RMSEA} = .10; \text{RMR} = .05$), with eigenvalues of 5.67 and 3.75. Table 4.2 contains factor loadings and subscales for the State Regulatory Focus measure.

5 Items with low factor loadings that were removed were all from the subscale intended to assess State Prevention Focus. These items included the following: ‘I was focused on preventing negative events in the discussion,’ ‘My major goal in the discussion was to avoid failure,’ and ‘I primarily tried to reach what I felt “ought” to be the result of the discussion.’
### Table 4.2

*Results from the Exploratory Factor Analyses of State Regulatory Focus Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Promotion Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I imagined how I would achieve my aspirations during the discussion.</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I thought about the things I ideally wanted to happen in the discussion.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I focused on the success I hoped to achieve in the discussion.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I thought about how I would achieve success in the discussion.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My major goal in the discussion was to achieve success.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I primarily tried to reach an “ideal” outcome in the discussion.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was focused on achieving positive outcomes in the discussion.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I imagined experiencing good things that I hoped would happen in the discussion.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was more oriented toward achieving success in the discussion than preventing failure.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Prevention Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was anxious that I would fall short of my responsibilities during the discussion.</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I thought about things I was afraid might happen in the discussion.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I worried that I would fail to accomplish the discussion goal.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I imagined experiencing bad things that I feared might happen in the discussion.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I thought about how I could prevent failures during the discussion.</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I was more oriented toward preventing losses than achieving gains in the discussion.</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized item alpha</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only. Primary factor loadings are in bold. Factor loadings are standardized.*

The remaining 15 items (with the factor structure presented in Table 4.2) were then submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis. This analysis resulted in the following fit indices: \( \chi^2(89, n = 151) = 274.61, p < .001; \) CFI = .86; RMSEA = .12; SRMR = .11.

Though fit was still poor, compared to the initial CFA of the full 18 items, overall fit was appreciably better and all factor loadings were greater than .40 and statistically significant (\( p < .001 \)). The two factors were not significantly correlated (\( r = -.14, p = .11 \)).

Within this initial CFA, a few modification indices were listed, noting that allowing the disturbances for items 10 and 12 in the prevention subscale to covary as well as items two and four and items five and nine in the promotion subscale to covary would result in a significant chi-squared improvement. Given that these modifications also seemed theoretically appropriate, the model was revised accordingly. The revised model
of State Regulatory Focus (e.g., with the aforementioned disturbances allowed to covary) demonstrated acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(86, n = 151)} = 208.31, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .91; \text{RMSEA} = .10; \text{SRMR} = .10$). All factor loadings were at least moderate in size (e.g., all $\geq .43$) and statistically significant at $p < .001$ and there was a non-significant, though marginal, correlation between the two factors ($r = -.15, p < .08$). As well, a one-factor structure was investigated in order to provide comparative fit indices; however, this model did not converge, thus providing additional support for the two-factor structure.

Finally, to cross-validate the revised two-factor structure, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted (e.g., with aforementioned disturbances allowed to covary) utilizing responses of supervisor participants. Results demonstrated poor fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(86, n = 151)} = 291.65, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .84; \text{RMSEA} = .13; \text{SRMR} = .11$). However, again, all factor loadings were greater than .40 and statistically significant at $p < .001$. Also, the two factors were not significantly correlated ($r = -.10, p = .29$).

**Perceived Non-Verbal Displays**

The perceived non-verbal displays items were developed for the present study, based on the work of Cesario (2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008), to inform manipulation check analyses. In the current study, items pertaining to specific displays were examined individually to investigate the merit of the experimental manipulations. However, in order to provide additional insight, scale scores based on these items were also created for use in manipulation check analyses. The following section describes the methods utilized to determine factor structures and scale scores for the perceived non-verbal display items.
To begin, all 12 items in the *Perceived Non-Verbal Displays* measure were submitted to an exploratory factor analysis using ML estimation with a Varimax rotation. This analysis was conducted on subordinate self-report data. Thus, these factors represent subordinates’ perceptions of the non-verbals displayed by supervisors. Scree plots, eigenvalues, MAP results, and exploratory factor analyses investigating differing numbers of factors (e.g., one through four) were examined for parsimony and interpretability in factor structure. Based on initial review of analyses, there appeared to be between one and four factors present in the data with the following eigenvalues: 3.88, 1.69, 1.28, and 1.15. Item loadings were reviewed and considered in lieu of a-priori reasoning. An EFA using ML estimation with a Geomin rotation was also conducted and produced very similar results, thus the results of the EFA with Varimax rotation were interpreted given greater parsimony.

A two-factor solution decidedly provided the most interpretable and best-fitting solution. Items that demonstrated high cross-loadings (one item) or low factor loadings (e.g., < .40; four items) were removed. This resulted in a seven-item measure, with three and four items reflecting prevention and promotion non-verbal displays, respectively. The remaining seven items were submitted to an additional exploratory factor analysis investigating one through four factors. A two-factor solution provided the most interpretable and best-fitting solution ($\chi^2(8, n = 151) = 12.92, p = .12; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{RMR}$

---

6 Two items (i.e., ‘sadness’ and ‘relaxed’) were reverse coded for conceptual clarity.

7 The item removed due to a high cross-loading was ‘positivity.’ Items removed due to low factor loadings included ‘carefulness,’ ‘caution,’ ‘vigilance,’ and ‘sadness’ (reverse scored as ‘non-sadness’ for analyses).
= .03), with eigenvalues of 3.13 and 1.45. Table 4.3 contains the factor loadings and subscales for the Perceived Non-Verbal Displays measure.

Table 4.3

Results from the Exploratory Factor Analyses of Perceived Non-Verbal Display Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion Non-Verbal Displays</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Happiness</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Excitement</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eagerness</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention Non-Verbal Displays</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anxiety</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negativity</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relaxed*</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized item alpha</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 151. Based on subordinate participants’ responses only; *Item was reverse scored for analyses. Primary factor loadings are in bold. Factor loadings are standardized.

The remaining seven items with the factor structure presented in Table 4.3 above were then submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis, again utilizing subordinate responses. Results demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(13, n = 151)} = 28.06, p < .01; \text{CFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = .09; \text{SRMR} = .06$). All factor loadings were statistically significant and no modification indices were listed. The two factors were also significantly and negatively correlated ($r = -.46, p < .001$). As well, this two-factor solution provided significantly better fit to the data than a one-factor solution, based on a chi-squared difference test ($\Delta \chi^2 = 46.60, \Delta df = 1, \chi^2\text{crit} = 10.83, p < .001$). Last, to provide a true cross-validation of this model, a separate confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using the factor structure identified in Table 4.3 based on responses of supervisor participants. As with subordinate data, results demonstrated good fit to the data for the two-factor solution ($\chi^2_{(13, n = 151)} = \ldots$)
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The two factors also again demonstrated a significant negative correlation ($r = -.32 \ p < .01$).

**Regulatory Fit**

As mentioned previously in Chapter III, the experience of regulatory fit was assessed using a battery of scales attending to the degree to which participants felt at ease during the interaction (three items), the extent to which they felt right during the interaction (two items), how much they enjoyed the interaction (three items), and how comfortable they were during the interaction (three items). Additionally, a measure was included to assess the degree to which individuals felt they could display natural non-verbal behaviors during the interaction (three items). To determine the underlying factor structure, all items were first submitted to an exploratory factor analysis using ML estimation with Varimax rotation. This analysis was conducted on subordinate data.

In order to coincide with the a-priori construal of regulatory fit, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted, requesting a five-factor structure. The five-factor solution based on the a-priori model provided good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (67, n = 151) = 109.75, \ p < .001$; CFI = .97; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .05). All factor loadings were strong (i.e., all $\geq .68$) and statistically significant at $p < .001$ and only two modification indices were listed. Additionally, the a-priori five-factor structure demonstrated significantly better fit to the data compared to a three-factor structure (e.g., with items for *Ease of Interaction* and *Feeling Right* loading on the first factor, items for *Enjoyment* loading on the second factor, and items for *Comfort* and *Natural Non-Verbal Displays* loading on the third factor), based on a chi-squared difference test ($\Delta \chi^2 = 36.42; \Delta df = 7; \chi^2 \text{crit} = 24.32, \ p < .001$). Table 4.4 contains the factor loadings and subscales for the Regulatory Fit measure.
for the CFA based on the *a-priori* five-factor structure. To provide a cross-validation of this model, a separate CFA was conducted based on responses of supervisor participants using the factor structure identified in Table 4.4. As with subordinate data, results demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (67, n = 151) = 108.44$, $p < .01$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .04), all factor loadings were strong (all $\geq .64$) and statistically significant at $p < .001$, and no modification indices were listed.

Table 4.4

*Results from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Regulatory Fit Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It was easy to talk with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.83$</td>
<td>$.69</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The interaction with this supervisor/subordinate went very smoothly.</td>
<td>$.84$</td>
<td>$.71</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interacting with this supervisor/subordinate was somewhat difficult. (R)</td>
<td>$.79$</td>
<td>$.62</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feeling Right</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It felt “right” to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.80$</td>
<td>$.64</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interacting with this supervisor/subordinate felt wrong. (R)</td>
<td>$.78$</td>
<td>$.61</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It was interesting to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.69$</td>
<td>$.48</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was enjoyable to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.86$</td>
<td>$.74</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It was exciting to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.86$</td>
<td>$.74</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I tended to relax easily with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.80$</td>
<td>$.64</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I felt very comfortable in this supervisor’s/subordinate’s presence.</td>
<td>$.80$</td>
<td>$.64</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt completely at ease with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.87$</td>
<td>$.76</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Non-Verbal Displays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I was able to behave as I wanted to when interacting with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.72$</td>
<td>$.52</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It felt natural to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.86$</td>
<td>$.74</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I was able to express my natural feelings when interacting with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>$.68$</td>
<td>$.46</td>
<td>$&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 151$. This analysis is based on subordinate participants’ responses only. Factor loadings are standardized.

Not surprisingly, all five factors were significantly inter-correlated (all $rs \geq .66$, $p < .001$). The presence of strong correlations between factors indicates that a higher order factor may be present in the data (see Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999).
Given these findings, a higher-order factor model was investigated. That is, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted utilizing subordinate participant responses, investigating a model with a single Regulatory Fit construct serving as the second-order factor with five first-order factors (e.g., Ease of Interaction, Feeling Right, Enjoyment, Comfort, and Natural Non-Verbal Displays), each of which were identified based on relevant scale scores. This model did not include item-level indicators for each scale.

Results indicated acceptable, but much less than ideal fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(5, n = 151)} = 47.31, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .91; \text{RMSEA} = .24; \text{SRMR} = .04$), though all first-order factors demonstrated strong and statistically significant loadings on the second-order factor. As such, model respecification was conducted based on statistical and theoretical considerations. That is, modification indices indicated that allowing the disturbance associated with the comfort subscale to covary with that of the natural non-verbal displays subscale as well as the enjoyment subscale would result in significant chi-squared improvement. Given that this made theoretical sense, both of these modifications were made to the model. Results for the revised higher-order model of Regulatory Fit (e.g., with aforementioned residuals allowed to covary) demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(3, n = 151)} = 5.18, p = .16; \text{CFI} = 1.0; \text{RMSEA} = .07; \text{SRMR} = .02$). This revised higher-order model of Regulatory Fit was also cross-validated based on supervisor participant responses and demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(3, n = 151)} = 11.17, p = .01; \text{CFI} = .97; \text{RMSEA} = .13; \text{SRMR} = .03$). Similarly, in the supervisor participant sample, all factor loadings were strong (e.g., $\geq .60$) and statistically significant, and no modification indices were listed. Subscale factor loadings as well as a depiction of the revised higher-order
model of Regulatory Fit based on the CFA of subordinate participant responses can be found in Appendix U (see Table U.1 and Figure U.1)

Value from Fit

As mentioned previously in Chapter III, the experience of Value from Fit was assessed with items measuring perceptions of Liking and Value. To verify the underlying factor structure, all items were first submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis utilizing the a-priori two-factor structure, again based on subordinate participants’ responses. Results demonstrated good fit to the data $(\chi^2_{(19, n = 151)} = 48.80, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = .10; \text{SRMR} = .04)$. All factor loadings were strong (all $\geq .65$) and statistically significant at $p < .001$. The two factors were significantly correlated ($r = .83, p < .001$). Subscale factor loadings from this CFA based on subordinate participant responses are provided in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

Results from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Value from Fit Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The thought of having this person as a supervisor/subordinate is attractive.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would value having this person as a supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would NOT like having this person as a supervisor/subordinate. (R)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It feels good to have this person as a supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I think this supervisor/subordinate would make a good friend.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I get along well with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like this supervisor/subordinate very much.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I was able to express my natural feelings when interacting with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151. This analysis is based on subordinate participants’ responses only. Factor loadings are standardized.*
Within this initial CFA, a few modification indices were listed, noting that allowing the disturbances for items two and three in the value scale to covary as well as the disturbances for items one and two in the liking scale to covary would result in a significant chi-squared improvement. Given that these modifications also seemed theoretically appropriate, the model was revised accordingly. The revised model of Value from Fit (e.g., with the aforementioned disturbances allowed to covary) demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (17, n = 151) = 25.80, p = .08$; CFI = .99; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .03). Additionally, this revised two-factor structure demonstrated significantly better fit to the data compared to a one-factor structure (e.g., where the same disturbances were allowed to covary) based on a chi-squared difference test ($\Delta \chi^2 = 24.75; \Delta df = 1; \chi^2_{\text{crit}} = 10.83, p < .001$). Subscale factor loadings as well as a depiction of the revised model of Value from Fit can be found in Appendix U (see Table U.2. and Figure U.2).

Finally, to cross-validate this model, a separate CFA was conducted based on responses of supervisor participants using the factor structure corresponding to the revised model of Value from Fit. Results demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (17, n = 151) = 39.62, p < .01$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .09; SRMR = .04). All factor loadings were strong (e.g., $\geq .60$) and statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Expected Relationship Quality

As mentioned previously in Chapter III, Expected Relationship Quality was assessed with measures of LMX and Trust. To verify the underlying factor structure, all nine items were first submitted to a confirmatory factor analysis utilizing the a-priori two-factor structure. A two-factor solution based on the a-priori model provided good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (26, n = 151) = 44.09, p < .05$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .07; SRMR = .05).
Additionally, all factor loadings were statistically significant at \( p < .01 \) (see Table 4.6).

Though the first item in the trust scale demonstrated a low factor loading (e.g., < .40), this item was retained given that it was statistically significant and that this is an established scale of trust (Mayer & Gavin, 2005).

### Table 4.6

Results from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Expected Relationship Quality Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This supervisor/subordinate would definitely understand my problems and needs.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I needed help at work I could count on this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would expect to have an effective working relationship with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This supervisor/subordinate could be trusted to make important decisions concerning my work.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If someone questioned this supervisor’s/subordinate’s motives, I would give him/her the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I had my way, I wouldn’t let this supervisor/subordinate have any influence over issues that are important to me. (R)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be willing to let this supervisor/subordinate have complete control over my work.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on this supervisor/subordinate. (R)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be comfortable giving this supervisor/subordinate responsibility for a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her actions.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only. Factor loadings are standardized.*

Within this initial CFA, two modification indices were listed, indicating that a significant improvement in the chi-squared value would result from allowing the disturbances for items two and four in the trust scale to covary. This modification made theoretical sense and therefore the model was revised accordingly. Results for this revised model of Expected Relationship Quality (e.g., with the aforementioned disturbances allowed to covary) demonstrated good fit to the data (\( \chi^2 (25, n = 151) = 33.28, p = .12; \) CFI = .98; RMSEA = .05; SRMR = .04). Additionally, this revised two-factor structure demonstrated significantly better fit to the data compared to a one-factor
structure (e.g., where the same disturbances were allowed to covary) based on a chi-squared difference test \(\Delta \chi^2 = 8.21; \Delta df = 1; \chi^2_{\text{crit}} = 6.63, p < .01\). Subscale factor loadings as well as a depiction of the revised two-factor model of Expected Relationship Quality based on the CFA of subordinate participant responses can be found in Appendix U (see Table U.3 and Figure U.3).

Finally, to cross-validate this model, a separate confirmatory factor analysis was conducted based on responses of supervisor participants using the factor structure corresponding to the revised two-factor model of Expected Relationship Quality. Results demonstrated good fit to the data \(\chi^2{(25, n = 151)} = 42.55, p < .05; \text{CFI} = .95; \text{RMSEA} = .07; \text{SRMR} = .05\). As well, all factor loadings were statistically significant \((p < .05)\) and no modification indices were listed.

**Regulatory Focus Manipulation Check**

In this section, the merit of experimental manipulations employed in the current study is investigated. Data gathered from both supervisor and subordinate participants were utilized in this regard. The analyses and resulting findings are described next.

**Subordinate Manipulations**

The results of analyses speaking to the merit of experimental manipulations for subordinate participants are described first. To begin, videotaped behaviors of subordinates during the discussion activity were examined. A detailed explanation of the procedures involved in coding the behavioral data collected for a random subset \((N = 100)\) of participant pairs in the present study is provided in Appendix V. Subsequently, self-report and implicit data for subordinate participants were examined.
Behavioral data. Descriptive statistics and correlations among key promotion versus prevention verbal and non-verbal behaviors of subordinates can be found in Table 4.7. Based on an initial inspection of these correlations, it appears that supervisors’ regulatory focus condition had a significant impact on the words subordinates utilized in discussion. That is, when supervisors were in the promotion condition, subordinates tended to utilize a greater number of promotion-focused words \((r = .21, p = .03)\) and significantly fewer prevention-focused words \((r = -.48, p < .001)\). Additionally, subordinates’ trait regulatory foci demonstrated significant correlations with various behaviors of interest. On the other hand, the subordinate participants’ regulatory focus condition appears to have no significant zero-order correlations with characteristic behaviors of interest.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RF Cond (Sub)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RF Cond (Sup)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Precise Arms</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Broad Arms</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pushing Hands</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open Hands</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Body Position</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prevention Words</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotion Words</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trait Prevention</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Trait Promotion</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 100\); All variables based on data for subordinates only, unless otherwise noted; RF Cond (Sub) = regulatory focus condition for subordinate (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = 0); Reg Foc Cond (Sup) = regulatory focus condition for supervisor (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = 0); Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale \([1 = \text{Backward lean (much > 90°)}, 5 = \text{Forward lean (much < 90°)}]\); SD = Standard Deviation; \(*p < .05, **p < .01\).
Analyses of variance revealed no significant differences between experimental conditions in characteristic promotion and prevention behaviors demonstrated across the five-minute discussion (see Table 4.8). To further investigate the manipulation, additional analyses of variance were conducted and subordinate trait promotion and prevention foci were each subsequently entered into analyses as covariates. The partial eta-squared values associated with the covariates were examined and compared to those associated with condition effects to determine if, perhaps, trait regulatory foci had equal or larger effects on behaviors as did the manipulations or conditions. These values are provided in Appendix X (Table X.1). Based upon a review of partial eta-squared values, trait prevention and promotion appeared to exert some impact on the behaviors expressed by subordinates. For example, when both trait prevention and promotion are entered as covariates, analyses of variance demonstrated that there is a significant effect of the covariate trait promotion focus on body position. As well, a separate analysis of variance demonstrated that there is a significant effect of the covariate trait prevention on the number of prevention words spoken.

Repeated measures analyses of variance and analyses of covariance (e.g., with trait promotion and prevention foci entered as covariates) were also conducted, looking at differences between conditions at minutes one and five. Still, there were no significant differences between conditions at either time interval. Based upon these analyses, there is little support concerning behavioral data for the merit of the experimental manipulations for subordinate participants.
Table 4.8

Promotion-Prevention Behaviors across Subordinate Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>$F$ Test</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Subordinate RF Condition Means</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arms</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Arms</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hands</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Hands</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Words</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Words</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 100 50 50

Note. $df = 1, 98$; Partial $\eta^2$ corresponds to effect of subordinate experimental condition. RF = Regulatory Focus; Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale [(1 = Backward lean (much > 90°), 5 = Forward lean (much < 90°)]; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Self-report and implicit data. Two self-report measures were considered in an effort to investigate the merit of the experimental manipulation for subordinate participants. These include reported state regulatory foci following the five-minute discussion activity and perceived non-verbal displays during the discussion (based on the reports of one’s interaction partner). Additionally, a Lexical Decision Task (LDT) was included to assess implicit state regulatory foci following the discussion activity. I begin with a review of analyses investigating the impact of manipulations on subordinates only.

As previously reported, exploratory factor analyses were performed on the State Regulatory Focus items to confirm the existence of a two-factor structure representing promotion and prevention state orientations, respectively. Scale scores were created to represent these two state orientations. Analyses of variance indicated that there were no significant differences between subordinate regulatory focus conditions in self-reported state promotion ($F_{(1,149)} = .01; p = .91, \eta^2 < .001$) or state prevention ($F_{(1,149)} = .07; p = .79, \eta^2 < .001$).
Additional analyses of covariance were conducted, with subordinate trait promotion and prevention foci entered as covariates, again investigating subordinates’ self-reported state regulatory foci (see Appendix X, Table X.3). Similarly, results demonstrated that there were no significant differences between subordinate regulatory focus conditions in state promotion \( (F_{(1,147)} = 2.34; p = .13, \eta^2 = .02) \) or state prevention \( (F_{(1,147)} = .22; p = .64, \eta^2 = .002) \). Though results were not significant, means were in the expected direction, with subordinate participants in the promotion condition reporting greater state promotion orientations than participants in the prevention condition (M = 6.94 vs. 6.65) and subordinate participants in the prevention condition reporting greater state prevention orientations than participants in the promotion condition (M = 3.55 vs. 3.42). These analyses also revealed significant main effects of trait regulatory foci on this particular index of state regulatory focus with subordinate trait promotion accounting for 28% of the variance in self-reported state promotion and subordinate trait prevention accounting for 10% of the variance in self-reported state prevention focus.

As described previously, exploratory factor analyses were performed on the Perceived Non-Verbal Display items to confirm the existence of a two-factor structure representing promotion and prevention nonverbal displays, respectively. Scale scores were created to represent these two categories of displays. In order to examine the displays of subordinate participants, the reported perceptions of supervisor participants were analyzed. Analyses of variance revealed that there was a non-significant difference between subordinate regulatory focus conditions in promotion non-verbal displays \( (F_{(1,149)} = .39; p = .54, \eta^2 < .01; M_{\text{promo}} = 3.19, M_{\text{prev}} = 3.27) \) and a marginally significant difference between conditions in prevention non-verbal displays \( (F_{(1,149)} = 3.42; p = .07, \)
\[\eta^2 = .02; M_{\text{promo}} = 1.82, M_{\text{prev}} = 1.99\). The latter marginally significant result, with subordinates in the prevention condition appearing to have demonstrated slightly greater prevention non-verbal displays than those in the promotion condition, is in line with expectations.

Additionally, analyses of variance were conducted examining the individual items developed to assess perceived non-verbal displays for the present study, based on the work of Cesario (2006). Results revealed a significant difference between subordinate regulatory focus conditions in displays of non-relaxation \((F_{(1,149)} = 4.65; p = .03, \eta^2 = .03; M_{\text{promo}} = 2.51, M_{\text{prev}} = 2.83\) and a marginally significant difference between conditions in displays of carefulness \((F_{(1,149)} = 3.82; p = .05, \eta^2 = .03; M_{\text{promo}} = 3.08, M_{\text{prev}} = 2.79\). The mean differences in non-relaxation are in line with expectations (e.g., subordinates in the prevention condition appeared to display greater non-relaxation than subordinates in the promotion condition). However, contrary to expectations, the mean carefulness ratings were higher for the promotion condition than for the prevention condition.

Next, results of the Lexical Decision Task (LDT) were considered. In line with the recommendations of Bargh and Chartrand (2000), extreme responses with untransformed latencies greater than three standard deviations beyond the mean were trimmed. Specifically, this translated to dropping any responses shorter than 300 milliseconds and responses greater than 3000 milliseconds. Remaining scores were log-transformed (natural logarithm function) to achieve homogeneity of error variance, though non-transformed means are reported herein in order to improve interpretability. Incorrect responses were excluded from analyses. To investigate whether differences in
subordinate reaction times existed across subordinate experimental conditions, separate analyses of covariance were conducted to investigate differences in promotion and prevention-related word response latencies.

Results of these analyses can be found in Table 4.9 below. In each analysis, non-word response latencies and promotion-related or prevention-related word response latencies were included as covariates. Results revealed significant effects of condition when predicting both prevention \( (F(1,146) = 5.67; p = .02, \eta^2 = .04; M_{\text{promo}} = 841 \text{ ms}, M_{\text{prev}} = 788 \text{ ms}) \) and promotion-related word response latencies \( (F(1,146) = 5.79; p = .02, \eta^2 = .04; M_{\text{promo}} = 703 \text{ ms}, M_{\text{prev}} = 745 \text{ ms}) \). Specifically, subordinates in the prevention condition demonstrated shorter response latencies than subordinates in the promotion condition when presented with prevention-related words. Similarly, subordinates in the promotion condition demonstrated shorter response latencies than subordinates in the prevention condition when presented with promotion-related words. These findings provide some evidence that, at an implicit level, the experimental manipulations had the expected effect on subordinates.

Table 4.9

Analysis of LDT Response Latencies across Subordinate Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F ) test</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Partial ( \eta^2 )</th>
<th>Subordinate RF Cond Means (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Word Latency</td>
<td>71.35**</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>Prevention: 788, Promotion: 841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Word Latency</td>
<td>26.28**</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>5.79*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Word Latency</td>
<td>71.35**</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Word Latency</td>
<td>16.28**</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>5.67*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 150; \ df = 1, 146; \) RF Cond = Regulatory Focus Condition; ms = Milliseconds; Mean values reported are estimated marginal means; *\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \).
Supervisor Manipulations

In the following section, the results of analyses speaking to the merit of experimental manipulations for supervisor participants are described. Just as with subordinate participants, videotaped behaviors of supervisors during the discussion activity were examined, followed by self-report and implicit data.

Behavioral data. Descriptive statistics and correlations among key promotion versus prevention verbal and non-verbal behaviors of supervisors can be found in Table 4.10. Analyses of variance revealed that there were significant differences between experimental conditions in supervisors’ precise arm gestures \( (F_{(1,98)} = 5.89; p = .02, \eta^2 = .06) \), open hand gestures \( (F_{(1,98)} = 6.42; p = .01, \eta^2 = .06) \), and use of promotion-oriented words \( (F_{(1,98)} = 90.73; p < .001, \eta^2 = .48) \) and prevention-oriented words \( (F_{(1,98)} = 152.06; p < .001, \eta^2 = .61) \). All means were in the expected direction for these behaviors, with the exception of precise arm gestures (see Table 4.11).

Analyses of variance revealed that there was also a marginally significant difference \( (F_{(1,98)} = 3.50; p = .06, \eta^2 = .03) \) between conditions in the degree to which supervisors utilized pushing hand motions. In contrast to expectations, it appears that supervisors in the promotion condition demonstrated slightly more pushing hand motions \( (M = 4.94) \) than supervisors in the prevention condition \( (M = 2.98) \). However, when considering these findings in tandem, it appears that supervisors in the promotion condition displayed, overall, a greater number of arm gestures (precise) and hand gestures (both open and pushing) in comparison to supervisors in the prevention condition. That is, promotion supervisors were generally more “animated” overall. Coincidentally, these supervisors also tended to utilize more promotion-focused words (e.g., exciting, fun,
On the contrary, prevention supervisors tended to be more restricted in their hand and arm motions and correspondingly utilized significantly more prevention-focused words in conversation (e.g., safe, risk, drawback, loss). Therefore, these findings lend support to the merit of the experimental manipulation for participants in the supervisor role.

Table 4.10

Correlations among Promotion and Prevention Coded Behaviors of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RF Cond (Sub)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RF Cond (Sup)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Verbal Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Precise Arms</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Broad Arms</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pushing Hands</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open Hands</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Body Position</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prevention Words</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.78**</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotion Words</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trait Prevention</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Trait Promotion</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean                          | 4.97  | .58   | 3.96  | 8.50  | 2.78  | 3.11  | 5.16  | 5.51  | 7.58  |       |       |
| SD                            | 6.46  | 1.39  | 5.31  | 9.16  | .78   | 3.78  | 4.15  | 1.22  | .88   |       |       |

*Note. N = 100; All variables based on data for supervisors only, unless otherwise noted; RF Cond (Sub) = regulatory focus condition for subordinate (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = 0); RF Cond (Sup) = regulatory focus condition for supervisor (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = 0); Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale [1 = Backward lean (much > 90°), 5 = Forward lean (much < 90°)]; SD = Standard Deviation; *p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 4.11

Promotion-Prevention Behaviors across Supervisor Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>F Test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>Supervisor RF Condition Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arms</td>
<td>5.89*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Arms</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hands</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Hands</td>
<td>6.42*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Words</td>
<td>152.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Words</td>
<td>90.73**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = 1, 98; Partial η² corresponding to effect of supervisor experimental condition. RF = Regulatory Focus; Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale [(1 = Backward lean (much > 90°), 5 = Forward lean (much < 90°)]; *p < .05, **p < .01.

To further investigate the manipulation for supervisors, additional analyses of covariance were conducted and supervisor trait promotion and prevention foci were each subsequently entered into analyses as covariates. Results (see Appendix X, Table X.2) revealed that, by and large, when significant effects were found, these effects were due to the experimental manipulation. Results did reveal that there were significant effects of the covariate trait prevention focus on supervisors’ pushing hand motions, broad arm motions, and precise arm motions. As well, there were significant effects of the covariate trait promotion focus on supervisors’ precise arm motions. In summary, supervisor trait foci do appear to have demonstrated significant effects on supervisors’ behaviors during the discussion activity. Yet, by and large, the experimental condition effects appear to be more substantial and such effects remain significant when trait foci are entered into analyses as covariates.

Self-report and implicit data. As with subordinates, supervisor self-reported state regulatory focus was reviewed in order to gain additional insight as to the merit of the
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experimental manipulations. Analyses of variance demonstrated that there was not a significant difference between supervisor regulatory focus conditions in state promotion focus \( (F_{(1,149)} = .09; \ p = .76, \ \eta^2 < .01; \ \text{M}_{\text{promo}} = 6.89, \ \text{M}_{\text{prev}} = 6.95) \), though there was a marginally significant difference in state prevention focus \( (F_{(1,149)} = 2.85; \ p = .09, \ \eta^2 = .02; \ \text{M}_{\text{promo}} = 3.81, \ \text{M}_{\text{prev}} = 4.26) \). Additional analyses of covariance were conducted, with subordinate trait promotion and prevention foci entered as covariates (see Appendix X, Table X.4). Results demonstrated similar findings concerning differences between supervisor regulatory focus conditions as analyses omitting these covariates.

Interestingly, just as with subordinates, these analyses revealed significant main effects of trait regulatory foci on this particular index of state regulatory focus, with supervisor trait promotion accounting for 29% of the variance in self-reported state promotion and supervisor trait prevention accounting for 22% of the variance in self-reported state prevention focus.

Subordinates’ perceptions of supervisors’ non-verbal displays were considered next. Analyses of variance demonstrated that there were no significant differences between supervisor regulatory focus conditions in promotion non-verbal displays \( (F_{(1,149)} = .06; \ p = .81, \ \eta^2 < .001; \ \text{M}_{\text{promo}} = 3.24, \ \text{M}_{\text{prev}} = 3.20) \) nor prevention non-verbal displays \( (F_{(1,149)} = 1.35; \ p = .25, \ \eta^2 = .01; \ \text{M}_{\text{promo}} = 1.81, \ \text{M}_{\text{prev}} = 1.94) \). Subsequently, analyses of variance were conducted examining the individual items comprising the non-verbal displays measure. Results revealed a significant difference between supervisor regulatory focus conditions in displays of caution \( (F_{(1,149)} = 4.66; \ p = .03, \ \eta^2 = .03; \ \text{M}_{\text{promo}} = 2.21, \ \text{M}_{\text{prev}} = 2.57) \) and a marginally significant difference in displays of happiness \( (F_{(1,149)} = \)
2.78; \( p = .10, \eta^2 = .02; M_{\text{promo}} = 3.54, M_{\text{prev}} = 3.29 \). These results are in line with \textit{a-priori} theory.

Finally, results of the LDT for supervisor participants were considered. To investigate whether differences in supervisors’ reaction times existed across experimental conditions, separate analyses of variance were conducted to investigate differences in promotion and prevention-related word response latencies. Results of these analyses can be found in Table 4.12 below. In each analysis, non-word latencies and promotion-related or prevention-related word latencies were included as covariates. Results revealed that there were no significant effects of condition when predicting prevention (\( F_{(1,144)} = .62; p = .43, \eta^2 < .01; M_{\text{promo}} = 773 \text{ ms}, M_{\text{prev}} = 757 \text{ ms} \)) or promotion-related word response latencies (\( F_{(1,144)} = .07; p = .80, \eta^2 < .001; M_{\text{promo}} = 690 \text{ ms}, M_{\text{prev}} = 694 \text{ ms} \)). Therefore, though the mean response latencies are in the expected direction, there is no evidence to support an implicit effect of the experimental manipulations for supervisors based on the LDT.

Table 4.12

\textit{Analysis of LDT Response Latencies across Supervisor Conditions}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F ) test</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Partial ( \eta^2 )</th>
<th>Supervisor RF Cond Means (ms)</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Prevention Word Latency</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.53**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>Prevention: 757; Promotion: 690</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Word Latency</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.90**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>( p = .39 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Promotion Word Latency</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.53**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>Prevention: 757; Promotion: 690</td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Word Latency</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.23**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>( p = .50 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{N}</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( p = .50 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note.} \( N = 148; df = 1, 144; \text{RF Cond} = \text{Regulatory Focus Condition}; \text{ms} = \text{Milliseconds}; \text{Mean values reported are estimated marginal means}; *p < .05, **p < .01. \)
Summary of Manipulation Check Results

By and large, the results of manipulation check analyses demonstrate little support for the merit of the experimental conditions (e.g., priming) for subordinate participants. There is some evidence, based upon self-report data of both supervisors and subordinates, that the prevention manipulation may have had relatively greater success than the promotion manipulation for subordinates. As well, results of the LDT demonstrated that, at least implicitly, there is evidence that the manipulations may have worked for subordinates. Researchers have argued that implicit and explicit (e.g., self-report) measures function quite differently and often show relatively low correlations (Banaji, Lemm, & Carpenter, 2001). Some have argued that implicit and explicit measures tend to assess different conceptualizations altogether of the same construct, thus explaining the typically low correlations between the two types of measures (Gawronski, LeBel, & Peters, 2007). Despite this potential explanation, it is possible that, on an unconscious level, the manipulations were successful for subordinates. However, there is little to no evidence that manipulations impacted subordinates explicitly.

The lack of support for the merit of experimental manipulations for subordinates may be due to a number of aspects. For one, subordinates were not provided a clipboard to use during the discussion (e.g., with discussion questions listed) to further emphasize the second regulatory focus priming, as was provided to supervisors. As well, for subordinates, interacting with supervisors in the present study may have introduced an additional prime. In fact, analyses of variance demonstrated clear main effects of supervisor condition on words used by subordinates in conversation in terms of both promotion ($F_{(1,96)} = 4.68; p = .03, \eta^2 = .05$) and prevention words ($F_{(1,96)} = 29.39; p <$
.001, $\eta^2 = .23$). Exploratory analyses of self-report data also revealed evidence that supervisors’ condition had an influence, to a certain degree, on subordinates’ responses. Therefore, it cannot be ignored that supervisors may have acted as an additional manipulation, at least insofar as having an impact on subordinates’ verbal tendencies. This could have served to add “noise” to the manipulations.

On the other hand, there is generally stronger support for the merit of manipulations for supervisors – especially when considering behavioral tendencies demonstrated during the experimental discussion activity. Behavioral measures reflect behaviors in the moment as observed by trained coders, blind to experimental condition and/or experimental purpose. Therefore, the behavioral measures provide one of the more direct indices of the manipulations in that they were not mediated by participant perceptions and were attained during the interaction rather than following the interaction, as with all other indices utilized herein. The behavioral measures provided good support for the merit of the experimental manipulations for supervisors, but not subordinates.

It should be noted that, for both supervisors and subordinates, significant main effects of trait regulatory focus were found when investigating differences in self-reported state regulatory foci. These findings may reflect the notion that, when participants were required to utilize memory structures to retroactively report their experiences during the five-minute discussion activity, they reverted to trait tendencies. Rather than negating the merit of the experimental manipulations (especially for supervisor participants), these measures reflect an amalgam of effects, and do not accurately reflect purely state tendencies.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive statistics and correlations among the key study dependent variables and covariates can be found in Table 4.13. Scale reliabilities are reported in the diagonal, where applicable. All of the scales demonstrated strong reliability (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001), with alpha coefficients ranging from .78-.93.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regulatory Focus Cond (Super)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regulatory Focus Cond (Sub)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trait Promotion Focus (Sub)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18  * (.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trait Prevention Focus (Sub)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regulatory Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Value from Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.74** (.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expected Relationship Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.72** (.80** (.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22** (.15)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20*  (.16)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.22** (.03)</td>
<td>-.16* (.00)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* N = 151; All variables based on data for subordinates only, unless otherwise noted; Regulatory Focus Cond (Sub) = regulatory focus condition for subordinate (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = -1); Regulatory Focus Cond (Super) = regulatory focus condition for supervisor (coded Promotion = 1 and Prevention = -1); Gender coded as Male = 0 and Female = 1; Race coded as 0 = Minority and 1 = Majority; SD = Standard Deviation; Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses; *p < .05, **p < .01.

Due to the presence of strong positive correlations among the key constructs in the present study, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with all variables of central interest included. That is, Regulatory Fit, Value from Fit, and Expected Relationship Quality were entered simultaneously into one CFA with Maximum
Likelihood estimation, utilizing final factor structures outlined previously in the current chapter. Results of this analysis demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (194, n = 151) = 286.73$, $p < .001$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .05). A figure depicting the results of this CFA can be found in Appendix U (see Figure U.4). Results provide evidence to the fact that, though these constructs are highly correlated, they are distinct.

Test of the Hypothesized Model

Hypotheses depicted in Figure 2.5 were tested with path analysis, using maximum likelihood estimation, performed in Mplus v. 5.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2007). A sequential approach was taken wherein abbreviated versions of the full hypothesized model were first tested, all the while adding in subsequent paths and building to the full model. This required testing three separate models in the following order: 1) An Interaction Model simultaneously investigating the interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on regulatory fit, value from fit, and expected relationship quality, 2) An Intermediate Model wherein paths from regulatory fit to value from fit and expected relationship quality, respectively, were added, and 3) A Full Hypothesized Model wherein a path from value from fit to expected relationship quality was added.

This sequential approach to model testing was first conducted utilizing experimental condition as the operationalization of regulatory foci for both supervisors and subordinates. However, results of these analyses demonstrated that the key hypotheses investigating interactions of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on relational outcomes (e.g., Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5) were not supported (see Appendix Y for the results of these analyses). Adding to these findings, as detailed previously in the current chapter, manipulation check analyses demonstrated a lack of support for the merit
of experimental manipulations for subordinate participants. On the other hand, there was relatively greater support for the merit of manipulations for supervisor participants – especially concerning the verbal and non-verbal displays demonstrated by supervisors in the five-minute discussion activity. Therefore, these analyses provided evidence that supervisors “played the appropriate role” in that they clearly demonstrated characteristic behaviors in line with the expected regulatory focus deemed by their experimental condition. As this was an important determination of subordinates’ experience with the supervisor, it was decided that utilizing experimental condition as the operationalization for supervisors’ regulatory foci was indeed more than appropriate.

However, given a lack of similar findings for the merit of experimental conditions with subordinate participants, the choice was made to operationalize subordinates’ regulatory foci based on self-reported trait foci. This approach was also deemed appropriate given the current study’s central interest in the perceptions of subordinate participants; whereas, supervisor participants were treated largely as “naive confederates.” Therefore, the following results are based upon the interactive effects of supervisor regulatory focus condition and subordinate trait regulatory foci. Specifically, as has been done in previous work (e.g., Lockwood et al., 2002), subordinates’ trait regulatory focus scores were calculated by subtracting their trait prevention scores from their trait promotion scores, as determined by the Lockwood et al. (2002) measure. Therefore, the resulting score provides an indication of subordinates’ dominant regulatory focus.

---

8 Examining the data in this fashion still resulted in an acceptably balanced distribution across conditions. That is, if a median split were to be conducted for subordinates based upon their dominant trait regulatory foci scores, this would result in the following sample sizes: Supervisor promotion/subordinate promotion (N = 29), supervisor promotion/subordinate prevention (N = 47), supervisor prevention/subordinate promotion (N = 45), and supervisor prevention/subordinate prevention (N = 30).
regulatory foci, with a higher score indicating a greater inclination toward a promotion orientation and a lower score indicating a greater inclination toward a prevention orientation. In line with recommendations of Aiken and West (1991), subordinates’ dominant regulatory focus scores were mean centered and this centered value was utilized in analyses. An interaction variable was also created by multiplying subordinates’ centered dominant regulatory focus scores by supervisor regulatory focus condition (contrast coded; -1 = prevention condition, 1 = promotion condition).

Based on the evidence provided in confirmatory factor analyses (presented earlier in this chapter) composite scores were created for Value from Fit and Expected Relationship Quality by first standardizing each respective sub-scale and then creating average scale scores for each of these constructs. Therefore, these scale scores represent unit-weighted composite variables. For Regulatory Fit, each of the five subscales is treated herein as an indicator of a latent construct. These endogenous variables were investigated for normality, and were deemed to be normally distributed, with values well below common rules of thumb (e.g., skew < 2, kurtosis < 8; Kline, 2005). In addition to the focal constructs, subordinate participants’ age, gender, and race were included as covariates on all endogenous variables. The paths between the covariates and endogenous variables are not depicted in subsequent figures in order to ensure the figures are clearly interpreted. However, the relationships between the three covariates and the endogenous variables are provided in tables embedded within each figure.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 – Test of the Interaction Model

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 proposed that supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci would interact to affect regulatory fit (e.g., feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment,
comfort, natural non-verbal display), value from fit (e.g., liking and perceived value), and expected relationship quality (e.g., LMX and trust). Specifically, these hypotheses stated that the subordinate would report greater regulatory fit (H1), value from fit (H2), and expected relationship quality (H3) when his or her regulatory focus matched versus contrasted the supervisor’s own regulatory focus. To test these hypotheses, relevant path coefficients in the Interaction Model were investigated (see Figure 4.1). The Interaction Model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{35, n = 151} = 51.45, p < .05; \text{CFI} = .98; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{SRMR} = .03$).

![Interaction Model Diagram]

Path Coefficients (β) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Regulatory Fit</th>
<th>Value from Fit</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Race</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. The Interaction Model

Note. $N = 151$; Paths corresponding to focal interaction effects bolded for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; $^*p < .10$, $^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$. 
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Investigation of path coefficients revealed that there was a statistically significant interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and regulatory fit ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$), thus providing full support for Hypothesis 1. This interaction was plotted in order to investigate its nature (see Figure 4.2). Values one standard deviation above and one standard deviation below each regression line were plotted. As shown in Figure 4.2, the interaction followed the expected pattern such that when a supervisor was promotion (prevention) focused, subordinates reported greater regulatory fit when they were also promotion (prevention) focused compared to prevention (promotion) focused. There was also a marginally significant interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and value from fit ($\beta = .14$, $p = .07$), providing marginal support for Hypothesis 2. This interaction is depicted in Figure 4.3. Similar to the results concerning regulatory fit, the interaction effect for value from fit conforms to the expected pattern.

*Figure 4.2. The Interaction of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Foci and Regulatory Fit*
Finally, the interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and expected relationship quality was also marginally significant ($\beta = .13$, $p < .10$), providing marginal support for Hypothesis 5. This interaction is depicted in Figure 4.4. Again, the pattern of the interaction generally falls in line with expectations. Though, it appears that when supervisors were prevention focused, expected relationship quality was lower overall and there was no appreciable difference between prevention and promotion subordinates’ perceptions of the expected quality of the relationship. Instead, regulatory focus congruence played a larger role when supervisors were promotion focused, in which case promotion focused subordinates reporting greater expected relationship quality than their prevention focused counterparts. Additionally, though no hypotheses were presented concerning the direct impact of supervisors, this interaction plot also depicts the significant main effect found such that, overall, subordinates reported expecting greater relationship quality when supervisors were promotion focused ($\beta = .19$, $p = .01$).
Investigation of an Alternative Interaction Model

In lieu of the marginal interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus and value from fit, an Alternative Interaction Model was specified in order to investigate the interactive effects of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on the separate components of value from fit – perceived value and liking (see Figure 4.5). The Alternative Interaction Model provided good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(39, n = 151)} = 58.76, p < .05$; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .03). In line with previous findings, investigation of path coefficients revealed a statistically significant interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and regulatory fit ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). This again provided full support for Hypothesis 1.

---

*The separate components of relationship quality were also investigated in an additional analysis. Results revealed that the interaction effects between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and both LMX ($\beta = .13, p < .08$) and trust ($\beta = .10, p < .19$) remained non-significant. The details of this investigation are not provided in detail as they added little insight to these findings.*
Path Coefficients (β) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Regulatory Fit</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13^</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Race</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5. The Alternative Interaction Model

Note. N = 151; Paths corresponding to focal interaction effects bolded for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; ^p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.

More importantly, pertaining to Hypothesis 2, investigation of path coefficients revealed a statistically significant interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and liking (β = .19, p = .01), whereas the interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and perceived value was not significant (β = .07, p = .37). Though not hypothesized, there was a significant main effect of supervisor regulatory focus on perceived value (β = .16, p < .05), indicating that, overall, subordinates reported greater perceived value when supervisors were promotion focused. These results
demonstrate that the marginal interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and value from fit is largely being driven by liking.

In order to better understand this interaction, values one standard deviation above and below the mean were plotted (see Figure 4.6). As can be seen in Figure 4.6, the pattern of the interaction coincided with expectations. These findings provide clarification and demonstrate partial support for Hypothesis 2. Finally, as was found previously, results revealed a significant main effect of supervisor regulatory focus on expected relationship quality ($\beta = .19, p = .01$) and a marginally significant interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and expected relationship quality ($\beta = .13, p < .10$). These latter findings again provide marginal support for Hypothesis 5.

Figure 4.6. The Interaction of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Foci and Liking

Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 – Test of the Intermediate Model

Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 all focused on regulatory fit and its relationship to other variables in the model as a central mediating construct. To test these hypotheses, paths from regulatory fit to value from fit and expected relationship quality were added to the
Interaction Model, thus resulting in the Intermediate Model (see Figure 4.7). The Intermediate Model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (35, n = 151) = 51.45, p < .05$; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .03). Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 were tested by interpreting relevant path coefficients in the Intermediate Model.

### Figure 4.7. The Intermediate Model

Note. $N = 151$; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; $^p < .10$, $^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Specifically, Hypotheses 3 and 6 focused on the relationships of regulatory fit to other endogenous variables in the model – proposing that regulatory fit would be
positively related to value from fit and expected relationship quality, respectively. Investigation of path coefficients demonstrated that there were significant paths from regulatory fit to both value from fit ($\beta = .82, p < .001$) and expected relationship quality ($\beta = .81, p < .001$), thus providing support for Hypotheses 3 and 6.

Hypotheses 4 and 7 focused on the potential for regulatory fit to serve as a key mediating variable in the model. Specifically, Hypothesis 4 proposed that regulatory fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit. Previous analyses demonstrated that there was a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit, and therefore, Hypothesis 4 could not be fully supported. Results, however, did demonstrate a significant indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on value from fit through regulatory fit ($\alpha \beta = .13, p < .05$). Therefore, there is evidence of a mediational relationship; nonetheless, without a significant interactive effect to be mediated, Hypothesis 4 could not be supported based on these results. Given the previous findings concerning the components of value from fit (e.g., a significant interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and liking), Hypothesis 4 will be explored further in the next section.

Finally, Hypothesis 7 proposed that regulatory fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality. Again, given a lack of full support for tests of Hypothesis 5, which demonstrated there was only a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality, Hypothesis 7 could not be fully supported. Results did demonstrate, however, that there is a marginally significant
indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality through regulatory fit ($a\beta = .13, p = .05$). Therefore, there is evidence of a mediating relationship; nonetheless, without a significant interactive effect to be mediated, Hypothesis 5 could not be supported.

**Investigation of an Alternative Intermediate Model**

In order to further investigate the impact of the separate components of value from fit, paths from regulatory fit to liking and perceived value as well as expected relationship quality were added to the Alternative Interaction Model. These additions resulted in the Alternative Intermediate Model (see Figure 4.8). The Alternative Intermediate Model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (39, n = 151) = 58.76, p < .05; \text{CFI} = .98; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{SRMR} = .03$).

Hypotheses 3 and 6 focused on the relationships of regulatory fit to other endogenous variables in the model – proposing that regulatory fit would be positively related to value from fit and expected relationship quality, respectively. Investigation of path coefficients within the Alternative Intermediate model demonstrated that there were significant paths from regulatory fit to both components of value from fit [e.g., liking ($\beta = .77, p < .001$) and perceived value ($\beta = .76, p < .001$)]. These findings again provide support for Hypothesis 3. As well, there was a significant path from regulatory fit to expected relationship quality ($\beta = .81, p < .001$). These results provide support once again for Hypothesis 6.

Next, Hypotheses 4 and 7 were investigated utilizing the Alternative Intermediate Model. Previous inspections of the Alternative Interaction Model demonstrated that there was a significant interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and
subordinate perceptions of liking (providing partial support for Hypothesis 2); whereas, there was a non-significant interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and subordinate perceptions of value. Hypothesis 4 proposed that regulatory fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on value from fit (e.g., perceived value and liking).

![Diagram showing the relationship between variables]

| Path Coefficients (β) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables | Endogenous Variables |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Covariates** | Regulatory Fit | Liking | Perceived Value | Relationship Quality |
| Subordinate Age | -.04 | -.10\(^\text{\textdagger}\) | -.05 | -.13\(^*\) |
| Subordinate Gender | -.10 | .00 | .06 | .08 |
| Subordinate Race | -.23\(^**\) | .21\(^**\) | .12\(^\text{\textdagger\textdagger}\) | .24\(^**\) |

**Figure 4.8. The Alternative Intermediate Model**

*Note. N = 151; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; \(^\text{\textdagger}p < .10, \ ^*p < .05, \ ^{**}p < .01.**
Turning to the path coefficients displayed in the Alternative Intermediate Model, there was a significant indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on liking through regulatory fit (αβ = .13, p < .05). As well, there was a non-significant, and basically “zero-value” direct relationship between the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and liking (β = .07, p = .24). This evidence indicates that there is full mediation of this relationship by regulatory fit. Not surprisingly, results also demonstrated that there was a non-significant, though marginal, indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on perceived value through regulatory fit (αβ = .12, p = .052). Therefore, these results provide some additional insight concerning the components of value from fit, demonstrating that the significant interactive effects of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on liking are functioning by way of increasing regulatory fit. However, this pattern of relationships was not found when perceived value served as the outcome variable of interest. That is, though perceived value is significantly related to regulatory fit, there is not a significant interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and perceived value, and hence, no relationship to be mediated by regulatory fit. These findings, nonetheless, underscore the partial support of Hypothesis 4.

_Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 – Test of the Full Hypothesized Model_

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 all focused on value from fit and its relationship to expected relationship quality as well as its potential role as an important mediating construct. To test these hypotheses, a path from value from fit to expected relationship quality was added to the Intermediate Model, thus resulting in the Full Hypothesized Model (see Figure 4.9). The Full Hypothesized Model demonstrated good fit to the data.
$(\chi^2_{(35, \, n = 151)} = 51.45, \, p = .04; \, CFI = .98; \, RMSEA = .06; \, SRMR = .03)$ and no modification indices were listed. Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 were tested by interpreting relevant path coefficients in the Full Hypothesized Model.

Figure 4.9. The Full Hypothesized Model

Note. $N = 151$; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; $^p < .10$, $^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Specifically, Hypothesis 8 proposed that value from fit would be positively related to expected relationship quality. There was a significant path from value from fit to expected relationship quality ($\beta = .46, \, p < .001$), thus providing support for Hypothesis
8. Hypotheses 9 and 10 focused on the potential for value from fit to serve as a key mediating variable in the model. Specifically, Hypothesis 9 proposed that value from fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality. However, given a lack of support for tests of Hypothesis 5, which demonstrated there was only a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality, Hypothesis 9 could not be fully supported. Indeed, results demonstrated that there was a non-significant specific indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality through value from fit ($\alpha\beta = .004, p = .87$). Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was not supported.

Hypothesis 10 proposed that value from fit would mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Results demonstrated a significant indirect effect of regulatory fit on expected relationship quality through value from fit ($\alpha\beta = .37, p < .001$). However, regulatory fit still demonstrated a significant direct effect on expected relationship quality ($\beta = .43, p < .001$), indicating that value from fit only partially mediated this relationship. Therefore, these findings provide partial support for Hypothesis 10.

**Investigation of an Alternative Full Hypothesized Model**

Finally, further investigations of Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 were conducted by examining a model specifying the separate components of value from fit – liking and perceived value. To test these hypotheses, paths from liking and perceived value to expected relationship quality were added to the Alternative Intermediate Model, thus resulting in the Alternative Full Hypothesized Model (see Figure 4.10). The Alternative
Full Hypothesized Model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(40, n = 151)} = 74.57, p < .001; \text{CFI} = .96; \text{RMSEA} = .08; \text{SRMR} = .03$). However, modification indices noted that adding a path from liking to perceived value in the Alternative Full Hypothesized Model would significantly improve model fit. This modification was deemed theoretically appropriate, and thus, was instituted.

![Diagram of the Alternative Full Hypothesized Model]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Regulatory Fit</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09^</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Race</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.10. The Alternative Full Hypothesized Model*

*Note. N = 151; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; ^p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.*
This resulted in the Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized Model (see Figure 4.11). The Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (39, n = 151) = 58.76, p = .02; \text{CFI} = .98; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{SRMR} = .03$) and no modification indices were listed. Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 were again tested by interpreting relevant path coefficients in the Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized Model.

**Figure 4.11. The Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized Model**

*Note. N = 151; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate trait regulatory focus; Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; $^p < .10$, $^*p < .05$, $^{**}p < .01$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Regulatory Fit</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Relationship Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Age</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Gender</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Race</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specifically, Hypothesis 8 proposed that value from fit would be positively related to expected relationship quality. Results demonstrated that there was a significant path from perceived value to expected relationship quality ($\beta = .35, p < .001$). Based on zero-order correlations, there was also a significant correlation between liking and expected relationship quality ($r = .73, p < .001$), thus providing support for Hypothesis 8. However, there was only a marginally significant path from liking to expected relationship quality in the Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized Model ($\beta = .14, p = .07$). This finding provides initial evidence that this path may be partially mediated by perceived value. In fact, analyses revealed that there is indeed a significant indirect effect of liking on expected relationship quality through perceived value ($\alpha \beta = .13, p < .01$). Therefore, it appears that liking demonstrated a positive impact on expected relationship quality partly by means of increasing the value subordinates placed on the possible relationship they could develop with their supervisor.

Hypotheses 9 and 10 focused on the potential for value from fit to serve as a key mediating variable in the model. Specifically, Hypothesis 9 proposed that value from fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality. However, given a lack of support for tests of Hypothesis 5, which demonstrated there was only a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality, Hypothesis 9 could not be fully supported. In fact, results demonstrated that there were non-significant specific indirect effects of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality through liking ($\alpha \beta = .01, p = .33$) as well.
as through perceived value ($\alpha\beta = -.03, p = .17$). Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was again not supported.

Finally, Hypothesis 10 proposed that value from fit would mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Results demonstrated that there was a significant indirect effect of regulatory fit on expected relationship quality through perceived value ($\alpha\beta = .16, p < .001$). As well, the direct path from regulatory fit to expected relationship quality was still significant ($\beta = .44, p < .001$), thus providing evidence of partial mediation. However, there was only a marginally significant indirect effect of regulatory fit on expected relationship quality through liking ($\alpha\beta = .11, p = .07$). Yet, it appears as though this may be due in part to the finding that perceived value is functioning as a partial mediator of the relationship between liking and expected relationship quality, thus accounting for the fact that there is only a marginally significant direct path from liking to expected relationship quality ($\beta = .14, p = .07$) in the Revised Alternative Full Hypothesized Model. Indeed, taking one step back in the model, results demonstrate that there is a significant indirect effect of regulatory fit on perceived value through liking ($\alpha\beta = .30, p < .001$). In that the direct path from regulatory fit to perceived value remains statistically significant ($\beta = .46, p < .001$), these findings provide evidence of partial mediation. Therefore, liking does in fact partially mediate the effect of regulatory fit on perceived value, which subsequently serves as a partial mediator for the effects of both liking and regulatory fit on expected relationship quality. These findings provide helpful clarification and underscore the partial support previously found for Hypothesis 10.
Summary of Hypothesis Test Results

In general, there was strong support for hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was supported such that there was a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on regulatory fit. Hypothesis 2 received partial support in that there was a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on value from fit. Subsequent analyses further demonstrated that, when looking at the individual components of value from fit (e.g., liking and perceived value), there was a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on liking.

Hypothesis 3 received full support as there was a strong, positive relationship between regulatory fit and value from fit. The relationships between regulatory fit and the individual components of value from fit – liking and perceived value – were also positive and significant. Hypothesis 4 received partial support based on an investigation of the separate components of value from fit in that regulatory fit was found to fully mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on liking but not perceived value. However, there was not a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on value from fit as a whole, and therefore, no relationship to be mediated by regulatory fit. As a result, this hypothesis could not be fully supported.

Hypothesis 5 received marginal support as there was a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality. Hypothesis 6 received full support in that there was a strong, positive relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Hypothesis 7, however, received no support as there was only a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and
subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality. Therefore, there was not a significant relationship to be mediated by regulatory fit.

Hypothesis 8 received full support as there was a significant, positive relationship between value from fit and expected relationship quality. There were also meaningful relationships between the individual components of value from fit and expected relationship quality, though liking was only marginally related to expected relationship quality. Additionally analyses revealed that perceived value functioned as a partial mediator of this relationship, providing additional insight as to the processes at play. Hypothesis 9, however, received no support as there was only a marginally significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship quality. Therefore, there was not a significant relationship to be mediated by value from fit. Finally, Hypothesis 10 received partial support such that value from fit served to partially mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Also, considering the individual components of value from fit, perceived value also served as a partial mediator for this relationship. A summary of all hypothesis test results is provided in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14

Summary of Hypothesis Test Results Based on Supervisor Condition and Subordinate Trait Regulatory Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong>: Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect regulatory fit (feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment, comfort, natural non-verbal display).</td>
<td><strong>Full Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2</strong>: Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect value from fit (liking and perceived value).</td>
<td><strong>Partial Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Marginally significant interaction for Value from Fit&lt;br&gt;-Significant interaction for Liking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3</strong>: Regulatory fit will be positively related to value from fit.</td>
<td><strong>Full Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4</strong>: Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit.</td>
<td><strong>Partial Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Full mediation for Liking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5</strong>: Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect expected relationship quality (trust, LMX).</td>
<td><strong>Marginal Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Marginally significant interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6</strong>: Regulatory fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
<td><strong>Full Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong>: Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
<td><strong>No Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8</strong>: Value from fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
<td><strong>Full Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9</strong>: Value from fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
<td><strong>No Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong>: Value from fit will mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality.</td>
<td><strong>Partial Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;-Partial mediation supported for Value from Fit&lt;br&gt;-Partial mediation also supported for Perceived Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory Analyses

In the following section, the influence of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus congruence on social perceptions beyond those outlined in study hypotheses is examined. Specifically, this section examines the effects of regulatory focus congruence on subordinates’ perceptions of similarity, interpersonal justice, and leadership impressions – each in reference to the supervisor with whom they interacted during the
study. The purpose of these analyses is to add to the understanding of the findings pertaining to the hypothesized model in the current study. As well, these analyses serve to provide additional insight as to the array of interpersonal phenomena that may be impacted by supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence. Table 4.15 contains descriptive statistics and correlations among covariates and the exploratory variables examined in subsequent analyses.

Table 4.16 displays the results for all exploratory analyses. To investigate the effects of regulatory focus congruence on the aforementioned social perceptions, hierarchical moderated multiple regression was utilized. In these analyses, all demographic variables were entered in step one. In line with recommendations of Aiken and West (1991), subordinates’ dominant regulatory focus scores were mean centered and this value was entered in step two along with a variable representing supervisors’ regulatory focus condition (contrast coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion). Finally, an interaction variable was also created by multiplying subordinates’ centered dominant regulatory focus by supervisor regulatory focus condition. This interaction variable was entered in step three.
Table 4.15

Correlations among Covariates and Exploratory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sup RF Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sub Trait Promotion</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sub Trait Prevention</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Similarity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leadership Impressions</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Race</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 151; All variables based on data from subordinates only, unless otherwise noted; Sup RF Condition = Supervisor Regulatory Focus Condition (coded as -1 = prevention, -1 = promotion); Sub = Subordinate; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Coefficient alphas are listed in parentheses, where appropriate; *p < .05, **p < .01.
### Table 4.16

*Results of Hierarchical Moderated Multiple Regressions Investigating Regulatory Focus Congruence and Subordinate Social Perceptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Perceived Similarity</th>
<th>Beta (B)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F at Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV = Perceived Similarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.18* (.04)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>F (3, 147) = 2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.08 (.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.02 (.04)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Regulatory Foci</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF</td>
<td>.07 (.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub RF</td>
<td>.03 (.02)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>F (5, 145) = 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF x Sub RF</td>
<td>.18* (.13)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>F (6, 144) = 1.98*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Interpersonal Justice</th>
<th>Beta (B)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F at Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV = Interpersonal Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>F (3, 147) = 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Regulatory Foci</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF</td>
<td>.04 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub RF</td>
<td>.03 (.01)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>F (5, 145) = 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF x Sub RF</td>
<td>.16* (.05)</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>F (6, 144) = 0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Leadership Impressions</th>
<th>Beta (B)</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F at Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV = Leadership Impressions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.10 (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.10 (.16)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>F (3, 147) = 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.08 (.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Regulatory Foci</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF</td>
<td>.21* (.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub RF</td>
<td>-.004 (.002)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>F (5, 145) = 2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super RF x Sub RF</td>
<td>.20* (.11)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>F (6, 144) = 2.91*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151; Gender coded as 0 = Male, 1 = Female; Race coded as 0 = Minority, 1 = Majority; Super RF = Supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Sub RF = Subordinate dominant trait regulatory focus; *p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.*
Regulatory Focus Congruence and Perceived Similarity

One assumption in the present study is that individuals are not only able to decipher others’ regulatory inclinations but also utilize this information to make comparisons to their own regulatory orientations (Vohs & Ciarocco, 2004). In the process of doing so, individuals may then determine the degree of similarity between themselves and others based on this information. In effect, congruence in regulatory foci is proposed to impact regulatory fit such that supervisors and subordinates utilize a “common language” and therefore see the world from a similar perspective. Concerning the present study, this raises the question: Do subordinates perceive themselves to be more similar to their supervisors if the supervisor demonstrates a regulatory focus congruent to their predominant trait focus?

Results demonstrated that, controlling for subordinate age, gender, and race, there was a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on subordinates’ perceptions of similarity to their supervisors (β = .18, p = .03). In order to better understand the pattern of relationships, points one standard deviation above and below the regression line were plotted. As can be seen in Figure 4.12, subordinates reported greater perceptions of similarity when their regulatory focus matched versus contrasted that of their supervisor. Therefore, these results provide evidence that individuals are indeed able to accurately detect variability in others’ regulatory focus inclinations (Vohs & Ciarocco, 2004). Moreover, such determinations appear to impact perceptions of similarity such that congruence in regulatory foci is associated with greater perceived similarity for both prevention and promotion focused subordinates.
Camacho et al. (2003) found that when the strategy used by a superior to resolve a conflict “fit” with an individual’s regulatory orientation, this led to increased judgments of the “moral rightness” of the resolution. One significant implication of these findings is that regulatory focus congruence between two individuals such as a supervisor and subordinate may have a profound effect on the subordinate’s interpretation of his or her supervisor’s actions during the discussion activity. It is possible, for instance, that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence may elicit greater feelings of “interpersonal rightness” or interpersonal justice in the present study.

Results demonstrated that, controlling for subordinate age, gender, and race, there was a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on subordinates’ perceptions of interpersonal justice ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). In order to better understand the pattern of relationships, points one standard deviation above and below the regression line were plotted. As can be seen in Figure 4.13, when supervisors were prevention (promotion) focused, subordinates reported greater perceptions of

Figure 4.12. The Interaction of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Foci and Perceived Similarity

Regulatory Focus Congruence and Interpersonal Justice
interpersonal justice during the interaction when they themselves were prevention (promotion) focused in contrast to promotion (prevention) focused. These results provide some of the first evidence that justice perceptions may be impacted based on the extent to which a supervisor and subordinate share a similar regulatory orientation.

![Interpersonal Justice](image)

*Figure 4.13. The Interaction of Supervisor and Subordinate Regulatory Foci and Interpersonal Justice*

**Regulatory Focus Congruence and General Leadership Impressions**

Kellett, Humphrey, and Sleeth (2002) proposed that emotional displays may serve as a basis for leadership perceptions. Additionally, research indicates that people associate certain behaviors with leadership and may categorize others as more or less “leaderly” based on their behavior (e.g., Cronshaw & Lord, 1987). In other words, individuals look to their own personal schemas of what it means to be a leader in making a determination of displayed leadership qualities. It may be possible that the extent to which a leader’s emotional displays and related behaviors are commensurate with a subordinate’s regulatory orientation may impact the subordinate’s perceptions of the degree to which a leader demonstrated prototypical leadership behaviors.
Results demonstrated that, controlling for subordinate age, gender, and race, there was a significant main effect of supervisor regulatory focus on general leadership impressions ($\beta = .21, p = .01$). This main effect functioned such that, overall, supervisors in the promotion focus condition were seen as more “leaderly” compared to supervisors in the prevention focus condition. Additionally, there was a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on subordinates’ perceptions of general leadership as demonstrated by supervisors ($\beta = .20, p = .01$). In order to better understand the pattern of relationships, points one standard deviation above and below the regression line were plotted.

As can be seen in Figure 4.14, the main effect of supervisor regulatory focus is quite obvious. More interestingly, the figure demonstrates that, when supervisors were prevention (promotion) focused, subordinates reported having perceived that the supervisor demonstrated leadership to a greater extent when they themselves were prevention (promotion) focused in contrast to promotion (prevention) focused. Additionally, from the pattern of the interaction, it appears as though the difference in perceived leadership impressions as demonstrated by supervisors was most pronounced for promotion-focused subordinates. That is, whereas prevention-focused subordinates did not report a significant difference between supervisors, promotion-focused subordinates perceived that promotion-focused supervisors demonstrated a noticeably greater degree of leadership compared to prevention-focused supervisors.
Summary of Exploratory Analysis Results

In summary, exploratory analyses demonstrate additional evidence of the significant impact supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence may have on interpersonal phenomena in the workplace. The phenomena examined include subordinates’ perceptions of similarity, interpersonal justice, and general leadership impressions. These findings provide additional weight to the main contention of this study – regulatory focus fit or congruence between individuals can have a significant impact on interpersonal perceptions and attitudes in the workplace. Additionally, considering the research that has demonstrated ties between these perceptions and important organizational outcomes (e.g., interpersonal justice is an established antecedent of job satisfaction and organizational commitment; see Colquitt et al., 2001; Simons & Roberson, 2003), these findings provide an important new avenue through which leaders may have a significant impact on followers, and inevitably, organizational outcomes.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

The current study incorporated regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) and LMX theory (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975) to investigate the mechanisms by which supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence impacts regulatory fit, value from fit, and subsequently, expected relationship quality. Specifically, it was proposed that congruence between supervisor and subordinate in predominant regulatory focus would engender regulatory fit (e.g., interactions characterized by natural displays, feeling right, enjoyment, ease of interaction, and comfort) as well as value from fit (e.g., subordinate perceptions of liking and value of the supervisor). Both the regulatory fit and value from fit experiences were then posited to have direct positive effects on expected relationship quality (e.g., trust and LMX). An indirect effect of regulatory fit on supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality through value from fit was also proposed. Results of the study showed that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence is an important determinant of fit experiences, which subsequently contribute to the expected quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship.

Overall, support for hypotheses was favorable and at least marginal support was found for 8 out of the 10 original hypotheses (see Table 4.14). There was a significant
interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on regulatory fit (Hypothesis 1),
supporting the proposition that congruence in regulatory foci elicits greater regulatory fit.
There were also marginally significant interactions of supervisor and subordinate
regulatory foci on value from fit (Hypothesis 2) and expected relationship quality
(Hypothesis 5). Additionally, regulatory fit demonstrated direct, positive relationships
with value from fit (Hypothesis 3) and expected relationship quality (Hypothesis 6).
Value from fit was also positively related to expected relationship quality (Hypothesis 8)
and served as a partial mediator of the relationship between regulatory fit and expected
relationship quality (Hypothesis 10). Contrary to hypotheses, neither regulatory fit
(Hypothesis 7) nor value from fit (Hypothesis 9) functioned as mediators of the
interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on expected relationship
quality. Though the pattern of relationships among these variables coincided with what
would be expected, the interactive effect of regulatory foci on expected relationship
quality was not statistically significant. Therefore, this precluded the possibility for
mediation of this effect to take place.

Results also demonstrated that there was a significant interaction of supervisor
and subordinate regulatory foci on liking – a construct that, in combination with
perceived value, comprised the operationalization of value from fit. These results
clarified previous findings pertaining to Hypothesis 2, indicating that liking was driving
the marginally significant interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on
value from fit. Further analyses investigating the separate components of value from fit
also revealed that regulatory fit fully mediated the relationship between supervisor-
subordinate regulatory focus congruence and liking – thus providing partial support for
Hypothesis 4. Additionally, perceived value partially mediated the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality (thus providing additional support and clarification for Hypothesis 10). Therefore, these results demonstrated that investigating the separate components of value from fit within the model afforded greater insight as to the processes that unfold in determining the effect of regulatory focus congruence on expected relationship quality.

In addition, exploratory analyses highlighted several other interesting outcomes of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence. Results demonstrated that there were statistically significant interactions of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on various other subordinate social perceptions including perceived similarity, interpersonal justice, and leadership demonstrated by the supervisor. In line with the propositions of Lord and Maher (1991), these findings suggest that individuals use implicit theories about leaders, drawing from self-regulatory structures, when interpreting behavior and forming social judgments. Further, Epitropaki and Martin (2005) demonstrated that the degree to which followers’ perceptions of their manager’s profile matched their implicit theories of ideal leadership was positively related to ratings of LMX quality and subsequent commitment to the organization. These results further underscore the important role of self-regulation, and more specifically, regulatory focus congruence between supervisor and subordinate, as an antecedent determining perceptions of social phenomena and, potentially, organizational attitudes.

The current study successfully utilized the core tenets of regulatory focus theory as a guiding framework (Higgins, 1997, 1998) in developing a model that ties together regulatory focus congruence and relationship quality. As a result, the current study
successfully united two disparate and well-established research streams. Despite its applicability, research examining the impact of regulatory fit in the workplace is relatively sparse. Research on the function of regulatory focus in social interactive contexts, specifically, is also lacking and that which has been conducted has traditionally failed to incorporate actual social interactions into the research design (see Galinsky et al., 2005). Finally, regulatory focus theory has seldom been investigated in the larger context of leadership research (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2007), and only a few studies have even considered social-cognitive constructs such as regulatory focus in the supervisor-subordinate relationship (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lapidot et al., 2007; Lord et al., 1999; Medvedeff & Lord, 2005). Therefore, this study makes several unique contributions to the literature by demonstrating the inter-individual function of regulatory focus in true social interaction and the resulting impact on work relationships, specifically the supervisor-subordinate relationship.

Contributions and Implications

Though slightly attenuated by a sequence of mediational chains, results support the proposition that effects of regulatory focus congruence in the leader-follower relationship are present and far reaching. As a reference, the final model is presented in Figure 5.1. The following section addresses some of the specific theoretical and practical contributions of the current study’s findings as well as the implications of these findings. I begin with a discussion of the importance of regulatory focus between individuals and, subsequently, how such congruence functions as a new antecedent of LMX quality. Next, the potential impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on leadership effectiveness and organizational outcomes is addressed. The discussion then turns to the
impact of supervisors’ regulatory foci on subordinates’ foci. Finally, the role of emotionally-related individual difference variables (e.g., self-monitoring and emotional expressivity) is discussed pertaining to the present study’s findings.

Figure 5.1. Final Model

Note. Direct, non-mediated paths are in bold for emphasis.

Regulatory Fit between Individuals

Previous research has examined the effect of regulatory focus and regulatory fit in a number of different domains (for a review, see Higgins, 2008; Higgins & Spiegel, 2004). The findings of many of these studies have alluded to the possible role of regulatory focus in social interaction (e.g., Camacho et al, 2003; Lockwood et al., 2002; Sassenberg et al., 2007). Yet, little research has explicitly set out to investigate the potential for regulatory fit to occur between individuals and the impact of such fit on interpersonal functioning (for exceptions, see Lake et al., in revision; Medvedeff & Lord, 2005; Santelli et al., 2009). The present study addresses this shortcoming in the regulatory focus theory literature, examining the process by which supervisor and
subordinate regulatory focus congruence interact to elicit fit experiences and expected relationship quality. Moreover, the current study’s design employed real-time interactions between individuals in the process of examining such effects – an endeavor not often undertaken in the few existing studies in this arena (see Galinsky et al., 2005). The role of person-supervisor fit has been a topic of interest to organizational researchers for quite some time. Such investigations have typically attended to supervisor and subordinate congruence in values, personality, and goals (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Therefore, by investigating congruence in regulatory focus, the present study also makes an important contribution to this literature as well.

The current study found that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence significantly impacted fit experiences encountered during brief, initial interactions between supervisor and subordinate. Subsequently, due to increased regulatory fit and value from fit, subordinates reported greater expected relationship quality. Research on regulatory fit has found that, with fit, people may also experience a stronger tie to an initial evaluative reaction, whether that reaction is positive or negative (Higgins, 2000; Cesario et al., 2004). These findings insinuate that the effects found in the present study concerning initial interactions with one’s supervisor may have a profound and long-enduring effect on the development of the quality of the relationship between subordinate and supervisor. Researchers in the LMX vein argue that individual characteristics have the strongest effect early in the relationship, and less of an effect as time goes on. Perhaps regulatory focus is an individual difference that, though it may have the most potent effects at first, can continue to color the relationship despite the passing of time. These initial interactions, and initial effects of regulatory fit, may have enduring effects as the
relationship continues to mature, above and beyond the effects of more “traditional” individual differences typically examined in the LMX literature.

Elucidation of the Antecedents of LMX

The leadership and related LMX literatures have long recognized the fact that leadership is a social process that depends on both leaders and followers, but research tends to focus less on followers (Hollander, 1992; Lord et al., 1999). As a case in point, LMX theory explicitly states that follower motivation is expected to impact the quality of the leader-member relationship. However, there is little research examining the manner by which followers’ motivation imparts such an influence (Howell & Shamir, 2005; see also Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Results of the present study support the perspective that both leader and follower regulatory focus inclinations (a construct encompassing motivations, cognitions, affect, etc.) bear implications for regulatory fit experiences and subsequent relationship quality.

Research has established liking as an important antecedent of LMX quality (Engle & Lord, 1997; Liden et al., 1993; Wayne et al., 1997; Turban et al., 1990; Wayne & Ferris, 1990). The present study also provided a significant contribution to the LMX literature by demonstrating that perceptions of value partially mediate the relationship between liking and relationship quality. In other words, liking’s positive impact on relationship quality functions in part by increasing the worth or value one places on the relationship with one’s supervisor. This contribution is especially important, given findings that the effects of liking perceptions in the beginning of the leader-member relationship are quite enduring, impacting perceptions of LMX even after six months (Liden et al., 1993).
Greater clarity surrounding the mechanisms contributing to the development of leader-member exchange relationships is important as it provides information needed to develop effective interventions aimed at improving these relationships (Engle & Lord, 1997). There is evidence that LMX interventions are indeed fruitful (Scandura & Graen, 1984; see also Reichard & Avolio, 2005) and that leaders should strive to improve their relationships with all followers (Schyns, 2006). Further refining the techniques necessary to do so based on the present study could serve to be highly profitable, especially given the impact of LMX relationships on key outcomes such as follower performance (Kacmar et al., 2003) and organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Results of the current study suggest that training should be focused on increasing leaders’ awareness of the impact of both their words and actions on followers’ perceptions. Namely, improving leaders’ abilities to detect followers’ regulatory inclinations based on their verbal and non-verbal displays, and to subsequently adjust their own displays to coincide could have significant impact on regulatory fit experiences and subsequent relationship quality.

*Regulatory Fit, Leadership Effectiveness, and Organizational Outcomes*

One major proposition in the present study is that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence positively impacts perceptions of the leader due largely to the presence of a shared perspective. A similar concept can be found in a recent line of work in the leadership literature referred to as authentic leadership (see Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Avolio, Luthans, & Walumbwa, 2004). Authentic leaders build trust in followers by encouraging open communication and freely sharing their perspectives and feelings. Similar to the propositions of the present paper, authentic leaders are said to “evoke followers’ self-concepts in the recognition that they share
similar values with the leader” (Avolio, Gardner, et al., 2004, p. 807). Results of central study hypotheses revealed that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence positively impacts subordinates’ perceptions of relationship quality (e.g., LMX quality and trust) through an impact on fit experiences.

The present study’s findings suggest one means by which leader-follower regulatory focus congruence may impact leader effectiveness, and relatedly, organizational outcomes. Leaders affect organizational outcomes through their influence on subordinates and other organizational members (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008; Lord & Brown, 2004). Leaders who are perceived to be just and considerate have the capability to positively influence followers’ attitudes (Tepper, 2000). Subsequently, attitudes are positively related to business-unit and organizational outcomes including profit, productivity, retention, and customer satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Schneider, Hanges, Smith, & Salvaggio, 2005). In the present study, results of exploratory analyses revealed that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence had a significant, positive impact on subordinates’ perceptions of supervisors including perceived similarity, interpersonal justice, and leadership displays. Such perceptions are likely to bear a significant influence on followers’ subsequent responses and actions in the workplace. Indeed, interpersonal justice has been found to demonstrate an impact on organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and discretionary service behavior (Colquitt et al., 2001; Simons & Roberson, 2003).

Additionally, the present study afforded an exploration of the effects of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on actual task performance. Previous research on regulatory fit has demonstrated that the ease of emotion regulation said to
underlie fit experiences can have implications for task performance. That is, the present study posits that supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence engenders regulatory fit, and thus enables more “automatic, intuitive” social interactions (Engle & Lord, 1997, p. 991). As such, there is less need to draw from self-regulatory resources (referred to as one’s self-regulatory strength) and such resources can instead be directed toward task-related activities (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2004). Unfortunately, exploratory analyses in the present study did not provide evidence of such performance effects, as evidenced by subordinate’s performance and persistence on an anagram task presented at the end of the study. It is possible that the time lag between the supervisor-subordinate interaction and presentation of anagrams may have impacted these results. Nonetheless, future research investigating the direct performance effects of regulatory focus congruence, and related fit experiences, is necessary to better understand the social functioning of self-regulatory processes.

The findings of the present study also bear implications for employees’ perceptions of the larger organization. Gerstner and Day (1997) argued that the relationship and interactions one has with his or her supervisor provides a lens through which the entire work experience is viewed. Research in the area of transfer of value from fit could explain one means by which the experience of fit as a result of regulatory focus congruence may color perceptions of the organization as a whole. Research has demonstrated that the value from fit experience can have enduring effects beyond the immediate context in which it is encountered. The “feeling right” experience from an earlier source can be mistakenly transferred to an evaluative response to a later, wholly unrelated event or activity (Higgins et al., 2003). This is known as transfer of value from
fit. Thus, drawing from the regulatory focus theory literature can help to explain one potential means by which the fit experiences that result from supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence transfers to perceptions of the organization (e.g., culture, climate).

*Supervisor Impact on Subordinate Regulatory Focus*

It is possible that leaders may utilize their influence to alter subordinates’ regulatory foci to coincide with their own, and thus, enact fit over time. Researchers have noted that leaders, as key role models, possess the power to shape their subordinate’s regulatory foci. According to Brockner and Higgins (2001), “the more that the actions taken by authorities suggest that they are either promotion focused or prevention focused, the more likely it may be for their subordinates to follow suit” (p. 57). This insinuates that leaders may strategically influence followers to enact strategies similar to their own, whether the follower’s chronic inclination is in line or in contrast with those strategies. Along the same lines, researchers have alluded to the ties between a transformational versus transactional style of leadership and promotion versus prevention focus, respectively (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2007). Recent work has found support for the idea that transformational leaders tend to elicit a promotion focus in followers; whereas transactional leaders elicit prevention focus in followers (Johnson et al., under review). Thus, it may indeed be possible for leaders to shape followers’ situational regulatory foci in such a way as to promote congruency between themselves and their followers (Kark & Van-Dijk, 2008).

Results of the current study provide some preliminary evidence to this effect. When considering subordinate verbal and non-verbal behaviors, analyses of variance
demonstrated clear main effects of supervisor condition on words used in conversation by subordinate for both promotion and prevention words. However, in separate analyses of variance, significant main effects of supervisor condition were not found when considering subordinate self-reported state regulatory foci. Rather, subordinate trait foci dominated in this case, accounting for substantial variance in subordinate state promotion and prevention foci. As well, results demonstrated significant interactive effects on perceptual and attitudinal outcomes when subordinate trait foci, and not state foci (e.g., experimental condition), were considered. At least preliminarily, these results suggest that subordinates’ *expression* of contextually cued regulatory orientations may have been affected by situational cues (e.g., by the supervisor’s verbal and non-verbal displays) during the supervisor-subordinate interactions. However, inevitably, chronic regulatory tendencies may have transcended the situational context introduced by supervisors when subordinates made social judgments. Nonetheless, it cannot be ignored that supervisors may indeed impact subordinates’ regulatory foci, at least concerning their verbal tendencies. This direct effect is likely to strengthen with the passing of time, after multiple interactions with one’s leader. This coincides with the proposition that chronic differences in regulatory focus are thought to arise from socialization experiences with significant others such as parental figures (Higgins, 1997, 1998, 2000b).

*Subordinate Self-Monitoring and Supervisor Emotional Expressivity*

To a certain extent, both self-monitoring and emotional expressivity describe an individual’s social skill. Possession of social interaction skills is an important determinant of the quality and quantity of interpersonal relationships, as such skills are critical to the “smooth flow of conversations and to the establishment of conversational rapport”
(Riggio, 1992; p. 11). Non-verbal displays are posited as an important vehicle by which the effects proposed herein are said to function. Therefore, differences in abilities related to the demonstration as well as the detection of such displays would likely have an important effect on the findings. Investigation of constructs relevant to this point in the current study, such as self-monitoring and emotional expressivity, may provide additional insight.

**Self-monitoring.** Self-monitoring represents the degree to which “an individual in a social setting attempts to construct a pattern of social behavior appropriate to that particular context” (Snyder & Tanke, 1976, p. 502). Recent work has demonstrated that individuals who are high self-monitors are, in fact, more attuned to, and hence, more accurate in decoding others’ non-verbal displays (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 1995). A study by Cheng and Chartrand (2003) found that high self-monitors mimicked an interaction partner more when the partner was their “leader” versus their “worker.” Therefore, the greater perceptiveness of high self-monitors may result in more pronounced regulatory fit (or misfit) effects. In other words, high self-monitoring subordinates may be more attuned to whether or not their supervisor is of the same or a disparate regulatory focus, and thus may experience the resulting effects of regulatory fit, or lack thereof, to a greater extent.

Exploratory analyses were conducted in Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 2007), investigating the independent effects of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus as well as a three-way interaction of subordinate self-monitoring, supervisor regulatory focus condition, and subordinate trait regulatory focus on regulatory fit. All variables were centered. Subordinate self-monitoring, age, gender, and
race were included as covariates on all endogenous variables. Results of these exploratory analyses demonstrated that subordinates’ self-monitoring was significantly and positively related to regulatory fit ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). More importantly, the two-way interaction of supervisor regulatory focus condition and subordinate trait regulatory focus was statistically significant ($\beta = .16, p < .05$) whereas the three-way interaction including self-monitoring was not significant ($\beta = -.09, p = .27$). Therefore, these results indicate that the significant impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on regulatory fit was not dependent upon subordinates’ level of self-monitoring.

*Emotional expressivity.* It is widely recognized that emotional expressivity plays an important role in social interaction. This construct describes the extent to which an individual manifests emotional impulses behaviorally (Gross & John, 1997, 1998). Given that certain emotional states are tied to specific regulatory foci, the degree to which an individual expresses emotions characteristic of a given foci outwardly may largely affect the degree to which another individual can discern his/her regulatory focus (whether implicitly or explicitly). Research has found more expressive individuals tend to be more “legible” or were judged more accurately in social situations, especially when the variables being judged are related to affective expression (see Ambady et al., 1995). Therefore, it is possible that the regulatory tendencies of individuals higher in emotional expressivity and/or extraversion may be more easily and accurately perceived by others. If this is the case, a supervisor’s degree of emotional expressivity may serve to moderate the effect of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on regulatory fit. This would take place in the sense that fit (non-fit) effects resulting from regulatory focus congruence (incongruence) should be more prevalent among supervisor-subordinate
dyads where supervisors were higher in emotional expressivity, and thus, more legible to subordinates.

Exploratory analyses were conducted in Mplus, investigating the independent effects of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus as well as a three-way interaction of supervisor emotional expressivity, supervisor regulatory focus condition, and subordinate trait regulatory focus on regulatory fit. All variables were centered. Supervisor emotional expressivity and subordinate age, gender, and race were also included as covariates on all endogenous variables. Results of these exploratory analyses demonstrated that supervisors’ emotional expressivity was not significantly related to regulatory fit (β = .04, p = .65). More importantly, the two-way interaction of supervisor regulatory focus condition and subordinate trait regulatory focus was statistically significant (β = .17, p < .05) whereas the three-way interaction including self-monitoring was not significant (β = -.002, p = .99). Therefore, these results indicate that the significant impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on regulatory fit was not dependent upon supervisors’ level of emotional expressivity.

Limitations and Future Research

In addition to the important implications and contributions of the current study’s findings, potential limitations also exist. These limitations as well as suggestions for future research directions are discussed next. Limitations of the present study discussed in this section include topics such as the measurement of regulatory focus, the experimental manipulations of regulatory focus, the focus on subordinate perspectives, the definition of regulatory focus congruence, and the use of a laboratory design.
Measurement of Regulatory Focus

Due to its prevalent use in extant research, the current study utilized the Lockwood et al. (2002) measure to assess individual differences in trait regulatory foci. Recently, the validity of the Lockwood et al. (2002) measure as a measure of trait regulatory foci has been scrutinized. Molden, Lee, and Higgins (2008) stated that this measure may confound promotion and prevention concerns with approach and avoidance motivations, respectively. Similarly, Summerville and Roese (2008) provided evidence that the prevention and promotion subscales in the Lockwood measure were uncorrelated with those in another prominent measure of regulatory focus – the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 2001). These authors also suggested that the Lockwood measure appears to function more like a measure of approach and avoidance, citing strong correlations with the BIS/BAS subscales (Carver & White, 1994) as evidence to this effect.

Despite these concerns, there is support that the measure functioned as intended in the present study. As reported in Chapter III, reliabilities for the promotion and prevention subscales were strong. There was a small, but non-significant correlation between the two subscales \( (r = .14, p = .08) \) – as would be expected based upon previous research by Lockwood and colleagues (2002). Exploratory analyses also revealed that the promotion and prevention subscales demonstrated significant correlations with theoretically pertinent constructs such as extraversion, neuroticism, positive affectivity, negative affectivity, and mood (see Appendix Z, Table Z.3). The pattern of relationships among these constructs is in line with extant theory, though correlations between trait regulatory foci and low activation moods (dejection and acquiescence) slightly deviated
from expectations. Taken together, the Lockwood measure demonstrated acceptable psychometric qualities, convergent validity, and provided useful information that contributed to the merit of the current study’s findings.

Nonetheless, given the limited options that currently exist concerning measures for assessing individuals’ regulatory foci, future research is needed to further analyze existing measures. Future research aimed at developing new measures of regulatory focus that are not only valid but practical would also provide a significant contribution. For instance, more work is needed to develop measures that do not rely on self-reports alone (e.g., implicit assessments) as well as measures that may be used more easily in workplace settings (e.g., Johnson & Chang, 2008).

*Regulatory Focus Experimental Manipulations*

In line with previous research (e.g., Freitas et al., 2002; Higgins et al., 1994; Liberman et al., 2001), the present study randomly primed participants to encourage momentary prevention and promotion foci, respectively. Unfortunately, manipulation check analyses revealed mixed results for the merit of regulatory focus manipulations on supervisor and subordinate participants. Whereas support was garnered for the merit of the manipulations for supervisor participants (e.g., especially concerning overt behaviors demonstrated during the interaction), little evidence was found for the merit of manipulations for subordinate participants. This introduces an important limitation in the present study in that the strength of the experimental design, at least for subordinate participants, is called into question.

The lack of support for the merit of experimental manipulations for subordinates may be due to a number of reasons. For one, subordinates were not provided a clipboard
to further emphasize the second regulatory focus priming, as was provided to supervisors. This clipboard, a “conscious prime,” further drew supervisor participants’ attention to the priming material in the form of discussion questions framed in prevention or promotion terms (Bargh & Chartrand, 2000). These types of primes are expected to produce stronger effects than more subliminal or implicit primes. Though the clipboard may have bolstered the experimental manipulation of regulatory focus for supervisors, an equivalent cue was not provided to subordinates. This decision was made intentionally so as to avoid any potential confusion that may have been introduced – especially in non-fit conditions. For example, if subordinates had their own clipboard during the discussion, this may have drawn participants’ attention to the fact that they each received explicitly different discussion questions, thus exacerbating possible suspicions of the study purpose and deterring focus from the task at hand. The provision of the clipboard to supervisors alone also helped to emphasize the supervisor’s position of greater power, thus emphasizing role differences. Providing subordinates with a similar cue may have detracted from this effect. Finally, as has been suggested previously, supervisors may have served as an additional prime for subordinates, thus creating additional “noise” to the experimental manipulations. Together, these study characteristics may have neutralized the manipulation effects for subordinates.

Regardless of these findings, the regulatory focus manipulations provided a great benefit to the present study, at least in the case of supervisors. These manipulations helped not only to add to the experimental design, but also contributed largely to the standardization of verbal and non-verbal behaviors enacted by supervisors. In contrast, relying on trait regulatory foci alone may have detracted from the power to find
interaction effects in the present sample and could also have lead to an imbalanced design – eliciting an oversampling of promotion focused supervisor-subordinate pairs.

One final point of consideration is important to note regarding experimental manipulations. That is, in response to the lack of support for the merit of experimental conditions with subordinate participants, the choice was made to operationalize subordinates’ regulatory foci based on self-reported trait foci. This approach was deemed appropriate given the current study’s central interest in the perceptions of subordinate participants; whereas, supervisor participants were treated largely as “naive confederates.” Results of exploratory analyses also provided an additional indication that this methodological choice was appropriate. Namely, results revealed that perceptions of similarity were highest when supervisor regulatory focus condition and subordinate predominant trait regulatory focus were congruent. These findings suggest that, in order to determine the degree of similarity between themselves and their supervisor, subordinates looked to their own internal trait regulatory focus tendencies during the interaction; whereas they looked to overtly displayed regulatory focus tendencies of supervisors. In a commensurate fashion, it was most likely these sources of information that drove subsequent perceptions and fit experiences.

Regulatory Focus over Time

Regulatory focus can function as both a trait and state (Higgins et al., 2001; Shah & Higgins, 2001). That is to say that, in addition to having a natural inclination toward one focus over another, individuals may also be primed utilizing situational characteristics to take on a given focus. Therefore, regulatory focus is a malleable construct. For the sake of illustration, consider the following scenario from the present
study: A supervisor and subordinate, both operating predominantly from a promotion focus, are engaging in the discussion activity. After narrowing the options down to three locations for the company trip, a potentially very serious negative consequence of a given location comes to light. This “pushes” the leader momentarily into a prevention-oriented focus (e.g., given the situational cue) as he or she attempts to address how to avoid the problem that has been presented. This example illustrates that, at any given point, a supervisor (as well as a subordinate) may toggle in and out of a particular regulatory focus during the course of an interaction.

However, perhaps due to the literature’s major focus on the intra-personal functioning of regulatory focus, the potential fluctuation of regulatory focus over a given period of time has largely been overlooked, and as such, has not been empirically investigated. This aspect is also not directly addressed in the present study, thus introducing a potential limitation. A recognition that regulatory focus fluctuates over time bears significant implications for the current investigation. In the present study, there is an inherent assumption that, though a given individual’s regulatory focus may indeed fluctuate over the course of a five-minute interaction, what may be most important to determining fit is the congruence of foci between individuals “where they start” in the initial moments of an interaction. These initial moments are expected to set the tone for the remainder of the interaction, and thus, congruence in regulatory foci between supervisor and subordinate – whether situational or chronic – is of the utmost important at this point in time.

The current study did not assess fluctuations in regulatory foci over the course of the five-minute interaction, and thus cannot directly address this idea. However, review
of independently coded behaviors displayed by supervisors and subordinates during the
discussion activity reveals that there are indeed changes in the frequency with which
behaviors characterized as promotion versus prevention are displayed. Future research
should more directly investigate the nature of regulatory focus over time and resulting
effects of such shifts in foci. Similarly, research might also benefit from investigations of
potential individual differences and/or situational characteristics that impact the extent of
fluctuation in regulatory foci over time. For example, Johnson (2008) found that
followers who were sensitive to emotional contagion (the self-reported tendency to
mirror expressions of others and thus “catch” their emotions) were more likely to report
experiencing the positive emotions expressed by leaders than were individuals low on
this individual difference. Therefore, it is possible that individuals who are more sensitive
to others’ emotions or emotional cues in the situation may be more likely to demonstrate
fluctuations in regulatory foci, given a sensitivity to situational cues that may be quite
diverse in regulatory bent. If such fluctuations are in line with one’s interaction partner,
this might actually serve to bolster fit effects such as those found in the present study.

Focus on Subordinate Perspectives

Previous research has demonstrated that LMX is more reliably assessed from the
perspective of the subordinate in contrast to that of the supervisor (Gerstner & Day,
1997). In addition to the LMX literature, the performance appraisal literature has also
demonstrated that supervisor and subordinate perceptions (e.g., of a subordinate’s
performance, for example) are often disparate (see Williams & Johnson, 2000). In order
to avoid this potential dilemma, and to focus our investigation, the current study
concentrated on the subordinate’s perspective of key outcome variables resulting from
the interactive effects of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci. However, this approach introduces a potential limitation in that data drawn from the supervisor’s perspective of key outcome variables were not considered.

Discrepancies between supervisor and subordinate in perceptions, for instance, of the quality of the LMX relationship may provide interesting insight as to the impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory congruence. Moreover, the presence of discrepancies may have a profound effect on subsequent organizational outcomes. Recent work by Cogliser, Schriesheim, Scandura, and Gardner (2009) demonstrated that congruence in leader and follower ratings of LMX quality is related to follower job performance, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction – the highest (lowest) levels of which result from congruence in perceptions of high (low) quality LMX. Though it was deemed to be outside of the scope of the current study, future research should investigate the impact of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on both supervisors’ and subordinates’ perceptions.

**Definition of Supervisor-Subordinate Regulatory Focus Congruence**

The manner by which supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence was operationalized in the present study has significant implications for the contributions of the current findings to the literature. Similar to the conundrum faced in the person-environment fit literature (see Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), congruence may be defined in numerous ways – an aspect that can have significant effects on results. Pertinent in the present study, various content dimensions may be considered when operationalizing regulatory focus congruence – ranging from a focus on one dominant attribute to simultaneously attending to multiple domains (e.g., an individual’s “profile”). In the
present study, we took the former approach, focusing on subordinate’s predominant regulatory trait focus compared to supervisors’ predominant regulatory focus as deemed by experimental condition. In line with previous research (e.g. Lockwood et al., 2002), subordinates’ predominant trait regulatory focus scores were calculated by subtracting each subordinate’s score on the prevention subscale from that on the promotion subscale. Though this approach is common in the regulatory focus literature, the extent to which it is appropriate to utilize a difference score to reflect a singular trait may introduce an important limitation (see Edwards, 1994, 1995).

Foregoing any potential methodological concerns this approach may have introduced, the theoretical implications also merit consideration. That is, for any one individual, promotion and prevention tendencies may be simultaneously low or high. Individuals could potentially be classified based on the patterns of levels they demonstrate on these sub-scales. This is not captured based on a regulatory focus predominance score, which only takes into account the relative difference between promotion and prevention scores. Another way to define regulatory focus congruence could be based upon an individual’s profile of regulatory foci – taking into consideration the level of each subscale independently. Higgins states that a good regulatory fit requires not only the appropriate means, but also the appropriate level of those means (Higgins, 2000, p. 1227). For instance, relational discrepancy theory (Robins & Boldero, 2003) states that the commensurability of a leader and follower’s actual self and self-guides (both ought and ideal selves) has a profound impact on levels of trust, intimacy, and goal alignment between these individuals. Future research investigating different operationalizations of congruence in regulatory foci would enable a clearer understanding
of what aspects of one’s regulatory orientation, when aligned with those of one’s leader, provide the greatest impact on regulatory fit and subsequent interpersonal experiences.

Furthermore, future research investigating the potential for differential outcomes to result based upon different forms of congruence would be highly beneficial. For instance, Ronit and Van-Dijk (2008) propose that members of leader-member dyads congruent in promotion foci will experience greater affective commitment, creativity, risk-taking behavior, and speed in task performance. On the other hand, dyads congruent in prevention foci will experience greater normative and continuance commitment, non-creativity, risk-avoidance, and attention to detail/safety performance. The question then becomes, what outcomes might result when congruence (or lack thereof) on both of these dimensions is considered in tandem? The answer to this question would provide useful insight.

*Congruent versus Complementary Regulatory Foci*

Lake and colleagues (in revision) found that regulatory focus *complementarity* (e.g., incongruence in predominant regulatory foci) was positively related to liking and regulatory fit. This directly contrasts with the findings of the present study. The explanation provided by the authors for such findings pertaining to complementarity is drawn from the notion that individuals may be able to capitalize on their differing strengths. For instance, the efficiency afforded by a prevention focus may be combined with the creativity afforded by a promotion focus when two individuals interact to accomplish a given task. To account for the contradictions of these findings to their own theoretical work, Ronit and Van-Dijk (2008) suggested that regulatory focus congruence, by and large, will positively impact LMX. However, in dyads where high LMX can be
formed based on other aspects, *incongruity* of regulatory focus might actually be a positive. Ronit and Van-Dijk call this an “ambidextrous leader-follower dyad” (p. 198) and state that such a dyad may be more adaptable and able to capitalize on each individuals’ strengths. These authors account for Lake et al.’s findings by noting that individuals may be able to form high quality LMX relationships based on alternative characteristics, thus overlooking their inherent differences in regulatory focus orientation.

These points in concert with Lake et al.’s findings are interesting and suggest that additional research is needed to further explicate the underlying processes at play in determining the interaction of individuals’ regulatory foci and subsequent relational outcomes. Considering, more specifically, the nature of Lake et al.’s study design also suggests that possible boundary effects should be examined as they may provide some explanation for the disparate findings. For instance, different experimental tasks were used in the Lake et al. (in revision) study compared to the present study. Also, whereas the present study enacted a hierarchical work relationship between individuals, the studies conducted by Lake and colleagues did not. Therefore, it is possible that the type of task (e.g., the degree of interdependence required) and/or the type of relationship (e.g., intimate vs. leader-follower) may have an impact on whether congruence or complementarity reigns supreme in determining greater regulatory fit among dyads.

*Laboratory-Based Study Design*

The use of a laboratory-based design in the present study might be criticized due to a lack of external validity. However, many of the relationships proposed herein had very little precedent from which to draw in terms of previous research. Therefore, it was important to utilize a highly controlled environment to investigate the key hypothesized
relationships. On the contrary, the number of confounds introduced in a field study may have severely reduced the level of control necessary to successfully initiate a new avenue of research inquiry. To this end, the lab design afforded the opportunity to utilize a sample of previously unacquainted individuals, so as to account for the potential effects of established relationships. This would have been extremely difficult if the study had been conducted in an organization with incumbent employees, for example.

Employing a laboratory-based methodology also made it possible to make causal inferences regarding the interactive effects of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci on relational outcomes as well as to further investigate the process by which these effects were proposed to unfold. Additionally, the videotaped footage of supervisors and subordinate interactions also made it possible to examine verbal and non-verbal behaviors of both supervisors and subordinates – proposed to serve as a major vehicle by which the effects of regulatory focus congruence transpired. Future studies should move to a field setting in order to replicate the current study’s findings and establish the applicability of such findings in an applied setting. It would be interesting to determine whether the effects that emerged in the present study hold for both newly formed as well as established supervisor-subordinate dyads.

Strategies for Leaders

The results of the present study bring a number of potential suggestions to light concerning how organizational leaders (e.g., supervisors, managers, etc.) may focus their interactions to improve relationships with subordinates. To a great extent, the present study suggests that when leaders “act the part,” demonstrating non-verbal behaviors and utilizing spoken words that are commensurate with a follower’s predominant regulatory
focus, this may have positive effects on follower perceptions. These findings suggest that it may be effective to provide supervisors with “scripts” to use in their communications to subordinates including emails, written memos, phone conversations, and so forth. Doing so would help supervisors to convey the desired orientation, as opposed to their natural orientations, namely in cases where the two diverge. Scripting of hand motions, facial expressions, and so forth might also be utilized to the supervisor’s advantage when addressing subordinates face-to-face, for instance when holding meetings or giving speeches to larger groups of associates. In the latter case, it may be best to utilize a mixture of promotion and prevention-focused displays so as to capture the attention of a mixed audience.

However, in terms of the effects on subordinates, to what extent does it matter that supervisors’ outward expressions are genuine, or match with supervisors’ internally felt states? The necessity for supervisors to, in the least, “act the part” is akin to the notion of emotional labor. Emotional labor is, stated simply, the alteration of emotional expressions as part of a job role (Hochschild, 1979, 1983). Humphrey and colleagues (Humphrey, Pollack, & Hawver, 2008) have referred to the use of emotional displays by leaders to influence followers’ emotions, motivations, and performance as “leading with emotional labor.” The emotional labor literature suggests that the greater the extent to which displays are actually commensurate with one’s internally felt states, the more “genuine” the display, and thus, the more likely the expected effects will unfold.

Epitropaki (2006) found that managers’ use of “deep acting” (e.g., trying to actually feel emotions expressed), but not “surface acting” (e.g., displaying emotions that are not truly felt), had a significant influence on followers’ perceptions of whether
managers were transformational leaders. This suggests that leaders who engage in
genuine emotion display and/or deep acting will have more pronounced effects on
followers compared to those who simply display intended emotions. Over the course of a
number of interactions, it is also possible that a supervisor’s natural inclinations will
emerge, breaking through scripted, intentional displays that are not truly felt. This may
potentially negate the positive effects of fit (especially if the supervisor’s natural
inclinations are in contrast to the subordinate’s). Future research is needed to investigate
whether different outcomes result when leaders simply modify outward displays of
regulatory foci to enact regulatory fit and improve relational outcomes versus truly
experience those displays (e.g., given internal regulatory tendencies).

Conclusion

The results of this study are very promising, emphasizing the significant impact of
supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on a number of subordinate
perceptions of relevant interpersonal phenomena. As a new area of research, continued
investigations of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory processes will
provide much needed insight as to the role of self-regulation in interpersonal relationships
as well as in the workplace. Despite the current study’s limitations, the opportunities for
future research are limitless as the present study has only breached the surface of inquiry.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

The results of this study demonstrate the importance of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence in determining fit experiences (e.g., regulatory fit and value from fit), and subsequently, expected relationship quality. Additionally, supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence demonstrated significant effects on subordinates’ perceptions of social phenomena (e.g., perceptions of interpersonal justice) relevant in the workplace. This study successfully utilized core tenets of regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) as a guiding framework to incorporate regulatory fit and LMX literatures (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975).

This study confirmed that there is a significant, positive impact of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus congruence on regulatory fit. Subsequently, regulatory fit has a positive impact on value from fit and expected relationship quality. Value from fit was also positively related to expected relationship quality and served as a partial mediator of the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Results also demonstrated that there was a significant, positive effect of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on liking – a construct that, in combination with perceived value, comprised the operationalization of value from fit. Further analyses investigating the separate components of value from fit also revealed that regulatory fit fully mediated the relationship between supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus
congruence and liking. Additionally, perceived value partially mediated the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality as well as the relationship between liking and expected relationship quality. Finally, exploratory analyses demonstrated that there were statistically significant and positive effects of supervisor-subordinate regulatory focus congruence on various other subordinate social perceptions including perceived similarity, interpersonal justice, and leadership demonstrated by the supervisor.

The current study successfully united two disparate and well-established research streams. This study makes several unique contributions to the literature by demonstrating the inter-individual function of regulatory focus in true social interaction and the resulting impact on work relationships, specifically the supervisor-subordinate relationship. Results support the proposition that effects of regulatory focus congruence in the leader-follower relationship are present and far reaching. This study paves the way for further exploration of the role of self-regulatory processes in interpersonal functioning and other social phenomena in the workplace.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

DISCUSSION ACTIVITY/ROLE INFORMATION CHECK

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are questions and statements concerning the important aspects of the discussion activity and the role you will play in this activity. You must respond correctly to all questions/statements in order to continue.

1. What role will you play in the discussion activity?
   Supervisor
   Subordinate

2. What is the purpose of the discussion activity?
   To determine what the company logo should look like
   To decide upon a location for the company’s 2-day trip
   To decide upon the amount of employees’ annual bonus

3. How much time will you have to complete the discussion activity?
   5 minutes
   7 minutes
   10 minutes

4. Both supervisor and subordinate should contribute their own opinions and thoughts in the discussion.
   True
   False

5. If an agreement cannot be made, or if time is running out, the supervisor will make the final decision in the discussion activity.
   True
   False
APPENDIX B

TRAIT REGULATORY FOCUS – LOCKWOOD, JORDAN, & KUNDA (2002)

INSTRUCTIONS: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects how you TYPICALLY perceive various aspects of your life.

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 =
6 =
7 =
8 =
9 = Very true of me

Trait Regulatory Focus
1. In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life.
2. I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations.
3. I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.
4. I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future.
5. I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future.
6. I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future.
7. I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my academic goals.
8. I often think about how I will achieve academic success.
9. I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me.
10. I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life.
11. I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains.
12. My major goal in school right now is to achieve my academic ambitions.
13. My major goal in school right now is to avoid becoming an academic failure.
14. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my “ideal self”—to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.
15. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I “ought” to be—to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations.
16. In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life.
17. I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me.
18. Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure.
APPENDIX C

REGULATORY FIT

EASE OF INTERACTION – WRITTEN FOR PRESENT STUDY
FEELING RIGHT – BASED ON CAMACHO ET AL. (2003); CESARIO (2006)
COMFORT – BUTCHER, SPARKS, & O’CALLAGHAN (2001)
NATURAL NON-VERBAL DISPLAY – BASED ON SASSENBERG ET AL. (2007)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor/subordinate with whom you interacted during the discussion.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

Ease/Smoothness of Interaction
1. It was easy to talk with this supervisor/subordinate.
2. The interaction with this supervisor/subordinate went very smoothly.
3. Interacting with this supervisor/subordinate was somewhat difficult. (R)

Feeling Right
1. It felt “right” to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.
2. Interacting with this supervisor/subordinate felt wrong. (R)

Enjoyment
1. It was interesting to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.
2. It was enjoyable to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.
3. It was exciting to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.

Social Comfort
1. I tended to relax easily with this supervisor/subordinate.
2. I felt very comfortable in this supervisor’s/subordinate’s presence.
3. I felt completely at ease with this supervisor/subordinate.

Natural Non-Verbal Display
1. I was able to behave as I wanted to when interacting with this supervisor/subordinate.
2. It felt natural to interact with this supervisor/subordinate.
3. I was able to express my natural feelings when interacting with this supervisor/subordinate.
APPENDIX D
VALUE FROM FIT

VALUE – BASED ON SASSENBERG ET AL. (2007)
LIKING – WAYNE & FERRIS (1990)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor/subordinate with whom you interacted during the discussion.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

Value
1. The thought of having this person as a supervisor/subordinate is attractive.
2. I would value having this person as a supervisor/subordinate.
3. I would NOT like having this person as a supervisor/subordinate. (R)
4. It feels good to have this person as a supervisor/subordinate.

Liking
1. I think this supervisor/subordinate would make a good friend.
2. I get along well with this supervisor/subordinate.
3. I like this supervisor/subordinate very much.
4. Working with this supervisor/subordinate is a pleasure.
APPENDIX E

EXPECTED RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

LMX – TURBAN, JONES, & ROZELLE (1990)
TRUST – MAYER & GAVIN (2005)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor/subordinate with whom you interacted during the discussion.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

LMX
1. This supervisor/subordinate would definitely understand my problems and needs.
2. If I needed help at work I could count on this supervisor/subordinate.
3. I would expect to have an effective working relationship with this supervisor/subordinate.
4. This supervisor/subordinate could be trusted to make important decisions concerning my work.

Trust
1. If someone questioned this supervisor’s/subordinate’s motives, I would give him/her the benefit of the doubt.
2. If I had my way, I wouldn't let this supervisor/subordinate have any influence over issues that are important to me. (R)
3. I would be willing to let this supervisor/subordinate have complete control over my work.
4. I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on this supervisor/subordinate. (R)
5. I would be comfortable giving this supervisor/subordinate responsibility for a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her actions.
APPENDIX F

STATE REGULATORY FOCUS – BASED ON LOCKWOOD ET AL. (2002)

INSTRUCTIONS: For the following statements, indicate the extent to which each statement reflects your perceptions as they took place DURING THE DISCUSSION ACTIVITY.

1 = Not at all true of me
2 =
3 =
4 =
5 =
6 =
7 =
8 =
9 = Very true of me

State Regulatory Focus
1. I was focused on preventing negative events in the discussion.
2. I was anxious that I would fall short of my responsibilities during the discussion.
3. I imagined how I would achieve my aspirations during the discussion.
4. I thought about things I was afraid might happen in the discussion.
5. I thought about the things I ideally wanted to happen in the discussion.
6. I focused on the success I hoped to achieve in the discussion.
7. I worried that I would fail to accomplish the discussion goal.
8. I thought about how I would achieve success in the discussion.
9. I imagined experiencing bad things that I feared might happen in the discussion.
10. I thought about how I could prevent failures during the discussion.
11. I was more oriented toward preventing losses than achieving gains in the discussion.
12. My major goal in the discussion was to achieve success.
13. My major goal in the discussion was to avoid failure.
14. I primarily tried to reach an “ideal” outcome in the discussion.
15. I primarily tried to reach what I felt “ought” to be the result of the discussion.
16. I was focused on achieving positive outcomes in the discussion.
17. I imagined experiencing good things that I hoped would happen in the discussion.
18. I was more oriented toward achieving success in the discussion than preventing failure.
APPENDIX G

LEXICAL DECISION TASK

(STATE REGULATORY FOCUS)

INSTRUCTIONS: In this task, you will be presented with a number of letter strings, which will appear on screen one at a time. Your task is to indicate, as quickly and accurately as possible, whether the letter strings that appear form a word (e.g., appoe) or non-word (e.g., apple).

Press the 'F' key if the letter string is a word and press the 'J' key if it is a non-word.

You will begin with 4 practice letter strings. Press the 'N' key when you are ready to start the practice trial.

PRACTICE: VISION, BRICK, BAMK, NOOKLE

INSTRUCTIONS: You have completed the practice trial and will now begin the letter string task. In total, you will be presented with 32 letter strings. Press the ‘N’ key when you are ready to start.

PROMOTION: GAIN, IDEAL, HOPE, SUCCESS

PREVENTION: LOSS, OUGHT, DUTY, FAILURE

RELATIONAL IDENTITY: PAIR, JOINED, UNITED, COUPLE

INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY: PERSON, ALONE, APART, SINGLE

NON-WORDS: BARTEN, MUSLY, POCE, VOUN, INCAP, ALDER, CORTAX, MARNY, PRET, GRACIER, DROWL, PANDS, NATHER, GELLET, DAPE, BUFFLE
APPENDIX H

PERCEIVED NON-VERBAL DISPLAY – BASED ON CESARIO (2006)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a list of words describing feelings. For each word, choose the response that describes the extent to which the supervisor/subordinate with whom you just interacted displayed each feeling during the discussion activity.

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

When interacting with the supervisor/subordinate, to what extent did he/she convey a feeling of…

1. Happiness
2. Sadness
3. Relaxation
4. Anxiety
5. Positivity
6. Negativity
7. Carefulness
8. Enthusiasm
9. Caution
10. Excitement
11. Eagerness
12. Vigilance

Promotion = 1, 2r, 5, 8, 10, 11
Prevention = 3r, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12
APPENDIX I

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions by selecting the appropriate option or indicating your response in the space provided.

1. Age ______

2. Gender (select one)
   Male            Female

3. Ethnicity (select one)
   African American
   Native American
   Asian/Pacific Islander
   Hispanic/Latino
   Caucasian
   Two or more races
   Other (please specify) _______________

4. Major (select one)
   Psychology      Other

5. Do you have any work experience? (select one)
   Yes            No

6. [If Yes] Please indicate the length of your work experience: _____ Years, _____ Months
APPENDIX J

EXTRAVERSION AND NEUROTICISM – GOLDBERG (IPiP; 1999)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following phrases describe people’s behaviors. Please respond by indicating how accurately each phrase describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

1 = Very Inaccurate
2 = Moderately Inaccurate
3 = Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate
4 = Moderately Accurate
5 = Very Accurate

Extraversion
1. Am the life of the party.
2. Feel comfortable around people.
4. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
5. Don’t mind being the center of attention.
6. Don’t talk a lot. (R)
7. Keep in the background. (R)
8. Have little to say. (R)
9. Don’t like to draw attention to myself. (R)
10. Am quiet around strangers. (R)

Neuroticism
1. Am relaxed most of the time. (R)
2. Seldom feel blue. (R)
3. Get stressed out easily.
4. Worry about things.
5. Am easily disturbed.
7. Change my mood a lot.
8. Have frequent mood swings.
10. Often feel blue.
APPENDIX K

TRAIT AFFECT – WATSON & CLARK (PANAS-X; 1994)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a list of words that describe different feelings and emotions. For each word, indicate to what extent you *GENERALLY FEEL THIS WAY.*

1 = Very slightly or not at all  
2 = A little  
3 = Moderately  
4 = Quite a bit  
5 = Extremely

1. Interested  
2. Distressed  
3. Excited  
4. Upset  
5. Strong  
6. Guilty  
7. Scared  
8. Hostile  
9. Enthusiastic  
10. Proud  
11. Irritable  
12. Alert  
13. Ashamed  
14. Inspired  
15. Nervous  
16. Determined  
17. Attentive  
18. Jittery  
19. Active  
20. Afraid

*Positive Affect = 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19*  
*Negative Affect = 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20*
INSTRUCTIONS: The following is a list of words that describe different feelings and emotions. For each word, indicate to what extent you feel this way right now.

1 = Very slightly or not at all
2 = A little
3 = Moderately
4 = Quite a bit
5 = Extremely

1. Happy
2. Excited
3. Satisfied
4. Sad
5. Disappointed
6. Discouraged
7. Relaxed
8. Calm
9. Peaceful
10. Tense
11. Anxious
12. Agitated
APPENDIX M

EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVITY – GROSS & JOHN (BEQ; 1997)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements describe people’s behaviors. Please respond by indicating how accurately each statement describes you.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly agree

1. Whenever I feel positive emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.
2. I sometimes cry during sad movies.
3. People often do not know what I am feeling. (R)
4. I laugh out loud when someone tells me a joke that I think is funny.
5. It is difficult for me to hide my fear.
6. When I'm happy, my feelings show.
7. My body reacts very strongly to emotional situations.
8. I've learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it. (R)
9. No matter how nervous or upset I am, I tend to keep a calm exterior. (R)
10. I am an emotionally expressive person.
11. I have strong emotions.
12. I am sometimes unable to hide my feelings, even though I would like to.
13. Whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.
14. There have been times when I have not been able to stop crying even though I tried to stop.
15. I experience my emotions very strongly.
16. What I'm feeling is written all over my face.

Negative Expressivity = 3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16,
Positive Expressivity = 1, 4, 6, 10
Impulse Strength = 2, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15
APPENDIX N

SELF-MONITORING – GANGESTAD & SNYDER (SMS; 1985)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following statements describe people’s behaviors. Please respond by indicating how accurately each statement describes you.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (R)
2. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like. (R)
3. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (R)
4. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
5. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.
6. I would probably make a good actor.
7. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. (R)
8. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.
9. I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (R)
10. I’m not always the person I appear to be.
11. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or win their favor. (R)
12. I have considered being an entertainer.
13. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (R)
14. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (R)
15. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (R)
16. I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should. (R)
17. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
18. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

Public Performance = 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16
Other-Directedness = 2, 5, 8, 10, 11, 18

Note. Subscales based on the work of John, Cheek, & Klohnen (1996)
APPENDIX O

LEADERSHIP PERCEPTIONS – CRONSHAW & LORD (GLI; 1987)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor with whom you interacted during the study.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

1. The supervisor exhibited leadership.
2. I would choose this supervisor to be my formal leader at work.
3. The supervisor engaged in leader behavior.
4. The supervisor was a very typical leader.
5. The supervisor fit my image of a leader.
APPENDIX P

INTERPERSONAL JUSTICE – COLQUITT (2001)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor/subordinate with whom you interacted during the study.

1 = To a small extent
2 =
3 = To a moderate extent
4 =
5 = To a large extent

1. The supervisor/subordinate treated me in a polite manner.
2. The supervisor/subordinate treated me with dignity.
3. The supervisor/subordinate treated me with respect.
4. The supervisor/subordinate refrained from improper remarks or comments.
APPENDIX Q

PERCEIVED SIMILARITY – LIDEN ET AL. (1993)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following statements regarding your perceptions of the supervisor/subordinate with whom you interacted during the study.

1 = Strongly disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly disagree
4 = Neither agree nor disagree
5 = Slightly agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly agree

1. The supervisor/subordinate and I handle problems in a similar way.
2. The supervisor/subordinate and I think alike in terms of coming up with a similar solution for a problem.
3. The supervisor/subordinate and I analyze problems in a similar way.
4. The supervisor/subordinate and I see things in much the same way.
5. The supervisor/subordinate and I are similar in terms of outlook, perspective, and values.
6. The supervisor/subordinate and I are alike in a number of areas.
APPENDIX R

DISCUSSION ACTIVITY OUTCOME

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following questions regarding the discussion activity you just completed.

1. Were you affected by being videotaped during the discussion activity?
   
   1 = Not at all
   2 = A little
   3 = Moderately
   4 = Quite a bit
   5 = Extremely

2. Was a decision made concerning where the company should go for the 2-day trip?
   
   Yes  No

3. Please indicate below the location for the company trip:

   Location ________________________________

4. How much input do you feel you had in this final decision?
   
   1 = Very little or none at all
   2 = A little
   3 = Moderate
   4 = Quite a bit
   5 = Very much

5. To what extent do you agree with the final decision?

   1 = Strongly disagree
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Neither agree nor disagree
   4 = Agree
   5 = Strongly agree
APPENDIX S


You have now completed the present study. Before you go, please take the next 5 minutes to work on one final activity as part of a separate study. This activity involves solving a set of word scrambles, or anagrams. Your participation is greatly appreciated. Remember – once you are done with this activity, you may complete the drawing for one of twenty $5 prizes!

INSTRUCTIONS: In this activity, you are asked to solve 15 anagrams. Each anagram has only one correct solution. You will use all of the letters in the original anagram to form each solution. You will have 5 minutes to try and solve as many of the 15 anagrams as you can. You may elect to quit working on this task when you feel you have done well enough. Please indicate your solution in the space provided for each anagram. An example is provided below.

EXAMPLE:  ANAGRAM  SOLUTION
YQERU  QUERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANAGRAM</th>
<th>SOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADEBL</td>
<td>BLADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACPR</td>
<td>CRAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTCUI</td>
<td>TRUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTYRA</td>
<td>FAIRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIMB</td>
<td>BLIMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIVU</td>
<td>VIRUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITRUF</td>
<td>FRUIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTED</td>
<td>DEPTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSHLA</td>
<td>SHAWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKCOA</td>
<td>CLOAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTLRI</td>
<td>FLIRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCUON</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERDN</td>
<td>TREND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORDCW</td>
<td>CROWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEVOL</td>
<td>GLOVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T

PILOT STUDY: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ___________________________ Date: _____________________

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your response to the following questions regarding the discussion activity you just completed.

1. Were you affected by being videotaped during the discussion activity?
   □ Not at all
   □ A little
   □ Moderately
   □ Quite a bit
   □ Extremely

2. Was a decision made concerning where the company should go for the 2-day trip?
   □ Yes  □ No

3. Please indicate below the location for the company trip:
   Location: __________________________

4. How much input do you feel you had in this final decision?
   □ Very little or none at all
   □ A little
   □ Moderate
   □ Quite a bit
   □ Very much

5. To what extent do you agree with the final decision?
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neither agree nor disagree
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree
OPEN RESPONSE QUESTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please provide a written response for the following questions.

Do you have any specific comments or concerns about having been videotaped during the discussion?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Do you feel the explanation for the videotaping is adequate?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Were the discussion activity directions and role assignment materials clear and easy to understand?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Were there any aspects of the discussion activity or materials involved that you felt were awkward?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Did you feel the 5 minutes provided to complete the discussion activity was an appropriate amount of time?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Do you have any suggestions to improve the directions pertaining to the discussion activity and/or role assignment?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Do you have any suggestions to improve the discussion activity itself?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX U

FACTOR ANALYSES OF FOCAL STUDY CONSTRUCTS

Table U.1

*Results from the Revised Higher-Order Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Regulatory Fit Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Interaction</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Right</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Non-Verbal Displays</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only.*

*Figure U.1. Revised Higher-Order Model of Regulatory Fit*
Table U.2

*Results from the Revised Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Value from Fit Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The thought of having this person as a supervisor/subordinate is attractive.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would value having this person as a supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would NOT like having this person as a supervisor/subordinate. (R)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It feels good to have this person as a supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I think this supervisor/subordinate would make a good friend.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I get along well with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like this supervisor/subordinate very much.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working with this supervisor/subordinate is a pleasure.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 151$. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only.

*Figure U.2. Revised Model of Value from Fit*
Table U.3

Results from the Revised Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Expected Relationship Quality Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This supervisor/subordinate would definitely understand my problems and needs.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I needed help at work I could count on this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would expect to have an effective working relationship with this supervisor/subordinate.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This supervisor/subordinate could be trusted to make important decisions concerning my work.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. If someone questioned this supervisor’s/subordinate’s motives, I would give him/her the benefit of the doubt.</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I had my way, I wouldn’t let this supervisor/subordinate have any influence over issues that are important to me. (R)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be willing to let this supervisor/subordinate have complete control over my work.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I really wish I had a good way to keep an eye on this supervisor/subordinate. (R)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would be comfortable giving this supervisor/subordinate responsibility for a task or problem which was critical to me, even if I could not monitor his/her actions.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 151$. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only. Factor loadings are standardized.

Figure U.3. Revised Model of Expected Relationship Quality
Figure U.4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Key Study Constructs

Note. N = 151. This analysis was based on subordinate participants’ responses only.
APPENDIX V

BEHAVIORAL DATA: VIDEO CODING PROCEDURES

As noted previously, participants were videotaped during their five-minute discussions. Two trained coders who were blind to the study’s hypotheses and to condition independently coded 100 randomly selected video segments. The coders were unacquainted with participants in the videos. The video segments for each supervisor-subordinate pair were separated into five one-minute segments. The segments were each coded for various behaviors of interest following a coding scheme developed to serve the specific purposes of the present study (see Bakeman, 2000; Bakeman & Gottman, 1997). This coding took on three general forms. First, individual nonverbal behaviors of both the supervisor and subordinate were coded independently – attending to one individual at a time. Individual nonverbal behaviors of interest included those identified by Cesario (2006; Cesario & Higgins, 2008) as characteristically promotion or prevention. Additionally, smiling, laughing, and head nodding behaviors were coded. One behavior was coded for each pass of the video segment. Where appropriate, nonverbal behaviors were coded based on frequency (e.g., hand gestures, arm gestures) or utilizing various 5-point Likert scales, tailored to the specific behavior of interest [e.g., posture; 1 = Backward lean (much more than 90°), 3 = Vertical posture (90°), 5 = Forward lean (much

10 The order in which behavioral coding commenced (e.g., starting with the supervisor vs. the subordinate) was variable and randomly determined by the coders.
less than 90°)]. All nonverbal behaviors were explicitly defined *a-priori* during a three-hour training conducted by the current author with the coders (to view the operational definitions and Likert scale anchors provided to coders, see Appendix W).

Second, individual *verbal* behaviors were also coded for frequency, focusing specifically on those characteristic of discrete regulatory foci. Again, this was done by attending to the verbal behaviors of each participant, whether supervisor or subordinate, independently. A list of words was developed by the author based on materials utilized in the study (e.g., regulatory focus priming materials, regulatory focus measures, etc.) and review of selected video segments. Words were categorized as promotion (e.g., gain, positive, achieve, ideal) or prevention (e.g., loss, negative, avoid, ought). An equivalent number of words were identified for each of these categories. Acceptable variations of these words were also defined *a-priori* for coders. Use of any of these words during the discussion by the supervisor or subordinate was coded as one occurrence of the behavior.

Finally, dyadic-level behaviors were coded by attending to both participants in tandem. These behaviors were considered across the entire five-minute video segment and were not delineated based on the 1-minute segments. Behaviors coded for frequency included number of speaking turns (e.g., the number of times the participants went “back and forth” in conversation) and number of interruptions (e.g., number of times one participant interrupted the other when he/she was speaking). Dyadic-level ratings involving more general impressions were also gathered utilizing Likert scales (e.g., quality of interaction, interaction comfort, and moments of silence). These variables were included as previous work has denoted that frequent interruptions, long silences, and
awkward turn-taking are characteristic of interactions lacking fluency or “smoothness” (see Guerrero, 2005).

**Interrater Reliability**

Interrater reliability was assessed via calculation of intra-class correlations (ICCsexacross the two coders for each rating aggregated over the five-minute discussion activity (McGraw & Wong, 1996; Shrout & Fleiss, 1979).

ICCs have been used in previous research to determine the level of consistency across observers who coded video-taped interactions in dyads (see Berry & Hansen, 2000). The ICC has also been deemed as the “best measure of interrater reliability for ordinal and interval level measurement” (Tinsley & Weiss, 2000, p. 117). Following the guidelines set forth by Shrout and Fleiss (1979), the Case 2 ICC (e.g., based on a two-way, random effects model with the individual rating serving as the unit of analysis) was utilized in the present study as the main index of interrater reliability.

As noted by McGraw and Wong (1996), the Case 2 ICC may be calculated in such a way as to provide either an index of overall consensus [ICC(C,1)] or absolute agreement [(ICC(A,1)]. When determining consensus, column variance (e.g., variance among raters) is deemed irrelevant and is thus excluded from the denominator. Therefore, it is not necessary for raters to provide the exact same rating, but only that the ratings demonstrate the same relative order, for reliability to be high. On the contrary, when determining absolute agreement, column variance is included in the denominator as it is

---

11 Of the total 100 video segments to be analyzed for non-verbal behaviors were selected by the present author to be coded by both raters in order to establish inter-rater reliability. Videos were selected in a random fashion, though with the intent of providing an adequate sampling from each of the four experimental conditions. The remaining 80 videos were coded by only one of the two raters (e.g., 40 videos each).
deemed to be a relevant source of variance. Therefore, this form of ICC provides an index more akin to a true agreement (vs. reliability) statistic where the level (e.g., exact value) of ratings impact the value of the ICC (for a more detailed discussion of reliability versus agreement, see Tinsley & Weiss, 2000). In an effort to be comprehensive, both forms of ICCs are reported herein. These ICCs along with Pearson product moment correlations, mean ratings, and operational definitions for each behavior of interest are provided in Table V.1

**Determination of Final Behavioral Ratings**

Behavioral data, including that gathered from the 20 videos used to establish reliability between the two coders, were included in subsequent analyses when relevant (e.g., manipulation check analyses). Therefore, final ratings for these 20 videos had to be determined. The procedure used to determine the final ratings for these videos involved two steps. First, three two-hour consensus meetings were held with the current author and two coders throughout the course of the coding process. These meetings were used to discuss any substantial points of disagreement in ratings and to arrive upon consensus ratings for these disagreements. Second, any remaining disparities were reviewed by the author and a rating was determined based on a mixture of video review and averaging of the two independent coders’ ratings.

---

12 Given the consensus meeting approach, the reliability estimates provided herein likely represent a lower bound of the true reliability of this data.
Table V.1

Reliability and Operational Definitions for Nonverbal Behavior Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>ICCa</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Individual Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>(Frequency) The corners of mouth turned upward in expression of amusement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>(Frequency) Head moves in the vertical direction (up/down) in which the head cranes either back or forward and returns to its starting point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>(Frequency) A vocal expression of amusement that occurs simultaneously with a smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arm Gestures</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>(Frequency) The arm moves in a brisk, sharp fashion; Gestures express precision; Each arm counted separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad, Animated Arm Gestures</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>(Frequency) Arm moves in a fluid fashion; Gestures express animated, broad opening movements; Each arm counted separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hand Motions</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>(Frequency) Hand in a “stop” or “slow down” motion; Palm facing outward from individual or down; Each hand counted separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open, Outward Hand Motions</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>(Frequency) Hand in an open, outward position; Fingers generally relaxed; Palm facing up; Each hand counted separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>(Likert) Seated posture relative to 90 degrees, averaged over the 5-minute period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Words</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>(Frequency) Promotion-oriented word (or derivative) spoken during the 5-minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Words</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>(Frequency) Prevention-oriented word (or derivative) spoken during the 5-minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dyadic Measures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Turns</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>(Frequency) Point in time when one individual is speaking while the other is not; Two words or more spoken by an individual counted as one turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>(Frequency) Occurrence when both individuals are speaking at the same time; Two words or more are spoken by the interrupter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Quality</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>(Likert) Judgment of the quality of the interaction (e.g., the flow of conversation) that took place between the individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>(Likert) Judgment of the overall level of comfort, or ease and relaxation, expressed by both individuals during the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moments of Silence</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>(Likert) Relative to the entire 5-minutes, the occurrence of moments of silence when neither individual is speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks Most</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(Likert) Relative amount of time the supervisor vs. subordinate speaks during the 5-minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Individual measures based on N = 40 (i.e., 20 supervisor-subordinate dyad video segments); Dyadic measures based on N = 20; ICC = Intra-class correlation [ICC<sub>c</sub> = ICC (C,1) based on consistency of ratings; ICC<sub>a</sub> = ICC (A,1) based on absolute agreement of ratings]; r = Pearson product moment correlation; M1 = mean rating for coder 1; M2 = mean rating for coder 2.
APPENDIX W

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS AND RATING SCALES FOR CODERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL RATINGS (Frequency)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smile:</td>
<td>Corners of the mouth turned upward in expression of amusement; possibly, but not necessarily, showing the teeth; counted anytime the corners of the mouth move in an upward (non-neutral) fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Nod:</td>
<td>Movement of head in the vertical direction (up/down) in which the head cranes either back or forward and returns to its starting point; one &quot;revolution&quot; counted as one nod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh:</td>
<td>A vocal expression of amusement that occurs simultaneously with the presence of a smile; Any continuous laugh uninterrupted by breath counts as one instance of laughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arm Gestures:</td>
<td>Arm moves in a brisk, sharp fashion; Gestures express precision; Each arm counted separately; One &quot;revolution&quot; of the arm counted as one gesture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad/Opening Arm Gestures:</td>
<td>Arm moves in a fluid fashion; Gestures express animated, broad opening movements; Each arm counted separately; One &quot;revolution&quot; of the arm counted as one gesture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hand Motions:</td>
<td>Hand in a &quot;stop&quot; or &quot;slow down&quot; motion; Palm facing outward from individual or down; Each hand counted separately; One movement of the hand counted as one hand motion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outward Hand Motions:</td>
<td>Hand in an open, outward position; Fingers generally relaxed; Palm facing up; Each hand counted separately; One movement of the hand counted as one hand motion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL RATINGS (Rating Scale)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Position:</td>
<td>Position of the torso, gauged in part by the relation of the torso to the chair upon which the individual is sitting; Based on the torso's relative position to a 90-degree angle (Note: the back of the chair creates a 90-degree angle to use as a referent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Backward lean (much more than 90 degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Slight backward lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Vertical posture (90 degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Slight forward lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Forward lean (much less than 90 degrees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED RATINGS (Frequency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking Turn:</strong></td>
<td>Point in time when one individual is speaking while the other is not; Two words or more are spoken by the individual to be counted as one turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interruption:</strong></td>
<td>Occurrence when both individuals are speaking at the same time; Two words or more are spoken by the interrupter (e.g., not simply just validation such as “uh-huh,” “yeah,” “right,” etc.); Individual interrupted clearly not finished with statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINED RATINGS (Rating Scale)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Moments of Silence:**       | Relative to the entire 5-minute period, the occurrence of moments of silence when neither individual is speaking.  
1 = Very Rare  
2 = Rare  
3 = Moderate  
4 = Common  
5 = Very common |
| **Interaction Quality:**      | Judgment of the quality of the interaction (e.g., the flow of conversation) that took place between the individuals. Informed to a great degree based on the number of TURNS, INTERRUPTIONS, and MOMENTS OF SILENCE. Specifically, a moderate/high number of turns where both individuals are actively engaged in the conversation with few interruptions or moments of silence indicates a high quality interaction.  
1 = Very low  
2 = Low  
3 = Moderate  
4 = High  
5 = Very High |
| **Interaction Comfort:**      | Judgment of the overall level of comfort, or ease and relaxation, expressed by both individuals during the interaction. Informed to a great degree based on the amount of SMILING, LAUGHING, and EYE CONTACT. Specifically, moderate to high levels of smiling, laughing, and eye contact indicates a high level of comfort.  
1 = Very low  
2 = Low  
3 = Moderate  
4 = High  
5 = Very High |
| **Talked Most:**              | Judgment of the relative degree to which the supervisor vs. subordinate talks during the 5-minute period.  
1 = Subordinate (talked much more)  
2 =  
3 = Equal (both talked an equal amount)  
4 =  
5 = Supervisor (talked much more) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORDS SPOKEN (Frequency)</th>
<th>Acceptable Word Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PROMOTION) Benefit</td>
<td>Benefits, Benefited, Benefiting, Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positives, Positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>Excitement, Excite, Excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>Encouragement, Encouraging, Encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish</td>
<td>Accomplished, Accomplishing, Accomplishes, Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote</td>
<td>Promoted, Promoting, Promotes, Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve</td>
<td>Achieved, Achieving, Achieves, Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Ideally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain</td>
<td>Gains, Gained, Gaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>Successes, Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PREVENTION) Drawback</td>
<td>Drawbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negatives, Negatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>Safety, Safely, Safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Secured, Securely, Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require</td>
<td>Required, Requires, Requirement, Requiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Risks, Risky, Risked, Risking, Riskier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibilities, Responsible, Responsibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent</td>
<td>Prevented, Prevents, Preventing, Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>Avoids, Avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>Losses, Lost, Lose, Losing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>Failures, Failed, Failing, Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X
ADDENDAL ANALYSES – MANIPULATION CHECKS

Table X.1

*Behaviors across Subordinate Conditions with Trait Regulatory Foci as Covariates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>Sub RF Cond Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arms</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Arms</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hands</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Hands</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>4.65*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Words</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>5.27*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Words</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 100; df = 1, 96; Sub RF Cond Means = marginal means across subordinate regulatory focus conditions; Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale (1 = Backward lean (much > 90°), 5 = Forward lean (much < 90°); **p < .05, *p < .01.*
### Table X.2

**Behaviors across Supervisor Conditions with Trait Regulatory Foci as Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
<th>Super RF Cond Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise Arms</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>6.85*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>8.45*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>5.30*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Arms</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>4.72*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Hands</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>8.40*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Hands</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>5.84*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Position</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Words</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>147.89**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Word</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>88.43**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 100; df = 1, 96; Super RF Cond Means = marginal means across supervisor regulatory focus conditions; Body Position measured on 5-pt Likert scale (1 = Backward lean (much > 90°), 5 = Forward lean (much < 90°); *p < .05, **p < .01.
Table X.3

**State Regulatory Foci across Subordinate Conditions with Trait Regulatory Foci as Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Foci</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>Sub RF Cond Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention State</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Promotion Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>17.13**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion State</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>56.70**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151; df = 1, 147; Sub RF Cond Means = marginal means across subordinate regulatory focus conditions; *p < .05, **p < .01.*

Table X.4

**State Regulatory Foci across Supervisor Conditions with Trait Regulatory Foci as Covariates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Foci</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>Super RF Cond Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention State</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Promotion Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>40.98**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion State</td>
<td>Promotion Trait</td>
<td>59.18**</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention Trait</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Condition</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151; df = 1, 147; Super RF Cond Means = marginal means across supervisor regulatory focus conditions; *p < .05, **p < .01.*
APPENDIX Y

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES – HYPOTHESIS TESTS

Hypotheses were tested with path analysis, using maximum likelihood estimation, performed in Mplus v. 5.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2007). Based on the evidence provided in confirmatory factor analyses (see Chapter IV), composite scores were created for Value from Fit and Expected Relationship Quality by first standardizing each respective subscale and then creating average scale scores for each of these constructs. Therefore, these scale scores represent unit-weighted composite variables. For Regulatory Fit, each of the five subscales is treated herein as an indicator of a latent construct. These endogenous variables were investigated for normality, and were deemed to be normally distributed, with values well below common rules of thumb (e.g., skew < 2, kurtosis < 8; Kline, 2005). In addition to the focal constructs, subordinate participants’ age, gender, and race were included as covariates on all endogenous variables. The paths between the covariates and endogenous variables are not included in the figures below in order to ensure the figures are clearly depicted. However, the relationships between the three covariates and the endogenous variables are provided in tables following each figure.

Test of the Hypothesized Model

In order to investigate study hypotheses, three separate path models were tested in the following order: 1) An Interaction Model simultaneously investigating the interaction between supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on regulatory fit, value from fit, and
expected relationship quality, 2) An *Intermediate Model* wherein paths from regulatory fit to value from fit and expected relationship quality, respectively, were added, and 3) A *Full Hypothesized Model* wherein a path from value from fit to expected relationship quality was added. Supervisors’ and subordinates’ regulatory focus conditions (contrast coded; -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion) were utilized as the operationalization of regulatory foci. An interaction variable was also created by multiplying the value for subordinates’ regulatory focus condition by that for supervisor regulatory focus condition.

**Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 – Test of the Interaction Model**

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 proposed that supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci would interact to affect regulatory fit (e.g., feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment, comfort, natural non-verbal display), value from fit (e.g., liking and perceived value), and expected relationship quality (e.g., LMX and trust). Specifically, these hypotheses stated that the subordinate would report greater regulatory fit (H1), value from fit (H2), and expected relationship quality (H3) when his or her regulatory focus matched versus contrasted the supervisor’s own regulatory focus. These hypotheses were tested utilizing the Interaction Model (see Figure Y.1). The Interaction Model provided good fit to the data ($\chi^2 (35, n = 151) = 55.77, p = .01$; CFI = .97; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .03). Investigation of path coefficients revealed that there were no statistically significant interactions between supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci and regulatory fit ($\beta = -.13, p = .12$), value from fit ($\beta = -.09, p = .26$), or expected relationship quality ($\beta = -.09, p = .26$). Therefore, Hypotheses 1, 2, and 5 were not supported.
Figure Y.1. The Interaction Model

Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 – Test of the Intermediate Model

Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 all focused on regulatory fit and its relationship to other variables in the model as a central mediating construct. To test these hypotheses, paths from regulatory fit to value from fit and expected relationship quality were added to the Interaction Model, thus resulting in the Intermediate Model (see Figure Y.2). The Intermediate Model demonstrated good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{(35, n = 151)} = 55.77, p = .01; CFI =$...
Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, and 7 were tested by interpreting relevant path coefficients in the Intermediate Model.

Figure Y.2. The Intermediate Model
Note. N = 151; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; *p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.

Specifically, Hypotheses 3 and 6 focused on the relationships of regulatory fit to other endogenous variables in the model – proposing that regulatory fit would be positively related to value from fit and expected relationship quality, respectively. Investigation of path coefficients demonstrated that there were significant paths from regulatory fit to both value from fit (β = .83, p < .001) and expected relationship quality.
(β = .81, p < .001), thus providing support for Hypotheses 3 and 6. Hypotheses 4 and 7 focused on the potential for regulatory fit to serve as a key mediating variable in the model. Specifically, Hypothesis 4 proposed that regulatory fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit. However, previous analyses demonstrated there was not a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit (Hypothesis 2). Not surprisingly, results demonstrated there was a non-significant indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit through regulatory fit (αβ = -.11, p = .12). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Similarly, Hypothesis 7 proposed that regulatory fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality. However, previous analyses demonstrated that there was not a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality (Hypothesis 5). Indeed, results demonstrated a non-significant indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality through regulatory fit (αβ = -.10, p = .12). Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was not supported.

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 – Test of the Full Hypothesized Model

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 all focused on value from fit and its relationship to expected relationship quality as well as its potential role as an important mediating construct. To test these hypotheses, a path from value from fit to expected relationship quality was added to the Intermediate Model, thus resulting in the Full Hypothesized Model (see Figure Y.3). The Full Hypothesized Model demonstrated good fit to the data.


$\chi^2_{(35, n = 151)} = 55.77, p = .01; \text{CFI} = .97; \text{RMSEA} = .06; \text{SRMR} = .03$ and no modification indices were listed. Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 were tested by interpreting relevant path coefficients in the Full Hypothesized Model.

![Diagram of Full Hypothesized Model](image)

| Path Coefficients ($β$) Between Control Variables and Endogenous Variables |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Endogenous Variables** | **Covariates** | **Regulatory Fit** | **Value from Fit** | **Relationship Quality** |
| Subordinate Age | - .06 | -.08 | -.09 |
| Subordinate Gender | -.09 | .03 | .06 |
| Subordinate Race | -.22** | .18** | .15** |

*Figure Y.3. The Full Hypothesized Model*

*Note. N = 151; Direct, non-mediated paths in bold for emphasis; Supervisor Reg Focus = supervisor regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Subordinate Reg Focus = subordinate regulatory focus condition (coded -1 = prevention, 1 = promotion); Super RF x Sub RF = interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci; Gender coded as 0 = male, 1 = female; Race coded as 0 = minority, 1 = majority; Path coefficients are standardized; ^p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.*

Hypothesis 8 proposed that value from fit would be positively related to expected relationship quality. There was a significant path from value from fit to expected relationship quality ($β = .45, p < .001$), thus providing support for Hypothesis 8.

Hypotheses 9 and 10 focused on the potential for value from fit to serve as a key
mediating variable in the model. Specifically, Hypothesis 9 proposed that value from fit would mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality. However, previous analyses demonstrated there was not a significant interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit (Hypothesis 2). Moreover, results demonstrated a non-significant specific indirect effect of the interaction of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality through value from fit ($a\beta = .01, p = .75$). Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was not supported.

Hypothesis 10 proposed that value from fit would mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality. Results demonstrated a significant indirect effect of regulatory fit on expected relationship quality through value from fit ($a\beta = .37, p < .001$). However, regulatory fit still demonstrated a significant direct effect on expected relationship quality ($\beta = .44, p < .001$), indicating that value from fit only partially mediated this relationship. Therefore, these findings provide partial support for Hypothesis 10.

Summary of Hypothesis Test Results

In general, there was not overwhelming support for central hypotheses in the present study. However, results demonstrated that there are meaningful relationships among constructs central to the regulatory fit literature such as regulatory fit and value from fit (Hypothesis 3). Second, there is also evidence of significant relationships between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality (Hypothesis 6) as well as value from fit and expected relationship quality (Hypothesis 8) – thus underscoring the importance of regulatory fit for relational outcomes. Finally, results helped to elucidate
the process by which fit effects unfold to impact expected relationship quality, demonstrating a partial mediation of relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality by value from fit (Hypothesis 10). However, the merit of these results is severely limited without answers concerning what precedes these important fit effects (see Table Y.1 for a summary of results).

Table Y.1.

Summary of Hypothesis Test Results Based on Supervisor and Subordinate Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1:</strong> Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect regulatory fit (feeling right, ease of interaction, enjoyment, comfort, natural non-verbal display).</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2:</strong> Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect value from fit (liking and perceived value).</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3:</strong> Regulatory fit will be positively related to value from fit.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4:</strong> Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on value from fit.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5:</strong> Supervisor and subordinate regulatory foci will interact to affect expected relationship quality (trust, expected LMX).</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6:</strong> Regulatory fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7:</strong> Regulatory fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8:</strong> Value from fit will be positively related to supervisor-subordinate expected relationship quality.</td>
<td>Full Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9:</strong> Value from fit will mediate the interactive effect of supervisor and subordinate regulatory focus on expected relationship quality.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10:</strong> Value from fit will mediate the relationship between regulatory fit and expected relationship quality.</td>
<td>Partial Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Partial mediation supported
## APPENDIX Z

### ADDITIONAL ANALYSES – EXPLORATION AND DISCUSSION

**Table Z.1**

*Supervisor Participant Demographics across Experimental Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Super Promotion/ Sub Promotion</th>
<th>Super Promotion/ Sub Prevention</th>
<th>Super Prevention/ Sub Promotion</th>
<th>Super Prevention/ Sub Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>55.3% Female</td>
<td>44.7% Male</td>
<td>55.3% Female</td>
<td>44.7% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (SD)</td>
<td>20.3 (4.16)</td>
<td>20.5 (4.81)</td>
<td>19.0 (2.03)</td>
<td>18.9 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work (SD)</td>
<td>4.2 (4.85)</td>
<td>4.8 (6.92)</td>
<td>2.9 (2.63)</td>
<td>2.5 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>73.7% Caucasian</td>
<td>26.3% African Am</td>
<td>29.7% Both Male</td>
<td>73.7% Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.7% African Am</td>
<td>26.3% African Am</td>
<td>2.7% Both Male</td>
<td>21.1% African Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6% Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>5.4% Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>67.6% Mixed</td>
<td>2.6% Asian/Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% Two or More</td>
<td>0% Two or More</td>
<td>0% Two or More</td>
<td>0% Two or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151; Demographics based on participants assigned to the supervisor role only; Super = Supervisor; Sub = Subordinate; African Amer. = African American.*

**Table Z.2**

*Supervisor and Subordinate Joint Demographics across Experimental Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Super Promotion/ Sub Promotion</th>
<th>Super Promotion/ Sub Prevention</th>
<th>Super Prevention/ Sub Promotion</th>
<th>Super Prevention/ Sub Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>28.9% Both Female</td>
<td>26.3% Both Female</td>
<td>29.7% Both Female</td>
<td>57.9% Both Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9% Both Male</td>
<td>15.8% Both Male</td>
<td>2.7% Both Male</td>
<td>10.5% Both Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.2% Mixed</td>
<td>57.9% Mixed</td>
<td>67.6% Mixed</td>
<td>31.6% Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13.2% &gt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>26.3% &gt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>16.2% &gt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>10.5% &gt; 5 Years Apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.8% &lt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>73.7% &lt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>83.8% &lt; 5 Years Apart</td>
<td>89.5% &lt; 5 Years Apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>5.3% Both Minority</td>
<td>15.8% Both Minority</td>
<td>8.1% Both Minority</td>
<td>13.2% Both Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.9% Both Majority</td>
<td>55.3% Both Majority</td>
<td>51.4% Both Majority</td>
<td>52.6% Both Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.8% Mixed</td>
<td>28.9% Mixed</td>
<td>40.5% Mixed</td>
<td>34.2% Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 151 pairs; Demographics based on supervisor and subordinate participants jointly.*
Table Z.3

Correlations among Trait Regulatory Foci and Theoretically Pertinent Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive Affectivity</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative Affectivity</td>
<td>-.29 **</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>.44 **</td>
<td>-.21 **</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.35 **</td>
<td>.62 **</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cheerfulness (T1)</td>
<td>.54 **</td>
<td>-.27 **</td>
<td>.30 **</td>
<td>-.33 **</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dejection (T1)</td>
<td>-.26 **</td>
<td>.62 **</td>
<td>-.16 *</td>
<td>.44 **</td>
<td>-.24 **</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acquiescence (T1)</td>
<td>.52 **</td>
<td>-.30 **</td>
<td>.25 **</td>
<td>-.53 **</td>
<td>.37 **</td>
<td>-.33 **</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agitation (T1)</td>
<td>-.18 *</td>
<td>.54 **</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.39 **</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.62 **</td>
<td>-.38 **</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trait Promotion</td>
<td>.49 **</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.27 **</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.23 **</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trait Prevention</td>
<td>-.17 *</td>
<td>.48 **</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.43 **</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.43 **</td>
<td>-.26 **</td>
<td>.32 **</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.71 2.17 3.52 2.90 3.29 1.75 3.53 2.06 7.53 5.48
SD: .56 .65 .89 .82 .96 .83 .90 .95 1.00 1.35

Note. N = 151; Analysis is based on subordinate participants’ responses only; T1 = (“time one”) indicates the construct was assessed at the beginning of the study, thus serving as a baseline; Scale coefficient alphas are provided in parentheses; *p < .05, **p < .01.
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