ME VERSUS THEM: HOW INDIVIDUALS REACT TO SELF-RELATED AND OTHER-RELATED FEEDBACK

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Ariel Roberts

May, 2020

ME VERSUS THEM: HOW INDIVIDUALS REACT TO SELF-RELATED AND OTHER-RELATED FEEDBACK

Ariel Roberts

Dissertation

Approved:

Advisor Dr. Paul Levy

Committee Member Dr. Joelle Elicker

Committee Member Dr. Andrea Snell

Committee Member Dr. Amanda Thayer Department Chair Dr. Paul Levy

Accepted:

Interim Dean of the College Dr. Joseph Urgo

Interim Director, Graduate School Dr. Marnie Saunders

Date

Committee Member Dr. Erin Makarius

ABSTRACT

Research and practitioners have a common interest in the benefits feedback can provide to individuals and employees. Feedback is an important tool that allows individuals to achieve a task, gain more clarity around expectations, and understand their own behavior. Individuals actively engage in feedback seeking to reap such benefits. However, feedback seeking is typically measured in the extant literature as frequency alone, as opposed to using multiple feedback seeking episodes. Additionally, much of the extant literature does not consider the multiple qualitative forms feedback can take.

In a recent paper by Gong et al. (2017), a new typology of feedback seeking was developed. This typology includes four different qualitative forms of feedback: self-positive, self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative. Self-positive and self-negative feedback are about the individual receiving feedback, whereas other-positive and other-negative feedback is still given to the recipient but is about others or peers of the recipient performing similar tasks. Gong and colleagues created a scale to measure one's feedback seeking. However, it is a self-report scale about typical behaviors. Thus, the present study determined it is more of a measure of feedback-seeking *tendencies*. This typology was explored in the context of multiple feedback-seeking episodes and feedback reactions.

The present studies examined Gong et al.'s (2017) typology in two different samples. Study 1 consisted of 207 participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk and Study 2 consisted of 198 participants from a Midwestern University. Results indicated that self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies do not translate into actual feedback-

iii

seeking behavior. Additionally, individuals react significantly more favorably to selfpositive feedback than all other types of feedback. But, when it came time to actually seek one of the four types of feedback, the majority of individuals in Study 2 sought selfnegative feedback. Results also indicated that there is a significant indirect effect of feedback received on feedback seeking through feedback reactions. Feedback Orientation and Empathy were also explored as individual differences and both add incremental variance in predicting feedback reactions. Ultimately, results suggest that while individuals may favor positive information about themselves, they still seek feedback that is corrective in nature and often different than their self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies.

DEDICATION

Completing my dissertation was the last hurdle in what has been, arguably, the biggest part of my life. To be completely honest, graduate school has been a long, and stressful but rewarding journey and being a graduate student has been a huge part of my identity. Now that I am moving on to becoming a Ph.D. graduate, I would be remiss if I didn't thank the people who have given me unwavering support throughout my process:

To my advisor, Paul Levy, thank you for your guidance, patience, and constant care. Thank you for making the next tasks feel less daunting by talking about nonacademic things like show tunes and the Oscars with me after many of our meetings. Thank you for checking in and being a part of my professional and personal development. Thank you for your confidence in me and standing by while my imposture syndrome turned into self-confidence. I am beyond privileged to have you as a mentor and a friend.

Thank you to the faculty and staff at the University of Akron and my committee, Andee Snell, Joelle Elicker, Erin Makarius, and Amanda Thayer, for their encouragement, collaboration, and valuable advice throughout my proposal and defense process. You have made me feel confident in my work and I have truly enjoyed working with you.

Thank you to my family for watching me struggle, celebrate, and everything in between while providing lots of hugs, meals, and encouragement. As a child who is part of a small, close-knit system, I am truly so lucky to call you my own. *This also includes my favorite partner-in-crime, Slice.

To my partner, Courtney. Thank you for listening to me with a genuine interest, for talking through analyses that were already boring to me – let alone someone else-, for sitting with me while I was stressed, and for celebrating the big and small wins with me when I was ready. I could not have asked for a more complete partnership and I am beyond fortunate to have you in my corner.

Lastly, to the friends I have made in graduate school and to the friends who have remained true throughout my education, thank you. My graduate school experience would not have been as sentimental, fun, or gratifying without those that experienced it with me. Catalina Flores, Allie Petruzzelli, Megan Nolan, Marc Cubrich, Sabina Samipour, Tyler Slezak, Ketaki Sodhi, Steven Tseng, and the Levy Lab, thank you! I cannot wait to continue celebrating our relationships. I am so grateful for you, and for the times where you made me feel like I was not alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER I	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	12
Feedback Tendencies and Feedback Seeking	14
Feedback Reactions	15
Reactions Leading to Change in Future Feedback Seeking	19
Summary	22
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
Feedback and Feedback Seeking	26
Exploring the Feedback Seeking Typology	33
Feedback Reactions	36
Individual Differences Affecting the Feedback-Seeking Process	43
Multiple Feedback Episodes: Changes in Behavior from Tendencies	47
Summary	57
III. STUDY 1	60
Methods	60

Results
Summary of Study 1 Results67
IV. STUDY 2
Methods 69
Results75
Summary of Study 2 Results
Study 1 and Study 2 Supplementary Analyses
V. DISCUSSION
Summary of Results
Theoretical Implications 107
Practical Implications113
Limitations and Future Directions
Conclusion
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Study 1 Measures
APPENDIX B: Study 2 Measures
APPENDIX C: Experiment Script for Study 2 151
APPENDIX D: Participant Task Materials for Study 1 and Study 2 155

LIST OF TABLES

Table	F	Page
1	Comparative Look at Previous Studies Defining and Testing Different Feedback Types	21
2	Summary of Hypotheses	48
3	Feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation	54
4	Logistic Regression Predicting Feedback-Seeking Behavior based on Feedback-Seeking Tendencies in Study 1	56
5	Summary of Measures and corresponding times when collected	64
6	One-Way ANOVA manipulation check results	66
7	Correlational Analyses and alpha levels for Variables of Interest in Study 2.	68
8	Feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation	69
9	One-Way ANOVA Testing Feedback Reactions Differences by Feedback Condition.	70
10	Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons Between Feedback Reactions based on Feedback Condition.	71
11	Regression Coefficients for Feedback Orientation and Feedback Condition Predicting Feedback Reactions	72
12	Regression results for the moderation of feedback orientation on feedback type and reactions	73
13	Regression Coefficients for Empathy and Feedback Condition Predicting Feedback Reactions	74

14	Regression results for the moderation of empathy on other-related feedback type and reactions	75
15	Regression results for the moderation of empathy on self-related feedback type and reactions.	76
16	Regression results for the moderation of mindset on reactions and change in feedback seeking	77
17	Logistic Regression Predicting a Change in Feedback-Seeking Behavior based on Feedback Reactions	78
18	Bootstrap Results for the Indirect Effect, Direct Effect, and Total Effect for the relationship between feedback received (feedback condition) and feedback-seeking behavior through feedback reactions. PROCESS Model 4	81
19	Percentages of feedback-seeking behavior in Study 1 and Study 2	83
20	Feedback given and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation.	84
21	Regression Coefficients for the relationship between Feedback Reactions and the individual differences of Feedback Orientation and Empathy.	85
22	Correlational Analyses for Feedback-Seeking Tendencies and Feedback-See Behavior	eking 86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	F	Page
1	Conceptual Model of the Feedback-Seeking Process	3
2	Hypothesized Model of feedback-seeking tendencies leading to feedback seeking to be tested in Study 1	14
3	Hypothesized Model of feedback type leading to feedback reactions and changes in future feedback seeking behavior conditional on feedback orientation, empathy, and IPT to be tested in Study 2	14
4	Study 2 Process Flow Diagram	60
5	Mediation Results for Hypothesis 7	79
6	Conceptual diagram of Model 1 (Hayes, 2017)	87
7	Conceptual diagram of Model 4 (Hayes, 2017)	87

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Feedback is an essential piece of a workplace puzzle that provides employees with the knowledge and information they need to achieve a goal (Ilgen, Taylor & Fisher, 1979). An environment that encourages feedback seeking allows employees to persevere and seek more feedback (Whitaker, Dahling, & Levy, 2007), clarify their role within a company (Peng & Chui, 2010), and ultimately perform well (Ashford, De Stobbeleir, & Nujella, 2016; Rosen, Levy, & Hall, 2006). Feedback-seeking behavior is recognized as a motivational process within the recipient (i.e., employees) in which contextual and individual level variables are assessed (Ashford et al., 2016; Ashford, Blatt, & VandeWalle, 2003).

Even though feedback plays a critical role in organizational outcomes, there seems to be a divide between empirical literature on feedback seeking and the actual practice in the workplace. Much of the examination of feedback seeking has conceptualized or measured it in an oversimplified manner. Feedback seeking is typically measured as a one-time behavior in which only one qualitative form of feedback is sought. In recent literature, feedback type has been expanded by Gong, Wang, Huang, & Cheung (2017) into a typology with four distinct types of feedback. Gong et al.'s (2017) typology takes a step in furthering feedback-seeking research by combining the sign (negative or positive) and target (self or other) of feedback to create a new typology. The typology therefore includes feedback about what one is doing wrong (self-negative), what one is doing well (self-positive), what others are doing poorly (other-negative), and what others are doing well (other-positive).

Results from Gong et al. (2017) suggest that goal orientation motivates seeking the four feedback types seen in the typology, which in turn is related to performance, role clarity, and social integration. A mastery orientation led to the seeking of self-negative, self-positive, and other positive feedback, whereas a performance approach orientation led to the seeking of self-positive and other-negative feedback seeking (Gong et al., 2017). Gong and colleagues measured feedback seeking by asking all individuals to selfreport their tendency to seek each type of feedback. Thus, some individuals were more likely to report seeking one of the four, more than one, none, or all types of feedback. However, actual feedback-seeking behavior was not measured, even though Gong et al. (2017) referred to their typology as a feedback-seeking typology. Because individuals self-reported which feedback they typically seek, it is more accurate to say that Gong et al. (2017) measured preferences, or tendencies, of feedback-seeking behavior. Thus, throughout the following chapters, the typology Gong et al. (2017) developed will be referred to as *feedback-seeking tendencies* as opposed to feedback-seeking behavior. It is also important to note that these are self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies.

What remains unanswered with regards to Gong et al.'s (2017) typology are (a) if the tendencies or preferences for a certain type of feedback translate into actual feedback-seeking behavior and (b) what kind of reactions to each type of feedback occur. More specifically, the current studies explore the relationships between self-reported feedback

tendencies, feedback seeking, and feedback reactions while taking into account individual differences such as empathy and feedback orientation. Additionally, multiple feedback-seeking episodes were examined in relation to previous feedback reactions and implicit person theory. Thus, a model was proposed in which feedback preferences are related to the giving and seeking of specific types of feedback, which in turn leads to feedback reactions. Reactions are expected to be dependent on individual differences such as empathy and feedback orientation. Reactions were also proposed to elicit different behavior in a later feedback-seeking episode, depending on one's implicit person theory (See Figure 1).

Figure 1





Feedback Tendencies and Feedback Seeking

Because Gong and colleague's (2017) typology is a new development in conceptualizing feedback types, there is little research generalizing and extending it. Inherent in the measurement of Gong et al.'s feedback types is the idea that this is a typical or consistent preference for a certain type of feedback. It isn't a new idea that individuals have a certain preference for and tendency to seek feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979). However, there is less known about whether these tendencies consistently lead to similar feedback-seeking behavior. Control theory states that when people perceive a discrepancy, they are motivated to reduce such a discrepancy (Carver & Scheier, 1981). To do so, individuals likely seek information about how to reduce that discrepancy. Thus, individuals should be aware of when to seek feedback, and what kind of feedback to seek in order to reduce such a discrepancy.

Because past behavior is a strong predictor of future behavior, it would make sense that one's self-report of his or her feedback-seeking tendencies would lead to actual feedback-seeking behavior. Yet, this remains unclear as the literature currently stands. Feedback seeking is a motivational process in which costs and values are considered (Ashford et al., 2003). This motivation should therefore translate into feedback seeking that is similar to past tendencies and preferences of feedback types. Therefore, it is expected that self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies would lead to feedback-seeking behavior that matches these tendencies.

Feedback Reactions

An integral part of the feedback-seeking process is the reactions one has after he or she receives feedback. A first step in the current study was to determine if feedbackseeking tendencies lead to actual feedback seeking behavior, and the second step was to determine if people even react favorably to each type of feedback in this newly developed typology. Reactions have been largely overlooked in recent years, especially with regard to feedback-seeking episodes as opposed to reactions to overall performance appraisals or ratings. Yet, it is understood that reactions elicit future behavior and motivation

(Elfenbein, 2007). Furthermore, reactions to feedback can take an affective, cognitive, or behavioral form (Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984). It is therefore clear that reactions to feedback are essential in future feedback seeking and ultimately performance. Accordingly, the current study explores feedback reactions specifically related to Gong and colleagues' (2017) feedback typology.

Reactions are conceptualized as a latent construct made up of satisfaction, utility, accuracy, and justice (Keeping & Levy, 2000). Additionally, motivation to use and seek more feedback have been added to this list in later work by Steelman and Rutkowski (2004). Past research shows that reactions are more favorable in general when the feedback is task relevant (Steelman et al., 2004), positive, and from a credible source (Ilgen et al., 1979). However, because reactions are often neglected criteria (McClelland, 1995), they have yet to be studied in the context of multiple different forms of feedback such as Gong and colleagues' work. Consequently, the current study investigates reactions to all four types of feedback including self-positive, self-negative, otherpositive, and other-negative. It is expected that reactions would differ based on the form of feedback across individuals. Thus, the current study sought to identify if individuals find each of these types of feedback favorable or unfavorable and if so, to what degree and what kind of individuals.

Feedback Orientation

Past research suggests that individuals vary on the extent to which they perceive feedback as beneficial, accurate, and useful. A person's general openness and approachability to feedback is known as feedback orientation (Dahling et al., 2012; Linderbaum & Levy, 2010; London & Smither, 2002). Feedback orientation (FO) is

operationally defined as an individual specific and enduring trait that includes four unique dimensions (Linderbaum & Levy, 2010). London and Smither (2002) originally proposed this individual difference as one's receptivity to feedback (Levy et al., 1995; London & Smither, 2002). Linderbaum & Levy (2010) built on this definition and identified four unique dimensions of feedback orientation that include utility, accountability, social awareness, and feedback self-efficacy. An individual seeks, accepts, interprets, and uses feedback based on his or her FO (Dahling et al., 2012). Furthermore, those who are self-aware, self-conscious, and mastery oriented tend to have higher FO than do those lower on these dimensions (Dweck, 1986; London & Smither, 2002).

Drawing from this literature, the current studies examine the differential effects of an individual's FO on the relationship between feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback reactions. More specifically, FO is expected to moderate the relationship between feedback received and reactions. Given that those high in FO place a large value on feedback, their reactions to feedback should be positive, regardless of what type of feedback they receive. Conversely, when one has a low FO, reactions are expected to be less positive and more dependent on the type of feedback received. In other words, reactions are expected to differ based on feedback type when one has a low FO, but when one has a strong desire for and positive view of feedback, his or her reactions should be favorable regardless of the type of feedback.

Empathy

Both feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback orientation are individual differences that consider the feedback message and value. But in Gong et al.'s (2017) typology, there

is a new piece that focuses on the social side of feedback. Because there is a social focus within Gong and colleague's typology where feedback recipients are receiving information about other people that is either positive or negative, it is likely that how they view that information would be affected by how much they are able to take the perspective of others. Other-related feedback provides information about peers, colleagues, and coworkers with the idea that the recipient of the feedback can take this information and change his or her behavior accordingly. Yet, intrinsic in this process is the fact that other-related feedback is most likely about people the recipient knows. Consequently, it is expected that an individual difference that is socially driven will also affect the relationship between feedback type and reactions. More specifically, individuals who are more empathic should react stronger to information about others.

Davis states that, "empathy in the broadest sense refers to the reactions of one individual to the observed experiences of another" (1983, p. 113). Included in the conceptualization of empathy are four dimensions: perspective taking, empathic concern, fantasy, and personal distress (Davis, 1980). Perspective taking refers to the ability to understand what others are going through and empathic concern is the disposition to care for the wellbeing of others. The fantasy dimension captures one's capacity to imagine him or herself in another person's position. Lastly, personal distress refers to the aptitude to remain calm in the face of other people's distress (Davis, 1980; Davis, 1983). Research on empathy has shown its relation to interpersonal functioning such as extraversion, anxiety, and self-esteem (Davis, 1983).

Because empathy allows an individual to take perspectives of others and care for the well-being of others, it seems clear that it would play a part in determining reactions to

information about other people. Those high in empathy would likely have stronger reactions to feedback regarding peers or colleagues. More specifically, it is expected that those high in empathy will have more positive reactions to other-positive feedback in addition to more negative reactions to other-negative feedback than those with low empathy. Those with low empathy are expected to have neutral reactions to other-related feedback. Having an individual difference such as empathy allows the further exploration of social aspects in the feedback-seeking process.

Reactions Leading to Change in Future Feedback Seeking

To understand how reactions and individual differences affect the future of feedback seeking, multiple feedback-seeking episodes must be explored. As stated previously, empirical research typically emphasizes a dichotomous measurement of feedback seeking, in which the measurement is a one-time "yes" or "no". Nevertheless, in both research and practice, the seeking of feedback is encouraged to continue over time to continuously improve performance. Feedback seeking is not a construct that should be oversimplified by measuring it as a one-time event. Feedback seeking is a complex process with the potential for the message to take different qualitative forms. With calls from Ashford et al. (2016) to have better measures of feedback-seeking behavior, another goal of the current studies is to understand how feedback-seeking tendencies relate to multiple feedback seeking episodes after an initial reaction to feedback.

Reactions to information that is upsetting, irrelevant, or simply different than the information one wanted in any situation is likely to influence future behavior such as approach, withdrawal, or deterrence (Elfenbein, 2007). This is especially true if the feedback produces a discrepancy in what the feedback recipient believes to be true or

expects (Carver & Scheier, 1981). Not every feedback-seeking episode should be treated the same, especially in a world where past experiences often lead to how people react to future experiences. Thus, the current studies explore the idea that negative reactions to the feedback one receives will lead to a change in future feedback-seeking behavior.

The above prediction is further supported by literature referring to resource depletion. When one receives unfavorable information and reacts negatively, resources are likely to be depleted. Past literature on depletion shows that one's resources come from a "pool" and are depleted after a difficult task or a task that requires self-regulation after negative emotion (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000) and respites are needed to replenish that resource pool (Trougakos, Beal, Green, & Weiss, 2008). However, the depletion literature has made a shift from a resource pool perspective (Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Twenge, 2005; Vohs, Baumeister, & Ciarocco, 2005) to a change in motivation and attention perspective after depletion (Converse & DeShon, 2009; Inzlicht & Schmiechel, 2012). In other words, once an event uses certain resources, a change in motivation or attention to different resources or strategies occurs. This shift explanation fits nicely with the feedback loop inherent in control theory. In control theory, one notices a discrepancy and strives to eliminate it (Carver & Scheier, 1981). Resources may be depleted after one receives unfavorable feedback, but a shift in attention and motivation after a discrepancy is noticed translates into a new potential feedback approach. However, if feedback is perceived as favorable, future feedback seeking is not expected to differ from previous feedback-seeking tendencies. If something is working, behavior is unlikely to change. Taken together, it is proposed that negative feedback

reactions will lead to a change in future feedback-seeking behavior that differs from feedback previously received.

Implicit Person Theory

For a change to occur in future behavior, one has to believe change is possible. Implicit Person Theory (IPT) suggests that individuals ascribe to one of two beliefs or mindsets: incremental or entity theory (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995). Typically IPT beliefs are applied to ability, whether it is about the ability of others or oneself. Incrementalists (often referred to as a growth mindset) believe that change and growth is possible, whereas entitists (those with a fixed mindset) believe that ability is determined at birth and stable throughout time (Dweck et al., 1995). IPT has important implications in taking information about performance and using it to influence future behavior and improvements. While reactions should lead to a certain behavior after feedback, this relationship is likely to depend on whether one has an incremental or entity IPT.

Incrementalists typically elicit a mastery response to failure (Dweck et al., 1995; Kammrath & Dweck, 2006). When individuals believe that change can come from conflict, they are more inclined to use active problem-solving strategies. Thus, incrementalists are more likely to voice their opinion and concerns in a constructive manner, whereas entitists are more likely to use acceptance, withdrawal, or disengagement in conflict (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006). Entitists, who believe that fundamental qualities are permanent, are likely to choose acceptance or conflict if they are committed and loyal to the relationship, but choose disengagement, neglect, or an exit strategy if they are not. Incrementalists tend to choose productive strategies regardless (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006).

Because IPT governs specific strategies after a conflict, it is expected that it will interact with people's reactions to feedback that is unwanted. A person may react positively or negatively to a type of feedback, but the strategy he or she takes after a reaction should depend on whether or not there is a belief that change is possible. If a person has a poor reaction to the feedback he or she received, it is expected that this individual would take a different route and request a new type of feedback. However, this is only expected if this person has an incremental IPT. For those that have an entity IPT, no behavioral change is expected, regardless of whether reactions to feedback are positive or negative. Thus, it is proposed that the relationship between feedback reactions and future feedback seeking is moderated by IPT.

Summary

In sum, with the call made by Ashford et al. (2016) to more accurately define and measure elements of the feedback-seeking process, it is critical to understand feedback seeking in relation to different qualitative types of feedback. Furthermore, looking at the feedback-seeking process as a whole in terms of exploring tendencies, behavior, reactions, and future behavior will provide a robust depiction of a more realistic flow of how feedback should further be encouraged. The current studies observe a comprehensive picture of a newly developed typology by Gong and colleagues and therefore contribute to the feedback seeking literature by examining a multifaceted process.

Additionally, the current studies elaborate on the role individual differences play in the feedback process by observing traits that have already gained prominence in the feedback literature in addition to traits that have more grounding in social psychology.

Lastly, the current studies seek to extend past conceptualizations of feedback-seeking outcomes by considering multiple feedback episodes and how previous feedback seeking tendencies can direct future feedback-seeking behavior. In the following chapters, the proposed conceptual model (Figure 1) in which feedback-seeking tendencies lead to feedback-seeking behavior and feedback reactions is further explained in addition to the presentation of hypothesized relationships and proposed methods.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The sections to follow provide a comprehensive overview of the literature used to develop the hypothesized model (See Figures 2 and 3). First, research on feedback and feedback seeking is discussed, introducing a new feedback-seeking typology and how this typology moves the feedback-seeking literature forward. This new typology includes four types of feedback stemming from crossing the sign (negative or positive) and target (self or others) of the feedback. Furthermore, feedback reactions and multiple feedback episodes are considered within the context of this 2x2 typology.

Second, the role of individual differences in the hypothesized model is outlined. More specifically, the effects of feedback orientation and empathy throughout the feedback-seeking process are discussed. Lastly, the literature surrounding changes in motivation and attention is considered with regard to feedback reactions during multiple feedback episodes. In addition, how these shifts interact with an individual's mindset to impact future feedback seeking is also examined. The research and findings presented regarding the feedback-seeking process and individual differences serve as the foundational framework of the hypothesized relationships and are reviewed in the following sections.

Figure 2

Hypothesized Model of feedback-seeking tendencies leading to feedback seeking to be tested in Study 1



Figure 3

Hypothesized Model of feedback type leading to feedback reactions and changes in future feedback seeking behavior conditional on feedback orientation, empathy, and IPT to be tested in Study 2



Feedback and Feedback Seeking

Feedback, as a process, is when a source provides a message to a recipient regarding workplace behavior (Ilgen et al., 1979). Characteristics of the source, the content of the message, and recipient can all affect the delivery and use of feedback. Each of these elements are critical in any exchange in which information is presented (Gregory & Levy, 2015). The role of feedback in practice is to provide unique insight into a person's performance in order to allow him or her to achieve a goal. A crucial part of everyday work is understanding whether or not to persevere with current behavior. Making such a decision about perseverance can only come from feedback about current behavior and expectations. Such information provides a potential road map to improving performance, role clarity (Whitaker, Dahling and Levy, 2007), individual beliefs about the self (Park, Schmidt, Scheu, and DeShon, 2007), and organizational commitment (Peng & Chui, 2010). However, these benefits are only achieved when an individual receives feedback, and this often only occurs when individuals ask for feedback.

Early work noted that this motivation to engage in feedback seeking proceeded from a cost-benefit analysis in which individuals actively analyze the perceived value and risk of requesting and receiving feedback (Ashford & Northcraft, 1992). Feedback-seeking behavior refers to the extent to which employees monitor themselves and their environment and inquire about how they are performing and/or being perceived (Ashford & Cummings, 1983; Moss, Sanchez, Brumbaugh, & Borkowski, 2009). When feedback is recognized as valuable, feedback seeking increases. Conversely, when feedback is seen as costly, feedback seeking decreases (Ashford, Blatt, & VandeWalle, 2003). Thus,

feedback seeking has been conceptualized as a tool used in self-regulation to reduce uncertainty within ambiguous situations and improve goal attainment (Tsui & Ashford, 1994).

In more recent literature, the construct of feedback seeking is regarded as an aggregate construct, consisting of two distinct processes called monitoring and inquiry (Anseel, Beatty, Shen, Lievens, & Sackett, 2015; Ashford & Cummings, 1983). Monitoring feedback seeking is defined as an indirect process of observing others and the environment, and inquiry tends to refer to directly asking for feedback (Anseel et al., 2015). Individuals can also seek feedback about the process or approach they are taking to achieve a goal, or the outcome of a finished goal (Medvedeff, Gregory, & Levy, 2008). Therefore, the information provided or the feedback message can take multiple different forms. Literature in the past two decades has started to define different qualitative forms of feedback, and thus different ways to approach feedback seeking.

Seeking Different Types of Feedback

Kluger and DeNisi (1996) state that feedback can be compared to a relative norm, an expectation or ideal goal, others' performance, or past performance levels of the recipient. This early distinction suggests that feedback can take multiple forms. A major gap that Ashford and colleagues (2016) point out in their recent feedback-seeking review, however, is the fact that the measurement of feedback seeking lags behind the conceptualization of feedback seeking. Included in this gap is the lack of empirical evidence on different qualitative forms of feedback, as suggested by Kluger & DeNisi (1996).

Despite Ashford and colleagues' (2016) claim regarding the lack of feedback-seeking measurement, there have been a few noteworthy studies that have emphasized preferences for different types of feedback. For example, feedback can take on different forms, such as negative versus positive feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979); normative, diagnostic, or assurance feedback (Park et al., 2007); and norm-referenced or selfreferenced feedback (Kim, Lee, Chung, & Bong, 2010; McColskey & Leary, 1985; Moore & Klien, 2008; Zingoni & Byron, 2017). Each of these distinctions and relevant findings are discussed below.

Negative versus Positive Feedback

In terms of feedback, negative and positive indicators have received the most analysis to date and are often referred to as the sign of feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979). Negative feedback refers to information about what one is doing poorly and where to improve, while positive feedback is information about what one is doing well. Past research shows that positive feedback is more easily accepted and remembered, whereas negative feedback is perceived as more costly (Hays & Williams, 2011) and too much negative feedback is seen as overwhelming (Smither & Walker, 2004). However, negative feedback is also more likely to elicit improved performance due to the direct diagnostic information it provides individuals about how to improve their performance or achieve a goal (Ilgen et al., 1979; O'Malley & Gregory, 2011).

Normative, Diagnostic, or Assurance Feedback

In Park et al.'s (2007) work, diagnostic feedback refers to corrective feedback intended to improve performance. Normative feedback focuses on a direct comparison of the recipient's performance with others' performance in order to understand how the

recipient measures up to others around him or her. Assurance feedback is positive feedback that is self-enhancing and used to boost the self-esteem of the feedback recipient (Park et al., 2007). Results from this study argue for a relationship between goal orientation and feedback preference for one or more of these three types of feedback. Mastery goal orientation led to an expectation that feedback is valuable because it provides information on how to reach one's goal (i.e., expectancy value), which in turn led to the seeking of diagnostic feedback. Both mastery goal orientation and performance prove orientation led to the expectation that feedback provides a marker for how one is currently performing (i.e., appraisal value) and this in turn leads to the seeking of normative feedback. Performance avoid goal orientation led to perceived ego and selfpresentation costs which led to the seeking of assurance feedback or no feedback at all (Park et al., 2007).

Self-Referenced versus Norm-Referenced Feedback

McColskey and Leary (1985) conducted a study in which feedback type was manipulated to be either norm-referenced or self-referenced. Norm-referenced feedback compares the participants' performance to the performance of others, and self-referenced feedback compares the participants' performance to other measures of their ability. Results from this study indicate that self-referenced failure feedback leads to more personal attributions about one's effort and a high expectancy to improve performance in the future compared to norm-referenced feedback. However, norm-referenced success feedback led to greater attributions of effort and better performance expectancies (McColskey & Leary, 1985). Kim et al. (2010) also drew the distinction between criterion-referenced feedback and norm-referenced feedback. In their work, criterion-

referenced feedback is defined as the comparison between the recipient and a preestablished criteria or standard, whereas norm-referenced feedback was defined as the comparison between the recipient and a group of peers (Kim et al., 2010). Results from this study show that different brain areas are activated when presented with the two types of feedback. For participants who perceived their competence to be low, brain regions for negative affect were stimulated when they received norm-referenced feedback. Conversely, the same negative affect brain regions were stimulated when those who perceived their competence to be high received criterion-referenced feedback (Kim et al., 2010). These results contribute to the idea that different feedback forms should be considered in addition to individual differences (Kim et al., 2010) as opposed to feedback that is oversimplified by only considering the sign or no type at all.

In a similar vein, Moore and Klien (2008) tested the effects of absolute feedback (percentage on a test) and comparative feedback (percentile score). Absolute feedback had a stronger relationship with performance satisfaction and self-esteem. Additionally, participants were given a chance to place a comparative or absolute bet about their performance on a subsequent task, in which absolute feedback led to comparative betting while comparative feedback led to inconsistent absolute bets (Moore and Klein, 2008). These results indicate that absolute feedback about ability is related to positive outcomes in addition to confidence about one's ability when compared with others whereas comparative feedback is less influential.

Lastly, a recent study done by Zingoni and Byron (2017) compared the interactive effects feedback standard and individual mindsets have on the perceived value and threat of feedback. The authors distinguished between a relative standard and an absolute

standard with regard to feedback. Feedback with an absolute standard provided information about the recipient alone, much like self-referenced feedback. Feedback with a relative standard provided information about how the recipient compares to others, similar to criterion-referenced or normative feedback. Results indicated that individual mindsets interact with whether feedback focuses on an absolute standard or the comparison of others to predict task effort and learning. More specifically, those with a growth mindset (i.e., the belief that ability is malleable) found negative absolute feedback valuable and non-threatening, which further led to increased effort and learning. Conversely, those with a fixed mindset (i.e., the belief that ability is stable) perceived negative comparative feedback as valuable but also threatening (Zingoni & Byron, 2017).

Even though the above studies identify different forms of feedback, research that differentiates between different types of feedback is rare and has maintained a narrow focus on both the initial preference for feedback and the forms feedback can take. Even though this literature has shown that individuals have a certain preference for varying types of feedback, there is rarely a measurement of individual preferences as a precursor to the act of seeking feedback. Little research focuses on an approach that combines and compares multiple types of feedback, using both the sign and target of feedback. Furthermore, the conceptualization and measurement of feedback is lacking with regard to who feedback can be about. All previous types of feedback have solely centered around an individual, whether this individual was compared to a standard or group. However, feedback can also be information about others the recipient is familiar with, taking on a completely new tactic to giving and reacting to feedback. Thus, the current studies focus on a new approach to feedback seeking, identifying a more complex

conceptualization of feedback preferences for different qualitative forms of feedback. More specifically, Gong et al., (2017) manipulates both the sign and target of feedback, creating a 2x2 typology. Gong et al.'s (2017) conceptualization is the first of its kind to incorporate feedback that isn't necessarily about the recipient of feedback. This new typology will be discussed in the following section. For a summary of the types of feedback just reviewed and how they compare to Gong et al.'s (2017) typology, please see Table 1.

Table 1

<i>Comparative</i>	Look at	Previous	Studies	Defining	and Testing	Different	Feedback 2	Types
00	2001000	1.0.0000	211101100	20,000		20,70.0.00		-) p = 0

Feedback that to Self (Compares the Self or Standard	Feedback th Self	at Compares the to Others	Feedback that Targets Others	
Title Article		Title	Article	Title	Article
Diagnostic	Park et al. (2007)	Normative	Park et al. (2007)	Other- Positive/Other- Negative	Gong et al. (2017)
Assurance	Park et al. (2007)	Comparative	Moore & Klien (2008)		
Absolute	Moore & Klien (2008); Zingoni & Byron (2017)	Relative	Zingoni & Byron (2017)		
Criterion- Referenced	Kim et al. (2010)	Norm- Referenced	McColskey & Leary (1985); Kim et al. (2010)		
Self-	McColskey &			-	
Referenced	Leary (1985)				
Self- Positive/Self Negative	Gong et al. (2017)				

Exploring the Feedback Seeking Typology

A large portion of feedback-seeking research still measures intent to seek feedback (Fedor, Rensvold, & Adams, 1992), whether or not feedback was sought, or the frequency with which it was sought (Ashford et al., 2016). However, feedback seeking has been consistently conceptualized as a much more dynamic process that inherently includes incentives and preferences in its theoretical conceptualization (Ashford et al., 2016; Dahling & Whitaker, 2016; Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004). Thus, what is often ignored is the type of feedback sought as a qualitative form rather than quantitative, in addition to the initial preference behind such seeking. In other words, the motivation behind and desire for a specific type or quality of feedback is often lost when feedback seeking is measured using frequency or intent alone.

More current examinations demonstrate that feedback can take on different qualitative forms as suggested above (Ilgen et al., 1979; McColskey & Leary, 1985; Zingoni & Byron, 2017). However, these differences have been narrowly explored. Additionally, there is less research observing the fact that feedback can take multiple forms with regard to the person the feedback is actually about. Within a realistic work setting, sources providing feedback may be responsible to provide it to multiple people. A manager often has more than one direct report within an organization. Due to this, he or she may be more familiar with a select few direct reports and therefore may provide feedback centering around these individuals as opposed to feedback focused on the employee who sought the feedback. Thus, a missing piece in the feedback literature with regards to type is feedback that is provided to the recipient but not necessarily about the recipient, and actually about his or her peers. Gong, Wang, Huang, and Cheung (2017)

take an approach that identifies four different qualitative types of feedback based on the foci (self or others) and sign (positive or negative) of feedback.

Gong and colleagues developed a feedback-seeking typology that includes selfpositive feedback, self-negative feedback, other-positive feedback, and other-negative feedback. In this typology, which type of feedback an individual typically seeks is dependent on whether the feedback is negative or positive *in addition* to the target of feedback. In all four types of feedback in Gong et al.'s (2017) typology, each are measured by both inquiry and monitoring. This typology is unique in the sense that it not only includes positive and negative feedback about the self, it also includes different forms of feedback that can be either positive or negative. Feedback about the self or focal recipient in Gong and colleagues' typology is similar to the other types of feedback discussed such as absolute or diagnostic feedback (See Table 1).

However, Gong et al.'s typology also incorporates a social aspect of feedback by defining a new type of feedback that is other-focused. While it is similar to normreferenced or relative feedback, it has a fundamental difference. Norm-referenced or relative feedback is information about the feedback recipient that compares him or her to others whereas other-focused feedback is about another individual(s) that the feedback recipient may know or work with. Other-related feedback is not necessarily about a specific person, but is general information about colleagues or peers and what they are doing well or poorly. This type of information adds a social element to feedback that is not about the feedback recipient. For example, an employee may ask his or her supervisor about what his or her coworkers are doing well in order to imitate that behavior. This

piece alone is unique and exclusive to Gong and colleagues' typology and thus makes it a fundamental addition to explore within the feedback-seeking research.

Across three studies, Gong et al. (2017) revealed that self-negative feedback had a positive effect on performance, role clarity, and social integration. The positive effect on performance and role clarity was due to negative feedback being about how one can improve within their role. Social integration involved adaptability, which is guided by task relevant, diagnostic feedback. Other-positive was also positively related to performance, explained by social learning theory. Within Gong et al.'s (2017) feedback typology, goal orientation was shown to be an integral piece in determining which feedback individuals typically preferred. A mastery orientation led to the seeking of self-negative, self-positive, and other-positive feedback, and a performance approach orientation led to the seeking of self-positive and other-negative feedback seeking (Gong et al., 2017). Within Gong et al.'s studies, feedback seeking is measured using self-reported data about what type of feedback the recipient "often" seeks, as opposed to actual feedback-seeking behavior.

This typology demonstrates promising results with regards to what type of feedback employees should be given to increase performance, social integration, and role clarity but it does not provide insight into actual feedback-seeking behavior or reactions to feedback. In other words, this initial study provides a new understanding of feedback tendencies or preferences, but it is unknown whether or not these preferences for certain types of feedback based on the authors' typology are maintained when feedback-seeking behavior is measured. Ajzen and Fishbein's (1980) theory of reasoned action states that intentions are a precursor to action based on information that is readily available and the

belief that a certain action will lead to a specific outcome. For example, a person's feedback-seeking tendencies are formed due to available information about what type of feedback will be beneficial and less costly, and how each type of feedback translates into a desired outcome, such as better performance. If an individual self-reports that he or she typically seeks a certain type of feedback such as in Gong and colleagues' work, it is implied that this feedback is the preference. Following the theory of reasoned action, if this type feedback has led to a desired outcome before, individual's intentions are likely to be consistent and achieve the expected outcome. Thus, it is expected that feedback-seeking tendencies will lead to congruent feedback seeking.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant relationship between feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior such that the best predictor of each type of feedback seeking is the tendency that matches that feedback seeking behavior.

Feedback Reactions

In addition to feedback-seeking tendencies and different qualitative forms of feedback receiving little attention, how these factors lead to feedback reactions also remains relatively under explained. Levy, Tseng, Rosen, & Lueke, (2017) state that reactions should both elicit change and improvement in PM processes and be a measurement of its success. Thus, reactions to feedback within a PM process can be important antecedents of future feedback seeking and performance changes. Despite the pivotal role reactions can therefore play in feedback seeking and acceptance, there is no research that measures reactions based on a typology such as Gong and colleagues' (2017). While there has been research on the relationships between reactions/attitudes and negative and positive feedback (Brett & Atwater, 2001; Fedor et al., 1989; Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004), the
personal or other focus that is present in Gong et al.'s feedback typology is ignored. In other words, reactions based on the four types of feedback established by Gong and colleagues have yet to be fleshed out, given that this typology is newly developed. It is expected that there will be different reactions based on each in addition to an interaction between individual differences and feedback type in predicting reactions. First, an examination of the current literature on reactions is presented.

Reactions have important individual and organizational implications for changing behavior and improving performance (Jawahar, 2010; Kinicki, Prussia, Wu, & McKee-Ryan, 2004). Feedback reactions can be cognitive, affective, or behavioral (Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984) and can be directed at the feedback itself, the feedback source, or the feedback system (Levy, 1989; Levy, Cawley, & Foti, 1998). Reactions about the feedback source include respect, perceived source competence and expertise, knowledge, and perceptiveness. Examples of reactions to the feedback itself include satisfaction with the feedback, perceived accuracy, and acceptance (Levy, 1989; Levy et al., 1998). Steelman and Rutkowski's (2004) work on feedback reactions focuses on satisfaction with the feedback, and motivation to use and improve from the feedback. Reactions to the feedback system include the recipient's perceptions of value, fairness, validity, accuracy, and utility of the feedback system (Levy, 1989; Levy et al., 1998). Cawley, Keeping, and Levy (1998) conducted a meta-analysis and identified common performance appraisal reactions as system and session satisfaction, utility, fairness, motivation to improve, and perceived accuracy. Following this, Keeping and Levy (2001) conceptualized reactions as a higher order latent construct of overall reactions with six reflective indicators. These

dimensions include session satisfaction, system satisfaction, utility, accuracy, procedural justice, and distributive justice.

To be as robust as possible, the current studies use and adapt the framework developed by Keeping and Levy (2000) in conjunction with Steelman and Rutkowski's (2004) addition of motivation when conceptualizing reactions to feedback and adapt these reactions to center around feedback as opposed to performance appraisal as a whole. Thus, the current studies use a higher order latent construct of feedback reactions that encompasses satisfaction, utility, accuracy, fairness (i.e., justice), and motivation to use and improve from the feedback. These indicators are discussed below.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction is increased if the feedback is congruent with the recipient's expectations and personal beliefs (Whiting, Kline, & Sulsky, 2008). Elicker, Levy, and Hall (2006) found that when individuals feel that they have a voice in the feedback process, they also have higher satisfaction. Additionally, people are more satisfied with feedback if they feel that it is useful for doing well on a task that they see as relevant, when the information is not redundant (Ilgen & Moore, 1987), when the source of the feedback is credible (Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004), when there is a strong relationship between the source and the recipient (Pichler, 2012) and when the message is favorable (Ilgen et al., 1979). Additionally, even if feedback is unfavorable, individuals are still satisfied if it is relevant to the task and to improving performance (Steelman et al., 2004). Lastly, recipient participation in the performance appraisal process leads to higher satisfaction with the feedback (Cawley et al., 1998).

Accuracy

Accuracy perceptions have arguably received the most attention (Levy et al., 2018). Such perceptions are strongest when the source is credible, trustworthy, and has expertise in the topic in which the feedback is being given (Ilgen et al., 1979; Jawahar, 2010). Strong accuracy perceptions occur when the feedback criteria are relevant to the recipient's job, when goal setting is used, and when the source refrains from using criticism (Jawahar, 2010). Accuracy perceptions are also higher when the feedback is congruent with the seeker's self-beliefs (Brett & Artwater, 2001).

Utility

Perceptions of utility are defined as the usefulness of the feedback provided (Cawley et al., 1998). In addition to higher satisfaction from the perceived voice within the feedback process, higher utility perceptions also occur (Elicker et al., 2006). Furthermore, the more accurate feedback perceptions are, the more likely the feedback will be used (Brett & Atwater, 2001). Greater utility is also perceived when feedback is positive, regardless of the recipient's perception of performance. In other words, even if recipients believe they performed poorly, they are still likely to perceive utility from positive feedback, in line with self-enhancement theory (Anseel & Lievens, 2006).

Fairness

Fairness perceptions can be the most complicated reaction to conceptualize because they are often confounded with accuracy and is further defined using organizational justice literature (Keeping & Levy, 2000). When feedback is part of a positive feedback environment, employees experience fewer stressors—ambiguity, for example—which leads to fewer perceptions of organizational politics and greater perceptions of fairness

(Rosen et al., 2006). With regard to appraisal reactions, Cawley et al. (1998) found that participation in which the recipient feels he or she has a voice in the appraisal process leads to favorable reactions including satisfaction, utility, motivation, fairness, and acceptance. If individuals feel that they can express themselves when receiving feedback, they are likely to perceive the feedback as fair. Furthermore, when feedback is perceived as congruent with the seeker's self-beliefs, it is perceived as more fair (Kinicki et al., 2004). Lastly, when feedback is accompanied with clearly defined standards for evaluation and is constructive, higher perceptions of distributive, organizational, and interactional justice occur (Chory & Westerman, 2009).

Motivation

Individuals are more motivated to use the feedback they receive if the source is perceived as competent, if the feedback environment is favorable, and if the content is relevant to helping them improve (Steelman et al., 2004). Furthermore, these variables often inspire individuals to seek feedback again at a later date, regardless of the cost (Steelman et al., 2004, Whitaker, Dahling, & Levy, 2007). Finally, source credibility, high feedback quality, and supportive feedback delivery mitigate the negative effects of negative feedback and lead to an individual being motivated to improve performance based on the feedback (Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004).

Integrating Feedback Reactions with Feedback Typology

To summarize, past research has shown that reactions are generally more positive when individuals feel they have an active role within the appraisal process (Cawley et al., 1998; Elicker, Levy, & Hall, 2006), when the source of the feedback is trustworthy and knowledgeable (Ilgen et al., 1979; Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004), when the feedback is

task/goal relevant (Jawahar, 2010; Steelman et al., 2004), and when feedback is positive (Anseel & Lievens, 2006; David, 2013).

Given these findings, the current studies measure reactions to the newly developed typology by Gong et al. (2017) to determine if this typology is generalizable in a dynamic feedback process. It is expected that reactions to each type of feedback will differ. More specifically, reactions to positive feedback overall should be more positive than reactions to negative feedback, based on past empirical evidence (Ilgen et al., 1979). The relationship between feedback type and reactions is expected to be more complex with regards to interaction effects and will be discussed in the next sections. Generally speaking, reactions to self-positive feedback are expected to be the most favorable, reactions to negative feedback will be less favorable but still favorable. This is due to the idea that initially, positive feedback is more easily accepted but negative feedback is still perceived favorably if it is relevant to improving.

Hypothesis 2a: Overall reactions to self-positive feedback are expected to be significantly different from reactions to all other types of feedback and the most favorable.

Hypothesis 2b: Overall reactions to self-negative feedback are expected to be significantly different from reactions to all other types of feedback, and overall favorable, but less favorable than reactions to self-positive feedback.

With regard to other-related feedback, information about others can be used to model or avoid specific behavior. However, compared with self-related feedback, other-related feedback is inherently less personally relevant to the task one is performing, which has been shown to lead to less acceptance of feedback (Steelman et al., 2004). Feedback that

is about another person, even if that person is doing the same task is less personally relevant. Due to this, reactions are generally expected to be neutral due to the lower relevance of the information received. However, much like reactions to self-related feedback, the relationship between other related feedback and reactions is expected to be more complex and further clarified by individual differences that will be discussed below. Generally speaking, reactions to other-positive feedback are expected to be more neutral than overtly positive based on the idea that the recipient doesn't know the target of the feedback well. This could change if the target was close to the feedback recipient or based on individual differences, but for the purposes of the current studies and these initial hypotheses, others who are not close with the recipient will be observed. Even though other-negative feedback is less personally relevant to the recipient, it can also be seen as a form of gossip or disparaging others, regardless of the recipient and target's relationship. When an individual hears information that is negative about someone else, even if he or she can use this information to avoid poor behavior, it still can be seen as a form of slander or malicious talk. Thus, reactions to other-negative feedback are expected to be the least favorable, due to the lack of personal relevance.

Hypothesis 2c: Overall reactions to other-positive feedback are expected to be significantly different than reactions to all other types of feedback and neutral. *Hypothesis 2d:* Overall reactions to other-negative feedback are expected to be significantly different than reactions from all other types of feedback and the least favorable.

Individual Differences Affecting the Feedback-Seeking Process

Because feedback seeking is a complex process, it is also important to examine other critical individual differences that affect feedback reactions. A person's receptivity to feedback in general is expected to interact with the feedback received to predict reactions. By observing the individual difference of feedback orientation, a fuller picture can be drawn with regards to the feedback-seeking process. Lastly, because Gong and colleague's typology includes a social aspect with regards to feedback about others, empathy is expected to play a role in determining reactions to feedback type. Each proposed moderator will be discussed in the sections that follow.

Feedback Orientation as a Moderator

Feedback orientation (FO) refers to an individual's overall receptivity to feedback about his or her work (Linderbaum & Levy, 2010; London & Smither, 2002). The measurement of FO consists of four dimensions, which include utility (is the feedback useful), accountability (will the recipient feel obligated or responsible to use the feedback received), social awareness (can the feedback be used to increase awareness of others' views of oneself), and feedback self-efficacy (perceived competence in interpreting and responding to feedback). FO is considered a quasi-trait that is fairly stable and has positive relationships with satisfaction with a performance appraisal session, involvement, and feedback seeking (Linderbaum & Levy, 2010). FO is also related to emotional intelligence, feedback inquiry, and task performance (Dahling et al., 2012; Rasheed et al., 2015). Additionally, Rasheed and colleagues (2015) found evidence to suggest that all four dimensions of FO are directly related to satisfaction with feedback.

Thus, the current studies examine FO in the context of other reactions to feedback in addition to satisfaction.

FO is conceptualized as a quasi-trait, but there is little research that tests how this enduring individual difference interacts with different qualitative types of feedback to predict feedback reactions. In a recent study done by Roberts, Levy, Dahling, Riordan, & O'Malley (2019), FO was shown to consistently predict favorable feedback reactions. This suggests that those with a high FO are more likely to have favorable reactions and value feedback more than those with a low FO. This is expected to be true regardless of the sign (negative or positive) of the feedback because individuals with a high FO value the information feedback provides and are more open to and interested in feedback. Thus, it is expected that feedback reactions will be favorable, regardless of the four types of feedback, for those who are high in FO. For those with a low FO, reactions are expected to be less favorable, with the exception of self-positive. This is due to the idea that positive feedback is more easily accepted in general, even if it is incongruent with individual beliefs about performance. Feedback used as self-enhancement is perceived favorably, thus someone with low feedback orientation should still react positively to self-positive feedback because it is a form of praise. However, for the other types of feedback, it is expected that for those with a low FO, reactions will be less favorable given that those low in FO are not receptive to feedback.

Hypothesis 3: FO will moderate the relationship between feedback and feedback reactions such that reactions will be more positive for those with a high FO, regardless of the type. Conversely, for those with a low FO, reactions will be more negative to all feedback types except for self-positive feedback.

Empathy as a Moderator

Research has integrated two unique types of empathy: cognitive and affective. Cognitive empathy encompasses perspective taking and understanding, whereas affective empathy is related to emotional reactivity. Davis (1980; 1983) took this approach and developed a further robust definition of empathy to include four dimensions: fantasy, perspective taking, empathic concern, and personal distress, each tapping into some aspect of how empathy is conceptualized (Davis, 1983). Fantasy and perspective taking are the cognitive empathy pieces, and empathic concern and personal distress are the affective pieces. The fantasy dimension refers to individuals' ability to use their imagination to see themselves in fictional situations or as fictional people. Perspective taking denotes the ability to adopt the feelings of others throughout situations. Empathic concern is an other-oriented approach and refers to one's ability to express sympathy for those less fortunate. Personal distress is a self-oriented affective reaction and relates to feelings of anxiety during a tense interpersonal setting (Davis, 1980; 1983).

In determining validity for the measurement of empathy with these four sub factors, Davis (1983) also tested how empathy relates to other social and emotional variables. Typically, women score significantly higher on all four dimensions than men, but the factor structure remains consistent for both sexes. High fantasy scores are related to verbal intelligence, emotional reactivity, and sensitivity to others. Perspective taking is positively related to positive social functioning and higher self-esteem, and negatively related to fearfulness and a self-centered awareness of others (i.e., the view that others exist to impact the self). Empathic concern tends to be positively related to a non-selfish concern for others, shyness, and anxiety, but negatively related to boastfulness and

egotism. Lastly, personal distress was positively related to lower self-esteem, shyness, social anxiety, uncertainty, and fearfulness (Davis, 1983).

Empathy is a social construct, yet it is individually driven. Consequently, relationships with coworkers, social networks, or teams are not required for a person to exhibit empathy. One can be empathic about others even if they are acquaintances or strangers. Because empathy encompasses compassion and understanding for others, it is likely that reactions to other-oriented feedback would be different for those with higher scores of empathy than for those with lower scores. Empathic people are able to imagine another person's situation as if it were their own and exhibit concern about his or her struggle (Davis, 1983). So when these individuals receive information-negative or positive—about others, they are likely to empathize, which will likely lead to an emotional reaction. Hearing negative feedback about others may elicit a stressful or adverse reaction for those with high empathy, whereas positive information may elicit a favorable reaction because those with high empathy are happy for that other person. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that empathy will interact with the type of feedback received, and affect reactions differently for those that have a high or low empathy score. For those with high empathy, negative other feedback will elicit negative reactions, but for those with low empathy, there will be no relationship between negative other feedback and reactions.

Hypothesis 4: Empathy will moderate the relationship between other-focused feedback and reactions such that for those with low empathy, there will be no relationship between other-negative/positive feedback and feedback reactions. For those with high empathy, there will be a significant positive relationship between

other-positive feedback and reactions, and a significant negative relationship between other-negative feedback and reactions.

The current studies also explore the potential for an interaction between self-negative feedback and empathy such that those with high empathy will have more positive reactions to self-negative feedback than those with low empathy. This is because those with higher empathy tend to also have higher self-esteem (Davis, 1980). Because those with low self-esteem tend to avoid negative feedback to protect their ego (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Cummings, 1983; Fedor et al., 1992), the same is expected to be true when it comes to reactions and low empathy. Those with low empathy are likely to react negatively to self-negative feedback because of an ego-loss. Moreover, these people are not able to imagine themselves in a different situation (i.e., the fantasy dimension) so they are unlikely to see the value in negative feedback being associated with future performance. Thus, those with high empathy are expected to have more positive reactions to self-negative feedback than those with low empathy.

Hypothesis 5: Empathy will moderate the relationship between self-focused feedback and reactions such that for those with high empathy, there will be a positive relationship between self-related feedback and reactions. For those who have low empathy, reactions will be negative for self-negative feedback and positive for self-positive feedback.

Multiple Feedback Episodes: Changes in Behavior from Tendencies

As highlighted in the previous sections, the feedback-seeking process is dynamic in that it occurs in multiple episodes over time. Temporal effects should be considered both in theory building (George & Jones, 2000) and in hypothesis construction (Mitchell &

James, 2001). Despite this, the measurement of feedback seeking is lacking in regard to multiple episodes and feedback type. Within a realistic work setting, employees work on multiple tasks, leading to the potential for differences in motivation regarding each task. The proposed study takes a multi-phase approach to feedback seeking, another step in furthering Gong and colleagues' research. In doing so, the current studies aim to answer the question of whether or not people are willing to take a path that is different from the feedback they already received based on the reactions they have to the feedback they receive.

In recent years, feedback seeking has moved from a one-time intervention to a day-today informal process in which employees gain valuable information over time during the completion of a goal (Steelman et al. 2004). Control theory provides a parsimonious structure for explaining the important role feedback seeking has in goal striving and performance. At the foundation of control theory is a negative feedback loop that allows individuals to compare feedback about performance with a goal or standard (Carver & Scheier, 1981). If there is a discrepancy perceived between the feedback and the individual's standard, he or she is motivated to reduce this discrepancy, often in the form of a behavioral change. If one is experiencing negative feelings, he or she is motivated to change such affect, by either altering his or her behavior or by seeking feedback again that disconfirms the discrepancy (Brett & Atwater, 2001). If feedback received is different than what individuals tend to seek or prefer and results in poor reactions, they are likely motivated to change their focus to a different feedback type that is discrepant from the previous feedback they received, hoping for a different result.

When a person receives feedback that produces negative reactions, he or she is still going to need more feedback at a different time within a realistic organizational setting, especially if more feedback will be beneficial for improving performance or managing impressions. He or she is then met with a choice; to seek more feedback or not, what kind, and for what reason(s). Once feedback needs to be sought again, previous feedback reactions may engender a different type of feedback-seeking behavior, particularly if the feedback was unfavorable. Negative reactions should elicit a different preference leading to a feedback-seeking behavior that is different from the feedback previously received.

Unfavorable feedback that leads to negative affective reactions requires emotion regulation, which in turn depletes employees' of their resources (Muraven & Baumeister, 2000). The depletion literature assumes that everyone has a specific pool of resources that are depleted due to a number of things such as self-presentation (Vohs et al., 2005), a dual task paradigm (Converse & DeShon, 2009), a controlled environment (Muraven et al., 2008), or social exclusion (Baumeister et al., 2005). Receiving unfavorable feedback after an initial task should then also deplete resources by requiring self-regulation because it damaged one's self esteem leading to less motivation to improve based on the feedback. However, recent research has moved away from this explanation of resources. Converse and DeShon (2009) found that by adding additional tasks after the initial resource depletion, individuals might actually experience learned industriousness and adaptation and perform better on the third task. This suggests that temporal depletion may not be due to a pool of resources, but a shift in attention. Furthering this point, Inzlicht and Schmeichel (2012) suggest that researchers should strive to understand not why resources are depleted, but how resources are depleted. They suggest that decreases in

self-regulation are not due to limited resources but instead due to a *change* in motivation and attention. This further supports the notion that if an individual receives unfavorable feedback, he or she may shift attention away from the type of feedback that caused negative reactions, and be motivated to seek a different type of feedback from what was originally received. If the feedback received was consistent with an individual's selfreported tendencies, the individual would most likely not react unfavorably, and thus a different strategy would not be necessary.

Motivation is often a state-dependent variable (Diefendorff & Chandler, 2011), which suggests that the context of motivation to seek feedback matters. Thus, negative reactions to feedback should lead to less motivation to seek the same type of feedback. Medvedeff et al. (2008) found that individuals who received negative feedback about an outcome were less likely to seek subsequent feedback. A lack of motivation for the same type of feedback should result in a shift of attention to a new type of feedback, leading to feedback-seeking behavior that is different than what was received in the first feedbackseeking episode. In a study done to observe feedback seeking and the reconsideration of feedback-seeking intent, Levy et al. (1995) tested situational and individual determinants and their effect on feedback seeking intent and reconsideration. The authors found that those who have impression management and ego concerns reconsider and modify their feedback seeking behavior based on the context in which feedback seeking takes place. In this case, the context was either public or private (Levy et al., 1995). Levy and colleague's (1995) study highlights the fact that feedback seeking is a process in which motivation can switch with regard to reconsidering feedback seeking. In other words, feedback seeking doesn't follow the same pattern each time it occurs.

Considering the findings from Levy et al. (1995), Converse and DeShon (2009) and Inzlicht and Schmeichel (2012), it is expected that the effects of negative feedback reactions will lead to a change in future feedback-seeking behavior. With unfavorable feedback leading to unfavorable reactions, individual resources will be refocused on something else. Thus, negative reactions should lead to a different type of feedback sought in another feedback episode. This is not expected to be true when reactions are positive. This is due to the idea that past experiences influence future behavior. Accordingly, reactions to a past experience become salient and should therefore influence whether or not one seeks a different kind of feedback. Positive reactions should lead to no change in behavior because the results were favorable, whereas negative reactions should elicit a new strategy to avoid future negative feelings. Thus, it is predicted that reactions to feedback will influence future feedback seeking such that the less favorable reactions to feedback will lead to a change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future.

Hypothesis 6: Reactions to feedback will predict future feedback seeking such that there will be a negative relationship between reactions to feedback and a change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future. In other words, the less favorable the reactions, the more likely a change in feedback-seeking behavior will occur. *Hypothesis 7:* Reactions to feedback will mediate the relationship between feedback received and change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future.

Implicit Person Theory as Moderator of the Relationship Between Feedback Reactions and Change in Feedback Seeking

The shift in attention and motivation toward a different type of feedback based on negative reactions can take many different forms such as management, withdrawal, or

perseverance (Elfenbein, 2007; Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012). Changes in motivation and attention are not as likely if there are favorable reactions to feedback. If an individual has an unfavorable reaction to negative feedback and chooses to take the route of impression management and self-regulation, he or she could choose to seek feedback that either highlights positive aspects of performance or concern/praise for others. If one chooses to withdrawal, he or she may seek feedback that focuses on others, or no feedback at all. Lastly, if an individual perseveres, he or she may not shift attention to a different type of feedback at all. However, this may all be dependent on whether the individual believes change is possible. Thus, feedback reactions are expected to interact with Implicit Person Theory.

Implicit Person Theory (IPT) emphasizes the belief one holds about the malleability of ability, intelligence, and personality (Dweck, Chui, & Hong, 1995; Erdley & Dweck, 1993). Individuals hold one of two implicit theories: incremental theory or entity theory. Incremental IPT refers to the belief that people have the potential to alter their personality and grow in their ability and performance. Entity IPT refers to the belief that people have set personal attributes, which cannot be altered (Dweck et al., 1995). In more recent literature, these theories have transitioned into what is referred to as a mindset. Incremental IPT refers to a growth mindset and entity IPT refers to a fixed mindset, with a major distinction between the two being an action for incrementalists ("I worked hard") versus an identity ("I am a hard worker") for entitists (Dweck, 2006). Individuals with an incremental mindset are not ones to try the same technique multiple times and expect different results. These people are expected to try different strategies to achieve their growth goals. This translates to whether or not an individual will change their feedback-

seeking behavior to a new type of feedback that is different than the one to which he or she reacted negatively.

Work as early as 1989 by Wood and Bandura in social psychology emphasizes the differences between those who believe individual abilities are acquired, as opposed to fixed. Those who believe that abilities are learned and adjustable are more able to set goals, use analytic strategies, have higher self-efficacy, and typically receive higher performance ratings (Wood & Bandura, 1989). Moving forward with this literature, Carol Dweck and her colleagues focused on the different beliefs of personal attributes and the attributes of others (Dweck, 1999, Dweck et al., 1995). An individual's IPT leads to differential judgments and reactions. Those who hold an incremental IPT are likely to view personal and others' attributes and abilities as dynamic and continuous (Dweck et al., 1995). In other words, incrementalists believe that attributes are state and context dependent. For example, if an incrementalist failed a test in school, he or she might give lack of effort or poor strategy as a reason. Conversely, those who hold an entity IPT view attributes as trait-like, fixed, and stable throughout time. These individuals would rationalize failing a test due to external factors or factors outside of their control, such as lack of ability or an unfair teacher (Dweck et al., 1995). Other explorations of these implicit cognitions have been done in areas such as diversity (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998), motivation (Dweck et al., 1995; Dweck, 1999; Murphy & Dweck, 2010), romantic partnerships (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006; Kammrath & Peetz, 2012), and organizational outcomes that have been previously listed.

Although scholars have made significant and impressive progress in leading IPT's transition into the organizational literature, there remains room for further examination

into daily workplace processes. Research has shown that IPT has a significant relationship with organizational outcomes such as perceptions of organizational leadership (Werth, Markel, & Forster, 2006), coaching (Gregory, 2010; Heslin, VandeWalle, & Latham, 2007), organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011), performance appraisal ratings (Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005), and feedback seeking (Devloo et al., 2011). In regard to feedback seeking, incrementalists have been shown to seek feedback when the demands of a task outweigh their ability, but entitists will not (Devloo et al., 2011). This work shows a direct link to incrementalists valuing feedback to complete a task, yet the exact place IPT occupies in the feedback-seeking nomonological network remains relatively unexplored.

Additionally, much of the empirical research on IPT and feedback seeking revolves around the IPT of the manager rating performance or the IPT of the source providing feedback (Devloo et al., 2011; Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005; Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011; Heslin, VandeWalle, & Latham, 2006). In particular, the focus of IPT has been on managers' ability to recognize performance changes and rate performance accurately (Heslin et al., 2005), managers' ability to coach (Heslin et al., 2007; Sue-Chan, Wood, & Latham, 2012), and employee justice perceptions as a product of supervisor IPT (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011). Very little focus has been placed on the IPT of the feedback recipient. Inherent in the feedback-seeking process is the actual behavior performed by the individual seeking the feedback. Even though aspects of the source providing feedback have been explored as antecedents to an individual seeking

feedback, the feedback recipient has the complex role of ultimately taking the feedback, reacting to it, and deciding what to do with it.

Given the role of the recipients' IPT in the feedback-seeking process, there are potential issues associated with the recipient holding an entity IPT, such as the stereotypes they may hold about the source or the feedback they may seek. Entitists are more likely to make an extreme judgment about an individual from limited social information, and therefore are more likely to hold stereotypes (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998). Thus, if a recipient of feedback holds an entity theory and has negative stereotypes about the source of feedback, feedback may not be valued. The same can be true if an entitist holds a negative stereotype about feedback in general. Because entitists think ability is fixed, they are likely to have a poor image or negative stereotype about feedback that emphasizes failure. Kammrath and Dweck (2006) maintain that entity theorists have a habit of responding to failure with helplessness. Thus, when a performance goal is not reached, entitists may respond with helplessness, which has been shown to lead to less feedback seeking (Sparr & Sonnetag, 2008). This helplessness would also seem to decrease utility perceptions and the motivation to use and improve after feedback, regardless of the type.

Recent work done by Zingoni and Byron (2017) found a relationship between an individual's IPT and his or her perceived value and perceived threat of feedback type. Results from their experimental design revealed that incrementalists did not perceive negative feedback as more valuable than entitists, but did perceive it as less threatening. Moreover, incrementalists perceive absolute feedback as more valuable than entitists, while entitists value relative feedback more (Zingoni & Byron, 2017). Thus, it is not that

entitists are not motivated to seek feedback, but their perceived value and risks to seeking feedback lead them to desire different types of feedback than incrementalists. Entitists associate a risk to feedback that is negative and absolute and are therefore more likely to seek positive and relative feedback. Additionally, entitists believe that change and growth is not possible and thus are also expected to associate a risk in changing attention to seeking a different type of feedback that isn't positive or relative after negative reactions to avoid any threat to their egos. Conversely, incrementalists, who perceive feedback as less threatening (Zingoni & Byron, 2017) and use new strategies in the face of conflict (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006) will be more likely to take a new strategy after negative reactions and seek a new type of feedback that is different than what they sought before.

In summary, it is likely that an incrementalist, who believes that change and improvement is possible and will take steps to problem solve, will be more likely to change his or her feedback-seeking behavior and seek feedback that is different than feedback previously received. Incrementalists try new strategies in the face of failure or negativity to achieve a desired outcome. However, entitists are expected not to change feedback-seeking behavior given the fact that they are likely to withdrawal or accept failure. With regard to positive reactions, a change in future feedback-seeking behavior and tendencies is not expected, given that no conflict or issues arise with feedback that is accepted and satisfactory. Thus, it is hypothesized that IPT will interact with feedback reactions to predict feedback seeking in another feedback-seeking tendencies. For those who have an incremental IPT and experience negative feedback reactions, feedback-seeking behavior will be different from previous self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies in a

second feedback episode, compared to those with an entity IPT who will not change their feedback-seeking behavior regardless of feedback reactions.

Hypothesis 8: IPT will moderate the relationship between negative feedback reactions and a change in feedback-seeking behavior such that the relationship between negative reactions and change in feedback-seeking behavior will be stronger for incrementalists and mitigated for entitists.

Summary

Taken together, the current studies take a step-by-step approach in answering the questions of (1) whether or not self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies lead to actual behavior, in terms of feedback seeking, (2) whether individuals react favorably to each of the four types of feedback and if so, what types of people, and (3) whether reactions from each type of feedback elicit new feedback-seeking behavior that is different from the original feedback received and if so, what type of people change their behavior. Feedback orientation and empathy should play a role in determining the type of individuals who will react favorably and unfavorably to feedback and IPT will be used to determine which type of individuals will choose a new feedback-seeking strategy.

Given the information discussed, the current studies contribute to the existing feedback-seeking literature by furthering Gong et al.'s (2017) typology and our understanding of the feedback-seeking process across multiple feedback-seeking episodes. More specifically, the current studies make five distinct contributions. First, the current studies will test the generalizability of Gong et al.'s typology in a US context in addition to determining whether this typology translates into actual feedback-seeking behavior. Second, including feedback reactions to each form of feedback will further

explore this typology and help determine if people have positive feelings towards each type of feedback and to what extent. This is also important to discuss in a practical setting, given the fact that employees naturally experience reactions at work that will lead to future outcomes. The third contribution of the current studies will be an enhancement in the conceptualization of feedback seeking as a dynamic process in which previous feedback seeking episodes and one's reactions influence future feedback seeking. Fourth, the current studies explore individual differences at different stages of the feedbackseeking process. Lastly, the current studies shed light on organizational and employee outcomes such as performance and role clarity. Given the fact that Gong et al. (2017) has shown a significant relationship with such outcomes, it is essential to understand mechanisms through which feedback is viewed as favorable or unfavorable so that these outcomes can be further understood and generalized. For a summary of all hypothesized relationships, see Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Hypotheses

1	There will be a significant relationship between self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior such that the best predictor of each type of feedback seeking is the tendency that matches that feedback seeking behavior.
2	 a. Overall reactions to self-positive feedback are expected to be significantly different from reactions to all other types of feedback and the most favorable. b. Overall reactions to self-negative feedback are expected to be significantly different from reactions to all other types of feedback, and overall favorable, but less favorable than reactions to self-positive feedback. c. Overall reactions to other-positive feedback are expected to be significantly different than reactions to all other types of feedback are expected to be significantly different than reactions to all other types of feedback and neutral. d. Overall reactions to other-negative feedback are expected to be significantly different than reactions from all other types of feedback and the least favorable.
3	FO will moderate the relationship between feedback and feedback reactions such that reactions will be more positive for those with a high FO, regardless of the type. Conversely, for those with a low FO, reactions will be more negative to all feedback types except for self-positive feedback.
4	Empathy will moderate the relationship between other-focused feedback and reactions such that for those with low empathy, there will be no relationship between other-negative/positive feedback and feedback reactions. For those with high empathy, there will be a significant positive relationship between other-positive feedback and reactions, and a significant negative relationship between other-negative feedback and reactions.
5	Empathy will moderate the relationship between self-focused feedback and reactions such that for those with high empathy, there will be a positive relationship between self-related feedback and reactions. For those who have low empathy, reactions will be negative for self-negative feedback and positive for self-positive feedback.
6	Reactions to feedback will predict future feedback seeking such that there will be a negative relationship between reactions to feedback and a change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future. In other words, the less favorable the reactions, the more likely a change in feedback-seeking behavior will occur.
7	Reactions to feedback will mediate the relationship between feedback received and change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future.
8	IPT will moderate the relationship between negative feedback reactions and a change in feedback-seeking behavior such that the relationship between negative reactions and change in feedback-seeking behavior will be stronger for incrementalists and mitigated for entitists.

CHAPTER III

STUDY 1

Methods

Participants

Data were collected from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) using an online survey and task to answer Hypothesis 1. The desired number of participants was 180, as indicated in a power analysis done in G*Power. A total of 207 participants completed the survey and task on MTurk. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (42%, 22.7% Black or African American, 20.8% Asian or Asian American, 4.3% Hispanic or Latino, 4.3% Native American, 2.4% Middle Eastern, 3.5% two or more races/other) and female (69.1%, 29% male, 1.4% other, and .5% did not disclose). The mean age of participants was 34 and ranged from 20 to 65 (4.8% were 18-24, 44.9% were 25-30, 32.4% were 31-40, 5.8% were 41-50, 1.9% were 60 or older, and 10.2% did not disclose). The majority of participants had earned a BA/BS (47.8%) or an MA/MS (22.7%), with 18.8% of participants having completed some college, 6.3% having received their high school diploma or GED, and 1.9% completed a Ph.D. Lastly, the majority of participants were employed full-time (91.8%, 3.9% employed part-time, 1.9% unemployed, 1.9% student, .5% did not disclose) with their tenure with current company ranging from 1 month to 9 years.

Procedure

Participants completed the demographic measure in addition to the feedbackseeking tendencies measure (See Appendix A for a list of all measures). Then, participants completed a narrative evaluation task (See Appendix D) in which they reviewed a fictional description of a focal employee and the work group to whom this employee belongs. Details were fictional but the participants were told the employee is from a local company in Akron, OH. Details included a job description, work group description, and fictional record of performance for the focal employee and others in the work group. Participants were told that the recorded performance is from the employee's manager. The narrative evaluation task required the participant to provide an assessment of the fictional focal employee. To do so, participants reviewed the provided information about the focal employee and wrote a short evaluative narrative. After completing this task, they were given a list of fictional experts that provide a unique type of feedback and descriptions of each of the four types of feedback discussed (self-positive, self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative). Participants did not know that the experts were fictional, but were told that they are on staff at a University Lab. Participants were asked to choose from whom they wish to receive feedback based on the descriptions, as a measurement of feedback-seeking behavior to confirm or deny Hypothesis 1. Once participants made their feedback choice, the study ended and participants were debriefed that the experts were fictional and no feedback would actually be given.

Measures

For a summary of measures included in Study 1 and Study 2, see Table 5. All measures and corresponding items for study 1 can be found in Appendix A.

Demographic Information

Participants completed a basic demographic questionnaire that consisted of questions assessing age, race and ethnicity, gender, and employment status.

Feedback Tendencies

In order to assess the type of feedback individuals typically seek, the measure created by Gong and colleagues (2017) was used. This is a 24-item measure assessing individual's tendencies to prefer one or more of the established four types of feedback: self-positive, self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative. Items were rated on a 7-point likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7(strongly agree). All participants received a score for each tendency. These are averaged separately as opposed to a composite score (α (self-negative) = .88; α (self-positive) = .89; α (other negative) = .85).

Feedback Seeking

Feedback-seeking behavior was assessed by the choice participants made when given the option to choose one of the four types in Gong et al.'s (2017) typology. Feedback seeking was thus measured as a 4-level categorical variable. Each feedback type was assigned with a neutral name and was described in as much detail as possible so the participant got an idea of each type before making a choice. See Appendix A for this summary.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to the hypothesis development, a dataset was provided by Gong and colleagues from their initial sample used for the EFA in their (2017) article. The data

were analyzed as a first step to determine if individuals report having a dominant feedback-seeking tendency as opposed to having multiple tendencies. All participants in the data received a mean score for each of the four self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies. Dominant tendencies were identified by taking the highest feedback-seeking tendency mean and assigning it as the dominant tendency. If two or more means were the same, there were two or more dominant tendencies assigned. Results from the data showed that 83% of participants in Gong et al.'s data had a dominant feedback-seeking tendency. Nine percent of participants had two dominant tendencies, and less than 5% had more than two dominant tendencies. Given these preliminary results, it was safe to assume that the majority of participants will have a dominant feedback-seeking tendency so that the relationship between self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies and feedbackseeking behavior (Hypothesis 1) can be fully tested.

Data Screening

A total number of 213 completed the survey on MTurk. There were two attention checks at the beginning of the survey and participants were taken to the end of the survey if they failed one and did not receive credit on MTurk. After removing individuals who did not follow the directions of the task, the resulting sample size was 207.

Analytic Strategy

Hypothesis 1 was tested using a chi-square analysis to determine if there is a significant pattern of self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies predicting feedback-seeking behavior. To further probe Hypothesis 1, a binomial logistic regression was also run to determine if feedback-seeking tendencies predict feedback-seeking behavior. A logistic regression expands upon a simple relationship and determines the probability of

each feedback-seeking tendency's influence on feedback-seeking behavior. Because feedback seeking is categorical, dummy coding was used and 3 dummy vectors were created to describe the four dichotomous variables. Each feedback type was coded as "1" in one vector and all other types were coded as "0". Hypothesis 1 predicted for each feedback type choice, the same feedback-seeking tendency would be the strongest predictor. In other words, each participant received a tendency score on each of the feedback-seeking tendencies and also selected one type of feedback to measure feedbackseeking behavior. For all individuals who chose self-positive, self-positive feedbackseeking tendencies should be the strongest predictor (i.e., strongest correlation). The same was tested for those that choose self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative feedback.

Primary Analyses

It was anticipated that the best predictor of each type of feedback seeking is the tendency that matches that feedback seeking behavior. As a first step, a chi-square analysis was run to determine whether self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback seeking are independent from each other or if there are significant patterns in the feedback individuals sought based on their feedback-seeking tendency. For those that had a self-positive tendency, 30.6% sought self-positive feedback. For those that had a self-negative tendency, 47.8% sought self-negative feedback. For those that had an other-positive tendency, 30% sought other-positive feedback, and for those that had an other-negative tendency, 10% sought other-negative feedback. Results indicate that there was not a significant association between feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior in terms of an expected pattern ($\chi^2 = 10.35$, p = .80). Table 3 presents the

feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation. In general, a little over 50% of participants with a dominant tendency sought self-negative feedback Dominant tendencies were determined for each participant based on which tendency of the four had the highest mean and 43 people did not have a dominant tendency and were removed from this analysis. Thus, the results of this chi-square are likely affected by the small n-sizes in general in addition to the majority of participants choosing self-negative feedback. To further probe the probability of tendencies translating into seeking selfnegative (and each other type) feedback using the dummy coded dichotomous variable, a logistic regression was run.

Table 3

	Feedback Seeking Dominant Tendency										
			Self		Self		Other		Other		
	Total		Positive		Negative		Positive			Negative	
	n	= 161	n = 49		n = 23		n = 50			n = 39	
Feedback											
Seeking	п	%	п	%	п	%	п	%	п	%	X2
Self Positive	41	25.47%	15	30.60%	3	13.00%	12	24.00%	11	28.20%	10.36
Self Negative	64	39.75%	19	38.80%	11	47.80%	17	34.00%	17	46.30%	(ns)
Other Positive	34	21.12%	9	18.40%	3	13.00%	15	30.00%	7	17.90%	
Other Negative	22	13.66%	6	12.20%	6	26.20%	6	12.00%	4	10.30%	

Feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation

Note: All participants received a mean score for each tendency. Dominant tendencies were assigned based on which tendency out of the four had the highest mean. 45 people have two or more dominant tendencies, so were removed from this analysis.

A logistic regression predicts the probability of being in a particular category of the dependent variable, given the independent variable. In other words, a logistic regression was run to identify the probability of an individual seeking a specific type of feedback, given their feedback-seeking tendency. For those that sought self-positive feedback (N=

56), the logistic regression model with all four tendencies predicting behavior was not statistically significant, $\chi^2(4) = 7.56$, p = .11. However, self-negative feedback seeking tendencies alone significantly predicted feedback-seeking behavior (B = -.45, Wald = 4.97, p < .05). Those that have a lower tendency to seek self-negative feedback are .64 times more likely to seek self-positive feedback. The model explained 52% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in feedback seeking and correctly classified 72.5% of cases. For those that sought self-negative feedback (N = 82), the logistic regression model with all four tendencies predicting behavior was statistically significant, $\chi^2(4) = 11.99$, p < .05. The model explained 76% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in feedback seeking and correctly classified 59.4% of cases. Again, the only significant predictor in the model, however, was self-negative feedback seeking tendencies (B = .52, Wald = 5.93, p < .05). Those that had a higher tendency to seek self-negative feedback were 1.68 times more likely to seek self-negative feedback. No significant tendency predictors were found for those that sought other-related feedback. Table 4 presents the b-weights for the binomial logistic regression for each feedback-seeking behavior and tendencies. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported, but one important piece emerged as predicted.

Table 4

Logistic Regression Predicting Feedback-Seeking Behavior based on Feedback-Seeking

Tendencies in Study 1

	_	В	SE	Wald	df	р	Odds Ratio	95% CI for	Odds Ratio
								Lower	Upper
Salf Desitive	SP FBST	0.081	0.231	0.122	1	0.727	1.084	0.689	1.705
Eadhaal	SN FBST	-0.453	0.203	4.974	1	0.026	0.636	0.427	0.947
Feedback Societing (N	OP FBST	0.107	0.299	0.128	1	0.72	1.113	0.619	2.001
Seeking (N	ON FBST	0.059	0.262	0.05	1	0.822	1.061	0.635	1.772
= 30)	Constant	-0.107	0.83	0.017	1	0.898	0.899		
Self	SP FBST	-0.032	0.238	0.018	1	0.893	0.968	0.607	1.545
Negative	SN FBST	0.517	0.212	5.937	1	0.015	1.678	1.106	2.544
Feedback	OP FBST	-0.107	0.29	0.136	1	0.712	0.899	0.509	1.586
Seeking (N	ON FBST	-0.034	0.258	0.017	1	0.896	0.967	0.583	1.603
= 82)	Constant	-2.08	0.872	5.687	1	0.017	0.125		
Other	SP FBST	-0.174	0.248	0.494	1	0.482	0.84	0.517	1.366
Positive	SN FBST	-0.169	0.218	0.596	1	0.44	0.845	0.551	1.296
Feedback	OP FBST	0.232	0.328	0.499	1	0.48	1.261	0.663	2.4
Seeking (N	ON FBST	0.035	0.288	0.015	1	0.903	1.036	0.589	1.821
= 42)	Constant	-1.075	0.931	1.333	1	0.248	0.341		
Other	SP FBST	0.228	0.335	0.461	1	0.497	1.256	0.651	2.423
Negative	SN FBST	0.128	0.278	0.213	1	0.644	1.137	0.659	1.961
Feedback	OP FBST	-0.349	0.39	0.802	1	0.37	0.705	0.329	1.514
Seeking (N	ON FBST	-0.116	0.346	0.112	1	0.738	0.89	0.452	1.755
= 27)	Constant	-1.281	1.032	1.541	1	0.214	0.278		

Note: SP FBST = Self-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency, SN FBST = Self-Negative Feedback-Seeking Tendency, OP FBST = Other-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency, ON FBST = Other-Negative Feedback-Seeking Tendency

Summary of Study 1 Results

Having a tendency to seek self-negative feedback significantly predicts self-negative feedback seeking. Additionally, those who have a self-negative feedback-seeking tendency are significantly less likely to seek self-positive feedback. Thus, it may be that a self-negative feedback-seeking tendency predicts the seeking of self-related feedback in general. No other tendency predicted the associated feedback-seeking behavior, but this may be due to the smaller n-sizes for those that sought other-positive and other-negative feedback. These small n-sizes make it difficult to run a logistic regression with given the lack of power. Additionally, this study only had one feedback-seeking opportunity directly after tendencies were measured. Although this makes it more surprising that tendencies didn't have an association with feedback seeking, it is likely that other factors play into such a dynamic process. To further probe the role tendencies play in the feedback-seeking process, Study 2 was conducted and includes individual difference variables and multiple feedback-seeking episodes.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY 2

Methods

Participants

Data were collected from psychology students working on their undergraduate degree at a Midwestern University. An online survey and a laboratory experimental design were used for Study 2. The desired number of participants was based on a power analysis done in G*Power and revealed that approximately 180-200 participant responses should be collected, with 45-50 in each condition. Because G*Power does not accommodate complex models, the analysis was done in an analysis of covariance framework, where the independent variable is categorical while controlling for other continuous variables. In addition, literature of best practices for power analyses for mediation were reviewed (Fritz & McKinnon, 2007).

A total of 198 participants completed the online survey and experimental design. Participants were predominantly Caucasian (68.2%, 16.7% Black or African American, 5.1% Asian or Asian American, 8.5% two or more races, and 1.5% other) and female (69.2%, 29.3% male, 1% other, and .5% did not disclose). The mean age of participants was 20, and ranged from 18 to 59 (92.4% were 18-24, 3% were 25-30, 2% were 31-40, 1% were 41-50, 1% were 60 or older, and .6% did not disclose). The majority of participants had completed some college (82.3%, 15.2% completed high school or received their GED, 1.5% received their BA/BS, and 1% received their MA/MS). Lastly, the majority of participants were students and employed part time (57.5%, 37.9% student only, 4.6% students employed full time).

Procedure

Study 2 consisted of a series of surveys (Appendix B) and a laboratory experiment that uses the same narrative evaluation task as Study 1 (Appendix D). For an experimenter laboratory script, see Appendix C. Participants first filled out a series of online surveys that included the demographic information, feedback seeking tendencies, and the individual difference measures of feedback orientation. The surveys for the individual differences of empathy and IPT were completed throughout the laboratory experiment. During participation in the laboratory study, individuals completed the same feedback assessment task from Study 1. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of four conditions. They wrote the feedback narrative with the same details given to them as in Study 1, but instead of asking them to seek feedback, they were given one of the four types of feedback after they wrote their narrative review. Participants were told the feedback they received was from one of many Faculty experts working with the fictional company. This served as the four-level feedback condition manipulation. Feedback was provided to each participant that was categorized as one of the four conditions of feedback type discussed previously. Participants received the feedback electronically (via email) once they completed the narrative evaluation task. The laboratory instructor was responsible for sending a pre-written feedback response via email based on the condition.

After participants received the feedback, overall reactions to the feedback was measured. Participants were then told to complete a second similar task with a different focal employee and work group. They were also told that there would be a third task after that. After they completed the second task, they were asked to choose from whom they wanted more feedback. They were to choose feedback from one of four new experts that were known to each give one of the four types and participants were asked to choose from one of them. They were not given the option to not seek feedback. The reason for using four new experts was to eliminate the possibility of the participant choosing a different expert simply for new information from a new person. Instead, with four new experts, the participant was choosing based on the feedback the experts tend to give as opposed to the experts themselves. In other words, participants received a brief biography of four new experts so that even choosing the same type of feedback they were assigned in task 1 would still be from a different expert. This served as the measurement of change in feedback-seeking tendencies. Once participants chose which type of feedback, they wanted to receive based on their performance on the second task, the experiment ended. Participant were debriefed and any questions were answered. For a visual depiction of the process flow of Study 2, see Figure 4.

Figure 4

Study 2 Process Flow Diagram



Measures

The measures listed and explained below were used in an online survey portion and the laboratory experiment of Study 2. There is some overlap from Study 1. For a summary of when each measure was collected, see Table 5. For a list of all measures, sources, and corresponding items, see Appendix B.

Demographic Information

Participants completed a basic demographic questionnaire that consisted of questions assessing age, race and ethnicity, gender, and employment status.

Feedback Tendencies

The same 24-item measure from Study 1 assessing individual's tendencies to prefer one or more of the established four types of feedback was used to assess tendencies in Study 2. All participants received a score for each tendency. These are averaged separately as opposed to a composite score (α (self-negative) = .83; α (self-positive) = .83; α (other-negative) = .87; α (other-positive) = .85).

Feedback Reactions

Consistent with previous research, reactions to feedback was measured as a latent construct, with reflective indicators including satisfaction, utility, accuracy, and fairness/justice, and motivation to use the feedback (Keeping & Levy, 2000; Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004). The scale to assess these factors was adapted and modified using Keeping and Levy's (2000) work, with the addition of motivation to use feedback from Steelman & Rotkowski (2004). Reliability for the composite scale was above the standard cutoff ($\alpha = .90$).
Feedback Orientation

Feedback Orientation was assessed using the scale developed by Linderbaum and Levy (2010). This scale has 20 items and consists of four dimensions including utility (5 items), accountability (5 items), social awareness (5 items), and feedback self-efficacy (5 items). Items are rated on a five-point likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). All items were combined to create a composite score ($\alpha = .88$).

Empathy

Empathy was measured through the 28-item Interpersonal reactivity index developed by Davis (1980). This scale consists of four subscales assessing a specific aspect of empathy including fantasy, perspective taking, empathic concern, and personal distress. Items are rated on a 5-point likert scale ranging from 0 (does not describe me well at all) to 4 (describes me very well). All items were combined to create a composite empathy score ($\alpha = .83$).

Growth Mindset (Implicit Person Theory)

IPT was assessed using the scale by Levy and Dweck (1997) that consists of eight items rated on a six-point likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). There are four items assessing incremental IPT and four items assessing entity IPT. In order to create a more parsimonious and reliable scale, all entity items were reverse coded to create an overall growth mindset score where higher scores indicate a growth mindset and lower scored indicate a fixed mindset ($\alpha = .86$).

Feedback-Seeking Behavior

Feedback seeking was measured by asking participants to make a choice of which type of feedback they would like after receiving one of the four types of feedback after

the first task. Measuring feedback-seeking behavior occurred after the second task, in preparation for an expected third task. While Gong et al.'s (2017) typology uses both inquiry and monitoring when measuring feedback seeking, the feedback-seeking behavior assessed in Study 2 was only measured using direct inquiry (i.e., asking for a certain type of feedback). Participants chose one of the four types of feedback after receiving one of the four types initially. Thus, change in feedback-seeking behavior was assessed by a two-level categorical variable where 0 = no change and 1 = a change from the feedback they originally received. Due to the nature of this hypothesis and it being a first step in measuring changes in feedback seeking over multiple episodes, Study 2 did not determine which feedback type participants' preferences change to, but just if there was a change in general. Hypothesizing the specific change was therefore outside the scope of this study.

Control Variables

Due to empirical findings and the nature of the experimental procedures, gender was also measured and controlled for in the analyses that included empathy. This is due to past literature suggesting that women tend to be higher on the empathy scale than men.

Measure	Source	Study	Time
			Collected
Feedback-Seeking	Gong et al. (2017)	Study 1 & Study 2	Online
Tendencies			
Feedback Seeking	Created	Study 1	Online
Feedback	Adapted from Keeping	Study 2	Lab
Reactions	& Levy (2000) &		
	Steelman & Rutkowski		
	(2004)		
Feedback	Linderbaum & Levy	Study 2	Online
Orientation	(2010)		
Empathy	Davis (1980)	Study 2	Online
Change in	Created	Study 2	Lab
Feedback-Seeking			
Behavior			
IPT	Levy & Dweck (1997)	Study 2	Online

Summary of Measures and corresponding times when collected

Results

Data Screening

A total number of 568 individuals completed the pre-laboratory survey and a total number of 211 participants completed the laboratory experiment. This resulted in 211 matched cases of participants that completed all surveys and tasks. Eleven participants were removed from the dataset based on the research log that indicated when participants were not paying attention, deviated from the lab protocol, or did not follow directions. Additionally, univariate outliers were observed, using recommendations from Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) of looking at Z-scores on all predictor variables greater than 3.29 and two individuals were removed from the dataset. Multivariate outliers were explored using Cook's D. No individual had a score higher than 1.00. Therefore, no other participants

were removed from the dataset. After these screens, the total n-size was 198 for the laboratory experiment.

A series of univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were then conducted as a check to determine if the manipulation was effective. More specifically, results from a series of one-way ANOVAs were used to determine if the type of feedback received in each condition was perceived to be the correct feedback type (self-positive, self-negative, other-positive, other-negative). All participants completed a 4-item scale with 1 item asking about each type of feedback. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed, on a 5-point scale, if the feedback was focused more on (1) aspects that he or she did well, (2) aspects that he or she did wrong, (3) aspects about others who performed the task and did well, and (4) aspects about others who performed the task and did wrong. Results indicate that all feedback types were perceived to be significantly different for each condition (See Table 6). Multiple comparisons and post hoc analyses revealed that the mean for the item assessing self-positive feedback was significantly higher for those that received self-positive feedback (M = 3.74) than those that received self-negative (M= 1.70), other-positive (M = 2.31), or other-negative (M = 2.19) feedback (F = 48.42, p < 100.001). The mean for the item assessing self-negative feedback was significantly higher for those that received the self-negative feedback (M = 4.30) than the mean for this item for those that received self-positive (M = 2.50), other-positive (M = 3.19), or other-negative (M = 3.44) feedback (F = 24.46, p < .001). The mean for the item assessing other-positive feedback was significantly higher for those who received other-positive feedback (M =3.96) compared to those who received self-positive (M = 2.12), self-negative (M = 1.91), or other-negative (M = 2.41) feedback (F = 39.26, p < .001). Lastly, the mean for the item assessing other-negative feedback was significantly higher for those who received othernegative feedback (M = 3.85) compared to the mean for those that received self-positive (M = 2.06), self-negative (M = 1.93), or other-positive (M = 2.58) feedback (F = 38.90, p< .001). Based on these results, it appears that the feedback conditions were perceived to be portraying each of the four types of feedback accurately.

Table 6

One-Way ANOVA manipulation check results

	Sum of		Mean		
	Squares	df	Square	F	р
The feedback I received was more focused on the things I did wrong in my narrative evaluation.	79.76	3	26.59	24.46	0.00
The feedback I received was more focused on the things I did well in my narrative evaluation.	113.68	3	37.89	48.42	0.00
The feedback I received was more focused on the things that others who performed this task did	119.15	3	39.72	38.89	0.00
The feedback I received was more focused on the things that others who performed this task did well.	123.79	3	41.26	39.26	0.00

Note: N = 198.

Analytic Strategy

A chi-square was run to test Hypothesis 1 in Study 2. Hypothesis 2 was tested using a one-way ANOVA to determine if there are significant differences in reactions for each of the four feedback seeking types. Mean differences and post hoc analyses were observed to determine the favorability of reactions to each type of feedback. Hypothesis 6 was tested using a bivariate correlation at the p < .05 level of significance and a simple regression in order to determine a relationship between feedback reactions and change in feedback-seeking behavior. Once direct relationships were tested, the remaining hypotheses (H3, H4, H5, H7, and H8) were tested using multiple regression analysis and Hayes' PROCESS macro for SPSS. More specifically, Models 4 (See Figure 7) and 1 (See Figure 6) were used to test for mediation and moderating effects.

Primary Analyses

Descriptives and Frequencies

Prior to testing each hypothesis, basic descriptives and frequencies were calculated to assess the data. Participants were randomly assigned 1 of 4 conditions, where 25.3% received self-positive feedback, 23.2% received self-negative feedback, 24.2% received other-positive feedback, and 27.3% received other-negative feedback. Table 7 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients of the variables of interest. Correlational relationships that are noteworthy include a significant relationship between feedback orientation and all feedback seeking tendencies ($r_{(SP)} = .40$, p < .001; $r_{(SN)} = .42$, p < .001; $r_{(OP)} = .30$, p < .001; $r_{(ON)} = .18$, p < .001). Additionally, feedback orientation was significantly related to feedback reactions (r = .18, p < .05). Unsurprisingly, empathy was significantly related to gender (r = .43, p < .001) in addition to feedback reactions (r = .23, p < .01). Lastly, negative feedback seeking tendencies was significantly related to feedback seeking (r = .14, p = .05). No other tendencies were related to feedback seeking (See Table 7).

Correlational Analyses and alpha levels for Variables of Interest in Study 2

		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	FB													
1	Condition													
2	Feedback			-0.10										
_	Seeking			0.40**	0.05									
3	FBS			0.19	-0.05									
	Change	2.02	0.71	0.22**	20**	0.00	0.00							
4	FB Departience	3.92	0.71	-0.33	.20	-0.09	0.90							
_	Reactions			0.06	0.01	0.04	1.0*	0.00						
5	FO	4.12	0.43	-0.06	-0.01	-0.04	.18	0.99						
6	SP FBST	4.98	1.02	-0.06	0.09	-0.03	0.04	$.40^{**}$	0.83					
7	SN FBST	4.68	1.12	-0.07	0.14^{*}	-0.15*	0.12	0.42^{**}	0.50^{**}	0.83				
Q	OD ED ST	5.01	1.04	-0.10	0.04	-0.08	-0.03	0.30**	0.55**	0.43**	0.85			
0	OF FBS1	5.01	1.04					0.40*	o **	o**	**			
9	ON FBST	4.64	1.15	-0.02	0.06	-0.05	0.02	0.18*	0.44	0.41	.732**	0.86		
10	Empathy	3.58	0.44	-0.12	0.03	-0.13	0.23**	0.01	0.08	-0.08	0.03	-0.07	0.83	
11	Growth Mindset	4.00	0.84	-0.09	0.08	-0.09	0.07	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.11	0.07	0.06	0.86
12	Gender			-0.06	0.00	-0.05	0.10	-0.08	-0.01	-0.09	0.00	-0.04	0.43**	-0.12

Note: FB Condition = Feedback condition; FBS Change = Feedback seeking change; FB Reactions = Feedback Reactions; FO = Feedback Orientation; SP FBST = Self-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency; SN FBST = Self-Negative Feedback Seeking Tendency; OP FBST = Other-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency; ON FBST = Other-Negative Feedback-Seeking Tendency; **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Feedback-Seeking Tendencies and Feedback Seeking

The same analysis was run using the Study 2 data to test Hypothesis 1. Chi square results are consistent with Study 1. As seen in Table 8, there is no significant pattern between all feedback-seeking tendencies overall and feedback seeking behavior ($\chi^2 = 15.85$, p = .20).

Table 8

Feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior crosstabulation

	Feedback Seeking Dominant Tendency									-	
								Other			-
	Т	otal	Self	Positive	Self	Negative	P	ositive	0	ther Negat	tive
	n =	= 167	n	= 62	1	n = 34	1	n = 54		n = 17	
Feedback											
Seeking	п	%	п	%	n	%	п	%	п	%	$X^2(df)$
Self Positive	39	23.35%	10	16.10%	7	20.60%	18	33.30%	4	23.50%	15.85
Self Negative	106	63.47%	45	72.60%	21	61.80%	30	55.60%	10	58.80%	(12)
Other Positive	18	10.78%	5	8.10%	6	17.60%	6	11.10%	1	5.90%	p =.20
Other Negative	4	2.40%	2	3.20%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11.80%	

Note: 31 people have two or more dominant tendencies, so were removed from this analysis.

Feedback Received and Feedback Reactions

Hypothesis 2 states that there will be a significant difference in reactions to each type of feedback such that (a) reactions to self-positive feedback are expected to be highly favorable, (b) reactions to self-negative feedback will be moderately favorable, (c) reactions to other-positive feedback will be neutral, and (d) reactions to other-negative feedback will be the least favorable. A one-way ANOVA was run to determine if reactions significantly differed based on the feedback received. Results indicate that there was a significant difference in reactions (F = 15.69, p < .001) for those who received self-positive feedback (M = 4.45) and those who received self-negative (M = 3.68), other

positive (M = 3.79), and other negative feedback (M = 3.73). There were no significant differences in reactions between those who received self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative feedback. Post-hoc analyses showed that reactions to self-positive feedback were significantly different from reactions to all other types of feedback and were the most favorable (See Table 9 for the One-Way ANOVA results and Table 10 for Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons). Other-related feedback reactions were more neutral than positive, as anticipated and reactions to self-negative were the lowest, even though they were not statistically different. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Table 9

One-Way ANOVA Testing Feedback Reactions Differences by Feedback Condition

Feedback Condition	Ν	Rxs Mean	SD	SE	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	р
Self Positive	50	4.45	0.39	0.05					
Self Negative	46	3.68	0.72	0.11					
Other Positive	48	3.79	0.60	0.09	19.60	3.00	6 53	15 69	0.00
Other	54	3.73	0.79	0.11	17.00	5.00	0.55	15.07	0.00
Negative									
Total	198	3.92	0.71	0.05					

Note: Rxs = Feedback Reactions

Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons Between Feedback Reactions based on Feedback

Condition

					95% Confide	nce Interval
		Mean Difference	SE	р	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Self	Self Negative	.77*	0.13	0.00	0.43	1.12
Positive	Other Positive	.66*	0.13	0.00	0.32	1.00
	Other Negative	.72*	0.13	0.00	0.39	1.05
Self	Self Positive	-0.77	0.13	0.00	-1.12	-0.43
Negative	Other Positive	-0.11	0.13	0.84	-0.46	0.23
	Other Negative	-0.05	0.13	0.98	-0.39	0.28
Other	Self Positive	-0.66	0.13	0.00	-1.00	-0.32
Positive	Self Negative	0.11	0.13	0.84	-0.23	0.46
	Other Negative	0.06	0.13	0.97	-0.27	0.39
Other	Self Positive	-0.72	0.13	0.00	-1.05	-0.39
Negative	Self Negative	0.05	0.13	0.98	-0.28	0.39
	Other Positive	-0.06	0.13	0.97	-0.39	0.27

Note: N = 198; * The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Moderating Effects

In order to test Hypothesis 3, 4, 5, and 8, moderation analyses were run. Analyses are organized by individual difference variables and their respective hypotheses below.

Feedback Orientation. Hypothesis 3 evaluates feedback orientation as a

moderator of the relationship between feedback received and feedback reactions. Specifically, it was anticipated that feedback reactions would be more positive for those with a high feedback orientation, regardless of the type. Conversely, for those with a low feedback orientation, reactions should be more negative to all feedback types except for self-positive feedback. As a first step, a simple regression analysis was run and shows that both feedback orientation ($\beta = .27, p < .05$) and feedback received (i.e., condition) ($\beta = -.20, p < .001$) significantly predicted reactions (See Table 11).

Table 11

Regression Coefficients for Feedback Orientation and Feedback Condition Predicting

Feedback Reactions

	В	SE	t	р				
Constant	3.30	0.47	6.97	0.00				
FB Cond	0.27	0.11	2.47	0.01				
FO	-0.20	0.04	-4.78	0.00				
	$R^2 = .14$							
	<i>F</i> (2,195) = 15.20, <i>p</i> <.01							

Note: N = 198; DV = Feedback Reactions; FB Cond = Feedback Condition; FO = Feedback Orientation

To test for an interaction between feedback received and feedback orientation, a moderation analysis was run using Model 1 in PROCESS to estimate the interactive effects of feedback condition (*X*) and feedback orientation (*M*) on feedback reactions (*Y*; See Figure 6). Because feedback received was a 4-level categorical variable, dummy coding techniques were used based on Hayes' (2017) protocol in which an interaction term was created for each of the levels of the categorical variable with self-positive feedback as the reference condition. However, as seen in Table 12, there was no significant interaction between feedback received and feedback orientation on reactions, F(7,190) = 8.45, p = .24. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Regression results for the moderation of feedback orientation on feedback type and

reactions

	В	SE	t	р			
Constant	3.77	0.94	3.99	0.00			
SN FB	0.18	1.32	0.13	0.89			
OP FB	-1.35	1.25	-1.08	0.28			
ON FB	-2.17	1.24	-1.75	0.08			
FO	0.17	0.23	0.73	0.47			
SN FB*FO	-0.23	0.32	-0.72	0.47			
OP FB*FO	0.17	0.30	0.56	0.57			
ON							
FB*FO	0.36	0.30	1.19	0.23			
	$R^2 = .24, p < .01$						
		F(7,190) =	8.45, <i>p</i> <.0	1			

Note: N = 198; SN FB = Self Negative Feedback; OP FB = Other Positive Feedback; ON FB = Other Negative Feedback; FO = Feedback Orientation; Feedback Condition was dummy coded with the compare group as Self Positive Feedback

Empathy. Hypothesis 4 states that empathy would moderate the relationship between other-focused feedback and reactions such that for those with low empathy, there should be no relationship between other-related feedback and feedback reactions. As a first step, a simple regression analysis shows that both empathy ($\beta = .32$, p < .01) and feedback condition ($\beta = -.20$, p < .001) significantly predicted reactions (See Table 13).

Regression Coefficients for Empathy and Feedback Condition Predicting Feedback

Reactions

	В	SE	t	р				
Constant	3.26	0.42	7.81	0.00				
FB Cond	-0.19	0.04	-4.56	0.00				
Empathy	0.32	0.11	2.93	0.00				
	$R^2 = .15$							
	F(2,195) = 16.61, p < .01							

Note: N = 198; DV = Feedback Reactions; FB Cond = Feedback Condition.

To test for an interaction between other-related feedback received and empathy on feedback reactions, a moderation analysis was run using Model 1 in PROCESS to estimate the interactive effects of feedback condition (*X*) and empathy (*M*) on feedback reactions (*Y*; See Figure 6). Results in Table 14 reveal no significant interaction between empathy and other-related feedback ($\beta_{other feedback*empathy} = .12, p = .69$). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Regression results for the moderation of empathy on other-related feedback type and

reactions

	В	SE	t	р			
Constant	4.68	1.70	2.75	0.007			
FB Cond	-1.21	1.10	1.11	0.27			
Empathy	0.16	0.46	0.34	0.74			
FB Cond*							
Empathy	0.12	0.30	0.41	0.68			
Gender	-0.01	0.14	-0.10	0.92			
	$R^2 = .35, p < .01$						
	<i>F</i> (4,90) = 12.29, <i>p</i> <.01						

Note: N = 95; FB Cond = Feedback condition; Feedback condition was dichotomized to reflect only self-negative and self-positive feedback.

Hypothesis 5 states that empathy would moderate the relationship between selffocused feedback and reactions such that for those with high empathy, there will be a positive relationship between self-related feedback and reactions. For those with low empathy, the relationship between self-related feedback and reactions will be negative. To test for this interaction between self-related feedback received and empathy, another multiple regression moderation analysis was run using Model 1 in PROCESS to estimate the interactive effects of feedback condition (*X*) and empathy (*M*) on feedback reactions (*Y*; See Figure 6). Results in Table 15 reveal that Hypothesis 5 was not supported. There is no significant interaction between empathy and self-related feedback ($\beta_{self feedback*empathy}$ = .24, *p* = .42).

Regression results for the moderation of empathy on self-related feedback type and

reactions

	В	SE	t	р			
Constant	3.96	1.65	2.40	0.02			
FB Cond	-0.91	1.04	-0.88	0.38			
Empathy	0.03	0.46	0.06	0.95			
FB Cond*							
Empathy	0.25	0.29	0.86	0.39			
Gender	-0.15	0.17	-0.92	0.36			
	$R^2 = .65, p = .16$						
	F(4,97) = 1.68, p = .16						

Note: N = 102; FB Cond = Feedback condition; Feedback condition was dichotomized to reflect only other negative and other positive feedback.

Implicit Person Theory. Hypothesis 8 states that IPT would moderate the relationship between feedback reactions and a change in feedback-seeking behavior such that for those with an incremental mindset, negative feedback reactions would lead to a change in feedback seeking, but for those with an entitist mindset, there would be no relationship between feedback reactions and a change in feedback-seeking behavior. To create a more parsimonious scale, all entity items were reverse coded and the IPT scale was converted into a growth/fixed mindset scale. Correlational analyses showed that a growth mindset is not significantly related to feedback seeking in general (r = .08, p = .28) or a change in feedback-seeking behavior (r = -.09, p = .19. To test for an interaction between growth mindset and feedback reactions, a multiple regression moderation analysis was run using Model 1 in PROCESS (Figure 6). As can be seen in Table 16, there was no significant interaction between feedback reactions and growth mindset on change in feedback-seeking behavior. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

Regression results for the moderation of mindset on reactions and change in feedback

seeking

	В	SE	Ζ	р
Constant	4.31	6.43	0.67	0.500
Growth Mindset Feedback	-0.35	1.61	-0.22	0.83
Reactions	-0.39	1.55	-0.25	0.80
Growth Mindset*Feedback				
Reactions	0.02	0.39	0.04	0.97

Note: N = 198; R2 and F values not generated because change in feedback-seeking behavior is a dichotomous variable. Results of DV are presented in a log odds ratio.

Feedback Reactions and Feedback Seeking

Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be a negative relationship between reactions to feedback and a change in the type of feedback that is sought in the future. A binomial correlational analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between feedback reactions and a change in feedback-seeking behavior (r = -.09, p = .23). However, change in feedback-seeking behavior is a dichotomous variable, so to further probe this hypothesis, a logistic regression was run to determine if people change their feedback seeking behavior based on their reactions to the feedback they previously received. Results of a binomial logistic regression show that there was no relationship between, there was one case with a standardized residual value of -3.33 standard deviations that was removed from the analyses. A second logistic regression was run after removing this individual. As can be seen in Table 17, feedback reactions do not significantly predict a change in feedback seeking, even though the p-value is approaching significance. The

logistic regression model was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 3.46$, p = .063). Thus,

Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Table 17

Logistic Regression Predicting a Change in Feedback-Seeking

Behavior based on Feedback Reactions

	В	SE	Wald	df	р	χ 2 (df)
FB Reactions	-0.56	0.32	3.14	1.00	0.08	3.46 (1)
Constant	3.85	1.31	8.67	1.00	0.00	p = .063
<i>Note:</i> N = 198.						

Mediating Effects

To test the effect of feedback condition on a change in feedback-seeking behavior through feedback reactions (Hypothesis 7), Model 4 in PROCESS was run (See Figure 7). Because feedback received was a 4-level categorical variable, dummy coding techniques were used again based on Hayes' (2017) protocol in which 3 dummy vectors were created to describe the four dichotomous variables using self-positive feedback as a reference (constant = 4.45, p <.001). This means that 3 a-paths were calculated comparing self-negative (a^1), other-positive (a^2), and other-negative (a^3) feedback to selfpositive feedback (constant). As can be seen in Figure 5, results of the three a-paths show that for a one-unit change in feedback condition (i.e., feedback that is different than selfpositive feedback), reactions decline. In other words, reactions drop in each feedback condition compared to those who received self-positive feedback. This is consistent with the results shown in Hypothesis 2. Reactions are higher for those who receive selfpositive feedback and when the feedback changes from self-positive feedback, reactions decrease. One indirect effect (b-path) is given, despite the independent variable being dummy coded. The b-path shows that there is a significant negative indirect effect of feedback given on change in feedback-seeking behavior through feedback reactions. This means that the more favorable individuals' reactions to the feedback received, the less likely they are to change the feedback they seek in a future feedback-seeking opportunity. The less favorable individuals' reactions are, the more likely they are to change the feedback they get the next time by seeking something different.

Figure 5

Mediation Results for Hypothesis 7



Note: a-path = feedback condition's effect on feedback reactions; b-path = feedback reactions direct effect on change in feedback-seeking behavior; c'-path – the direct effect of feedback condition on change in feedback-seeking behavior; c-path = total effect; a₁, c_1, c'_1 = self-negative feedback; a_2, c_2, c'_2 = other-positive feedback; a_3, c_3, c'_3 = other-negative feedback; self-positive feedback as reference.

As can be seen in Table 18, there is a direct main effect of self-negative feedback received predicting a change in feedback-seeking behavior (b = -3.61, CI₂₅: -5.03, -2.18). This is consistent with results from Hypothesis 1 and likely due to the large amount of participants who sought self-negative feedback when given the chance. Total effects were not calculated due to the dependent variable being a dichotomous variable (Change versus No Change) where 3 c-paths are generated. Because each unit change of feedback condition does not differ compared to self-positive, total effects do not give any further information. There is a significant indirect effect of feedback condition on change in feedback-seeking behavior through feedback reactions for self-negative feedback received (b = 1.01, CI₉₅: .34, 2.21), other-positive feedback received (b = .87, CI₉₅: .27, 1.98), and other-negative feedback received (b = .94, CI₉₅: .30, 2.22). In other words, feedback received indirectly influences a change in future feedback seeking through the effects of feedback reactions. Those who receive self-negative feedback are 1.01 times more likely to change their feedback-seeking behavior to something else compared to those who receive self-positive feedback. Those who received other-positive feedback are .87 times more likely to seek a different type of feedback compared to those who received self-positive. Lastly, those who received other-negative feedback are .94 times more likely to change their future feedback-seeking behavior compared to those who received self-positive. Overall, 82.8% of participants sought a different type of feedback from the original feedback they received as part of the manipulation. Thus, Hypothesis 7 was supported.

Bootstrap Results for the Indirect Effect, Direct Effect, and Total Effect for the relationship between feedback received (feedback condition) and feedback-seeking

behavior through feedback reactions. PROCESS Model 4

Change in Feedback Seeking Behavior

through Reactions

				95%	95%
		Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Direct Effect of Feedback Condition on	SN FB	-3.61	0.73	-5.03	-2.1
Change in Feedback Seeking Behavior	OP FB	-1.26	0.73	-2.69	0.1
	ON FB	14.03	427.69	-824.22	852.2
Total Effect of Feedback Condition on Change in Feedback Seeking Behavior	Total eff Feedbac negative	ects not calc k conditions feedback.	ulated with do not diffe	a dichotomoi er compared t	us DV. All o self-
Indirect Effect of Feedback Condition on	SN FB	1.01	0.48	0.34	2.2

-2.180.17 852.28

2.21

1.98

2.22

Note: N = 198; Feedback Condition dummy coded with Self-Positive Feedback as the compare group; Bootstrap set to 5,000; Indirect effect SE and 95% LLCI/ULCI are based on the normal theory of test; SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence interval; SN FB = Self-Negative Feedback; OP FB = Other-Positive Feedback; ON FB = Other-Negative Feedback. The 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effect are bootstrapped. Direct and indirect effects are on a logodds metric.

OP FB

ON FB

0.87

0.94

0.44

0.49

0.27

0.30

Summary of Study 2 Results

Overall, Study 2 revealed that individuals react more favorably to self-positive feedback, but still seek self-negative when given the choice. This is an encouraging finding and is consistent with empirical and theoretical literature, both academic and popular press. Individuals want feedback that helps them improve, and self-negative feedback is that type of constructive criticism. Additionally, this means that people are also seeking self-negative feedback, regardless of feedback-seeking tendencies.

Dominant tendencies did not match actual feedback-seeking behavior. This leaves room for further exploration of the typology created by Gong et al. (2017) and shows that this typology should not be measured or conceptualized as feedback-seeking behavior, but as an individual difference that may be prone to self-report error or some other artifact. Furthermore, feedback orientation and empathy do not interact with the type of feedback one receives to predict reactions but do add unique variance in predicting reactions to feedback. Incremental Person Theory/ Mindset also does not interact with feedback reactions to predict a change in future feedback-seeking behavior. Lastly, such reactions mediate the relationship between the feedback received and a change in future feedbackseeking behavior. For those that received self-positive feedback, reactions were the most favorable which led to individuals being less likely to seek a different type of feedback in the future, whereas reactions were lower for those who received self-negative, otherpositive, and other negative feedback and those less favorable reactions led to a higher likelihood that individuals would change their feedback-seeking behavior.

Study 1 and Study 2 Supplementary Analyses

Exploratory analyses were conducted to further explore the relationship between feedback-seeking tendencies, feedback reactions, feedback seeking, and individual differences. Multiple regression, and frequency data reveal a fuller picture of the results of Study 1 and Study 2. Thus, there are a few other findings that warrant discussion. First, basic descriptives show that in Study 1, the highest percentage of participants selfreported that their dominant feedback-seeking tendency was an other-positive (24.2%) or self-positive tendency (23.7%), whereas less people self-reported an other-negative tendency (18.8%) or self-negative tendency (11.1%). Additionally, 20.8% of participants

indicated they had two or more dominant tendencies. However, a large percentage of participants overall also sought self-negative feedback (39.60%). A similar pattern can be seen in Study 2. The highest percentage of participants self-reported that their dominant feedback-seeking tendency was either a self-positive tendency (31.3%) or an other-positive tendency (27.3%), whereas fewer participants reported self-negative tendencies (17.2%) or other-negative tendency (8.6%). A little over 15 percent reported two or more dominant tendencies (15.7%). Yet again, an overwhelming number of participants overall sought self-negative feedback (62.60%). See Table 19 for feedback seeking in both studies.

Table 19

Percentages of feedback-seeking behavior in Study 1 and Study 2

	Feedback Seeking Behavior									
	Self Positive Self Negative Other Positive Oth									
Lab (N = 198)	23.70%	62.60%	11.10%	2.50%						
Mturk (N = 207)	27.10%	39.60%	20.30%	13.00%						

Second, only 21.7% of participants sought feedback that matched their tendency, and 78.3% sought feedback that did not match their tendency in Study 1. Consistent with these results, 19.7% of participants sought feedback that was consistent with their dominant tendency and 80.3% of individuals sought feedback that did not match their dominant tendency in Study 2.

As can be seen in the Table 3, there was a significant relationship between feedback given and a change in feedback-seeking behavior (r = .19, p < .01). Given the fact that these are categorical and dichotomous variables, this correlation was further probed. To further probe the relationship between multiple feedback episodes, a chisquare analysis was run for Study 2 to test the relationship between feedback condition and feedback seeking. Results showed a significant relationship between feedback given and feedback sought ($\chi^2 = 24.16$, p < .01). This suggests a significant pattern between feedback received and future feedback-seeking behavior. In other words, the first feedback episode significantly influenced future feedback seeking in Study 2 (See Table 20).

Table 20

T 11 1	•	1 C	11 1	1.	1 1 •	. 1 1
Hoodhack	awon (nnd to a	odhack_sol	n n n d	hohawor	crosstabulation
reeunack	<i>eiven</i> i	inu iee	ะนาวนแห-งยะ	κ_{μ}	Denuvior	
	0					

	Feedback-Seeking Behavior									
		Self	Self Positive Self Negati		Negative	Other Positive		Other Negative		/e
	Total	1	n = 47	n = 124		n = 22		n = 5		
	n = 198	(23.7%)	(62.6%)		(11.1%)		(2.5%)		
Feedback										
Condition	п	п	%	п	%	п	%	п	%	χ 2 (<i>df</i>)
Self Positive	50	6	12.00%	40	80.00%	1	2.00%	3	6.00%	24.16
Self Negative	46	13	28.30%	25	54.30%	7	15.20%	1	2.20%	(9),
Other Positive	48	7	14.60%	33	68.80%	7	14.60%	1	2.10%	p < .01
Other Negative	54	21	38.90%	26	48%	7	13%	0	0.00%	

Third, given that individuals were removed in analyses due to having more than one dominant tendency, the current study explored the relationship between feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback seeking even further. A bivariate correlation was run where the self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies were left as continuous and feedback-seeking behavior was recoded into four dichotomous variables (1= sought feedback, 0 = did not seek feedback) for each of the four feedback types. As can be seen in Table 21, results did not reveal significant correlations for tendencies predicting the corresponding

feedback for any tendency besides self-negative. Consistent with Study 1 logistic

regression results, having a self-negative feedback-seeking tendency positively predicts

the seeking of self-negative feedback and negatively predicts the seeking of self-positive

feedback.

Table 21

Correlational Analyses for Feedback-Seeking Tendencies and Feedback-Seeking

Behavior

			Feedback Seeking Behavior							
	Mean	SD	Self Positive	Self Negative	Other Positive	Other Negative				
SP FBST	4.98	1.02	-0.11	0.12	-0.03	-0.02				
SN FBST	4.68	1.12	17*	.18*	-0.04	-0.01				
OP FBST	5.01	1.04	-0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.07				
ON FBST	4.64	1.15	-0.08	0.08	-0.02	0.02				

Note: N = 198; SP FBST = Self-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency; SN FBST = Self-Negative Feedback-Seeking Tendency; OP FBST = Other-Positive Feedback-Seeking Tendency; ON FBST = Other-Negative Feedback-Seeking Tendency; Feedback Seeking Variables are dichotomous where 0=did not seek and 1= sought feedback; **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Although Hypothesis 3, 4, and 5 were not supported and these individual differences did not interact with feedback type received, a multiple regression was run to determine the predictive ability of all variables separately in a model where feedback reactions were regressed on each individual difference. Results from the analysis revealed that feedback condition, feedback orientation, and empathy all uniquely predicted feedback reactions. The model with these individual differences and feedback given significantly predicted feedback reactions (F = 13.46, p < .001) and accounted for 17.2% of the variance in feedback reactions. Results can be seen in Table 22.

Regression Coefficients for the relationship between feedback reactions and the

	В	SE	t	р	F	\mathbb{R}^2
Constant	2.14	0.61	3.51	0.00	13.45	0.00
Feedback Condition	-0.18	0.04	-4.47	0.00		
Empathy	0.32	0.11	2.96	0.00		
FO	0.27	0.11	2.50	0.01		

individual differences of feedback orientation and empathy

Note: N = 198; DV = Feedback Reactions; FO = Feedback Orientation.

Lastly, to further explore why feedback-seeking tendencies did not lead to feedback-seeking behavior, an exploratory factor analysis was run with the 24 items from Gong et al.'s (2017) feedback seeking scale to test the a priori four-factor structure of Gong et al.'s (2017) scale. This was exploratory in nature given that this scale is newly developed. However, to further understand this scale, an exploratory factory analysis was also run on the 24 items capturing feedback-seeking tendencies. Recommendations from Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, and Strahan (1999), a series of exploratory factor analyses were run with various extraction and rotation methods. Using the Kaiser criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1 and a scree-plot visualization, 5 factors were interpretable. However, because it was developed as a four-factor model, a forced fourfactor model was run. The cleanest structure emerged from a Maximum Likelihood extraction and a Varimax rotation with a .3 suppression cutoff. Two factors emerged and loaded expected, indicating a self-negative tendency and self-positive tendency factor. The third and fourth factors are other-related feedback but have a mix of negative and positive other feedback and a few items cross loaded. The same analysis was done with Study 1 and Study 2 data and results were consistent across both datasets.

Figure 6

Conceptual diagram of Model 1 (Hayes, 2017)



Figure 7

Conceptual diagram of Model 4 (Hayes, 2017)



CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Past explorations of feedback seeking have measured it as a one-time only variable with little attention to the different qualitative forms in which feedback is provided. With calls from Ashford et al. (2016) and other scholars to better define the feedback-seeking process, the current studies took a first step in further exploring such a process. Ashford et al. (2016) stated that the measurement of feedback seeking is behind the conceptualization of it. The current studies took an approach in which both feedbackseeing tendencies and behavior were measured using four different qualitative types of feedback. In doing so, the current studies observed feedback seeking as a process with more than one feedback episode. Feedback does not occur one time only in ones' work, social experience, or day-to-day life. Inherent in feedback is the idea that past experience influences future performance by allowing individuals to use feedback to drive behavior. The current studies were aimed at contributing to the literature by exploring feedback in a dynamic way, including observing individual differences and multiple feedback episodes using the newly developed typology by Gong and colleagues (2017).

Summary of Results

In order to fully understand Gong et al.'s (2017) typology and how it adds to the feedback literature, two studies were carried out. As discussed in earlier sections, the two studies had four main goals. First, to examine the generalizability of Gong et al.'s (2017) typology in a new cultural context and to determine if these tendencies translate to actual behavior. The second goal was to explore this typology in relation to the feedback reaction literature by observing reactions to each type of feedback to determine if people react favorably to each. Third, the current studies sought to understand the role of individual differences in the feedback process with regards to Gong et al.'s typology. Fourth, the current studies examined feedback seeking as a dynamic, multiphase process where multiple chances for feedback occur.

Feedback Tendencies versus Feedback Behavior

The first goal was to explore whether or not Gong et al.'s (2017) typology of feedback-seeking tendencies actually translated into feedback-seeking behavior. This exploration was carried out in in Study 1 and retested in Study 2. It was predicted that those who self-reported a dominant tendency would be more likely to seek the feedback that matched their tendency. However, results found no such pattern, except for those who had a self-negative tendency. Having a self-negative feedback tendency significantly predicted the seeking of self-negative feedback and the lack of seeking self-positive feedback. No other feedback-seeking tendencies predicted feedback-seeking behavior. This may be due to the fact that a large number of participants overall sought selfnegative feedback. An important finding that will be discussed in further detail in later sections of this chapter. This also may have been influenced by the methods of the

current studies in which the option to not seek any feedback was not given. This will also be discussed as a limitation in the sections that follow.

What can be seen in Study 1 is the fact that feedback-seeking tendencies are not a proxy for feedback-seeking behavior. This typology developed by Gong and colleagues is fairly new and has only been tested in one study prior to the current studies. Thus, empirical findings are limited in terms of its generalizability. Previous literature does show evidence for the importance of different types of feedback leading to differential outcomes such as performance, effort, and future feedback seeking (e.g., Kim et al., 2010; Moore & Klien, 2008; Park et al., 2007; Zingoni & Byron, 217). However, with regards to feedback based on Gong et al.'s (2017) typology, the current study did not find any relationship between how feedback seeking tendencies were measured and actual feedback-seeking behavior. Gong et al. (2017) had participants self-report their feedbackseeking behavior using the scale that was created and validated within their studies. The language used had participants indicate what they "typically do". Thus, the current studies defined these as *tendencies* using Gong and colleagues' scale and then measured actual feedback-seeking behavior by having participants send emails asking for feedback. Results indicated that feedback-seeking tendencies defined by Studies 1 and 2, by and large, do not lead to feedback-seeking behavior matching those tendencies with only one exception. Having a self-negative tendency significantly predicts the seeking of selfnegative feedback and negatively predicts the seeking of self-positive feedback. This leaves room for future research to further explore this typology to determine if it should be used as a measure of feedback seeking, and if so, does a self-negative tendency carry much of the weight in predicting behavior. It would seem that having a self-reported

tendency to seek self-positive, other-positive, or other-negative feedback does not lead to feedback-seeking behavior that matches the tendency. This may be due to the fact that individuals value feedback that is diagnostic and about themselves, even if they do not report that they typically seek it. This is consistent with research that shows that individuals are more satisfied with and motivated to use and seek negative feedback if it is perceived as accurate (Steelman et al., 2004). Other research has shown that negative feedback is sought even in the face of self-consciousness because it provides clarity about a task or role (Levy et al., 1995). Even when it is perceived as costly (Ashford & Northcraft, 1992; Ashford et al., 2003), individuals are motivated to seek feedback regardless of the cost if that feedback can provide diagnostic information (i.e., negative feedback) that will help them improve (Hays & Williams, 2011). With this in mind, it may be that even though an individual self-reports a tendency (or perhaps a preference) of seeking one of the four types of feedback developed by Gong et al. (2017), when it comes time to actually seek feedback, the perceived value of self-negative is so high that these tendencies do not translate into behavior.

Feedback Reactions

In addition to testing the generalizability of Gong et al.'s feedback typology, the second goal of the current studies was to explore the typology by measuring reactions to each type of feedback. Because this typology is new, it was also important to determine if individuals even favor all four feedback types, and to what extent. Study 2 randomly assigned each type of feedback to participants after they completed a task and measured their reactions to each qualitative form of feedback from Gong et al. (2017). It was predicted that reactions would significantly differ for each feedback type and they would

be overall positive for self-related feedback and neutral for other-related feedback (Hypothesis 2). In line with what was expected, results showed that reactions were significantly higher for those who received self-positive feedback than any other type of feedback. These results are consistent with past literature (Anseel & Lievens, 2006; David, 2013; Ilgen et al., 1979). The extant literature has also shown that reactions are more favorable when feedback is relevant to the task or goal (Jawahar, 2010; Steelman et al., 2004). Contrary to what was predicted, reactions did not differ for those who received self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative feedback. In Study 2, all feedback was relevant to the task, but it may be that individuals did not find other-related feedback as relevant as information about themselves. However, this doesn't explain why selfnegative feedback reactions did not differ from other-related feedback reactions, but less favorable reactions did lead to a change in future feedback-seeking behavior. The current studies measured reactions as a latent construct and did not measure affective, cognitive, and behavioral reactions as distinct constructs. It could be that the reactions, which were measured as a latent construct, did not target all reactions possible and therefore reactions to self-negative feedback did not differ as expected. It might be that affective reactions are less favorable for self-related feedback, but cognitive and behavioral reactions are favorable. Further exploration into different kinds of reactions measured as separate constructs (affective, cognitive, and behavioral; Taylor et al., 1984) may provide more insight into this relationship.

The Role of Individual Differences

A third goal of the current studies was to understand the role of individual differences in the feedback process with relation to Gong et al.'s typology. More

specifically, Study 2 examined Feedback Orientation (FO; Hypothesis 3), empathy (Hypotheses 4 and 5), and growth mindset (Hypothesis 8) as moderators in this process. Previous literature has shown that having a high FO leads to more favorable reactions and feedback seeking (Linderbaum & Levy, 2010; Roberts et al., 2019). Additionally, empathy has been shown to lead to affective reactions to information about others (Davis, 1980; Davis, 1983). Therefore, it was predicted that both FO and empathy would interact with feedback given to predict reactions. For those with high FO, reactions were expected to be positive regardless of the type of feedback received, whereas for those with low FO, reactions were expected to be favorable for self-positive, less favorable for self-negative, and neutral for other-related feedback. It was anticipated that for those high in empathy, reactions to other-related feedback would be more favorable for other-positive and less favorable for other-negative and reactions to self-related feedback would be more favorable. For those low in empathy, reactions were expected to be more favorable for self-positive feedback only, less favorable for self-negative feedback, and neutral for other-related feedback. Results indicate that neither FO nor empathy significantly interacted with feedback received to predict reactions. However, when put in a model with feedback received, both FO and empathy did add unique variance in predicting feedback reactions on their own. This shows that these individual differences matter during the feedback process, especially with regard to how individuals react after receiving feedback. Both individual differences incrementally and positively predicted reactions. Those who have a high FO and are more empathic are more likely to react favorably to feedback.

Mindset did not play a role in any of the feedback process in Study 2. Previous research has indicated that those with a growth mindset are more likely to take strategic steps during challenging situations (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006) and seek feedback when demands outweigh their abilities (Devloo et al., 2011), whereas those with a fixed mindset are more likely to become helpless (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006). Based on these findings, it was expected that those with a growth mindset would be more likely to change their feedback-seeking behavior after experiencing unfavorable reactions. However, having a growth mindset did not interact with reactions to predict a change in feedback seeking nor did it add any unique variance on its own when put into a model with feedback reactions. Even though research has shown that those with a growth/incremental mindset are more likely than those with a fixed/entitist mindset to change their strategy in the face of conflict (Kammrath & Dweck, 2006), it may be that those with a growth mindset didn't see seeking a different type of feedback as a new strategy. It also might be the case that less favorable reactions were not negative enough to lead to those with a growth mindset to think they were in a challenging situation and therefore elicit a new strategic approach.

Feedback Given and Future Feedback Seeking

The fourth goal of the current studies was to explore feedback seeking as an intricate process in which there are multiple episodes of feedback. Study 2 was aimed at simulating a multiphase approach of performance and feedback where participants were expected to complete multiple tasks, receive feedback in between, and have the option of seeking more feedback after. This approach was employed to observe individuals in a controlled environment that more closely mirrored an actual applied context. Within an

employee's workday or work week, he or she is likely to encounter feedback opportunities more than once (Gregory & Levy, 2015), especially given the emphasis on the day-to-day feedback environment where feedback is meant to be given in a timely manner and consistently, as opposed to a formal meeting once a year (Steelman et al., 2004; Tseng & Levy, 2019). Feedback is meant to be a dynamic process (Ashford et al., 2016; Dahling & Whitaker, 2016; Steelman et al., 2004), which is why Study 2 took such an approach. It has also been shown that once someone receives feedback, an emotional component is likely to be seen (Taylor et al., 1984). After this occurs, it is doubtful the employee never has to seek or receive feedback again. Realistically, and shown empirically through control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1981), performance requires consistent feedback where one gauges and monitors how he or she is doing in order to improve (Taylor et al., 1984). Thus, feedback seeking that occurs after reactions was worth exploring.

As can be seen by Study 2 results, people react most favorably to self-positive feedback. This makes sense given that it is a form of praise and a job well done that is directed at the self as the target of feedback. However, when digging a bit deeper, results from the current studies also show that when it comes to actually seeking feedback, the majority of people choose self-negative. This is likely due to the fact that individuals can see that self-negative feedback is a form of diagnostic feedback, or constructive criticism; it will help them improve. Individuals are inherently driven to meet a goal, which therefore drives behavior (Diefendorff & Chandler, 2011) so it makes sense that more people seek feedback that would allow them to do so. Results from the current studies also indicate that feedback seeking doesn't necessarily follow a consistent pattern. It was

already noted that the type of feedback individuals report to favor doesn't translate into actual seeking behavior of that feedback type. Even though individuals react favorably to a certain type of feedback, it doesn't mean they will choose to seek that same type of feedback when given the chance.

Additionally, reactions to feedback mediate the relationship between feedback given and a change in feedback-seeking behavior such that the less favorably people react to feedback, the more likely they are to change their feedback-seeking strategy and pick a different type of feedback than what they received in the first place. More specifically, in Study 2, individuals reacted most favorably to self-positive feedback. For those who received feedback that was not self-positive, reactions became less favorable and these individuals were more likely to seek feedback that was different from the original feedback given. In other words, individuals favor positive feedback about themselves, and when they receive something other than self-positive feedback, they are more likely to seek a different type of feedback than what they originally received. It may be that they are changing strategies in order to improve, especially if they are seeking selfnegative feedback, which was also seen in the current studies.

Theoretical Implications

Results were expected to add to empirical research, theory, and organizational practice by providing a fuller understanding of the effects different types of feedback have on reactions and future feedback seeking. Even though there have been studies identified in previous chapters that distinguish between different qualitative forms of feedback, this is rarer than it should be in the literature. There has been a limited focus on both the preference individuals have for feedback in addition to the multiple forms

feedback can take, how people react to these forms, and their feedback-seeking behavior after a feedback event. Gong et al. (2017) took an important first step in conceptualizing people's typical feedback-seeking approach, which I've labeled as tendencies. These tendencies can take more than one form, but we need better measurement and operational definitions of the feedback-seeking process. The current studies were aimed at doing just that.

In Gong and colleagues' pivotal paper, they found that the four types of feedback were distinct from each other based on factor analysis, but to call it a measure of feedback-seeking behavior doesn't hold true based on the current results. Gong et al. (2017) measured feedback seeking by using self-reported items that used language such as "I typically seek". Due to this, the current studies identified Gong et al.'s scale as feedback-seeking *tendencies* as opposed to behavior. It may be that the actual measure of feedback-seeking tendencies isn't tapping tendencies at all, given the findings from the current studies. Perhaps it is measuring more of a preference for certain types of feedback in a perfect or even sterile world. When participants were asked to actually choose what type of feedback they wanted, the majority did not select the feedback that matched their tendencies or the feedback they were given during the first feedback event. It also may be that participants are self-reporting incorrectly the type of feedback they tend to seek. In a study done by Levy et al. (1995), the authors sought to understand the process of people who desire feedback, initially intend to seek it, but then reconsider and change their minds prior to actually seeking feedback. Individuals were asked about their feedbackseeking intent and then were given a choice to seek feedback. Depending on the feedback-seeking context (public, semi-private, or private), individuals reconsidered and
modified their feedback-seeking behavior to something different than their intent due to impression management and ego enhancement concerns (Levy et al., 1995). Based on these findings, it may be that individuals in the current studies say they tend to seek or prefer a certain type of feedback in order to make a positive impression or because they think it is what they should be doing in a perfect world, especially because feedbackseeking tendencies were self-reported (i.e., a private context). However, when it actually came time to seek feedback, these individuals could have reconsidered and modified what type of feedback they desired, leading to a large amount of people seeking the selfnegative feedback that would help them improve.

Another possibility is that the manipulation of self-negative feedback may not have been as strong the wording of self-negative items in Gong et al.'s (2017) scale. When participants were given the option to choose from whom they would like feedback, descriptions of experts and what type of feedback they will give were provided. It may be that the wording of the expert who gives self-negative feedback was more positive and constructive in nature as opposed to the language used in the self-reported tendency scales. Wanting "constructive criticism" from Dr. Rich may be different than asking about information that one "failed to perform" (See Appendix A for expert descriptions and Gong et al.'s scale), which might account for the large amount of individuals who sought self-negative feedback in both studies. Thus, the further exploration of why feedback-seeking tendencies and behaviors do not match is an important one to be fleshed out. Future research should examine more closely the difference between intent and behavior and what may affect the change between the two. Additionally, when using theory to explain feedback seeking based on this new typology, the distinction between

tendencies, preferences, and actual feedback-seeking behavior should be an important one, given the fact that tendencies did not translate into behavior in the current studies. Thus, researchers need to be careful when defining and measuring feedback seeking, taking special care to accurately capture feedback-seeking tendencies and behavior as separate and distinct constructs.

Another goal of the current studies was to test the generalizability of Gong et al.'s typology in a different context. Gong et al. (2017) collected their data and carried out their research in an Asian country using supervisor and self-report data. It is worth noting that cultural differences exist when comparing Asian countries to the United States. Thompson (2013) further showed that culture determines the type of performance information (i.e., feedback) individuals' value. Western countries such as the U.S. tend to be higher on individualism, a cultural dimension defined as valuing independence and autonomy, whereas Eastern countries such as China tend to be higher on collectivism that values the group as a whole and downplays individual goals and achievement (Hofstede, 1980). Early research has also shown that collectivist cultures are more averse to openly discussing the performance goals of individuals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), especially when there is a high-power distance between a feedback recipient and the source of feedback (Morrison, Chen, & Salgado, 2004). It would then make sense that collectivistic cultures, such as China, would be more likely to seek other-related feedback both from peers and supervisors to try and gather information about their own performance more so than those in the U.S. In comparing the distribution of individuals' dominant tendencies from the data provided by Gong et al. (2017) with the data from the current studies, little differences are seen in the distributions of tendencies. In fact, more people in the current

studies sought other-related feedback than those identified in Gong et al.'s (2017) data. In Study 1, 42.5% of individuals reported either a other-positive or other-negative feedbackseeking tendency and in Study 2, 51.5% of individuals reported an other-related feedback-seeking tendency whereas in Gong et al.'s (2017) data, only 29.9% reported having an other-related feedback-seeking tendency. However, it should be noted again that actual feedback-seeking behavior was not measured in Gong et al.'s study in the same way the current studies measured it, so it is unclear if the tendencies would translate to behavior in China even though they did not translate in a U.S. context. Gong and colleagues (2017) highlight that they collected their sample in a culture where independence is valued, and the performance of others is highlighted. This may make the actual seeking of other-related feedback more likely than what was found in the current studies. Therefore, future research is needed to compare the current study findings to a collectivistic culture with regard to actual feedback-seeking behavior. It is expected that results of this measure tapping feedback-seeking behavior may translate better in a collectivistic culture than an individualistic culture.

The current research also expands the literature on feedback reactions. Reactions typically are discussed within the context of performance management, and less in the feedback seeking literature. A main contribution of the current research is the finding that reactions motivate future behavior. Reactions play a critical role in the relationship between feedback received and feedback sought. Results from Study 2 suggest that reactions are significantly more favorable for self-positive feedback than self-negative, other-positive, and other-negative feedback. No other significant differences in reactions between self-negative, other-positive, other-negative feedback were found. When

reactions were less favorable for feedback that wasn't self-positive, individuals were more likely to seek feedback that was different than the original feedback they received. Past research has shown that positive reactions lead to motivation and future feedback seeking (Keeping & Levy, 2000; Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004). However, this wasn't exactly the case with the current research. The less favorable the reaction, the more likely individuals were to seek feedback that was different than what they received the first time. This can be supported by Affective Events Theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). In AET, events lead to affect which in turn leads to behavior. The current studies showed that the behavior affect elicits is specific to whether one experiences negative or positive affect. In other words, the less favorable the reactions (i.e., negative affect), the more likely people are to change their feedback-seeking strategy. This speaks to the idea that even though feedback elicits a reaction, past literature has looked at this with too narrow of a focus. Feedback should be conceptualized as a process that includes reactions and behavior based on those reactions. It is worth noting, again, that this typology of four different qualitative forms of feedback is fairly new and still remains underexplored. Because of this, participants were not given an option to not seek any feedback. The current study wanted to test whether tendencies lead to behavior, thus individuals had to choose one of the four types of feedback. Therefore, this change in feedback seeking after a less favorable reaction should be interpreted with caution. It is possible that participants didn't want feedback at all after a less favorable reaction, but since they had to choose one of the four types, they chose something different than what was previously given. Future research should explore whether the less favorable reactions from self-negative,

other-positive, and other negative feedback lead to the seeking of a new type of feedback or none at all.

Additionally, the exact motivation behind seeking feedback in the current studies remains unknown. While it has been discussed that feedback seeking is a motivational process, the exact motivation in the current studies remains unexplored. Results from the current study can rule out that mindset does not affect the motivation to seek feedback, but it is likely that other motivational variables such as goal orientation, impression management, or instrumental value placed on feedback play a role in predicting feedback seeking. Future research should identify and test motivational theories and ideas that may explain the motivational aspects that lead individuals seek feedback. It may be that individuals are motivated by social desirability, which leaves room for future research to measure and control for this type of motivation. Furthermore, Gong et al. (2017) tested goal orientation as an antecedent and found significant results that a mastery orientation leads to the seeking of self-negative feedback. While the current studies focused on the outcomes of this typology, more research is warranted on the antecedents of feedback seeking and self-reported feedback-seeking tendencies.

Practical Implications

Results from the current studies also have implications for organizational settings. The results showed that reactions were significantly more favorable for those who received self-positive people. Further, when reactions were less favorable, a change in future feedback-seeking behavior occurred. Furthermore, the majority of participants (62.6%) in Study 2 sought self-negative feedback and the highest percentage of individuals sought it in Study 1 (39.6%) as well. First, perhaps employees are not given

enough credit in the sense that they want self-negative feedback and may not be getting it due to many managers or other sources of feedback being uncomfortable giving it (Gregory & Levy, 2015). This has been seen in many popular press articles (e.g., Grayson Reigel, 2018; Hirsch, 2018; Zenger & Folkman, 2014). Grayson Reigel (2018) found in talking to her clients that she coaches, employees want negative feedback so that they can improve their performance, but when it comes to asking their managers for it, their managers tend to dismiss the request, deny that their employees need it, or delay giving it. She suggests that this may be due to managers being afraid to go against a certain cultural norm or because of fear that the employee will become emotional. Hirsh (2018) provides suggestions about how managers can deliver negative feedback because there is often a disconnect between what type of feedback employees want versus what they get, and they want feedback that helps them improve. In a study done by Zenger and Folkman (2014) at Harvard Business Review, the authors found that after assessing 899 employees globally, 57% of respondents said they preferred negative corrective feedback and 72% said that it would help them improve their performance, yet these same individuals responded negatively to giving corrective feedback. In other words, people want negative feedback but don't want to give it (Zenger & Folkman, 2014).

Research on performance management and rater motivation has shown that individual differences of raters (i.e., the source of feedback) influence ratings (Spence & Keeping, 2010). Ratings in performance management can go hand in hand with feedback, given that many managers must rate their employees' performance and provide feedback (Gregory & Levy, 2015). Ratings are most lenient (and thus can translate to providing feedback that is more focused on praise than constructive criticism) when the source does

not have domain specific knowledge, when the source does not have to justify his or her ratings, and when there are organizational norms for giving lenient ratings in place (Spence & Keeping, 2010). Furthermore, other research (Mero, Guidice, Brownlee, 2007) maintains that the accuracy of performance ratings increase when raters are held accountable. Thus, organizations should implement training programs that focus on providing negative/corrective feedback and make sure there are norms in place that encourage providing negative feedback by holding sources of feedback accountable to do so. Training aimed at individuals responsible for providing feedback should pull from the current research and the like in order to inform sources of feedback that employees desire constructive criticism, even if they react less favorably to it. Certainly, there is some irony in this state of affairs: we want negative feedback because we know it can help us improve and there are many secondary outcomes of performance improvement, but we don't really like it because it does highlight our weaknesses and threatens our ego.

In line with this, feedback interventions should also be aimed at providing the right type of feedback to individuals. Although future research is needed, the results of the current studies indicate that feedback interventions should include some type of self-negative feedback, regardless of feedback-seeking tendencies. With this, reactions should be taken into account. Anticipating reactions and making sure they lead to positive outcomes such as more feedback seeking is an important piece of the feedback process that organizations should consider. It is clear that self-negative feedback is the most diagnostic and leads to better performance (Gong et al., 2017), but individuals still may initially react less favorably to it. Because of this, sources of feedback should engage in feedback interventions that provide both positive feedback when it is deserved to increase

reactions, but also to engage in efforts to mitigate the less favorable reactions after receiving self-negative feedback. One suggestion would be to allow the recipient to engage in reflection strategies about the feedback at the task level (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996), which has been shown to lead to increased performance after the feedback (Anseel, Lievens, & Schollaert, 2009). Anseel et al. (2009) found that through dual processing theory, reflection strategies in combination with feedback improve future performance more than feedback by itself. This was especially true for individuals with a high need for cognition, a mastery orientation, and when the feedback can allow individuals to engage in a deeper learning after the corrective feedback is received in order for them to actually use the feedback to improve. Additionally, reflection is a relatively easy and cheap intervention for organizations to implement (Anseel et al., 2009).

Lastly, the role of individual differences within an organizational setting should not be discounted. Even though the current research did not find that individual differences such as FO and empathy interact with feedback received, they do add unique variance in predicting feedback reactions. Empathic individuals who value feedback react more favorably to it. Thus, organizations should consider how to increase employee's receptivity to feedback and empathy. However, there are important implications for how to handle those with low FO and low empathy. One idea is for organizations to implement training aimed at increasing FO by highlighting the value of feedback. Further, increasing empathy by investing in training that uses techniques allowing employees to think about situations from another perspective or point of view should be beneficial. Some empirical research suggests that feedback orientation changes with age

and experience (Wang et al., 2015). This suggests that there may be a place for organizational training where individuals are exposed to positive feedback events associated with positive outcomes to increase FO. Additionally, a recent meta-analysis has shown that empathy can be increased through training programs and it is especially effective for certain professions such as healthcare professionals and students, when trainees are compensated and using high quality measures (van Berkhout & Malouff, 2015). If organizations are to train empathy, objective measures that focus on understanding the emotions of others, feeling emotions, and communicating emotions should be used (van Berkhout & Malouff, 2015). Communications from organizations should include the value of FO and empathy, which suggests that cultural shifts may need to occur to encourage favorable reactions to feedback. This is important because both FO and empathy added unique variance in predicting positive reactions to feedback received. Engaging in active reflection strategies as suggested earlier (Anseel et al., 2009) should also facilitate receptivity to feedback and empathy.

Limitations and Future Directions

While the current studies make several contributions to the feedback seeking literature, it is important to note a few limitations. First, Study 1 was a cross-sectional design where feedback-seeking tendencies and feedback-seeking behavior were measured at one time. Thus, common-method bias/variance is a concern. However, recent literature by Spector (2019) suggests that we have been too concerned with common method bias and cross-sectional designs. Spector (2019) states that the ability to determine causality only from longitudinal data has been overstated. In fact, when comparing cross-sectional data with longitudinal data in a meta-analysis, there was no evidence of inflated relationships. Spector (2019) also highlights a few reasons for using a cross-sectional design and one of those is when working in a newly developed field – the current studies examined a very new feedback typology, which was very recently introduced and has received very little empirical examination. Further, Study 2 measured individual difference variables and feedback-seeking tendencies a few days to weeks prior to having individuals participate in the laboratory experiment where feedback-seeking behavior was measured. This was done so that individuals were not primed on the four types of feedback directly before they were to seek it in the laboratory experiment, thus providing additional controls for method variance (Spector, 2019).

Another limitation is the surprisingly results from the exploratory factor analysis that did not show a clean factor structure. However, the manipulation check in Study 2 showed each feedback condition was perceived to be portraying the corresponding feedback type from Gong et al.'s (2017) typology accurately. Thus, the current studies are not concerned with the validity of the measure in a controlled laboratory context. Given that this scale is a newly developed, further research is needed to validate the scale in multiple samples and contexts.

Additionally, when using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), there is a concern that participants will engage in insufficient effort responding, resulting in inflated data (Huang et al., 2015). However, data screening and requirements were placed on participants such as geographic location and HIT approval rates. Explicit instructions in addition to two attention checks were administered to all participants to reduce insufficient effort responding. Furthermore, Mturk participants are actually more

demographically diverse, with gender, race, and age being more representative of the general population than an American student or internet sample (Burhmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010), which is seen as a strength in Study 1.

In line with the current studies' sample, it is also possible that the outcomes would be different in a field study. As mentioned previously, there may be a context effect happening with the sample, especially in Study 2. Recent literature has found generational differences in feedback orientation (Wang et al., 2015). The same may be true for what types of feedback conversations certain generations are used to having. Given that study 2 consisted of college undergraduates, it may be that they are used to receiving constructive criticism (self-negative feedback) because that is the most common form of feedback in college courses. Another potential context effect may be due to the laboratory nature and the task required within the laboratory. The task was to write a short essay, a task college students are typically required to perform. Thus, potential demand characteristics of the laboratory setting may have affected results. Deception and manipulations checks were done to combat this, however future research should conduct a similar study in the field at an actual organization(s) where the tasks are what is required on the job. In doing so, a wider range of age, tenure, and task-related situations can be collected in addition to eliminating potential laboratory context effects.

Fourth, feedback-seeking behavior was only measured using direct inquiry as opposed to using both inquiry and monitoring. While the current research was more concerned about inquiry, there is a piece that is left out using self-report and inquiry alone. According to a meta-analysis done by Anseel et al., (2015), feedback seeking is an

aggregate model with monitoring and inquiry being distinct and important predictors of feedback seeking outcomes. For example, there is a curvilinear relationship between monitoring and uncertainty, but a negative linear relationship between inquiry and uncertainty (Anseel & Lievens, 2007). However, inquiry is also more notably related to increases in performance (Anseel et al., 2015). While Gong et al.'s (2017) measure included both inquiry and monitoring, the measurement of feedback-seeking behavior was measured by direct inquiry. Future research should use a measure of monitoring in addition to inquiry for feedback-seeking behavior that isn't self-report so that the aggregate construct of feedback seeking is measured to the fullest capacity. It may be that tendencies match more closely to monitoring as opposed to inquiry, since monitoring is more covert. Seeking a specific kind of feedback such as self-negative through inquiry may be seen as more socially desirable if an instrumental motive is perceived (Dahling et al., 2015), whereas monitoring is more covert and could potentially match individuals' feedback-seeking tendencies more closely. Additionally, future research could take a qualitative approach by asking individuals to describe the type of feedback they would like to receive. This opens the door to feedback options other than Gong et al.'s (2017) typology, but it may reveal a more accurate and honest depiction of the types of feedback individuals prefer.

In addition to feedback-seeking behavior and tendencies, all other data were selfreport, leading to the potential for data points such as FO or feedback-seeking tendencies to be inflated. For example, the overall mean for FO in Study 2 was 4.10, which is fairly high for a 1-5 Likert scale. This could be because many of the participants were young students and not employed full time (only 4.6% were employed full time), and therefore

may never have actually received regular performance feedback. Students who have yet to have a job where feedback is given or who have not received a feedback-based performance review may be more likely to endorse having a high receptivity to feedback, but it is hard to know how accurate these responses are. Overall means for feedbackseeking tendencies were also high, and potentially inflated, which also could help explain why they did not translate to feedback-seeking behavior. Again, students who have yet to have a full-time job may not actually know what type of feedback they typically seek because they haven't had to seek performance feedback at all. If their self-reported tendencies are inflated, they may be saying they have such a tendency but when it comes to actually seeking behavior, the tendencies do not hold. This is further supported by research showing that feedback orientation can change with experience and age (Wang et al., 2015). The same might be true of feedback-seeking tendencies. Thus, future research should replicate and extend these studies using employees with tenure and measure feedback seeking in other ways than self-report such as supervisor ratings. This could provide further answers to whether or not feedback-seeking tendencies, or what feedback an employee prefers, actually influence feedback-seeking behavior.

A main contribution of the current research to the extant literature is the role of feedback-seeking tendencies and their lack of translation into actual behavior. However, the role these tendencies play remains unclear. Why people self-report what they're likely to do something different than what they actually do is yet to be understood. Within the current research, tendencies were determined for each individual by giving a mean score of each tendency and looking at the highest mean of the four. Perhaps future research should strive to find a better way to identify a person's dominant tendency. Potential

alternative approaches might ask participants to rank order the four feedback seeking tendencies and use the top-ranked as their feedback-seeking tendency. Furthermore, there may be a multivariate complexity in which there are certain patterns of feedback-seeking tendencies that appear in individuals. While the current studies do not have enough power to do a latent-profile analysis, future research could collect more data on feedbackseeking tendencies to identify certain patterns or clusters of tendencies that are not just one dominant tendency.

Additionally, future research could look at the match between employees' self-report of their dominant tendency and supervisors/team members' report of their employees' and coworkers' dominant tendency. This might provide a better understanding of these processes and the differing perceptions among employees and supervisors.

In addition to looking at team members' rating of their colleagues' feedback-seeking tendencies, future research should also look at translating Gong et al.'s (2017) typology into peer to peer feedback. Peer feedback is an area that merits further examination and it might be fruitful to observe reactions to each type of feedback from one's peers. Furthermore, Gong et al. (2017) observed social integration as an outcome of feedback seeking and found that both self-negative feedback seeking and other-positive feedback seeking were positively related to social integration. Social integration was defined by Gong and colleagues as how well an employee fits into his or her work unit, which can be translated to team integration. However, only individual performance was measured in Gong et al.'s (2017) studies. Thus, future research should look at team performance, engagement, feedback seeking, and identification as key outcome variables to better

understand and improve team performance through feedback seeking (Costa, Passos, & Bakker, 2014).

In accordance with looking at team performance outcomes based on the observed feedback-seeking typology, another area for future research is measuring individual performance throughout the feedback-seeking process. The current research did not measure the effectiveness and influence of the four types of feedback from Gong et al.'s (2017) typology on performance. Gong et al. (2017) found that self-reported self-negative and other-positive feedback seeking were positively related to performance and selfpositive feedback was negatively related to performance. Looking at performance in a different context and in relation to actual feedback-seeking behavior and after feedback reactions occur would provide a deeper understanding of the implications of all four types of feedback. It would be interesting to see if performance increases or decreases after the seeking of all four types of feedback, and if performance is influenced by the reactions that come with receiving feedback. Testing such a relationship would further support the previous literature that shows negative feedback is positively related to job performance, whereas positive feedback does not lead to an increase in performance (Gong et al., 2017; Smither & Walker, 2004). Testing these links would also shed light on the influence of social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) if other-related feedback increased performance.

Another limitation is the use of "others" in the other-related feedback manipulations. Results indicated that empathy does not interact with feedback received to predict reactions. However, this may be because the targeted others that the other-related feedback portrayed were strangers that were not close to the participants. As stated

previously, empathy is a social construct and perhaps for empathy to interact with otherrelated feedback to elicit a strong reaction, the others have to be well known or salient to the individual receiving the feedback. Future research should replicate and extend Study 2 using individuals that the feedback recipient knows. Additionally, future research should look at other-related feedback in a team context where team members can seek feedback about other team members with whom they have an established relationship. As discussed in Chapter 2, it might be that reactions to other-related feedback are stronger if recipients know the targeted others. For those that receive other-positive feedback, reactions may be more favorable because they are proud of their teammates, but reactions may be strongly unfavorable towards other-negative feedback because it is seen as a form of gossip or disparagement of their teammates and team as a whole.

Another area for future research is observing the effects of incongruent versus congruent feedback with regard to feedback-seeking tendencies and how that affects reactions. It may be that reactions are influenced by whether or not the feedback they receive matches the feedback they typically seek. Observing how individuals react and behave if the feedback they receive does not match their tendencies is an interesting question that was outside the scope of the current studies. Exploring the relationship between a match or mismatch of feedback with tendencies may provide a roadmap for how to handle individuals who prefer a certain type of feedback and don't get it. It is likely that reactions will always be more favorable for self-positive feedback based on previous empirical findings (Anseel & Lievens, 2006; David, 2013; Ilgen et al., 1979). But previous literature has shown that individuals want self-negative feedback, but don't always get it (Grayson Reigel, 2018). This would suggest that a match between feedback

desired and feedback received would lead to more favorable reactions, especially for feedback other than self-positive. Furthermore, if a person identifies what type of feedback they tend to seek or prefer, and they get feedback that does not match, he or she may assume that (1) they do not play an active role in the feedback-seeking process and (2) that the source of feedback isn't knowledgeable or credible. Not being able to play an active role in the feedback-seeking process, feeling like you do not have a voice, and perceiving a lack of credibility and knowledge from the source have all been known to lead to negative reactions (Cawley et al., 1998; Elicker et al, 2006; Ilgen et al., 1979; Jawahar, 2010; Steelman et al., 2004).

Lastly, the current studies did not observe feedback seeking over a long period of time or give participants the option to not seek feedback. Within a realistic setting, employees are encouraged to seek feedback on a day-to-day basis as well as within a work week quarterly, etc. Measuring what type of feedback employees seek on a consistent basis using supervisor, coworker, and self-report data over time to test the relationship between tendencies and behavior would also provide a more realistic examination of the implications of Gong et al.'s (2017) typology on research and practice. Additionally, it is safe to assume that employees also have the option to not seek feedback at all. The current research did not give participants an option to opt out of receiving feedback. This was done to be able to better test the relationship between tendencies and behavior, but future research should provide that option to individuals to determine if people prefer to not receive feedback at all after a less favorable reaction.

Further, and stated throughout this discussion, future research should test whether less favorable reactions lead to the seeking of different forms of feedback or no feedback at all.

Conclusion

Together, the current research makes a few valuable contributions to the literature by further exploring the feedback process using a newly developed typology. This process is one that is multifaceted and not the same across all situations. First, the current studies found that even though an individual may self-report that they typically seek a certain type of feedback, that does not mean that is feedback they will seek when they are given the chance. This has important implications for future theory and practice involving feedback. This also means that further research is needed to fully understand how each of the four types of feedback in Gong et al.'s (2017) typology indicate actual behavior, interact with individual differences, and influence organizational outcomes. The current studies also established that although people like self-positive feedback more than other forms of feedback, they still seek feedback that will allow them to improve (i.e., selfnegative). Moreover, the majority of people, overall, sought self-negative feedback. This indicates that people are strategists who understand the value of feedback, regardless of how they reacted. Furthermore, by observing feedback as a dynamic, multi-phase process, a fuller picture of the influence of reactions to one feedback episode directly influences the next feedback-seeking episode. Less favorable reactions lead an individual to seek feedback that was different than the original feedback received. Though these findings warrant future research that has been outlined, the current research strongly recommends that academics and practitioners be more thoughtful when defining feedback

seeking and understand it as a dynamic process with social, affective, and cognitive components. Feedback seeking is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Individual differences, reactions, and multiple chances to seek feedback all play a role in influencing feedback seeking. While the idea that the feedback-seeking process is complex is not a new one, the current studies shed light on a few individual differences and different qualitative types of feedback that influence such a process.

References

- Anseel, F., Beatty, A.S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P.R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management*.
- Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2006). Certainty as a moderator of feedback reactions? A test of the strength of the self-verification motive. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79(4), 533-551.
- Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2007). The Relationship Between Uncertainty and Desire for Feedback: A Test of Competing Hypotheses 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(5), 1007-1040.
- Anseel, F., Lievens, F., & Schollaert, E. (2009). Reflection as a strategy to enhance task performance after feedback. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 110(1), 23-35.
- Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 29(3), 465-487.
- Ashford, S. J., Blatt, R., & VandeWalle, D. (2003). Reflections on the looking glass: A review of research on feedback-seeking behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 29, 773-799.
- Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 32, 370-398.
- Ashford, S. J., De Stobbeleir, K., & Nujella, M. (2016). To seek or not to seek: Is that the only question? Recent developments in feedback-seeking literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *3*, 213-239.
- Ashford, S. J., & Northcraft, G. B. (1992). Conveying more (or less) than we realize: The role of impression-management in feedback-seeking. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 53, 310-334.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (2012). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(1), 8-34.
- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2005). Social exclusion impairs self- regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 589-604.

- Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). 360° feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 930.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). The self-attention-induced feedback loop and social facilitation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *17*(6), 545-568.
- Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 83(4), 615-633.
- Chiu, C. Y., Hong, Y. Y., & Dweck, C. S. (1997). Lay dispositionism and implicit theories of personality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 73(1), 19.
- Chory, R. M., & Westerman, C. (2009). Feedback and fairness: The relationship between negative performance feedback and organizational justice. *Western Journal of Communication*, 73(2), 157-181.
- Converse, P. D., & DeShon, R. P. (2009). A tale of two tasks: Reversing the self-regulatory resource depletion effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1318-1324.
- Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Team work engagement: A model of emergence. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(2), 414-436.
- Dahling, J. J., Chau, S. L., & O'Malley, A. (2012). Correlates and consequences of feedback orientation in organizations. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 530-545.
- Dahling, J., O'Malley, A. L., & Chau, S. L. (2015). Effects of feedback motives on inquiry and performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(2), 199-215.
- Dahling, J.J. & Whitaker, B.G. (2016). When can feedback-seeking behavior result in a better performance rating? Investigating the moderating role of political skill, *Human Performance* (online), <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2016.1148037</u>.
- David, E. M. (2013). Examining the role of narrative performance appraisal comments on performance. Human Performance, 26(5), 430450.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of personality and social psychology, 44(1), 113.
- Diefendorff, J. M., & Chandler, M. M. (2011). Motivating employees. In S. Zedeck (Ed.). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 65-135). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A word from two perspectives. *Psychological inquiry*, 6(4), 267-285.
- Elicker, J. D., Levy, P. E., & Hall, R. J. (2006). The role of Leader-Member Exchange in the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management*, *32(4)*, 531-551.
- Erdley, C. A., & Dweck, C. S. (1993). Children's implicit personality theories as predictors of their social judgments. *Child development*, 64(3), 863-878.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272.
- Fedor, D.B., Rensvold, R.B., & Adams, S.M. (1992). An investigation of factors expected to affect feedback seeking: A longitudinal field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 779-805.
- Gong, Y., Wang, M., Huang, J. C., & Cheung, S. Y. (2017). Toward a Goal Orientation–Based Feedback-Seeking Typology: Implications for Employee Performance Outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1234-1260.
- Grayson Reigel, D. (2018). How to solicit negative feedback when your manager doesn't want to give it. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <u>https://hbr.org/2018/03/how-to-solicit-negative-feedback-when-your-manager-doesnt-want-to-give-it.</u>
- Gregory, J. B., & Levy, P. E. (2015). *Using feedback in organizational consulting*. American Psychological Association.
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach. Guilford publications.
- Higgins, E. T. 1998. Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30: 1-46.
- Hirsch, A. A. (2018). Mastering the art of negative feedback. *Society for Human Resource Management*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.shrm.org/ResourcesAndTools/hr-</u> <u>topics/employee-relations/Pages/Mastering-the-Art-of-Negative-Feedback.aspx</u>.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values (Vol. 5). Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(4), 349-371.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Moore, C. F. (1987). Types and choices of performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 401-406.

- Inzlicht, M., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). What Is Ego Depletion? Toward a Mechanistic Revision of the Resource Model of Self-Control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 450–463.
- Jawahar, I. M. (2010). The mediating role of appraisal feedback reactions on the relationship between rater feedback-related behaviors and ratee performance. *Group & Organization Management*, *35*(*4*), 494-526.
- Kammrath, L. K., & Dweck, C. (2006). Voicing conflict: Preferred conflict strategies among incremental and entity theorists. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(11), 1497-1508.
- Keeping, L.M. & Levy, P.E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 708-723.
- Kinicki, A. L., Prussia, G. E., Wu, B., & McKee-Ryan, F. M. (2004). A covariance structure analysis of employees' response to performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1057-1069.
- Laerd Statistics (2017). *Statistical tutorials and software guides*. Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/
- Levy, P. E. (1989). The effects of feedback sign, attributional discrepancy, and performance discrepancy on reactions to feedback. Doctoral Dissertation.
- Levy, P. E., Cawley, B. D., & Foti, R. J. (1998). Reactions to appraisal discrepancies: Performance ratings and attributions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12(4), 437-455.
- Levy, S. R., Stroessner, S. J., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Stereotype formation and endorsement: The role of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1421.
- Levy, P. E., Tseng, S. T., Rosen, C. C., & Lueke, S. B. (2017). Performance Management: A Marriage between Practice and Science–Just Say "I do". In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 155-213). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Linderbaum, B. A. & Levy, P.E. (2010). The development and validation of the Feedback Orientation Scale (FOS). *Journal of Management*, *36*(6), 1372s-1405.
- London, M., & Smither, J. W. (2002). Feedback orientation, feedback culture, and the longitudinal performance management process. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(1), 81-100.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review; Psychological Review, 98(2), 224.

- McColskey, W., & Leary, M. R. (1985). Differential effects of norm-referenced and selfreferenced feedback on performance expectancies, attributions, and motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *10*(3), 275-284.
- Medvedeff, M., Gregory, J. B., & Levy, P. E. (2008). How attributes of the feedback message affect subsequent feedback seeking: The interactive effects of feedback sign and type. *Psychologica Belgica*, 48, 109–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/ pb-48-2-3-109
- Mero, N. P., Guidice, R. M., & Brownlee, A. L. (2007). Accountability in a performance appraisal context: The effect of audience and form of accounting on rater response and behavior. *Journal of Management*, *33*(2), 223-252.
- Moore, D. A., & Klein, W. M. (2008). Use of absolute and comparative performance feedback in absolute and comparative judgments and decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 107(1), 60-74.
- Morrison, E. W., Chen, Y. R., & Salgado, S. R. (2004). Cultural differences in newcomer feedback seeking: A comparison of the United States and Hong Kong. Applied Psychology, 53(1), 1-22.
- Moss, S. E., Sanchez, J. I., Brumbaugh, A. M., & Borkowski, N. (2009). The mediating role of feedback avoidance behavior in the LMX—performance relationship. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*(6), 645-664.
- Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 247–259.
- Muraven, M., Gagné, M., & Rosman, H. (2008). Helpful self-control: Autonomy support, vitality, and depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 573-585.
- Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. (1995). Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives. Sage.
- Park, G., Schmidt, A.M., Scheu, C., & DeShon, R.P. (2007). A process model of goal orientation and feedback-seeking. Human Performance, 20(2), 119-145.
- Pichler, S. (2012). The social context of performance appraisal and appraisal reactions: A metaanalysis. Human Resource Management, 51(5), 709732.
- Peng, J. C., & Chiu, S. F. (2010). An integrative model linking feedback environment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150 (6), 582-607.
- Rasheed, A., Khan, S. U. R., Rasheed, M. F., & Munir, Y. (2015). The impact of feedback orientation and the effect of satisfaction with feedback on in-role job performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *26*(1), 31-51.

- Roberts, A., Levy, P. E., Dahling, J., Riodan, B., & O'Malley, A. (2019). *Don't just look back, you're not going that way: Using feedback to look forward.* Symposium accepted at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, National Harbor, MD.
- Rosen, C., Levy, P.E., & Hall, R.J. (2006). Placing perceptions of politics in the context of the feedback environment, employee attitudes, and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 211-220.
- Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *34*(2), 125-137.
- Spence, J. R., & Keeping, L. M. (2010). The impact of non-performance information on ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(4), 587-608.
- Steelman, L. A., Levy, P. E., & Snell, A. F. (2004). The feedback environment scale (FES): Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64, 165-184.
- Steelman, L. A., & Rutkowski, K. A. (2004). Moderators of employee reactions to negative feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(1), 6-18.
- Sue-Chan, C., Wood, R.E., & Latham, G.P. (2012). Effect of a Coach's Regulatory Focus and an Individual's Implicit Person Theory on Individual Performance. *Journal of Management*, 38(3), 809-835.
- Taylor, M. S., Fisher, C., & Ilgen, D. (1984). Individuals' reactions to performance feedback in organizations: Control theory perspective. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (pp. 81-124). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Dan Fidel, L. S. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics. USA: Person Education Inc.
- Thompson, D. J. (2013). Understanding the contextual, cultural, and individual antecedents of self-directed development (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron).
- Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Green, S. G., & Weiss, H. M. (2008). Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. *Academy of Management Journal*, *51*(*3*), 131-146.
- Tseng, S. T., & Levy, P. E. (2019). A multilevel leadership process framework of performance management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(4), 100668.

- Vohs, K.D., Baumeister, R.F., & Ciarocco, N.J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful selfpresentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Vol 88(4)*, 632-657.
- Wang, M., Burlacu, G., Truxillo, D., James, K., & Yao, X. (2015). Age differences in feedback reactions: The roles of employee feedback orientation on social awareness and utility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1296.
- Waung, M., & Highhouse, S. (1997). Fear of conflict and empathic buffering: Two explanations for the inflation of performance feedback. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 71, 37–54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ obhd.1997.2711
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Vol. 18* (p. 1–74). Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Whitaker, B.D., Dahling, J., Levy, P.E. (2007). The development of a feedback environment and role clarity model of job performance, *Journal of Management*, *33*(4), 570-591.
- Whiting, H. J., Kline, T. J. B., & Sulsky, L. M. (2008). Performance appraisal congruency: An important aspect of person-organization fit. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57, 223–236.
- Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2014). Your employees want the negative feedback you hate to give. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2014/01/your-employees-want-the-negative-feedback-you-hate-to-give.
- Zingoni, M., & Byron, K. (2017). How beliefs about the self-influence perceptions of negative feedback and subsequent effort and learning. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 139, 50-62.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Study 1 Measures

Demographics

- 1. Which of the following options best describes you (select all that apply):
 - a. Student
 - b. Employed Full-time
 - c. Employed Part-time
 - d. Unemployed
- 2. [If answered full-time or part-time] How long have you worked with your current company, in years and months? (Fill in the blank)
- 3. [If answered full-time or part-time] What is your current job title? (Fill in the blank)
- 4. Which of the following best describes the industry in which you work (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013)?
 - a. Administrative Support
 - b. Agriculture
 - c. Arts/Entertainment/Recreation
 - d. Construction
 - e. Educational Services
 - f. Finance & Insurance
 - g. Food Services
 - h. Health Care
 - i. Information
 - j. Manufacturing
 - k. Military
 - 1. Professional, Scientific, & Technical Sciences
 - m. Public Administration
 - n. Real Estate
 - o. Retail
 - p. Social Assistance
 - q. Student
 - r. Transportation
 - s. Utilities
 - t. Warehouse
 - u. Waste Management
 - v. Wholesale Trade
 - w. Other: _____

- 5. What is your current education level?
 - a. High school diploma or GED
 - b. Some college education
 - c. Completed a BA/BS
 - d. Completed a MA/MS
 - e. Completed a PhD
- 6. What is your age, in years? (Fill in the blank)
- 7. What is your gender identity?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Other
- 8. What is your race or ethnic background? (check all that apply):
 - a. White/Caucasian, Anglo, European American
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American
 - d. Asian or Asian American
 - e. Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian
 - f. American Indian
 - g. Alaskan Native
 - h. Middle Eastern, including Northern African, Arabic, West Asian, and others
 - i. Other (fill in the blank)

Feedback Seeking Tendencies (Gong et al., 2017)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Remember that there are no right answers, just your honest thoughts and feelings.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
			nor Agree			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Self-Negative

1. I often indirectly ask for information on what I failed to perform.

- 2. I often observe my supervisor or colleagues to seek negative information on my performance.
- 3. I often seek comments concerning what areas I did not do well in upon task completion.
- 4. I often ask for my supervisor's comments concerning my below-expectation performance areas.
- 5. I often seek negative comments on areas I did not perform well in during task engagement.
- 6. I often ask my colleagues for negative information to understand my performance weaknesses.

Self-Positive

- 7. I often indirectly ask information on what I performed well in.
- 8. I often pay attention to whether my job behavior is emulated by others.
- 9. I often seek information concerning what areas I performed well in upon task completion.
- 10. I often ask my supervisor for information concerning what areas I performed well in.
- 11. I often seek information on my good performance during task engagement.
- 12. I often ask my colleagues for information concerning my performance strengths.

Other-Negative

- 13. I often ask information from third parties (e.g., supervisor) regarding what colleagues failed to perform.
- 14. I often pay attention to colleagues' negative moods upon the completion of a task.
- 15. I often pay attention when colleagues are scolded by my supervisor during and after task engagement.
- 16. I often pay attention to my supervisor's negative reactions to colleagues' work.
- 17. I often pay attention to my supervisor's negative comments on colleagues' work.
- 18. I often pay attention to my supervisor's or other colleagues' criticisms of a colleague's work.

Other-Positive

- 19. I often ask information from third parties (e.g., supervisor) regarding what colleagues performed well in.
- 20. I often pay attention to colleagues' positive moods upon the completion of a task.
- 21. I often pay attention when colleagues are praised by my supervisor during and after task engagement.
- 22. I often pay attention to my supervisor's positive comments on colleagues' work.
- 23. I often pay attention to my supervisor's affirmation of colleagues' work.
- 24. I often pay attention to my supervisor's or other colleagues' discussion of a colleague's work strengths.

Feedback Seeking Behavior

Self-Positive

Dr. Jones will give you feedback about positive aspects of your performance; what you have done well and what to continue doing. Dr. Jones often gives praise for a job well done.

Self-Negative

Dr. Rich will give you feedback about negative aspects of your performance; what you have done wrong and what to improve upon. Dr. Rich often gives constructive criticism.

Other-Positive

Dr. Evans will give you feedback about the positive performance of those who have done really well on this task. Dr. Evans often describes the performance of others so you know what has worked when others have completed this task.

Other-Negative

Dr. Roberts will give you feedback about the negative performance of those who have done poorly on this task. Dr. Evans often describes the performance of others so you know what has not worked when others have completed this task.

APPENDIX B

Study 2 Measures

Demographics

- 9. Which of the following options best describes you (select all that apply):
 - a. Student
 - b. Employed Full-time
 - c. Employed Part-time
 - d. Unemployed
- 10. [If answered full-time or part-time] How long have you worked with your current company, in years and months? (Fill in the blank)
- 11. [If answered full-time or part-time] What is your current job title? (Fill in the blank)
- 12. Which of the following best describes the industry in which you work (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013)?
 - a. Administrative Support
 - b. Agriculture
 - c. Arts/Entertainment/Recreation
 - d. Construction
 - e. Educational Services
 - f. Finance & Insurance
 - g. Food Services
 - h. Health Care
 - i. Information
 - j. Manufacturing
 - k. Military
 - 1. Professional, Scientific, & Technical Sciences
 - m. Public Administration
 - n. Real Estate
 - o. Retail
 - p. Social Assistance
 - q. Student
 - r. Transportation
 - s. Utilities
 - t. Warehouse
 - u. Waste Management
 - v. Wholesale Trade
 - w. Other: _____

- 13. What is your current education level?
 - a. High school diploma or GED
 - b. Some college education
 - c. Completed a BA/BS
 - d. Completed a MA/MS
 - e. Completed a PhD
- 14. What is your age, in years? (Fill in the blank)
- 15. What is your gender identity?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Other
- 16. What is your race or ethnic background? (check all that apply):
 - a. White/Caucasian, Anglo, European American
 - b. Black/African American
 - c. Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American
 - d. Asian or Asian American
 - e. Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian
 - f. American Indian
 - g. Alaskan Native
 - h. Middle Eastern, including Northern African, Arabic, West Asian, and others
 - i. Other (fill in the blank)

Feedback Seeking Tendencies (Gong et al., 2017)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Remember that there are no right answers, just your honest thoughts and feelings.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
			nor Agree			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Self-Negative

- 1. I often indirectly ask for information on what I failed to perform.
- 2. I often observe my supervisor or colleagues to seek negative information on my performance
- 3. I often seek comments concerning what areas I did not do well in upon task completion.
- 4. I often ask for my supervisor's comments concerning my below-expectation performance areas.
- 5. I often seek negative comments on areas I did not perform well in during task engagement.
- 6. I often ask my colleagues for negative information to understand my performance weaknesses.

Self-Positive

- 7. I often indirectly ask information on what I performed well in.
- 8. I often pay attention to whether my job behavior is emulated by others.
- 9. I often seek information concerning what areas I performed well in upon task completion.
- 10. I often ask my supervisor for information concerning what areas I performed well in.
- 11. I often seek information on my good performance during task engagement.
- 12. I often ask my colleagues for information concerning my performance strengths.

Other-Negative

- 13. I often ask information from third parties (e.g., supervisor) regarding what colleagues failed to perform.
- 14. I often pay attention to colleagues' negative moods upon the completion of a task.
- 15. I often pay attention when colleagues are scolded by my supervisor during and after task engagement.
- 16. I often pay attention to my supervisor's negative reactions to colleagues' work.
- 17. I often pay attention to my supervisor's negative comments on colleagues' work.
- 18. I often pay attention to my supervisor's or other colleagues' criticisms of a colleague's work.

Other-Positive

- 19. I often ask information from third parties (e.g., supervisor) regarding what colleagues performed well in.
- 20. I often pay attention to colleagues' positive moods upon the completion of a task.
- 21. I often pay attention when colleagues are praised by my supervisor during and after task engagement.
- 22. I often pay attention to my supervisor's positive comments on colleagues' work.
- 23. I often pay attention to my supervisor's affirmation of colleagues' work.
- 24. I often pay attention to my supervisor's or other colleagues' discussion of a colleague's work strengths.
The Feedback Orientation Scale (Linderbaum & Levy, 2010)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Remember that there are no right answers, just your honest thoughts and feelings.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Utility

- 1. Feedback contributes to my success at work.
- 2. To develop my skills at work, I rely on feedback.
- 3. Feedback is critical for improving performance.
- 4. Feedback from supervisors can help me advance in a company.
- 5. I find that feedback is critical for reaching my goals.

Accountability

- 1. It is my responsibility to apply feedback to improve my performance.
- 2. I hold myself accountable to respond to feedback appropriately.
- 3. I don't feel a sense of closure until I respond to feedback.
- 4. If my supervisor gives me feedback, it is my responsibility to respond to it.
- 5. I feel obligated to make changes based on feedback.

Social Awareness

- 1. I try to be aware of what other people think of me.
- 2. Using feedback, I am more aware of what people think of me.
- 3. Feedback helps me manage the impression I make on others.
- 4. Feedback lets me know how I am perceived by others.
- 5. I rely on feedback to help me make a good impression.

Feedback Self-Efficacy

- 1. I feel self-assured when dealing with feedback.
- 2. Compared to others, I am more competent at handling feedback.
- 3. I believe that I have the ability to deal with feedback effectively.
- 4. I feel confident when responding to both positive and negative feedback.
- 5. I know that I can handle the feedback that I receive.

Implicit Person Theory Scale, General Beliefs (Levy & Dweck, 1997)

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Remember that there are no right answers, just your honest thoughts and feelings.

Strongly	Disagree	Slightly	Slightly	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Agree		Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Entity IPT

- 1. The kind of person someone is says something basic about him or her, and it can't be changed very much.
- 2. People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can't really be changed.
- 3. As much as I hate to admit it, you can't teach an old dog new tricks people can't really change their deepest attributes.
- 4. Everyone is a certain kind of person and there is not much that they can do to really change that.

Incremental IPT

- 1. People can substantially change the kind of person they are.
- 2. No matter what kind of person someone is, they can always change very much.
- 3. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic characteristics.
- 4. People can change even their most basic qualities.

Empathy - Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980) **Instructions.** Please rate the extent to which each statement describes you using the following scale. Remember that there are no right answers, just your honest thoughts and feelings.

0	1	2	3	4
Does not				Describes me
describe me				very well
well at all				

Fantasy

26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.

5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.

7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it. (RC)

16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me. 12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. (RC)

23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character.

Perspective Taking

28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. 15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. (RC)

11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.

21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.

3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (RC)

8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.

25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while.

Empathic Concern

9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them. 18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (RC)

2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.

22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.

4. Sometimes I don't feel sorry for other people when they are having problems. (RC)

14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (RC)

20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.

Personal Distress

27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.

10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation.

6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease.

19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (RC)

- 17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me.13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. (RC)
- 24. I tend to lose control during emergencies.

Feedback Reactions (Keeping & Levy, 2000; Steelman & Rutkowski, 2004)

Instructions. Please answer the following items pertaining to the feedback you just received.

- 1. How interested were you in the feedback you just received?
 - a. (Extremely Uninterested, Uninterested, Neutral, Interested, Extremely Interested)
- 2. How accurate do you think the feedback you just received was?
 - a. (Extremely inaccurate, somewhat inaccurate, neutral, somewhat accurate, extremely accurate)
- 3. How satisfied were you with the feedback you just received?
 - a. (Extremely Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neutral, Satisfied, Extremely Satisfied)
- 4. To what extent would you feel that the feedback you just received was fair?a. (Not at all fair, Unfair, Neutral, Fair, Very Fair)
- 5. How likely are you to use the feedback you just received?
 - a. (Extremely Unlikely, Unlikely, Neutral, Likely, Extremely Likely)
- 6. How motivated are you to use the feedback you just received?
 - a. Very Unmotivated, Unmotivated, Neutral, Motivated, Very Motivated)
- 7. How motivated are you to improve your performance after the feedback you just received?
 - a. (Very Unmotivated, Unmotivated, Neutral, Motivated, Very Motivated)

Feedback Seeking Behavior

Self-Positive

Dr. Jones will give you feedback about positive aspects of your performance; what you have done well and what to continue doing. Dr. Jones often gives praise for a job well done.

Self-Negative

Dr. Rich will give you feedback about negative aspects of your performance; what you have done wrong and what to improve upon. Dr. Rich often gives constructive criticism.

Other-Positive

Dr. Evans will give you feedback about the positive performance of those who have done really well on this task. Dr. Evans often describes the performance of others so you know what has worked when others have completed this task.

Other-Negative

Dr. Roberts will give you feedback about the negative performance of those who have done poorly on this task. Dr. Evans often describes the performance of others so you know what has not worked when others have completed this task.

APPENDIX C

Experiment Script for Study 2

[Feedback-Seeking Tendencies and Feedback Orientation measured prior to coming into the lab]

Hello! Thank you for your participation in this lab study. My name is ______ and I will be your laboratory instructor. Throughout your 60 minutes here, you will complete a series of surveys and evaluate three employees from a local organization. Your evaluations will be based on each employee's job description and their recorded performance, including specific behaviors. You will receive credit for your enrolled psychology class. I really appreciate your willingness to participate in my study. Please note that at any time, you may choose to stop the experiment to ask questions or to end your session. Are you ready to begin? Just so you know, I will be doing some of my own work during this.

Great. First, please take a look at the Internet Explorer Survey Page for you to read over the informed consent form. [*Refer participant to the Internet Explorer window with the Qualtrics survey open.*] This form goes over the procedures, potential risks and benefits and states that you have the freedom to ask any questions or to stop this study at any time without any penalty. Please read it through carefully. By clicking continue, you are agreeing to participate in this study.

Once you click continue, there will be a prompt for you UANet ID and a short survey. Your UANet ID is required for us to give you SONA credit, but your responses and UANet ID will be kept confidential. Please take note that once you complete these surveys, you will be asked to stop and notify me. Do not move on without instructions.

[**<u>OUALTRICS</u>** Administer the Informed Consent and UANet ID]

Thanks so much for filling that out. We will now proceed to your task for today.

Because we have a number of affiliated faculty members, who are experts in feedback and performance management, a local company here in Akron has asked us to help them with its performance reviews. This company is hoping to see how a non-biased individual will review them. This company evaluates their employees quarterly.

Your task today is to conduct your own evaluations for a handful of employees at this company using the information provided to you. You will evaluate one employee at a time, and you will do a total of three evaluations. Let's start with the first employee.

[HANDOUT: Administer Employee # 1 Job Description and Behaviors]

Here is the employee's portfolio. First, please read the job description at the top to get familiar with what the employee is expected to do at his or her job. Then, read the list of behaviors and manager notes on this employee. Once you are finished reviewing these materials, write a narrative review in the empty Word document on your desktop. A narrative review is a typed-up version of the feedback you would give to this employee directly. In this review, give your opinion about the employee's performance with regards to how you feel he or she is doing, any suggestions you may have for him or her, etc. The review should be at least 150 words long. You should write your review in the open Microsoft Word document that is minimized on your computer. You will have 20 minutes to evaluate Employee #1.

[Give participants 20 minutes to read the materials and evaluate Employee #1. They may finish early.]

Now, let's send your evaluation to one of our Faculty experts, Dr. Mills, for them to take a look at. Go to the Internet Explorer window where I have logged you into your temporary participant e-mail account. I have already started an email so all you have to do is copy and paste your narrative review into the body of the message. Please do not delete your message from the Word Document after you copy and paste it. Once you copy and paste it, click "send". Dr. Mills will read your evaluation and give you feedback about how you did in evaluating Employee #1. It will probably take a couple minutes to review your evaluation and send you feedback so in the meantime, you can fill out a quick survey about the review you just completed and sent. If you finish the survey before they send you feedback, feel free to just relax. But please let me know when you receive a reply.

[Make sure participant sends the email in the message you already pulled up and started during your preparation. Make sure the participant does NOT start a new email other than the one you started.]

[**<u>OUALTRICS:</u>** *Administer Empathy and IPT*]

[SEND FEEDBACK FROM EXPERT GMAIL ACCOUNT:

- *Hit "reply" to the email the participant sent you. Access the 4 Feedback Messages for Lab document you previously pulled up during your preparation.*
- Use the correct condition of Self-Negative, Self-Positive, Other-Negative, or Other-Positive feedback. Copy and paste the message and insert a quote from the participant's narrative in the brackets of the message where it prompts you.

[Instruct participants to wait for feedback message if they finish the survey early. If participant does not notice email message after 5 minutes, remind them to check] Have you gotten an e-mail yet? They are usually pretty quick, but if they haven't sent you anything yet I can try to get in touch with them and let them know.

[Give participant 2 minutes to read the feedback]

Now that you have read your feedback, you will evaluate Employee #2. But first, please use Internet Explorer to answer a few more questions about the feedback you just received and let me know when you have completed that.

[**<u>OUALTRICS:</u>** Administer Feedback Reactions Scale]

Thanks for completing that survey. Next, I will give you another employee's job description and recorded behaviors.

[HANDOUT: Administer Employee # 2 Job Description and Behaviors]

Now you will evaluate Employee #2. Please do not delete your first evaluation. Write your second underneath after skipping a few lines. Like before, you will be writing a narrative review into the same Word document. Again, please read the job description and recorded behaviors to inform your evaluation. Then, you will write a second narrative review based on the information you are given regarding Employee #2. In this review, give your opinion about the employee's performance with regards to how you feel he or she is doing, any suggestions you may have for him or her, etc. Again, the review should be at least 150 words long. You will have 20 minutes to evaluate Employee #2. You should write your review in the open Microsoft Word document. Please do not delete your first evaluation. Let me know when you are done.

[Give participants 20 minutes to read the materials and evaluate Employee #2.]

Great, now that you have evaluated Employee #2, you have the option of requesting more feedback from another one of our Faculty experts about your evaluation of Employee #2. You can seek this feedback before you evaluate Employee #3. You can choose from whom you want to receive feedback. Please read this brief description of our four available experts and send an email to one of them. There are a number of faculty experts on staff, so the faculty members you have the option to receive feedback from are different than the expert who you heard from on your first task. Once you decide, send your evaluation to one of the email addresses listed. You can copy and paste into the body again and title is "Feedback Request 2" with the today's date. While you decide on this, I am going to step out and check on another other study that is running. I will be right back.

[Give participants the handout descriptions of four experts and feedback they provide and go over each with the participant. This means read the descriptions below. After, experimenter should leave for a minute to let them decide in private from whom to seek feedback.]

Dr. Jones will give you feedback about positive aspects of	A.Jones.Evals@gmail.com
your performance; what you have done well and what to	
continue doing for your next narrative evaluation. Dr. Jones	
often provides praise for a job well done.	
Dr. Wells will give you feedback about the negative	A.Wells.Evals@gmail.com
performance of others who worked on this task and did	
poorly. Dr. Wells often describes the performance of others	
so you know what has not worked when others have	
completed this lab.	
Dr. Rich will give you feedback about negative aspects of	A.Rich.Evals@gmail.com
your performance; what you have done wrong and what to	
improve upon for your next narrative evaluation. Dr. Rich	
often provides constructive criticism.	
Dr. Evans will give you feedback about the positive	A.Evans.Evals@gmail.com
performance of others who worked on this task and done	
really well. Dr. Evans often describes the performance of	
others so you know what has worked when others have	
completed this task.	

Alright, next I have another survey for you to complete.

[**<u>QUALTRICS</u>**: *Administer final survey that includes manipulation checks.*]

You will actually not need to evaluate a third employee. We have collected enough information and this is the end of the experiment.

[Debrief]

This study is actually looking at feedback seeking and feedback reactions based on individual preferences and feedback type you received. More specifically, we are looking at the effects of multiple feedback-seeking episodes to see if feedback reactions facilitate future feedback-seeking behavior, while taking into account individual differences like empathy, mindsets, and feedback orientation. The experts described, the local business, and its employees are completely fictional, but we do have individuals here who have expertise in performance management and feedback. Your responses are very valuable and will help us in our research on the feedback process, employee evaluations, and how people react to feedback based and if it is about others or yourself. Do you have any questions? Thank you so much for you participation.

APPENDIX D

Participant Task Materials for Study 1 and Study 2

Employee #1

Job Title: Information Technology Analyst

<u>Job Description</u>: Analyze and troubleshoot science, engineering, business, and other data processing problems to implement and improve computer systems. Analyze user requirements, procedures, and problems to automate or improve existing systems and review computer system capabilities, workflow, and scheduling limitations. May analyze or recommend commercially available software. Should develop, document, and revise system design procedures, test procedures, and quality standards. Read manuals, periodicals, and technical reports to learn how to develop programs that meet staff and user requirements. Prepare cost-benefit and return-oninvestment analyses to aid in decisions on system implementation. Provide staff and users with assistance solving computer related problems, such as malfunctions and program problems

Manager Observations:

- General
 - Completes assigned tasks in a timely manner
 - Good report-writer and programmer
 - Lacks initiative
 - Works well in teams and with other analysts, but often does not volunteer to take the lead on new projects
 - Does not communicate well with managers and employees outside of the IT department
- Specific
 - Timely and quick turnaround time for assignments on the two recent projects of this quarter (the PEC project and the management department system upgrade)
 - Code written for projects produced no errors; did not require editing or extensive troubleshooting for bugs
 - One customer filed a complaint due [*Employee*] being overly technical and coming off as impatient
 - Teammates on the PEC project reported no problems working with [*Employee*] or understanding code, but noted that [*Employee*] did not step up to take a leadership role in any of the numerous assignments
 - [*Employee*] was originally assigned to be the lead on the management department system upgrade project, but [*another employee*] eventually took over
 - Changes committed by [*Employee*] were documented well and understood by myself and the rest of the IT department
 - Management department initially had a difficult time understanding the explanations for the changes from [*Employee*]
 - Manager from the management department reported that [*Employee*] "seemed to know their stuff, but just was not conveying things in nontechnical terms effectively"; however, the confusion and any misunderstandings were eventually resolved

• Summary report of projects, mostly written by [*Employee*], was clear and easy to understand; I basically just had to forward the report to the project manager

Employee #2

Job Title: Administrative Assistant

<u>Job Description</u>: Perform routine clerical and administrative functions such as drafting correspondence, scheduling appointments, organizing and maintaining paper and electronic files, or providing information to callers. Set up and manage paper or electronic filing systems, recording information, updating paperwork, or maintaining documents, such as attendance records, correspondence, or other material. Operate office equipment, such as fax machines, copiers, or phone systems and arrange for repairs when equipment malfunctions. Greet visitors or callers and handle their inquiries or direct them to the appropriate persons according to their needs. Coordinate conferences, meetings, or special events, such as luncheons or graduation ceremonies and supervise other clerical stall

Manager Observations:

- General
 - Organized; good time management skills
 - Attentive to detail
 - Not completely up-to-date with recent technological advances
 - Communicates well in writing and speech
 - Lacks ability to work independently
 - Gets overwhelmed when there are multiple tasks with the same due date
- Specific
 - Managed my schedule and other Senior manager's schedule in an organized and timely fashion; did not overbook meetings
 - Struggled with the new Outlook email updates and Microsoft package updates resulting in a longer response time on tasks
 - Managed my budget and company credit card receipts effectively for things like travel expenses and training workshops and maintained confidential information professionally
 - Is sometimes a distraction to teammates, due to [*Employee*] having many follow-up questions and lacking the ability to complete a project alone
 - Lacked confidence in making decisions and calling the shots during the attendance record overhaul; always consulted me or another manager before making decisions or left the decision-making to others
 - All meeting notes taken during the past quarter were easily understood and distributed to the team in a comprehensive and easy to understand format
 - Had trouble completing all development goals (improve skills with Excel, improve skills with Oracle software, work on completing tasks without consulting others, complete CTC training) by the end of the quarter and expressed that having to achieve more than three goals was a challenge
 - Reduced waste in the office after completing the Lean Lite training for corporate employees, but still has room for improvement on waste reduction
 - Ordered all office supplies (monitors, keyboards, mice, software packages) before I anticipated the need so that the team was able to perform their MWRs adequately and easily throughout the quarter