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ABSTRACT

Superior and Subordinate Style Fit:

Dominance Complementarity as a Determinant of Subordinate Success

Lily Benjamin Maissen

A number of literatures bear on the question of which behaviors subordinates should employ with their superiors in order to be successful, i.e., to achieve their preferred psychological and work-related outcomes. Yet, these literatures have been disconnected and have not incorporated key theoretical and empirical developments from each other. Although there has been much scholarly research on the effectiveness of subordinate influence behaviors, this research has been atheoretical and has not considered important contingencies. Consequently, it is not surprising that the results have been inconsistent.

To remedy this problem, I articulate a meso theory that connects the relevant literatures in order to better understand the success of subordinates with their superiors. The central contribution of my dissertation is that it specifies how different contingencies affect the relationship between subordinates’ behaviors with their superiors and their success. I propose that subordinates will be most successful when their style is complementary with their superiors’ with respect to the interpersonal dimension of control (i.e., dominance-submissiveness) and consider how these relationships are mediated and moderated by micro and macro variables in a dynamic context. The results of two empirical studies—an experimental study with international MBA students and
senior executives and a field study with partner-associate dyads at a law firm—support my theory.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Everyday views of successful subordinates paradoxically tell us that in their interactions with superiors, they should be assertive, forthright and ambitious, express themselves with confidence and decisiveness and, at the same time, be cautious and helpful, conform to superiors’ wishes and refrain from “rocking the boat.” There has been a similar split in the scholarly research on subordinate influence behaviors with their superiors (i.e., “upward influence tactics”). For example, assertiveness (a more forceful tactic) has been positively and negatively correlated to subordinates’ performance appraisals and promotability assessments (e.g., Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Thacker, 1999; Thacker & Wayne, 1995; Wayne, Linden, Graf, & Ferris, 1997). Likewise, ingratiation (a less forceful tactic) has been positively and negatively correlated to subordinates’ performance appraisals and promotability assessments (e.g., Ferris, Judge, Rowland, & Fitzgibbons, 1994; Thacker, 1999; Thacker & Wayne, 1995; Watt, 1993). For both theoretical and practical purposes, it is important to understand better the effects of subordinates’ different behaviors with their superiors on their success in organizations.

In this dissertation, I propose that the reasons for the inconsistent results about subordinate influence behaviors are threefold: (1) the influence literature has not considered important contingencies that may moderate the effects of subordinate behaviors on their success; (2) researchers have focused on atheoretically-derived independent tactics from popular taxonomies (as opposed to interdependent behavioral strategies), which have not been defined and measured consistently across studies, and may not be the most critical for subordinates’ success; and (3) the influence literature has been disconnected from other relevant literatures regarding superior-subordinate dyadic
processes which may help to illuminate how subordinates should behave with their superiors to be successful.

In order to address these deficiencies, I articulate a meso theory that: (1) looks at a number of key contingencies that may explain the inconsistent results regarding subordinate influence behaviors; (2) specifies behavioral styles of subordinates and superiors; and (3) integrates relevant but hitherto disconnected literatures regarding the superior-subordinate dyadic processes which have implications for how subordinates should behave with their superiors to be successful. At the core of this theory, I draw on the dominance complementarity framework from interpersonal circumplex theory (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins, 1979, 1982) to examine whether the effectiveness of subordinate styles is contingent on their superiors’ styles. In addition, I specify how higher level authority structures, such as organizational culture, act as moderators and how the normative expectations that are associated with different authority roles act as mediators of the proposed relationships. I also consider how the hypothesized relationships are contingent on the duration and intensity of the superior-subordinate relationship. Consistent with prior researchers (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995; London & Stumpf, 1983), I define subordinate success as including both psychological (e.g., job stress, burnout) and work-related outcomes (e.g., pay, promotion). Figure 1 displays the hypothesized model of subordinate success and proposed relationships among the variables in this model.
Figure 1. Conceptual model of subordinate success.

Part 1. Proposition 1: Superior-subordinate style complementarity on the interpersonal dimension of control will be positively associated with subordinate’s success.

Part 2. Proposition 3: Subordinate’s fulfillment of superior’s role expectations will mediate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate’s success.

Part 3. Proposition 4: Other authority structures will moderate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate’s success.

Note. Not shown here are the propositions regarding: (1) complementary and non-complementary superior-subordinate styles; (2) dynamics of complementarity; and (3) normative congruence versus incongruence and complementarity.

The model has three parts: (1) the positive relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate success; (2) the mediation of this relationship by subordinate’s fulfillment of superior’s role expectations; and (3) the moderation of this relationship by other authority structures.

Part 1 of the model suggests that the effectiveness of a subordinate’s behavioral style in achieving preferred outcomes may depend on its complementarity with a superior’s leadership style and underlying conception of authority with respect to the interpersonal dimension of control (dominance-submissiveness). Complementarity refers to the extent to which one person’s interpersonal style evokes a predictable set of behaviors from the other person (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins,
Complementary behavior is reciprocal with respect to the control dimension (i.e., dominance invites submissiveness; submissiveness invites dominance) and has been shown to facilitate social relationships and task accomplishment (Dryer & Horowitz, 1979, 1982; Estroff & Nowicki, 1992; Nowicki & Manheim, 1991; O'Connor & Dyce, 1997; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tracey, 2004). In contrast to past research which has tended to focus on the automatic nature of complementarity in relationships where there is no prior hierarchy (for an exception, see Moskowitz, Ho, & Turcotte-Tremblay, 2007), I propose that complementary behavior may be a conscious strategic means by which subordinates empower themselves in the hierarchically differentiated superior-subordinate relationship. I also consider how complementarity processes play out in superior-subordinate relationships over time.

Based on previous research in the leadership and authority literatures, I derive a classification of two fundamental, opposing superior styles based on their underlying authority cognitions: (1) empowering cognitive behavioral style—a person-oriented, participative approach based on normative authority, and (2) controlling cognitive behavioral style—a task-oriented, directive approach based on rational authority. I view these on a continuum, with empowering at one end and controlling at the other. Moreover, I classify subordinate behavioral styles based on the interpersonal dimension of control, which has at opposing poles dominance and submissiveness, and I argue that previous tactics identified by popular typologies in the influence literature can be subsumed by these two meta-categories. I posit that there is complementarity between the empowering superior style and the dominant subordinate style and between the controlling superior style and the submissive subordinate style. Specifically, empowering
superiors delegate authority to subordinates, thereby adopting a more submissive stance within the relationship, and consequently may prefer subordinates who adopt a dominant stance (complementarity) over subordinates who adopt a submissive stance (non-complementarity). In contrast, controlling superiors keep authority to themselves, thereby adopting a more dominant stance, and consequently may prefer subordinates who adopt a submissive stance (complementarity) over subordinates who adopt a dominant stance (non-complementarity). Thus, I argue that even though the superior-subordinate relationship is hierarchically asymmetrical, complementarity may ironically go in both directions depending on whether the superior adopts a more submissive or more dominant leadership style.

Part 2 of the model suggests that the positive effects of complementarity on subordinates’ success may be due to the subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ normative expectations\(^1\) about appropriate behaviors for the subordinates’ role. Despite the popularity of the complementarity construct in recent years, there has been surprisingly little work on how the complementarity mechanism works. I propose that by meeting their role obligations and behaving in ways that are useful to their superiors, subordinates fulfill their superiors’ needs (e.g., for task coordination, productivity), who in turn fulfill their subordinates’ needs to achieve their preferred psychological and work-related outcomes. Accordingly, using fit terminology, complementarity may also be viewed as a type of “complementary fit,” which is the compatibility between a subordinate and

\(^1\)Normative expectations are not simply a belief about will happen, but they are also a fundamental desire for something to happen. Normative expectations are distinct from success. Subordinates may conform to normative expectations and not be successful. Likewise, they may not conform to normative expectations and be successful.
superior (or person and environment, more generally) that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987).

Part 3 of the model suggests that other authority structures, like organizational culture, may moderate the effects of superior-subordinate style complementarity on subordinates' success. These other authority structures contain their own expectations about the appropriate behaviors of individuals in the different social roles implied by them. Subordinates must also behave with superiors in ways that conform with the role obligations that attach to their different social roles. As such, I theorize that subordinates will have greater success when the norms of authority for their different roles are congruent than when they are incongruent.

Structure of this Paper

In Chapter 2, I review the literatures relevant to understanding subordinate success with superiors and derive a theory, theoretical propositions and hypotheses. In Chapters 3 and 4, I test these hypotheses in two empirical studies. In Chapter 3, I present the first study, an experimental study conducted with international MBA students and senior executives who rated a subordinate presented in a case as if they were that subordinate's superior, and in Chapter 4, I present the second study, a field study which was conducted with superior (partner)-subordinate (associate) dyads at a law firm. In Chapter 5, I conclude with a discussion of the research findings and their theoretical and practical implications, and directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2

Theoretical Framework, Including Literature Review, Propositions and Hypotheses

Power, Influence, Politics and Status

In this section, I define the key concepts of power, influence, politics and status and describe the power bases available to superiors and subordinates to influence each other. I then review the current literature on subordinates' upward influence behaviors with their superiors.

Definition of Key Concepts

Power is contextual or defined with respect to a particular relationship (Emerson, 1962; Thibault & Kelley, 1959). Power refers to the potential of one person to influence another person. Specifically, the power of person A over person B is A’s ability to influence B despite B’s resistance (Cartwright, 1959; Dahl, 1957; French & Raven, 1959; Pfeffer, 1981). Power stems from the possession of important resources or power bases.

French and Raven’s (1959) five bases of social power has been the most influential taxonomy of power bases: (1) coercive power (based on control over punishments); (2) reward power (based on control over rewards); (3) legitimate power (based on authority); (4) referent power (i.e., relational power, based on attraction or identification); and (5) expert power (based on knowledge, skills and abilities). Raven (1965) identified a sixth base of power, informational power (based on control over information). Subsequent

---

2 Another popular framework distinguishes between personal power and social power. In this framework, personal power involves one’s ability to act for oneself with agency, whereas social power is derived from one’s relationships to others and involves the exercise of one’s ability to influence (Fiske, 1993; Freitas & Higgins, 2002; Freitas, Liberman, & Higgins, 2002). In the present paper, power is viewed as a social construct – a person’s power depends on the relationship. This conception of power encompasses personal power, which is derived from personal characteristics (i.e., referent, expert) in contrast to structural power, which is derived from organizational position (i.e., legitimate, reward, control).
theorists grouped French and Raven’s (1959; Raven, 1965) bases into two meta-categories: (1) structural bases, which are properties of the organization or broader social structure, such as “formal” hierarchical and “informal” social network positions (e.g., "positional power," Bass, 1960; "hard/strong," Bui, Raven, & Schwarzwald, 1994; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998), and (2) personal bases, which are characteristics of the individual, such as reference and expertise (e.g., "personal power," Bass, 1960; "soft or weak," Bui et al., 1994; Raven et al., 1998).

Whereas power is a potential, influence is the actualization of that potential, or the use of that power to affect outcomes. Specifically, influence is the process through which individuals change the beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors of another person (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; French & Raven, 1959; Lewin, 1951). Politics involves the exercise of influence (or use of power) to overcome resistance or build a bigger power base, and tactics are the political behaviors used in this regard.

Status is a structural position involving relative respect and esteem (Fiske & Berdahl, 2007; Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Others confer status to an individual based on their judgments of that individual’s expertise or competence (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Magee & Galinsky, 2008). People generally want to associate with and be liked by high status others. Thus, status is a source of legitimate power, expert power and referent power. Individuals may draw on the bases of power afforded by their status to influence their superiors.

Superiors’ and Subordinates’ Power Bases

In superior-subordinate relationships, superiors and subordinates have access to different power bases that they may use to influence each other or build a bigger power base vis-à-vis the other. Superiors have authority and control over subordinates’ rewards
and punishments as dictated by their formal position and may have access to information
subordinates need to do their work through their formal position in the hierarchical
structure and informal position in social networks. In addition, they may have access to
personal bases of power, such as reference and expertise, to influence subordinates
(downward influence). In contrast, subordinates have less access to authority and control.
Although they may have some authority based on their status, and control over access to
persons, information and resources through their informal positions in social networks,
subordinates must rely to a greater extent on personal bases of power, or behavioral
strategies which rely on these bases of power, when trying to influence their superiors
(upward influence). By strategically employing behavioral styles, subordinates may build
their power vis-à-vis superiors and strengthen their ability to influence superiors to attain
desired outcomes.

Review of Upward Influence Literature

Despite numerous studies that have been conducted on the effectiveness of
influence tactics for subordinates’ success, there has been little consensus in the literature
regarding which tactics are effective, let alone which are relatively more effective. For
example, ingratiation has been positively related (e.g., Ferris et al., 1994) and negatively
related (e.g., Thacker, 1999) to superiors’ assessments of subordinates’ performance.
Likewise, assertiveness has been positively (e.g., Wayne et al., 1997) and negatively
related to superiors’ assessments of subordinates’ performance (e.g., Kipnis & Schmidt,
1988). A number of conceptual and empirical issues likely contribute to these
inconsistencies.

A critical conceptual issue is that researchers have taken a bottom-up descriptive
approach to the identification and classification of political tactics. Although numerous
taxonomies of influence tactics have been proposed, the classifications of Kipnis and colleagues (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980, later refined by Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988), Yukl and colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992) and Jones and Pittman (1982) have received the most attention. There has been no theory on power and politics driving the selection of constructs and describing how they relate to each other. Consequently, it is not clear whether the tactics that have been selected and subjected to empirical study are the most important tactics for subordinate success. The majority of research has focused on one or more of the following six tactics drawn from these typologies: ingratiation, self-promotion, assertiveness, rationality, exchange, upward appeals and coalitions (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). Of these tactics, only ingratiation and self-promotion have been extensively studied. In addition, as is evident from the numerous taxonomies in the literature, there is not a unified conception of the key political tactics.

There has also been a lack of consensus about the definition and measurement of political tactics. Accordingly, tactics that have the same label have been conceptualized and measured differently in different studies, which makes it difficult to integrate findings across studies. For example, some theorists define ingratiation as including self-promotion behaviors (e.g., Gordon, 1996), while others argue that ingratiation and self-promotion are two different classes of tactics (e.g., Godfrey, Jones, & Lord, 1986). Likewise, assertiveness has tended to be defined as a threatening, coercive tactic (e.g., Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Tracey, 1992), but outside of this literature, assertiveness is defined much more innocuously, as pursuing and speaking up for one’s interests (e.g., Ames & Flynn, 2007). Further compounding this problem is that researchers have used
different labels for the same construct. For example, Wayne and Ferris (1990) studied
what they called supervisor-focused and job-focused influence tactics but defined these
tactics in the same way as ingratiation and self-promotion, respectively.

Two meta-analyses have attempted to cumulate the results across studies and
draw firm conclusions. In a meta-analysis of 69 studies on ingratiation, Gordon (1996)
found a small positive effect of ingratiation on performance evaluations and a
significantly stronger positive effect of ingratiation on liking. However, Gordon included
self-promotion as a tactic of ingratiation, and when he looked at each tactic of
ingratiation individually he found significant negative effects for self-promotion on
judgments of likeability and performance. Higgins, Judge and Ferris (2003) conducted
another meta-analysis of 31 studies in which self-promotion was not defined as a tactic of
ingratiation, and they found stronger positive effects of ingratiation on performance
assessments and extrinsic success (salary and promotions). They found similar effects for
rationality. In contrast to Gordon (1996), they found non-significant positive effects of
self-promotion on performance assessments and extrinsic success. Higgins and
colleagues reported a significant positive effect of assertiveness on extrinsic success but a
significant negative effect of assertiveness on performance assessments. These results
need to be interpreted judiciously. As the discrepant results between the two studies
highlight, meta-analyses are only as good as the studies that they include, and as such
suffer from the same conceptual and empirical issues that contribute to the
inconsistencies in the literature.

Theorists have suggested that the political tactics identified by Kipnis and
colleagues (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Kipnis et al., 1980) can be regrouped into two
general categories, hard or soft, based on the amount of freedom they give the target in choosing whether to comply (e.g., Farmer, Maslyn, Fedor, & Goodman, 1997; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985; Van Knippenberg, Van Knippenberg, Blaauw, & Vermut, 1999). Hard tactics (e.g., assertiveness) involve the use of authority and formal power and allow the target less freedom in deciding whether to yield or resist than soft tactics (e.g., ingratiation), which involve the use of informal power or sources derived within the individual. In this research, hard tactics are generally found to be less effective than soft tactics (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Although this classification system is a step in the right direction because it is theory-based, its utility has been limited for several reasons. First, the categories are abstract meta-categories and do not imply specific behaviors. The meta-categories have also been limited to the behaviors identified in prior taxonomies and are not inclusive of all possible influence behaviors. In addition, the particular tactics used to represent each strategy have differed across different studies. However, this may in part be a function of the fact that the same tactic may be used in hard or soft ways. For example, exchange may be hard or soft depending on how overtly the person uses the exchange to manipulate the target into compliance.

Another critical issue with the influence literature is that past research has tended to investigate tactics individually despite the fact that tactics are likely used in interdependent ways. The results of the few studies that have looked at combinations of tactics have shown that tactics used in combination are generally more successful than single tactics if the tactics are compatible (Barry & Shapiro, 1992; Case, Dosier, Murkinson, & Keys, 1988; Falbe & Yukl, 1992). In superior-subordinate relationships, configurations of tactics that are used together over time (i.e., behavioral strategies) are
likely more important for subordinate success than specific tactics used on any one occasion. Furthermore, past research has tended to treat each influence attempt as an isolated episode rather than as part of a sequence of reciprocal influence processes that occur in a relationship between two individuals. Accordingly, the literature needs to move away from the examination of single isolated tactics to the examination of behavioral strategies within the context of reciprocal influence relationships.

Moreover, past research on influence has tended to be unmoderated and uncontextualized. For example, it has not considered how characteristics and behaviors of superiors may moderate the effectiveness of influence behaviors, or how higher level concepts, like organizational culture, may moderate the effectiveness of influence behaviors. Theorists have suggested a number of contextual factors that may affect the outcomes of using different political tactics, including the direction of influence (Yukl & Falbe, 1990), political norms (Porter, Allen, & Angle, 1981) and affect or liking (Ferris & Judge, 1991). Perhaps the most comprehensive contingency model to date is that of Yukl and Tracey (1992). They propose that a political tactic will be more effective: (1) if the target perceives it to be a socially acceptable form of influence behavior; (2) if the agent has sufficient power to use the tactic; (3) if the tactic has the capability to affect target attitudes about the desirability of the request; (4) if agent has the skill to use the tactic; and (5) if it is used for a request that is legitimate and consistent with target values and needs. Although this model is compelling, to date it has only been used to test predictions about directional differences (i.e., peers, subordinates, superiors) in tactic selection and effectiveness. As the model proposes, within superiors there may be significant
differences in targets’ beliefs, values and needs which may influence the effectiveness of
tactics. Accordingly, these differences need to be considered.

For the literature to progress beyond these limitations, we need a theoretically
informed approach that provides a strong rationale for the selection of constructs,
considers important contingencies and describes the broader context of how things hang
together. In this thesis, I propose a theory that draws on additional relevant literatures to
accomplish these objectives.

*Leadership Style and Authority Theories*

In this section, I draw on the leadership style and authority literatures and their
respective constructs to argue that there are two primary, opposing superior cognitive
behavioral styles. These two styles are based on different prototypes of how subordinates
and superiors should behave and imply different superior behaviors. In addition, they
imply distinct perceptions and evaluations of subordinate behaviors.

Leadership style (or leader behavior) theories are universal or “one best way”
theories. That is, they are based on the assumption that certain behaviors will be effective
for all leaders. These theories focus solely on the leader and not on the superior-
subordinate entity: The leader’s behavior is assumed to cause the subordinate’s behavior.
The style approach is exemplified by Blake and Mouton’s (1964) Managerial Grid, which
proposes that there are different styles of leadership based on combinations of two factors
regarding a concern for people and production and one best style of leadership, a
manager who is high on both factors (“high-high”); however, this has not been
empirically supported. Pure behavioral theories have fallen out of favor due to the failure
to find evidence for a universal style that is effective in all situations and to the failure to
find evidence for a clear link between style and performance outcomes. Nevertheless, the behavioral approach contributed greatly to our understanding of leadership processes.

Behavioral theorists sought to identify different patterns of leadership behavior and numerous conceptual schemes appeared to describe people’s leadership styles. Although the concepts were given different labels (and were not fully overlapping in meaning), they tended to draw a distinction between two opposing classes of leader behavior—task-oriented, directive behavior and relationship-oriented, participative behavior (Bass, 1990). In the present paper, I label the former class of behaviors “controlling” and the latter class of behaviors “empowering” to avoid confusion with prior theoretical terminology. This clustering of leadership behaviors has been empirically supported by factor analyses (e.g., Sweeney, Fiechtner, & Samores, 1975).

Although I draw on the leadership concepts from behavioral theories like Blake and Mouton’s (1964) Managerial Grid, my theory differs from these theories in that I do not purport there to be one best leadership style for all subordinates. Rather I argue that subordinates’ effectiveness will depend on the complementarity of their styles to their superiors’ styles.

Similarly to the leadership style literature, the authority literature has also distinguished between two opposing types of bureaucratic authority, rational and normative (Abrahamson, 1997; Barley & Kunda, 1992), which I argue have fundamental parallels to controlling and empowering styles respectively. Authority is the legitimate power associated with a role, which superiors possess. Specifically, they possess bureaucratic authority or authority from the charter of the organization (Weber, 1947). Rational authority is based upon the assumption that managers can optimize employee
productivity through formalized and rationalized work processes and reward systems. In contrast, normative authority is based upon the assumption that managers can optimize employee productivity by shaping their thoughts and fulfilling their social and psychological needs (Abrahamson, 1997; Barley & Kunda, 1992).

Rational and Normative Authority as Managers’ Internal Working Models

Superiors’ different conceptions of authority are cognitive schemas through which they process, interpret and evaluate subordinates’ behaviors. Their rational or normative conceptions of authority shape their implicit beliefs and values about subordinates and the nature of management and their normative expectations about the appropriate role behaviors of superiors and subordinates. They also sensitize them to different types of subordinate behaviors, affect the attributions they make for these behaviors and influence their reactions to them.

Superiors have been shown to respond differently to subordinates depending on the attributions they make for their behavior. For example, Eastman (1994) found that raters who attached different causal labels to the same set of extrarole behaviors (i.e., good citizenship versus ingratiation) gave higher overall performance evaluations and greater pay raises to subordinates whose behavior was believed to be good citizenship. Furthermore, the type of perceptions superiors form about their subordinates may lead them to attend selectively to their subordinates’ work behaviors over time such that they notice, store and then later recall, when rating subordinates, the positive work behaviors of subordinates whom they view favorably and the negative work behaviors of subordinates whom they view unfavorably (e.g., DeNisi & Williams, 1988). Accordingly, superiors’ different conceptions of authority may lead them to respond in different ways to the same subordinate behaviors.
Mapping of Leadership Styles onto Conceptions of Managerial Authority

The controlling and empowering leadership styles map onto the two types of authority, rational and normative respectively. Leadership concepts that draw on rational rhetorics include concern for production (Blake & Mouton, 1964), autocratic (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1938, 1938), production-centered (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), initiating structure (Fleishman, 1953) and Theory X (McGregor, 1960). Leadership concepts that draw on normative rhetorics include concern for people (Blake & Mouton, 1964), democratic (Lewin et al., 1938), employee-centered (Katz et al., 1950), consideration (Fleishman, 1953) and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960). Given that leadership concepts have their bases in rational or normative conceptions of authority, the authority literature provides a useful framework for integrating the different streams of leadership style research. Specifically, the controlling and empowering leadership styles can best be understood by situating them in the authority literature and defining them based on their underlying conceptions of authority. Accordingly, I label empowering and controlling as cognitive behavioral styles, because they involve different cognitions and behaviors. That is, empowering and controlling superiors have distinct schemas for how subordinates and superiors should behave that affect how they perceive, evaluate and interact with subordinates. These styles may be viewed as opposite poles on a continuum, with empowering at one end and controlling at the other. It is important to note that this conception of leadership styles does not exclude past conceptions but instead represents a higher level of abstraction (or meta-category) based on authority conceptions. Prior conceptions of leadership styles can be viewed as components of a broader category of controlling and empowering styles.
Rational authority and controlling cognitive behavioral style. Rational authority has its historical roots in Taylorism and the scientific management movement (Abrahamson, 1997; Barley & Kunda, 1992). Employees are conceived as self-interested and largely averse to responsibility and work. They are assumed to produce work only because formal organizational processes control their actions and appeal to their economic self-interest through the provision of extrinsic rewards for their efforts (McGregor, 1960). The role of management, then, is to optimize production by streamlining and formalizing organizational processes and by providing employees with extrinsic rewards for adhering to such processes. Managers are conceived as objective and calculating human engineers who are best equipped to understand and address issues of organizational importance due to their superior knowledge and abilities. Subordinates are conceived as ill-informed cogs that are unlikely to care about what is best for the organization.

Controlling managers, with their rational assumptions, sharply distinguish between superior and subordinate roles. Their perceptions of subordinates as ill-informed and effort averse feeds into their belief that management’s role is to conceive of and structure the work to be executed by subordinates, and to closely monitor subordinates to make sure they stay on task. Accordingly, their relations with subordinates tend to be more reserved and hierarchically ordered. In addition, they emphasize hierarchical relations, because social hierarchy establishes social order and facilitates coordination.

Controlling managers make all of the decisions. They view participative decision making with subordinates to be inefficient and not worth the time and effort it requires, since they perceive their subordinates to be ill-informed and unconcerned with what is in
the organization’s best interest. They expect subordinates’ agreement with decisions and unquestioning compliance with directives due to their hierarchical position. Controlling leaders may implicitly or explicitly discourage disagreement from subordinates, because they perceive such dissent or negative feedback as stemming from motives of self-interest, and as a challenge to the system and to their power and credibility (Bass, 1990).

In addition, controlling managers emphasize the strict adherence to organizational rules, processes and standards, because this allows them to maintain control over subordinates and optimize production. Controlling managers believe that structure is necessary to ensure subordinates do their work efficiently and effectively. Accordingly, they are not tolerant of deviations from the system, which lead to ambiguity and slow down production.

*Normative authority and empowering cognitive behavioral style.* Normative authority has its historical roots in the human relations and personnel management movement, which arose out of a reaction to the scientific management movement (Abrahamson, 1997; Barley & Kunda, 1992). Employees are conceived as having the capacity to find intrinsic rewards through work, to set their own direction, and to be self-controlling (McGregor, 1960). It is also believed that employees are ambitious and eager to accept greater responsibility. When their social and psychological needs are satisfied by superiors, work groups and organizations, employees are believed to exhibit increased loyalty, satisfaction and commitment, as well as increased motivation to achieve the organization’s goals and creativity to improve the processes to achieve those goals. Employees who are loyal can be trusted to act in the best interest of the organization. The
role of management, therefore, is to satisfy employees' needs and shape their thoughts and loyalties with enriched tasks, empowering management styles, and strong cultures.

Empowering managers delegate authority and responsibility to subordinates, because of their normative beliefs that subordinates have the capacity and desire to take control over their work and will experience greater intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and feelings of ownership and creativity when given this opportunity (e.g., Burke, 1986; Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006). Empowering managers encourage subordinates to take initiative and experiment with new approaches to their work, because they believe this will result in enhanced motivation to achieve goals and creativity to improve processes toward goal completion. They try to remove structural constraints and unnecessary rules or policies that prevent employees from performing to the best of their abilities. They also take a personal interest in subordinates' well-being and development. Empowering managers support and mentor their subordinates so that they are capable of acting autonomously and realizing their potential (Burke, 1986).

Empowering managers' relations with subordinates are less formal and more egalitarian in nature. They champion the use of participative decision making, because they believe that subordinates can offer valuable input and because they believe participation will increase subordinates' involvement and commitment. In this and other ways (e.g., by seeking advice, opinions and feedback), empowering managers motivate subordinates to engage in upward communication. They encourage subordinates to express divergent viewpoints, because they believe dissent can lead to better solutions.

At the same time, empowering managers also take steps to ensure that subordinates do not use their increased power to pursue their own objectives at the
expense of the organization (Hardy & Leiba-O'Sullivan, 1998). For example, subordinates may be permitted to make decisions only within the specified policies and procedures set by management. In this way, empowering managers use their power to set the constraints within which their subordinates are encouraged to join in deciding what is to be done. Thus, empowering leadership, like controlling leadership, is a control mechanism whereby subordinates are given power within a limited domain to accomplish what the leader wants. By empowering subordinates, leaders lower their subordinates' resistance to do what they want them to do, thereby increasing their own power. Subordinates are expected to take the power granted to them in the form of greater autonomy and responsibility to do good things for the organization.

**Summary of Leadership Style and Authority Literatures**

The two opposing leadership styles that have been identified in the leadership literature—controlling and empowering—draw on the two opposing types of bureaucratic authority that have been identified in the authority literature—rational and normative respectively. Superiors’ conceptions of authority are cognitive schemas through which they process, interpret and evaluate subordinate behaviors. I propose that leadership styles may be better understood by defining them in terms of their underlying conceptions of authority. In other words, I posit that they should be viewed as cognitive behavioral styles because of their different underlying cognitions and overt behaviors. The controlling cognitive behavioral style is based on rational assumptions that employees are self-interested and averse to effort and responsibility. Accordingly, controlling managers assume a directive, task-oriented approach whereby they seek to control employees’ actions through formal organizational processes and reward systems. In contrast, the empowering behavioral style is based on normative assumptions that
employees have the capacity to find intrinsic rewards from their work and are eager to
take on greater responsibility. Thus, empowering managers assume a participative,
people-oriented approach whereby they delegate authority and responsibility to
subordinates.

**Superior-Subordinate Dyadic Processes**

This section will cover four major classes of theories from different literatures
that provide key insights into superior-subordinate dyadic processes and their effects on
subordinate success: (1) contingency theories; (2) leader-member exchange (LMX)
theory; (3) superior-subordinate fit theory; (4) complementarity theory.

**Contingency Theories**

As mentioned earlier, despite numerous studies, researchers have not been able to
demonstrate consistent relationships between leadership style and effectiveness, which
suggested that these effects might not be universal. Accordingly, leadership theorists
began to consider how contextual factors might moderate the relationship between leader
characteristics and leader effectiveness (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977;
House, 1971; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The central premise of these contingency theories
is that there is no one best leadership style; rather, the optimal leadership style will
depend on various contextual factors. These theories made great strides in recognizing
the importance of contextual influences on leadership effectiveness. They were also the
first to incorporate the subordinate and consider superior-subordinate dyadic processes
(i.e., the influence of subordinate characteristics on leader effectiveness and the superior-
subordinate relationship on subordinate outcomes). However, they still put primary
emphasis on the characteristics of superiors and how these characteristics make them
more or less effective in different situations, while characteristics of subordinates or of
the relationship are relegated to moderator variables. Moreover, existing theories have only looked at the superior’s style and not at the subordinate’s style or how the two combine to affect subordinate outcomes. They also have not considered other authority structures, like demographic and cultural factors, as potential moderator variables (Yukl, 2006).

*Leader Member Exchange (LMX) Theory*

In contrast to previous theories that assumed leaders treated all of their subordinates in a similar way, leader-member exchange (LMX) theory was the first to posit that leaders form differentiated relationships with their subordinates (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975). Moreover, LMX theory is the only leadership approach that makes the dyadic relationship between the superior and subordinate the focal point of the leadership process. LMX specifies that the quality of the dyadic relationship between a superior and subordinate (high versus low) is predictive of positive individual, group and organizational outcomes. However, the literature on LMX has serious conceptual and methodological shortcomings that limit the utility of this approach and of research demonstrating LMX to be associated with a number of positive organizational outcomes, such as more positive performance evaluations, higher frequency of promotions, greater job satisfaction, decreased turnover, greater organizational commitment and greater organizational citizenship (for an overview, see Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). One issue is that researchers have not been consistent in their definition of LMX: Although for the most part LMX has been defined as the quality of exchange between the superior and subordinate, a number of other theoretical definitions have been offered, including negotiating latitude (e.g., McClane, 1991); social exchange (e.g., Deluga & Perry, 1991); latitude or supervisor attention (e.g., Yammarino &
Dubinsky, 1990); maturity of the relationship (e.g., Graen & Wakabayashi, 1992); and incremental influence (e.g., Fairhurst, 1993). There has also been a lack of consensus about whether LMX is uni-dimensional or multi-dimensional, and among researchers who view LMX as comprised of sub-dimensions there has been little agreement about what those dimensions are (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). Another major issue is that the basic theoretical premises of LMX are not fully developed. LMX does not provide a clear description of the nature of the exchange process between the superior and subordinate (i.e., what must be given for an exchange to be perceived as rewarding or beneficial, i.e., high quality; (Dansereau, Yammarino, & Markham, 1995; Dienesch & Liden, 1986); nor does it specify what pattern of downward and upward exchange relations leads to optimal outcomes (i.e., the specific leader and subordinate behaviors that promote high quality relationships and thus optimal organizational outcomes). These issues have been further compounded by the operationalization of LMX with many different measures of questionable validity across studies (Schriesheim et al., 1999). Thus, it remains unclear exactly what these LMX scales are measuring and difficult to interpret and synthesize study results.

In the present research, I draw on LMX theory in the following ways. Similarly to LMX, I focus on the dyadic relationship between the superior and subordinate and view superiors as having different relationships with different subordinates. In addition, like LMX, I draw on social exchange theory, which emphasizes that individuals develop and maintain relationships with others who engage in behaviors that are reinforcing to them, or in which benefits of participating in the relationship outweigh the costs (Homans, 1958). In contrast to LMX, I describe the nature of the exchange process, and I specify
the subordinate behaviors that lead to optimal subordinate outcomes with superiors who have different leadership styles.

**Superior-Subordinate Fit**

Fit refers to the compatibility between a subordinate and superior (or person and environment, more generally) that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs (complementary fit), or (b) they possess similar fundamental characteristics (supplementary fit; e.g., values, goals, personality, attitudes), or (c) both (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). The literature on superior-subordinate fit examines three types of similarities or compatibilities—actual similarity, perceived similarity and perceptual congruence—between superiors and subordinates with respect to a host of variables and the implications of these compatibilities for outcomes. Much of the previous research on superior-subordinate fit has focused on surface-level, easily observable attributes, like gender, race and age, but the findings from these studies are inconsistent (e.g., see Harrison, Price, & Bell, 1998). Of greater relevance, studies of superior-subordinate fit on deep-level, underlying attributes (e.g., values, attitudes, traits) have consistently found actual and perceived similarity in these attributes to be associated with positive subordinate affective and behavioral outcomes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, superior-subordinate liking, performance, promotion and pay (e.g., Adkins, Russell, & Werbel, 1994; Deluga, 1998; Lankau, Riordan, & Thomas, 2005; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989, 1992; Miles, 1964; Phillips & Bedeian, 1994; Pulakos & Wexley, 1983; Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002; Senger, 1971; Turban & Jones, 1988; Van Vianen, 2000; Witt, 1998). Research further suggests that perceptual congruence, or accuracy of perception of the other, may be most important in leader-follower relations (Turban &
Most significant to the present paper, studies have demonstrated that congruency of role perceptions between superiors and subordinates is positively related to subordinate job satisfaction and performance ratings (Bernardin, 1979; Greene, 1972), presumably because this awareness enables subordinates to comply with superiors’ expectations. Although this research frames perceptual congruence as a similarity effect – or, using the fit terminology, as due to “supplementary fit” – the underlying mechanism actually seems to be the fulfillment of superiors’ needs – that is, to be due to “complementary fit.” However, this research does not test whether the fulfillment of superiors’ expectations accounts for the similarity of perceptions effect. More significantly, this literature does not examine the nature of the superiors’ needs and expectations, and how subordinates’ compliance with these needs and expectations affects subordinate outcomes. The theory and research presented in this dissertation addresses these questions.

Complementarity

Interpersonal theorists argue that people differ in their preferred ways of interacting and that these preferences can be described along two primary dimensions: power or control, which is anchored by dominance and submissiveness, and affiliation, which is anchored by agreeableness and quarrelsomeness (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins, 1979, 1982). Behavior associated with the control dimension conveys information about desires and expectations regarding who will be in charge, while behavior associated with the affiliation dimension conveys information about desires and expectations regarding warmth and closeness. These theorists postulate that the most prevalent and rewarding interaction pattern is complementarity. Complementarity refers to the extent to which one person’s interpersonal style evokes a
predictable set of behaviors from the other person. Specifically, complementary responses are reciprocal with respect to the control dimension (i.e., dominance invites submissiveness and submissiveness invites dominance) and similar with respect to the affiliation dimension (i.e., agreeableness invites agreeableness and quarrelsomeness invites quarrelsomeness). Interpersonal theorists further posit that individuals' behavioral styles will become more complementary as their relationship progresses if they are invested in and/or cannot leave the relationship (Kiesler, 1983).

There is considerable evidence that people often respond to others in a complementary fashion (Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Horowitz et al., 1991; Locke & Sadler, 2007; Markey, Funder, & Ozer, 2003; Sadler & Woody, 2003; Strong et al., 1988; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tracey, 1994; Tracey, Ryan, & Jaschik-Herman, 2001). Moreover, recent research suggests that individuals' perceptions of "dominance complementarity," i.e., interactions whereby one person assumes the dominant role and the other assumes the submissive role, are more common in task-oriented relationships than non-task-oriented relationships (Moskowitz et al., 2007; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tiedens, Unzueta, & Young, 2007), and are enhanced to the degree that they want a successful working relationship (Tiedens et al., 2007). Other research supports that complementarity produces more positive outcomes for the interaction, including greater liking of the other person, greater comfort with the other person and improved performance when working with the other person (Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Estroff & Nowicki, 1992; Nowicki & Manheim, 1991; O'Connor & Dyce, 1997; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tracey, 2004). Furthermore, there is preliminary support for the notion that people's behavioral styles
become more complementary over time. Specifically, in a recent study, Markey and Kurtz (2006) found that college roommates' perceptions of their behavioral styles became more complementary the longer they knew each other (at 15 weeks versus at 2 weeks).

In this thesis, I focus solely on the dominance-submissiveness dimension, because it is this dimension that concerns power and control. Following Tiedens et al. (2007), I refer to interactions whereby one person assumes the dominant role and the other assumes the submissive role as "dominance complementarity." To date, studies of dominance complementarity have focused on the negotiation of status positions in relationships in which there is no prior hierarchy. In this research, complementarity effects have been thought to be automatic and unconscious, because participants lack awareness of others' effects on their own behavior and of the positive interpersonal consequences of this behavior (e.g., Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens et al., 2007). The majority of this research has been conducted in the laboratory with individuals interacting with confederates, imagined interaction partners or randomly paired strangers (e.g., Markey et al., 2003; Sadler & Woody, 2003; Strong et al., 1988; Tracey, 1994). Thus, in this research, complementarity has been examined as a static process in which two individuals come together and either exhibit complementarity or do not exhibit complementarity (for an exception, see Markey & Kurtz, 2006).

In contrast, this dissertation examines the behavior of people in positions where there are real power differences based on hierarchical status. Moreover, I consider how superiors' and subordinates' conscious awareness of complementarity processes may affect subordinates' behaviors and superiors' evaluations of these behaviors. In addition,
I consider complementarity dynamically with superior-subordinate dyads that differ in their degree of familiarity. I also seek to understand the processes by which complementarity leads to beneficial relationship outcomes. Although research has begun to address when people engage in complementary behavior (Markey & Kurtz, 2006; Moskowitz et al., 2007; Tiedens et al., 2007), research has not examined why complementarity has beneficial effects on relationship outcomes.

Summary of Superior-Subordinate Dyadic Processes

In this section, I reviewed four classes of theories from different literatures that are relevant for understanding superior-subordinate dyadic processes: contingency theories, leader-member exchange theory, superior-subordinate fit theory and complementarity theory. Contingency theories have focused on identifying the types of leadership behaviors that are optimal in a given situation, including with subordinates of given characteristics and behaviors. Although contingency theories contributed much to our understanding of leadership processes, existing theories have only looked at the superior’s style and not at the subordinate’s style and how the two combine to affect subordinate’s outcomes, and they have not considered how other authority structures (e.g., demographic or cultural variables) affect subordinate’s outcomes. In my theory, I consider how the effectiveness of the subordinate’s style is contingent on the superior’s style and also how other authority structures affect these relationships.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory is the only leadership approach that makes the dyadic relationship between the superior and subordinate the focal point of the leadership process. LMX posits that superiors develop different types of exchange relations with different subordinates and that these relations are linked to organizational outcomes (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975). However, its contribution
has been limited because of significant conceptual and methodological shortcomings. Like LMX theory, in this dissertation I focus on the superior-subordinate dyad and argue that superiors develop different exchange relationships with different subordinates; however, I go further to describe the nature of the exchange process and specify the types of subordinate behaviors contingent on superior behaviors that lead to optimal subordinate outcomes.

Research on superior-subordinate fit suggests that superior-subordinate perceptual congruence concerning subordinate work expectations is positively related to subordinate job satisfaction and performance ratings (Bernardin, 1979; Greene, 1972). Although perceptual congruence is framed as a similarity effect in this research—or, using fit terminology, as due to supplementary fit—the true but untested mechanism seems to be the fulfillment of the superiors' needs and expectations—that is, to be due to complementary fit. In this research, I examine the nature of the superiors’ needs and expectations, and how subordinates’ fulfillment of these needs and expectations affects their outcomes.

Research on dominance complementarity shows that interaction partners tend to differentiate in terms of dominance, particularly in task-oriented relationships; this tendency may strengthen when people want a successful work relationship and over the course of a relationship, and when complementarity occurs, there are positive relational and task outcomes (e.g., Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Estroff & Nowicki, 1992; Markey & Kurtz, 2006; Moskowitz et al., 2007; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tiedens et al., 2007). In this research, complementarity effects have been thought to exist below awareness and have been demonstrated with individuals who did not differ in
terms of their status (for an exception, see Moskowitz et al., 2007). In contrast, I consider how complementary behavior may be used intentionally by subordinates, in their hierarchically asymmetrical relationships with their superiors, in order to facilitate positive relations and achieve their preferred outcomes. Moreover, while recent research has examined when complementarity leads to better outcomes (i.e., moderators of complementarity), I consider why complementarity leads to better outcomes (i.e., mediators of complementarity).

**Dominant and Submissive Styles of Subordinateship**

In this section, I draw on interpersonal theory to argue that there are two primary, opposing styles of subordinateship—dominance and submissiveness—which can be viewed as meta-categories that subsume previous tactics identified by popular typologies in the influence literature. I explain how subordinates may strategically employ these styles as impression management devices to obtain valued outcomes from superiors. As described earlier, interpersonal theory has identified the interpersonal dimension of control, which has at opposing poles dominance and submissiveness, as the dimension of interpersonal behavior central to understanding power relationships (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins, 1979, 1982). Accordingly, I propose that subordinate influence behaviors be classified based on whether they are dominant or submissive behaviors. This taxonomy does not exclude past taxonomies but instead represents a further level of abstraction. The prior tactics described in popular upward influence taxonomies can be viewed as components of the broader categories of dominance and submissiveness. For example, dominance subsumes previous conceptualizations of assertiveness and self-promotion, and submissiveness subsumes ingratiation and supplication. Unlike prior meta-categories in the influence literature,
which are abstract (namely, hard-soft), dominance-submissiveness implies specific, real behaviors.

**Dominance**

Dominance\(^3\) involves the use of agentic behaviors (e.g., assertiveness, self-promotion) to gain the superior’s respect for one’s competence and ambition. Dominant subordinates engage in proactive “attention-getting” nonverbal and verbal behaviors to demonstrate their personal competencies and goal orientation and signal their value to superiors (Godfrey et al., 1986). For example, dominant subordinates are assertive and forthright, express their ideas with confidence, engage in initiative-taking behavior, and indicate their forcefulness when interacting with superiors. In other words, dominant subordinates exhibit what Keltner and colleagues (2003) describe as an action orientation, which comprises approach-related behaviors associated with the powerful, namely the pursuit of opportunities and benefits in the immediate environment and disinhibited social behavior.

Prior research has shown that individuals are granted greater status, and consequently influence, if they are perceived as possessing greater task and social competence (e.g., Berger et al., 1972; Ridgeway & Diekema, 1989). In a recent study, Anderson and Kilduff (2009) demonstrated that dominant individuals achieved influence because their behavior made them appear more competent even when they actually lacked competence. Accordingly, subordinates who behave dominantly may benefit from

---

\(^3\) Although this conceptualization of dominance is more akin to assertiveness (i.e., independent and autonomous behavior), I chose the former term over the latter term to avoid confusion with the influence tactic assertiveness, which has tended to be defined as threatening, coercive behavior (e.g., Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl & Tracey, 1992).
a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby superiors view them as more competent and consequently grant them greater power as a result of their behaving in powerful ways.

**Submissiveness**

Submissiveness involves the use of appeasement behaviors (e.g., ingratiation, supplication) to elicit interpersonal attraction or liking from the superior for one’s affability and helpfulness. Submissive subordinates engage in reactive “attention-giving” verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Godfrey et al., 1986). For example, they are cautious and humble, conform to their superiors’ opinions, avoid conflict and comply with their superiors’ requests. In other words, submissive subordinates exhibit what Keltner and colleagues (2003) call inhibition-related behaviors associated with the powerless, which include attention to threats and others’ interests in social interactions and constrained social behavior.

Although it seems counterintuitive that individuals would behave in submissive, powerless ways to achieve power, and contrary to the notion of the self-fulfilling prophecy, previous theorists have suggested that in certain circumstances submissive behavior may be necessary to achieve one’s objectives (e.g., Baumeister, Tice, & Hutton, 1989; Trower & Gilbert, 1989). Specifically, they have argued that individuals will employ submissiveness when they have low expectations about being able to effectively exert influence via a dominance approach. These theorists postulate that submissive behaviors allow people to stay in contact with dominant individuals, by signaling their commitment to the social norms, assuring the dominant others that their status is not being threatened and by evoking emotions that reduce aggression and increase liking and affiliation. Thus, subordinates may use submissive behaviors to minimize the possibility of conflict with superiors.
Research suggests that subordinates may frequently adopt a submissive approach when they have low expectations about being successful with a dominant approach. For example, Mainiero (1986) reported that people in low-power jobs were more likely to employ acquiescence as their primary tactic than individuals in high-power jobs (and women in these positions more so than men), because they felt their jobs were structured in such a constraining manner that they had no other alternative. In addition, Westaphal and Stern (2006) found that it was especially important for top managers with low status characteristics (i.e., non-elite background, demographic minority) to behave submissively toward the CEO of their companies to receive board appointments. Other research shows that low-power individuals will defend and justify the systems that subordinate them (e.g., Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Pelham, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2003), and that they will try to achieve a high-power position within the system rather than attempt disruptive forms of action when they perceive the system as permeable to individual advancement (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). Therefore, subordinates may engage in submissive behavior and project an image opposite to what they want to achieve to appease superiors and meet their expectations in order to gain rewards. By adopting a subdominant social role and supporting the hierarchy, submissive subordinates seek to elicit supportive and socially responsive behaviors from superiors. Theorists have noted that submissive subordinate behaviors make salient a cultural norm of obligation or social responsibility, which requires that superiors who have the skills and resources provide help to dependent subordinates who would not otherwise be able to get what they need on their own (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Jones & Pittman, 1982). In this regard, submissive subordinates exchange a temporary loss of power for an anticipated gain in
the future. In other words, by behaving in powerless ways, submissive subordinates may be granted greater power by superiors who view them as more attractive.

**Dominance and Submissiveness as Strategic Behavior**

A number of theorists have emphasized the strategic, impression management function of political behaviors (e.g., Jones & Pittman, 1982; Schlenker, 1980). Goffman (1955) introduced the notion that people alter the image they choose to present and the strategy used to present this image based on the situation they are in and the outcomes they hope to achieve. Research indicates that people reliably attend to the person who controls their outcomes in order to understand how they need to behave to receive them (e.g., Depret & Fiske, 1999; Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000; Stevens & Fiske, 2000). Subordinates who depend on superiors for their valued outcomes are especially likely to use political tactics to manage the impressions they convey in interpersonal interactions with their superiors in order to achieve desired outcomes (Baron, 1986; Stevens & Kristof, 1995; von Baeyer, Sherk, & Zanna, 1981). Copeland (1994) found that low-power individuals confirmed high-power individuals' expectations about them, because they were motivated to facilitate favorable interaction outcomes. Ferris and Judge (1991) proposed that political tactics can be used to promote the perception of fit, and thus influence human resource decisions. Several studies have found that subordinates adapt their political behaviors to complement their superiors' leadership style. Ansari and Kapoor (1987) found that undergraduates in a role-play situation were more likely to use rationality tactics when their target was participative but were more likely to employ ingratiation tactics when their target was authoritarian. Similarly, in a sample of Indian participants, Pandey and Bohra (1984) found that subordinates in a role-play situation were more likely to use ingratiation tactics with autocratic superiors than
with other types of superiors. In addition, in a sample of actual subordinates, Cable and Judge (2003) found that subordinates were more likely to use consultation and inspirational appeal tactics when their superiors were transformational leaders, but were more likely to use exchange, coalition, legitimization and pressure tactics when their superiors were laissez-faire leaders. Although compelling, this research is limited in that it does not address the effectiveness of adapting one’s approach to a superior’s style.

In this thesis, I argue that subordinates may use dominant and submissive behaviors as impression management strategies. That is, they may exhibit complementarity to their superiors—i.e., adopt submissive roles in response to their superiors’ dominant roles or vice versa—in order to develop and maintain a reputation that will influence their superiors to provide them with their desired outcomes. In this regard, dominance and submissiveness may be consciously adapted behavioral styles used to build harmonious relations with superiors and secure long-term goals (i.e., what theorists have labeled strategic impression management (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984) and impression management tactics (Yukl, 2006)) as opposed to episodic tactics enacted to accomplish a specific task objective or secure a short-term goal (i.e., what theorists have labeled tactical impression management (Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984) and proactive influence tactics (Yukl, 2006)). Moreover, I posit that subordinates’ desired growth or consolidation of power may or may not be directed toward valued outcomes in the immediate future. Subordinates may instead build their power base and tap into it in unspecified future encounters with superiors. From this perspective, dominance and submissiveness may both be considered empowerment strategies.
Note this is not to say that all dominance and submissiveness styles are strategic behaviors. For example, some subordinates will not attempt to strategically alter their behavioral styles but rather will exhibit behaviors in their interactions with superiors that are consistent with their dispositions regardless of whether these behaviors complement their superiors’ behaviors. Others may unconsciously adopt a complementary pattern of behavior to their superiors. However, I argue that subordinates will tend to be conscious of their expression of dominant and submissive behaviors and motivated to exhibit complementarity in order to facilitate a positive working relationship and achieve their desired outcomes. Although dominance complementarity may operate outside of awareness in interactions with new relationship partners where there is no prior hierarchy or in more egalitarian relationships, it may be more obvious in interactions with relationship partners where there are pre-established hierarchical differences in positions. In such relationships, individuals are likely more aware of their styles of relating to each other and the implications thereof.

Superior and Subordinate Style Complementarity and Subordinate Success

Based on interpersonal circumplex theory (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins, 1979, 1982), I theorize that subordinates will have the greatest success when their style is complementary to their superiors’ with respect to control (i.e., dominance-submissiveness). In other words, I theorize that superior-subordinate dominance complementarity will lead to positive superior attitudes, cognitions and behaviors toward subordinates. The superior-subordinate relationship is an exchange relationship where each party brings different needs and resources (Baird & Kram, 1983; Winch, 1955), and through dominance complementarity each party gets his or her personal needs met. Thus, dominance complementarity may be viewed as a type of
complementary fit, which is the compatibility between a subordinate and superior that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Superiors who experience dominance complementarity with their subordinates will find the relationships more rewarding and productive and will consequently view their subordinates more favorably (see Dryer & Horowitz, 1997; Estroff & Nowicki, 1992; Nowicki & Manheim, 1991; O'Connor & Dyce, 1997; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tracey, 2004). Accordingly, they may grant them more resources, higher performance ratings and better promotability assessments. Previous research has linked the superior-subordinate relationship and superior affect to resource allocation, performance ratings, and promotability assessments (Ferris et al., 1994; Judge & Ferris, 1993; Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971; Podsakoff, 1982; Thacker, 1999; Turban & Jones, 1988; Wayne & Liden, 1995; Wayne et al., 1997).

Complementary behavior is reciprocal with respect to power. As illustrated in Figure 2, there is complementarity between the empowering leadership style and the dominant subordinate style, and between the controlling leadership style and the submissive subordinate style. In contrast, there is non-complementarity between the empowering leadership style and the submissive subordinate style, and between the controlling leadership style and the dominant subordinate style.
Figure 2. Dominance complementarity relationships between empowering and controlling leadership styles and dominant and submissive subordinate styles.

Specifically, controlling superiors keep authority to themselves, thereby adopting a more dominant stance. Subordinates who adopt a submissive stance may thus have better outcomes with controlling superiors than subordinates who adopt a dominant stance. In contrast, empowering superiors delegate authority to subordinates, thereby adopting a more submissive stance. Subordinates who adopt a dominant stance may thus have better outcomes with empowering superiors than subordinates who adopt a submissive stance.

Like prior researchers (Judge & Bretz, 1994; Judge et al., 1995; London & Stumpf, 1983), I define subordinate career success as including both psychological (e.g., job stress, burnout) and work-related outcomes (e.g., pay, promotion).
Proposition 1. Subordinates will be more successful when their style is complementary to their superiors’ style on the interpersonal dimension of control (i.e., dominance-submissiveness).

Complementarity between Empowering Superior and Dominant Subordinate

Empowering superiors want their subordinates to take the authority and responsibility granted to them to do good things for the organization. Therefore, they may prefer competent, ambitious subordinates who utilize their potential, work independently and make unique contributions. By maximizing their potential, dominant subordinates enable their empowering superiors to do their job better and thus make them look good. That is, dominant subordinates’ effective performance reinforces their empowering superiors’ personal interests. In addition, mutual knowledge sharing and open communication may lead to the development of greater trust between empowering superiors and dominant subordinates. Through such cooperative behaviors, dominant subordinates facilitate positive interactions and greater coordination with their empowering superiors.

Furthermore, agentic behaviors are considered essential for the success of leaders (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002). Thus, empowering superiors may view dominant subordinates as having what it takes to succeed at higher levels in the organization. In this way, subordinates’ behavior toward their superiors may create a positive self-fulfilling prophecy. Empowering superiors may view subordinates who behave in dominant ways as more competent and may then provide them the means to accomplish even more (cf. Anderson & Kilduff, 2009). Accordingly, empowering superiors may react more positively to subordinates who present themselves as dominant, because they take the authority delegated to them to support the organization’s objectives.
Proposition 1A. There is complementarity between the empowering leadership style and the dominant subordinate style.

Non-complementarity between Empowering Superior and Submissive Subordinate

In contrast, empowering superiors may react negatively to submissive subordinates, because they do not utilize the power granted to them. They may view submissive subordinates’ failure to take on authority and responsibility as indicative of incompetence or laziness. For example, they may attribute submissive subordinates’ dependence and conformity to weakness and lack of creativity. Submissive subordinates may also be slower to complete tasks due to their dependence on their superiors for guidance, and may consequently hinder their superiors’ accomplishment of work objectives.

Since submissive behavior goes against the agentic stereotype of successful leaders (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002), empowering superiors may not view submissive subordinates as having what it takes to advance in the organization and may consequently provide them with fewer opportunities to develop. Hence, submissive subordinate behavior may create a negative self-fulfilling prophecy with empowering superiors, which negatively affects their success.

Proposition 1B. There is non-complementarity between the empowering leadership style and the submissive subordinate style.

Complementarity between Controlling Superior and Submissive Subordinate

Controlling superiors want to maintain their status and control. Therefore, they may prefer submissive subordinates who affirm their authority. By submitting to controlling superiors’ authority, submissive subordinates bestow respect and power unto them and validate the system (Goffman, 1955; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986). In addition,
submissive subordinates facilitate harmonious relationships and task coordination with controlling superiors by obediently doing their work and not causing trouble and supporting them in realizing their objectives. This in turn helps make their controlling superiors look good. In this way, submissive subordinates’ effective performance reinforces their controlling superiors’ personal interests.

Furthermore, controlling superiors may not consider submissive subordinates’ powerless behavior as indicative of their ability to take on a leadership position, because they themselves will behave submissively with their superiors (Fiske & Berdahl, 2007). Since controlling superiors will shift between submitting to their superiors and dominating their subordinates, they may view subordinates as having the same capacity and perceive them as being able to flexibly adapt to their role. Therefore, controlling superiors may react more positively to subordinates who present themselves as submissive, because they get their job done and support the system.

**Proposition 1C. There is complementarity between the controlling leadership style and the submissive subordinate style.**

**Non-complementarity between Controlling Superior and Dominant Subordinate**

In contrast, controlling superiors may react negatively to dominant subordinates who display competence and ambition, because they challenge their authority and the hierarchy. Tactics viewed by superiors as challenging their power tend to be ineffective (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Schilit & Locke, 1982). Controlling superiors may view dominant subordinates’ competent and ambitious behavior as a threat to their power and the system. For example, they may see subordinates’ dominant behavior as illegitimate attempts to gain power at their expense and as signaling a sense of superiority in the relationship (Anderson, Srivastava, Beer, Spataro, & Chatman, 2006). Dominant
subordinates may have conflictual relationships with controlling superiors, because of the formers’ refusal to defer and attempts to take charge. Controlling superiors may view them as troublemakers for causing discord and hindering the realization of their goals.

Accordingly, controlling superiors may be less likely to acknowledge and reward the competence of dominant subordinates who try to outshine them by taking on aspects of their role through the demonstration of agentic leader behaviors, because their successful performance may threaten the controlling superiors’ position. Controlling superiors may instead meet dominant subordinate behaviors with resistance and backlash. Therefore, controlling superiors may react more negatively to subordinates who present themselves as dominant, because they subvert their authority and the hierarchy and hinder task coordination and productivity.

**Proposition 1D. There is non-complementarity between the controlling leadership style and the dominant subordinate style.**

*The Dynamics of Complementarity*

In superior-subordinate relationships, complementarity is a dynamic process whereby superiors and subordinates to some extent explicitly negotiate the roles that each person will assume in the relationship. Accordingly, it is a reciprocal influence process in which subordinates’ behaviors and attitudes are shaped by superiors’ behaviors, and superiors’ behaviors and attitudes are shaped by subordinates’ behaviors. However, I argue that subordinates will adapt their behaviors to superiors’ behaviors to a much greater extent than vice versa. Superiors may adapt their empowering and controlling behaviors to some extent based on their subordinates’ abilities, because when their subordinates do well at their job, it helps them do well at their job. In addition, they may be better able to adjust their behaviors than subordinates because their higher status
makes them less constrained (Keltner et al., 2003; Moskowitz et al., 2007). However, they may be less motivated to adjust their behaviors than subordinates. Superiors do not have to behave the way subordinates would like them to behave to get their needs met. Moreover, to the extent that superiors’ status is derived from normative adherence due to legitimacy, they may not want to adjust their behaviors to their subordinates’ behaviors because it would cost them in terms of their status and power. In contrast, subordinates have a greater incentive to adjust their behaviors, because this enables them to get their needs met by their higher power superiors. Subordinates will exhibit the behaviors their superiors’ desire, and thus meet their superiors’ needs, in exchange for the rewards that their superiors control. Consequently, I posit that leadership style will be more fixed than subordinate style. Superiors will be more likely to express their true attitudes and behaviors in their interactions with subordinates (Anderson & Berdhal, 2002; Keltner et al., 2003). They will not alter their fundamental style from subordinate to subordinate, but their attitudes toward, evaluations of and willingness to grant rewards to subordinates will be affected by their subordinates’ behaviors.

However, not all subordinates will exhibit complementary styles to their superiors (see Figure 2). Not all subordinates will want to adapt their behaviors to their superiors’, and even among those that do, not all will be successful. For example, some subordinates will exhibit behaviors in their interactions with superiors that are consistent with their dispositions, regardless of the utility of the behaviors for achieving desired outcomes (e.g., low self-monitors; Snyder, 1987). In addition, some subordinates will be more successful than others at reading the behavioral cues of their superiors and adapting their behaviors accordingly (e.g., high self-monitors; Snyder, 1987). Accordingly, I argue there
is a weak reciprocal causation by which some subordinates shape their style to fit their superiors, who then respond more positively as a result.

Superior-subordinate dyads may exhibit more style complementarity over time, and the importance of this complementarity for subordinate outcomes may also increase over time. According to Kiesler (1983), individuals' behavioral styles will become more complementary as their relationship progresses if they are invested in and/or cannot leave the relationship. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, Markey and Kurtz (2006) found that college roommates' perceptions of their behavioral style became more complementary the longer they lived together. Roommates need to coordinate with each other to live harmoniously and consequently are invested in the relationship. Moreover, research suggests that dominance complementarity is more likely in task relationships than in purely social relationships and is enhanced to the degree that people want a successful working relationship with another individual (Moskowitz et al., 2007; Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tiedens et al., 2007). Superiors and subordinates are generally invested in their relationships with one another, because they need to work together harmoniously to meet their individual as well as joint objectives, and may become increasingly so over time provided they cannot leave the relationship, as they become more dependent on each other. In addition, as the relationship progresses through multiple interactions, subordinates should become more attuned to their superiors' styles and how their own behavioral styles affect their outcomes. Consequently, they should exhibit increased style complementarity with their superiors as the duration and intensity of the relationship increases. Moreover, when individuals have greater flexibility over whom they work with (e.g., in project-based firms such as law firms and management consulting firms), they
should be more likely to select to work with others whose styles are complementary to their own. Accordingly, there should be fewer dyads in which there is superior-subordinate style non-complementarity, particularly in the long-term, since subordinates who cannot easily exit a relationship will adjust their styles to their superiors' styles and superiors and subordinates who have greater flexibility over whom they work with will chose working partners with complementary styles. In addition, the repercussions for subordinates of not exhibiting complementary behavioral styles vis-à-vis their superiors may be more severe as the relationship progresses. Superiors may attribute subordinates' non-complementary behaviors to such negative factors as lack of motivation, inability to exhibit appropriate behaviors or deliberate defiance.

**Proposition 2A.** There will be a greater number of superior-subordinate dyads with complementary styles than superior-subordinate dyads with non-complementary styles.

**Proposition 2B.** The tendency for there to be more dyads in which there is superior-subordinate style complementarity will be enhanced as relationships increase in intensity and duration.

**Proposition 2C.** The relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates' success outlined in Proposition 1 will be greater as relationships increase in intensity and duration.

*Summary of Superior and Subordinate Style Complementarity and Subordinate Success*

Drawing on interpersonal circumplex theory (Carson, 1969; Kiesler, 1983; Leary, 1957; Wiggins, 1979, 1982), I argued that subordinates will have the greatest success when their style is complementary to their superiors' with respect to control (i.e., dominance-submissiveness). Specifically, subordinates who adopt a submissive style will
have better outcomes with controlling superiors (a more dominant style). In contrast, subordinates who adopt a dominant style will have better outcomes with empowering superiors (a more submissive style). Superiors who experience dominance complementarity with their subordinates will find the relationships more rewarding, because such relationships will be more harmonious, enjoyable and productive. Consequently, they will view subordinates who exhibit complementary behaviors more favorably and grant them more resources, higher performance ratings and more promotions. Thus, through dominance complementarity, both superiors and subordinates may get their needs met in the superior-subordinate exchange relationship. Accordingly, dominance complementarity may be viewed as a type of complementary fit, which is the compatibility between a subordinate and superior that occurs when at least one entity provides what the other needs (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Complementary interactions between superiors and subordinates should be more common than non-complementary interactions, and this should be especially true in superior-subordinate relationships of greater intensity and duration. Moreover, the failure of subordinates to exhibit complementary behavioral styles to their superiors may be increasingly detrimental to subordinates’ relationships with their superiors and their ability to achieve their preferred outcomes vis-à-vis their superiors as the relationships increase in intensity and duration.

*Fulfilling Role Expectations as a Mediator of Dominance Complementarity*

Although research has begun to address when people engage in complementary behavior (Markey & Kurtz, 2006; Moskowitz et al., 2007; Tiedens et al., 2007), it is not clear why complementarity has beneficial effects on relationships. In this section, I
propose that subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ normative expectations will mediate the effect of superior-subordinate dominance complementarity on subordinates’ success.

As discussed earlier, recent research indicates that dominance complementarity is more common in task relationships than social relationships (Tiedens & Jimenez, 2003; Tiedens et al., 2007). Moreover, individuals’ perceptions of dominance complementarity are enhanced to the degree that they want a successful working relationship with a target (Tiedens et al., 2007). Based on these findings, I posit that complementarity may ensure that each member of a dyad adopts a separate role in pursuing task goals, which will result in greater coordination, enjoyment and productivity. Thus, dominance complementarity may help to clarify roles and facilitate coordination in task contexts.

In superior-subordinate relationships, there are separate, hierarchically-differentiated roles for each member of the dyad to fulfill. I’ve argued that superiors’ different conceptions of authority shape their normative beliefs about the appropriate role behaviors of superiors and subordinates and affect the attributions they make for subordinates’ behavior and their evaluations of this behavior. Accordingly, superiors will be aware of their subordinates’ styles of relating to them. That is, they will be conscious of whether their subordinates display behavioral styles that are complementary to their own and thus fulfill or do not fulfill their expectations, which will affect their attributions for and evaluations of their subordinates’ behaviors. Thus, the positive effects of dominance complementarity on subordinates’ success may be due to the subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ normative expectations about appropriate behaviors for the subordinates’ role. Empowering superiors expect subordinates to use the authority delegated to them and consequently may do better with dominant subordinates, while
controlling superiors expect subordinates to obey them and consequently may do better with submissive subordinates. When subordinates take on their expected role obligations, they enable superiors to focus on their roles and thus facilitate coordination and better joint outcomes. Superiors, in turn, will help subordinates fulfill their needs to achieve their preferred outcomes. Thus, through complementarity, superiors and subordinates meet each others needs and achieve complementary fit. This instrumental perspective is not incompatible with past theories. For example, social connection in the form of a positive relationship may be one need that is met for both members of complementary superior-subordinate dyads.

Roles include both descriptive and injunctive norms (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Descriptive norms are shared expectations about how people in a given position actually behave. Injunctive norms are shared expectations about how people in a given position ought to or ideally should behave. When people fail to meet the descriptive standards for their role, a contrast effect may cause them to be viewed as inappropriate. Thus, when subordinate political behaviors deviate from descriptive expectations, it may become more obvious that the subordinate is deliberately using a tactic to achieve a desired end (i.e., it may be more visible) and consequently it may be viewed as manipulative or coercive. For example, since empowering superiors do not view submissive subordinate behavior as normative, they may be particularly likely to recognize that subordinates, who are dependent on them for career advancement and resources, have something to gain by engaging in it, and they may thus view such behavior as manipulative or insincere. In addition, superiors may make a number of negative attributions for subordinates’ failure to fulfill their role obligations (e.g., incompetence, lack of social
skills, defiance). Subordinates who violate injunctive expectations for their role may thus experience a backlash effect whereby they are sanctioned socially or economically by superiors for their inappropriate behavior (e.g., Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Rudman, 1998).

Previous theorists have argued that individuals must convince others that they are acting in conformity with the role obligations of their position, that their behavior is appropriate, to cultivate and exercise power. For example, Biggart and Hamilton (1984) argue that people must convince others that their behavior is consistent with the norms of authority of their position in order to create and maintain influence and that doing so requires the use of impression management. Expectation states theory postulates that it is legitimate (i.e., appropriate) for people in high but not low status roles to behave authoritatively (Berger, Ridgeway, Fisek, & Norman, 1998; Ridgeway & Berger, 1986).

As discussed earlier, status is a structural position involving relative respect and admiration and a source of power based on legitimate authority, expertise and reference. Expectation states theory further postulates that whether people view behaviors as legitimate or not will affect the motives that they attribute to the behaviors: People in low status roles who behave authoritatively will be perceived as acting from motives of competitive status advancement, whereas people in high status roles who behave authoritatively will be perceived as acting for the good of the group. Furthermore, Jones and colleagues (Jones, 1964; Jones & Wortman, 1973) note that subordinate political behavior that matches role expectations is more likely to be successful with superiors, because such tactics will be less visible and consequently less likely to generate resistance. Pfeffer (1981) similarly argues that politics are most effective when they are legitimate and invisible, because the blatant use of power generates resistance. Research
supports that political tactics that are too strong and too visible are unlikely to be successful (Baron, 1986). Yukl and Tracey (1992) also note that political tactics will be more effective when targets perceive them to be socially acceptable and consistent with their values and needs.

Theorists have described how superiors and subordinates explicitly negotiate the roles that each person will assume in the relationship (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Katz & Kahn, 1978). In the initial phase of the relationship, the superior sends his or her expectations for the subordinate’s behavior (role sender). After this initial phase, the superior evaluates the contribution of the subordinate to the work situation and will make the decision regarding whether to accept the subordinate socially. If the subordinate (role receiver) accurately perceives the sent role, the subordinate can modify his or her behavior to comply with the superior’s expectations and positively influence the superior’s evaluations and reactions.

Accordingly, to be successful, subordinates must know their superiors’ expectations for their roles and behave in ways that demonstrate their willingness to meet those expectations (Greene, 1972). That is, they must act out their roles to establish the identities they wish to convey, which can result in personal gain. Subordinates must observe superiors’ verbal and nonverbal behaviors to understand the contingencies for receiving valued outcomes. Then they must adopt different styles in conformity with their superiors’ expectations in order to increase their efficacy and avoid potential backlash that may result from violating injunctive norms. In other words, they must engage in exchange relationships with their superiors whereby they exhibit desired behaviors in
exchange for receiving the rewards and avoiding the punishments that their superiors control.

Research supports that people often use others’ expectations when they regulate their actions because of beliefs about their efficacy and fears of backlash (e.g., Copeland, 1994; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Goffman, 1955). In addition, research supports that people use different political tactics that correspond to the expectations of normative political behaviors for their role. For example, women are more likely to adopt submissive strategies, and men are more likely to employ dominant strategies (e.g., Johnson & Goodchilds, 1976; Mainiero, 1986). Studies with undergraduates in role play situations cited earlier provide preliminary support for the notion that people are more likely to use dominant tactics with empowering superiors and submissive tactics with controlling superiors (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Pandey & Bohra, 1984).

In conclusion, I posit that subordinates whose behavior fulfills superiors’ normative expectations for their role—as determined by the superiors’ leadership styles and underlying conceptions of bureaucratic authority—will be more successful than subordinates whose behavior does not fulfill their superiors’ normative expectations for their role. In other words, superiors’ perceptions of subordinates’ fulfillment of their dyadic role obligations will mediate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate outcomes.

**Proposition 3.** Subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ role expectations will mediate the relationship between superior-subordinate dominance complementarity and subordinates’ success.
Other Authority Structures as Moderators of Dominance Complementarity

On a macro level, the superior-subordinate role relationship is an exchange in multiple structures of authority. These authority structures are based on cultural values that endow some members in society with the right to exercise power (French & Raven, 1959). In other words, they are role structures from the social repertoire, which involve assumptions about who should be in charge, and shape people's beliefs about appropriate behaviors for occupants of a given social role, as well as their attributions for and evaluations of the behaviors of people in that role. In the next sections, I describe three authority structures that may impinge on the superior-subordinate role relationship and affect subordinate success in organizations: societal culture, organizational culture and demographics (e.g., gender, race, age). I argue that expectations about subordinates may reflect an integration of the descriptive content of their multiple roles, which may contain congruent or incongruent norms, and that subordinates will be most effective when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent, because this allows them to satisfy all of their role obligations with the same behavioral style.

Societal Culture

Societal culture is the overarching context within which superior-subordinate interactions within organizations are embedded. Culture consists of the shared perceptions of the social environment, including beliefs, values, norms and behaviors (e.g., Geertz, 1973; Rousseau, 1990). Shared values are considered central to culture, because they underlie norms and behaviors (Schein, 1992). Values are enduring, fundamental beliefs about important goals and the appropriate behaviors members of the culture should use to pursue them. Emerging from values, norms are shared expectations
for appropriate behavior for members of the culture and individuals in specific roles within the social structure, which when violated lead to sanctions.

Scholars emphasize that culture creates shared meaning by shaping the cognitive schemas people use to process, interpret and evaluate information in the environment (e.g., Triandis, 1989). People who live in the same society share similar values and cognitive schemas, which implies that they use similar criteria for evaluating the contribution of certain types of behaviors. Much research supports that societal culture shapes individuals’ cognitive processes and behavioral responses to situational stimuli. For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991) show that cultural differences in self-construals lead to differences in cognition, emotion and motivation. Accordingly, the societal culture in which an organization resides affects the beliefs that its superiors hold about subordinates and consequently will have implications for the relationships between superior-subordinate dominance complementarity and subordinate success. Indeed, cross-cultural studies of political tactics have found that cultural values are associated with differences in preferences for the use of different political strategies across cultures (e.g., Fu et al., 2004).

Societies have been shown to differ along a number of cultural value dimensions that have implications for conceptions of authority. Of the many dimensions that have been identified, those specified by Hofstede (1980) and Triandis (1995) have been the most well-developed theoretically and empirically. Hofstede (1980) proposed four independent dimensions of national cultural value differences: power distance (i.e., the extent to which power differences are deemed acceptable in a given society; low versus high), individualism-collectivism (i.e., the degree to which strong individual identity and
personal choice are revered versus a strong collective identity), uncertainty avoidance (i.e., the extent to which people prefer structure and certainty over risk-taking and unpredictability; low vs. high), and masculinity-femininity (i.e., the extent to which people value behaviors that are stereotypically masculine versus feminine and the extent to which there are distinct social roles for men and women). Triandis and colleagues proposed four distinct culture types at the intersection of power distance and individualism (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998): vertical individualism, horizontal individualism, vertical collectivism and horizontal collectivism.

These cultural value dimensions are fundamentally linked to conceptions of bureaucratic authority. Specifically, rational conceptions of authority and controlling leadership styles that are based on them should be more prevalent in cultures that are high in power distance and collectivistic (i.e., vertical collectivist) and high in uncertainty avoidance, because rational conceptions of authority encompass these value dimensions. High power distance ("vertical") cultures view hierarchies and inequalities among people as appropriate and acceptable. Collectivist cultures value unity and obedience. Thus, vertical collectivist cultures emphasize hierarchy and conformity. In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, people are more risk-averse and are less tolerant of deviations from rules and standards.

---

4 Note I do not link the masculinity-femininity value dimension to conceptions of bureaucratic authority, because this dimension is exclusive to social gender roles. Feminine cultures are more egalitarian with greater overlap of social gender roles, while masculine cultures are more hierarchical with stricter division of social gender roles. In feminine cultures, there is a preference for relationships, cooperation, nurturance and quality of life, and in masculine cultures there is a preference for achievement, assertiveness, ambition and material success.
In contrast, normative conceptions of authority and empowering leadership styles that are based on them should be more prevalent in cultures that are low in power distance and individualistic (i.e., horizontal individualist) and low in uncertainty avoidance, because normative conceptions of authority encompass these value dimensions. In low power distance ("horizontal") cultures, there is a sense of discomfort with hierarchical distinctions and an emphasis on egalitarianism. Individualist cultures emphasize the importance of self-expression and individual initiative. Horizontal individualist cultures emphasize equality and self-reliance. In low uncertainty avoidance cultures, people are more willing to take risks and are more tolerant of deviations from rules and standards. The results of one cross-cultural study, which included managers from 39 different cultures, provides evidence linking cultural value dimensions to leadership practices (Offerman & Hellman, 1997). In this study, power distance was negatively related to leader communication, delegation, approachability and team-building (i.e., elements of the empowering style), and uncertainty avoidance was positively related to more leader control but less delegation and approachability (i.e., elements of the controlling style). Accordingly, the societal culture in which an organization resides may affect people’s expectations about and relationships to authority. Consequently, it may impact the effectiveness of subordinates’ dominant and submissive strategies.

Organizational Culture

Every organization can be thought of as having its own culture, which is an important factor in determining how well an individual fits into an organizational context (e.g., Rousseau, 1990; Schein, 1992). Recall fit has been defined as the compatibility between a subordinate and superior (or person and environment, more generally) that
occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs (complementary fit), or (b) they possess similar fundamental characteristics (supplementary fit; e.g., values, goals, personality, attitudes), or (c) both (Kristof, 1996; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Research has indicated that fit between an employee’s characteristics and those of the organization’s culture is associated with positive behavioral and affective outcomes, including increased influence, job satisfaction, greater organizational commitment, longer tenure and better performance (e.g., Anderson, Spataro, & Flynn, 2008; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Person-culture fit tends to be operationalized as the congruence between an individual’s values and those of an organization (or supplementary fit; e.g., O'Reilly et al., 1991). However, person-culture fit can also be studied as the congruence between an individual’s behaviors and an organization’s values and norms (or complementary fit). More specifically, person-culture fit can be examined as complementarity (which I have argued is a form of complementary fit) between subordinates’ behaviors and the predominant managerial conception of authority in the organization—empowering or controlling. Subordinates whose behavior complements predominant managerial conceptions of authority will be accepted by their colleagues and be more effective, while those whose behaviors deviate from such values will be rejected and be less effective. In support of this contention, Fragale (2006) found that whether dominant or submissive speech styles lead to greater status conferral depended on the context: Individuals with dominant speech styles were conferred greater status in contexts that required little member coordination, while individuals with submissive speech styles were conferred greater status in contexts that required high member coordination. However, this research investigated situations in
which there was no prior hierarchy, and it remains to be seen whether the results will
hold in situations in which there is an established hierarchy.

Organizational culture has been viewed as a form of social control that operates
when members of an organization share values and expectations about appropriate
behavior (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996). Organizational culture consists of prevailing
managerial assumptions and beliefs about employee nature and behavior and the nature
of the task and how it can best be accomplished (Schein, 1992). Employee-related
assumptions are shaped by the socio-cultural environment (as described above), and task-
related assumptions are shaped by the enterprise environment (e.g., market
characteristics, ownership status, industry, resource availability, age, size; Aycan,
Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999). The predominant managerial ideology, be it empowering or
controlling, will thus be influenced by a number of contextual factors. These ideologies
give rise to different structures, policies and practices that make up the organizational
culture. Organizational structures, practices and policies send signals to subordinates
about organizational values and expected behaviors.

Empowering assumptions and values about people at work create cultures where
egalitarianism, autonomy, individual discretion and low control are emphasized.
Common features of empowering organizations are flat structures, decentralized decision
making and formal upward feedback mechanisms. Flat structures have fewer tiers within
the organization and wider spans of control, which minimizes bureaucracy and power
differences and facilitates information flow across the organization. Decentralized
decision making involves the delegation of decision-making authority to the lower tiers
of the organization, which allows for greater flexibility, innovation and efficiency closer
to the means of production and bottom-up information flow. Formal upward feedback mechanisms (e.g., systematic surveying, multi-source feedback) also facilitate bottom-up information flow. Common practices of empowering organizations include management by objectives, participative decision-making and goal-setting. Empowering organizations tend to run on less rigid policies.

Controlling assumptions and values about people at work create cultures where hierarchy, standardization, managerial discretion and strict control are emphasized. Common structural features of organizations dominated by controlling beliefs are hierarchical structures, centralized decision making and lack of formal upward feedback mechanisms. Hierarchical structures have more tiers within the organization and narrower spans of control, which increases bureaucracy and power differences and limits information flow across the organization. Centralized decision making is a system in which decisions are made at the top level of an organization and enforced through local managers, which enables global efficiency and impedes change. The lack of formal feedback mechanisms limits bottom-up information flow, which is not encouraged, if not explicitly discouraged. Common practices of controlling organizations include autocratic decision-making and goal-setting and the provision of extrinsic rewards for adherence to formal work processes. Controlling organizations emphasize the maintenance of the status quo through a strong tradition of top-down directives and are run on the basis of rigid policies.

**Demographics**

Research shows that people automatically classify others by their membership in social categories. Demographic differences (e.g., gender, race, age) are particularly salient social categories that people use to classify each another. These attributes are
considered diffuse status characteristics because they are associated with widely held cultural beliefs ascribing greater social significance and competence to one category of the social distinction compared to another (Berger et al., 1972). Expectation states theory proposes that status emerges from expectations that people hold for their own and each other’s performance and that these expectations can be based on past task performance or on status characteristics that afford power (Berger et al., 1972). Although some status characteristics may bear on an individual’s ability to make contributions to a group’s task (e.g., education), most are not predictive (e.g., race, gender). Similarly, social role theory (Eagly, 1987) argues that certain demographic groups are more likely than others to occupy powerful social roles, which affects others’ expectations regarding their behavior. Accordingly, people’s demographic characteristics specify what behavior is expected of them and evoke standards to which they are compared in interactions with others. In Western societies, male gender, white race and older age are considered high status characteristics that confer authority and expertise, while female gender, non-white race and younger age are considered low status characteristics that do not confer authority and expertise.

Research from the stereotypes and status literatures indicates that people expect high status individuals to behave more dominantly and low status individuals to behave more submissively. For example, men are believed to possess more dominant characteristics and women are believed to possess more submissive characteristics (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Eagly, 1987; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Moreover, the prescriptive nature of stereotypes leads to backlash against individuals who act in ways that are inconsistent with their status (e.g., Cialdini &
Trost, 1998; Ridgeway, Johnson, & Diekema, 1994; Rudman, 1998). For example, individuals who inaccurately perceive their own status and engage in actions that others view as inappropriate are socially rejected (Anderson, Ames, & Gosling, 2008; Anderson et al., 2006). Past research has also shown that women who engage in agentic, assertive behavior are viewed as competent but not likable, and suffer economic sanctions in the form of hiring discrimination (e.g., Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman & Glick, 1999, 2001). In general, high status individuals are more likely to be given the benefit of the doubt if they violate others’ expectations of appropriate behavior (e.g., Foschi, 2000; Hollander, 1958). Although gender has been the most studied, research suggests that the same processes operate with other demographic roles (e.g., Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999; Ridgeway et al., 1994).

A meta-analysis of evaluation studies also found the same task performance to be evaluated less favorably when performed by a woman rather than a man (Swim, Borgida, Maruyama, & Meyers, 1989). In addition, studies of gender and race found that lower status groups (i.e., women, African Americans) are held to higher standards of performance to prove high ability than are higher status groups (i.e., men, Whites; e.g., Foschi, 2000). Accordingly, it may often be harder for low status individuals to achieve success than it is for high status individuals.

Superior’s demographics. Theorists have posited that the impact of demographic characteristics on expectations may be context-specific. For example, expectation states theory argues that characteristics will only affect performance expectations when they are salient, which will occur either when the characteristics distinguish between individuals in a situation or are perceived to be relevant to the task (Wagner & Berger, 1997).
According to this theory, which research supports, people combine the positive and negative implications of all salient roles and characteristics weighted by their relevance to the task to form aggregated performance expectations for each person compared to the others. Furthermore, the degree of differentiation in an individual’s status in a situation is a direct function of the size of his or her aggregate expectation advantage or disadvantage relative to the other individuals (Berger, Norman, Balkwell, & Smith, 1992; Berger et al., 1998). This suggests that the subordinate’s demographics relative to the superior’s may also have a significant impact on the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and outcomes. Subordinates who are demographically advantaged relative to their superiors may be given greater leeway to employ a dominant style. However, the more demographically disadvantaged subordinates are relative to their superiors, the more important it may be for them to behave submissively. In support of this thesis, research has found that achieving influence by behaving assertively is more difficult for women than for men, particularly when the women are dealing with men (e.g., Carli, 1990; Carli, LaFleur, & Loeber, 1995; Ridgeway, 1982; for an exception to the general pattern, see Rudman, 1998 who found that women's disapproval of assertive women was stronger than men's under some circumstances). Similarly, Crawford (1988) found that older males gave assertive women the lowest likeability ratings.

Role Congruence

Empirical evidence indicates that perceivers blend the information associated with targets’ multiple roles (e.g., Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995). For example, Fiske and Neuberg (1990) found that people are not fixated on general stereotypes about large social groups but rather form more specific and differentiated stereotypes about smaller social groups that are defined by simultaneous membership in
more than one group, such as the intersection of gender and role (e.g., "career woman"). Thus, expectations about subordinates may reflect an integration of the descriptive content of their multiple roles, which may contain congruent or incongruent norms. For example, a subordinate’s direct superior and organization-wide policies may both encourage dominance. By behaving dominantly, the subordinate meets both dyadic and organizational role obligations. When norms of authority for subordinates’ different roles are congruent, subordinates’ behavior may satisfy multiple role obligations and hence be most successful.

Alternatively, a subordinate’s direct superior may discourage dominance, while organization-wide policies and practices encourage dominance. In this instance, the norms of authority for the subordinate’s different roles are incongruent. Incongruence or incompatibility occurs when one role is perceived to require attributes stereotypical of the other role. Role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002) considers the congruity between gender roles and other organizational roles, most notably leadership roles. It describes the potential for descriptive and injunctive forms of prejudice toward female leaders. Such prejudice arises from the dissimilarity between the female gender role and the agentic requirements of leadership roles. When role incongruity occurs, the combining of information across the subordinate’s multiple roles may produce a disadvantage for the subordinate. For example, subordinates who violate the expectations of one role to conform to the expectations of another role may experience a mix of positive and negative reactions from their superiors. Subordinates may thus face a dilemma in reconciling conflicting role expectations and may be less successful as a result.
Subordinates may also experience role conflict when forced to take on conflicting and incompatible roles at the same time, which may lead to role ambiguity or unclear and vague expectations regarding their behavior. Their lack of clarity regarding others’ expectations about and reactions to their behavior may lead to increased anxiety, stress and frustration, which in turn may lead to increased burnout and decreased satisfaction and performance (e.g., Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970).

In this thesis, I propose that norms may operate as three-way or even more complex interactions. For example, superiors may reward subordinates when they exhibit behavior that is consistent with their expectations especially when their expectations are consistent with the organization’s expectations. Norms may also vary in their relative strength. For example, organizational norms may supersede superiors’ stylistic preferences. In such instances, superiors may have to be more accepting of behavior that goes against their expectations if it is consistent with the organization’s expectations. The manner by which these processes work is an empirical question that I seek to answer in this research.

**Proposition 4.** Other authority structures will moderate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ success.

**Proposition 5A.** Subordinates will be most successful when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent (as opposed to incongruent) and their behavior complements the norms of authority for their congruent roles.
Proposition 5B. Subordinates will be least successful when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent (as opposed to incongruent) and their behavior does not complement the norms of authority for their congruent roles.

Research Overview and Predictions

I have argued that the effectiveness of subordinates' behavioral styles will be contingent on their complementarity with superiors' leadership styles with respect to the interpersonal dimension of control (dominance-submissiveness). More specifically, I posited that there is complementarity between the empowering superior style and the dominant subordinate style and between the controlling superior style and the submissive subordinate style; and that there is non-complementarity between the empowering superior style and the submissive subordinate style and between the controlling superior style and the dominant subordinate style. I further argued that superior-subordinate dyads with complementary behavioral styles are more common than superior-subordinate dyads with non-complementary behavioral styles, especially as the superior-subordinate relationship increases in intensity and duration, and that complementarity plays an increasingly important role in subordinate success as the relationship increases in intensity and duration. In addition, I proposed that the relationship between complementarity and success is mediated by the fulfillment of superiors' normative expectations for the subordinate role and moderated by other authority structures, which contain norms about appropriate behaviors for occupants of different social roles. From these theoretical propositions, I derived hypotheses that I tested in two empirical studies. The hypotheses are as follows:
Hypothesis 1A. With empowering superiors, subordinates who exhibit a dominant style (complementarity) will be more successful than subordinates who exhibit a submissive style (non-complementarity).

Hypothesis 1B. With controlling superiors, subordinates who exhibit a submissive style (complementarity) will be more successful than subordinates who exhibit a dominant style (non-complementarity).

Hypothesis 1C. Subordinates who behave dominantly will be more successful with empowering superiors (complementarity) than controlling superiors (non-complementarity).

Hypothesis 1D. Subordinates who behave submissively will be more successful with controlling superiors (complementarity) than empowering superiors (non-complementarity).

Hypothesis 2A. There will be a greater number of superior-subordinate dyads with complementary styles than superior-subordinate dyads with non-complementary styles.

Hypothesis 2B. The tendency for there to be more dyads in which there is superior-subordinate style complementarity will be enhanced as superiors and subordinates get to know each other better.

Hypothesis 2C. The relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates' success will be greater as superiors and subordinates get to know each other better.
Hypothesis 3. Subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ role expectations will mediate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ success.

Hypothesis 4. Organizational culture will moderate the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ success.

Hypothesis 5A. Subordinates will be most successful when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent (rather than incongruent) and their behavior complements the norms of authority for their congruent roles.

Hypothesis 5B. Subordinates will be least successful when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent (rather than incongruent) and their behavior does not complement the norms of authority for their congruent roles.
CHAPTER 3

Study 1

In Study 1, I sought initial evidence for the positive effects of superior-subordinate style complementarity on subordinate outcomes by asking international MBA students and senior executives to rate a subordinate presented in a case as if they were this subordinate's superior on various dimensions (i.e., performance, rewards, liking). I also examined whether subordinates' fulfillment of superiors' role expectations mediates the positive effects of superior-subordinate style complementarity on subordinates' success. Specifically, Study 1 tests Hypothesis 1A-D and Hypothesis 3.

Method

Participants

Data was collected from one hundred and eight participants (n = 34 senior executives enrolled in a continuing education program; n = 74 international MBA students enrolled in an orientation program). The mean age for the senior executive participants was 45.3 (SD = 5.4) and 95% were male. The mean age for the international MBA participants was 28.3 (SD = 2.8) and 76% were male.

Procedure

The data was collected in two parts. Early in the program, participants completed a measure of their leadership style preferences. On a later occasion, they read a case about Chris Cunningham, a subordinate who is a star salesman but breaks many organizational rules, and employs either a more dominant or a more submissive style. Participants were randomly assigned to either the dominant subordinate condition or the submissive subordinate condition (See Appendix A and B for the dominant and submissive manipulations, respectively). After reading the case, they completed a
questionnaire in which they rated Chris on the dimensions of performance, fulfillment of role expectations, deservingness of organizational rewards and likeability. Participants were instructed to answer the questionnaire as if they were Stover, Chris Cunningham’s superior. In both questionnaires, items from the different scales were mixed together in random order.

Measures

Performance appraisal. Participants rated Chris Cunningham on five dimensions of job performance using a 7-point Likert type scale from 1 (unacceptable) to 7 (outstanding). This measure was adapted from Wayne and Ferris (1990). The dimensions were quality of work, knowledge of the job, supervisor potential, technical potential and overall job performance.

Rewards. Participants gave their recommendations for four organizational rewards on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly). Two items were adapted from Tiedens (2001): “Chris should be promoted;” and “Chris should be rewarded.” I also developed two additional items: “Chris should be reprimanded” (reverse scored); and “Chris should be fired” (reverse scored).

Liking. Participants indicated their degree of liking toward Chris on three items: “I would want to work with Chris as my subordinate;” “Chris is warm in relations with others;” and “Chris is likable.” Responses ranged from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly).

Role expectations. Participants rated the degree to which Chris fulfilled their normative expectations on three items using a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly). The items included: “Chris’s disregard for rules and
procedures is unacceptable" (reverse scored); “Chris’s role performance would meet my expectations;” and “Chris exhibits appropriate conduct.”

Leadership style. Participants rated their preferred approach to managing others on a leadership style questionnaire. I developed this questionnaire for the present research after a comprehensive review of the extant literature failed to find any measures that fully captured these constructs. To develop this measure, I derived items from descriptions of these constructs in the literature (e.g., Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006) and adapted items from extant measures of controlling and empowering leadership (Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1962; Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). Specifically, I performed a content analysis of literature descriptions of the constructs and of extant measures of the constructs, and derived five key categories of empowering and controlling leadership styles, respectively: (1) Shares information freely versus shares information selectively; (2) Establishes and maintains informal relationships with subordinates versus establishes and maintains formal relationships with subordinates; (3) Delegates to subordinates/encourages autonomy versus maintains authority over subordinates/maintains control; (4) Encourages subordinates to experiment with new approaches to work versus encourages subordinates to follow procedures, rules and standards; and (5) Encourages voice and nonconformity versus discourages voice and encourages conformity (see Appendix C). The final survey items were chosen to fit within this framework.

The leadership style questionnaire contained 23 items on which participants were asked to rate, on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly) the extent to which a leader should engage in a given behavior. Thirteen items
measured the empowering style, including: “Involve subordinates in making decisions;” and “Allow subordinates to adopt their own approach to their work.” Ten items measured the controlling style, including: “Maintain control over subordinates” and “Insist on adherence to standards and procedures.” (See Appendix D for the text of all items.) The coefficient alpha for the empowering subscale was .83, and the alpha for the controlling subscale was .77.

Leadership style was computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering style while lower scores indicate more of a controlling style.

**Subordinate style.** In order to operationalize the dominant and submissive styles in the case manipulations, I relied on descriptions of these constructs from the literature (e.g., Kiesler, 1985; Yukl, 2006) and from extant scales of dominant and submissive behavior (Kiesler, 1983; LaForge & Suczek, 1955; Lorr & McNair, 1967; Wiggins, Trapnell, & Phillips, 1988). As with the leadership style questionnaire, I performed a content analysis of literature descriptions of the constructs and of extant measures of the constructs and derived four key categories of dominant and submissive subordinate styles, respectively: (1) Takes charge versus follows others’ leads; (2) Expresses self openly and confidently versus inhibits self-expression, meek; (3) Engages in confrontation versus avoids confrontation; (4) Persuades/influences others versus easily persuaded/influenced; and (5) Promotes self versus helps others. Modifications were made to the case to reflect each style in accord with this framework.

**Results**

See Table 1 for a summary of the descriptive statistics, coefficient alphas and correlations among the variables in this study. There was no evidence of differences
between the senior executives and international MBA students in my results. Therefore, I collapsed across the two samples in the analyses I report below.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations and Coefficient Alphas (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4, 5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reward Recommendation</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive Affect</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role Expectations</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leadership Style</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subordinate Style</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 108. Subordinate style scored 1 = dominance; -1 = submissiveness. Leadership style is the mean of empowering and controlling items, with controlling items reverse-coded. Correlations of scale scores are presented below the diagonal. Coefficient alphas are in italics on the diagonal. A coefficient alpha cannot be computed for subordinate style because it is a binary variable. *p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Testing the Effect of Style Complementarity on Subordinate Success

I assessed whether subordinates' success is contingent on the complementarity between their styles and their superiors' styles, as set forth in Hypothesis 1A-D. Following Aiken and West (1991), I mean-centered each of my independent variables in order to minimize the impact of multicollinearity. I then conducted a moderated multivariate regression analysis using GLM, in which I regressed participants' performance appraisals, rewards recommendations and liking of Chris on their leadership styles, a contrast code for subordinate style (1=dominant, -1=submissive), and the leadership style x subordinate style interaction. There was a significant main effect for leadership style (Wilks' \( \Lambda = .89 \), \( F(3, 97) = 4.12, p < .01, \eta^2 = .11 \)) but not for subordinate style (Wilks' \( \Lambda = .97 \), \( F(3, 97) = 1.14, p = .34, \eta^2 = .03 \)). Most importantly, the interaction was significant (Wilks' \( \Lambda = .88 \), \( F(3, 97) = 4.58, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12 \)).
Next, I conducted a multivariate analysis using MPLUS 5.2, a structural equation modeling software to obtain parameter estimates. A summary of this analysis is reported in Table 2. As shown in Table 2, the leadership style x subordinate style interaction was positively related to participants' ratings of Chris's performance ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < .01$), rewards ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < .05$), and liking ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < .01$).

Table 2. Results of Moderated Multivariate Analysis for Leadership Style, Subordinate Style and Their Interaction Predicting Performance Appraisal, Rewards and Liking (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Liking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Style</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style x Subordinate Style Interaction</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 108. Subordinate style (-1 = dominant; 1 = submissive). * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

To clarify the form of the interaction between leadership style and subordinate style, I followed the procedures set forth by Aiken and West (1991), in which I generated the predicted values of the relationship between subordinate style and each of the dependent variables (performance appraisal, rewards, liking) at a high level of leadership style, i.e., empowering (one $SD$ above the mean) and at a low level of leadership style, i.e., controlling (one $SD$ below the mean). As can be seen in Figure 3, people with a controlling style rated Chris significantly higher in performance when Chris displayed a submissive style than when Chris displayed a dominant style ($\beta = -0.38$, $t (104) = -2.74$, $p < .01$). In addition, people with an empowering style rated Chris higher in performance when Chris displayed a dominant style than when Chris displayed a submissive style, but not significantly so ($\beta = 0.17$, $t (104) = 1.24$, $p = .22$). Moreover, people with an
empowering style rated Chris significantly higher in performance than did people with a controlling style when Chris displayed a dominant style ($\beta = 0.52$, $t(104) = 4.08$, $p < .01$). However, there was not a significant simple main effect of performance on leadership style when Chris displayed a submissive style ($\beta = 0.06$, $t(104) = 0.46$, $p = .65$).

Figure 3. The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on performance appraisal (Study 1).

As shown in Figure 4, there was a trend for people with a controlling style to recommend Chris for more rewards when Chris displayed a submissive style than when Chris displayed a dominant style, but this was not significant ($\beta = -0.21$, $t(104) = -1.46$, $p = .15$). Likewise, there was also a trend for people with an empowering style to recommend Chris for more rewards when Chris displayed a dominant style than when Chris displayed a submissive style, but again this was not significant ($\beta = 0.22$, $t(104) = 1.56$, $p = .12$). People with an empowering style recommended Chris for significantly more rewards than did people with a controlling style when Chris displayed a dominant style ($\beta = 0.42$, $t(104) = 3.15$, $p < .01$). However, there was not a significant simple main
effect of rewards on leadership style when Chris displayed a submissive style ($\beta = 0.06$, $t(104) = 0.43$, $p = .67$).

Figure 4. The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on rewards (Study 1).

As depicted in Figure 5, people with a controlling style liked Chris significantly more when Chris displayed a submissive style than when Chris displayed a dominant style ($\beta = -0.43$, $t(104) = -2.93$, $p < .01$). People with an empowering style liked Chris more when Chris displayed a dominant style than when Chris displayed a submissive style ($\beta = 0.25$, $t(104) = 1.70$, $p < .10$). People with an empowering style liked Chris significantly more than did people with a controlling style when Chris displayed a dominant style ($\beta = 0.34$, $t(104) = 2.49$, $p < .05$). People with a controlling style liked Chris more than did people with an empowering style when Chris displayed a submissive style ($\beta = -0.21$, $t(104) = -1.66$, $p < .10$).
Summary of the effect of style complementarity on subordinate success. The results provided support for Hypothesis 1B: Controlling individuals rated Chris significantly higher in performance and liked Chris significantly more when Chris displayed a submissive style than when Chris displayed a dominant style. There was also a trend for controlling individuals to recommend Chris for more rewards when Chris displayed a submissive style than when Chris displayed a dominant style, although this was not significant. In support of Hypothesis 1A, empowering individuals liked Chris more when Chris displayed a dominant style than when Chris displayed a submissive style. There was also a trend for empowering individuals to rate Chris higher in performance and recommend Chris for more rewards when Chris behaved dominantly than when Chris behaved submissively. The results strongly supported Hypothesis 1C: Empowering individuals rated Chris significantly higher in performance, recommended Chris for significantly more rewards and liked Chris significantly more than did
controlling individuals when Chris behaved dominantly. The results only partially supported Hypothesis 1D. In support of Hypothesis 1D, controlling individuals liked Chris more than did empowering individuals when Chris behaved submissively. However, controlling and empowering individuals did not differ significantly in their performance ratings and reward recommendations for Chris when Chris behaved submissively.

Testing the Mediating Role of Fulfillment of Role Expectations

I assessed whether people’s role expectations for Chris’s behavior accounted for the relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction (i.e., superior-subordinate style complementarity) and each of the subordinate success dependent variables as laid out in Hypothesis 3, drawing on the procedures specified by Baron and Kenny (1986). Because the mediation is of an interaction, the two main effects, leadership style and subordinate style are entered in the steps which include the interaction term (i.e., Steps 1, 3 and 4).

The results for performance appraisal are shown in Figure 6: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of performance appraisal; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of performance appraisal; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and performance appraisal became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and performance appraisal remained highly significant; and (5) The Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on performance appraisal
was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not 

\[ t(103) = 1.97, p < .05. \]

**Figure 6.** Mediation of the relationship between leadership x subordinate style interaction (complementarity) and performance appraisal by fulfillment of role expectations (Study 1).

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

The results for rewards are shown in Figure 7: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of rewards; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of rewards; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and rewards became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and rewards remained highly significant; and (5) the Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on rewards was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not \( t(103) = 2.10, p < .05 \).
The results for liking are shown in Figure 8: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of liking; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of liking; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and liking decreased when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and liking remained highly significant; and (5) the Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on liking was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not ($t(103) = 2.00, p < .05$).
These findings support Hypothesis 3: Subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ role expectations mediated the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ success. Specifically, the relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and the dependent variables of performance appraisal and rewards became non-significant when role expectations was controlled, which indicates that role expectations fully mediated the relationship between complementarity and performance appraisal and between complementarity and reward recommendation. The relationship between leadership style x subordinate style interaction and liking decreased but still remained significant even when role expectations was controlled, which indicates that role expectations partially mediated the relationship between complementarity and liking.

Additional Analyses

I examined the predicted values from the interactions for each of the four cells of the two by two leadership style by subordinate style matrix depicted in Figure 2 to
determine how the subordinates in the different combinations fared on the dependent variables. Although I did not make any predictions about how the different combinations of styles would lead to differential subordinate success, I thought this would be an interesting question to examine. Across the three dependent variables, the highest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, empowering superior cell (complementarity) and the lowest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, controlling superior cell (non-complementarity). On the performance appraisal and rewards dependent variable, the predicted values for the submissive subordinate, empowering superior cell (non-complementarity) were higher than the predicted values for the submissive subordinate, controlling superior cell (complementarity). However, this was reversed on the liking dependent variable where the predicted values for the submissive subordinate, controlling superior cell were higher than the predicted values for the submissive subordinate, empowering superior cell.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to determine whether subordinates’ success is contingent on the complementarity between their styles and their superiors’ styles. The results of Study 1 generally supported the complementarity hypotheses. In support of Hypothesis 1B, controlling individuals rated Chris higher in performance, recommended Chris for more rewards and liked Chris more when Chris behaved submissively than when Chris behaved dominantly. In line with Hypothesis 1A, empowering individuals rated Chris higher in performance, recommended Chris for more rewards and liked Chris more when Chris behaved dominantly than when Chris behaved submissively. However, the results for performance and rewards were not statistically significant, and the results for liking were only marginally significant, and thus can be viewed only as preliminary
support for Hypothesis 1A. In support of Hypothesis 1C, empowering individuals rated Chris higher in performance, recommended Chris for more rewards and liked Chris more than did controlling individuals when Chris behaved dominantly. The results partially supported Hypothesis 1D. Controlling individuals liked Chris more than did empowering individuals when Chris behaved submissively; however, this was only marginally significant. In addition, controlling and empowering individuals did not differ significantly in their performance and reward recommendations for Chris when Chris behaved submissively. In support of Hypothesis 3, subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ role expectations mediated the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and the dependent variables, performance appraisal (full), rewards (full) and liking (partial).

It is possible that the subordinate style manipulation was responsible for the failure to find more than marginally significant results for Hypothesis 1A and 1D. In the submissive manipulation, Chris still displayed dominant behaviors (i.e., rule breaking, assertiveness with peers), which may have served to minimize some of the differences between the two conditions. If the submissive manipulation was pure, I may have found stronger effects. Accordingly, I test the hypotheses with a complementary methodology in Study 2.
CHAPTER 4

Study 2

In Study 2, I attempt to build on the findings from Study 1 by examining the relationship between superior-subordinate dominance complementarity and subordinate success with real partner (superior)-associate (subordinate) dyads in a law firm. Thus, I reexamine Hypothesis 1A-D and Hypothesis 3 with this sample. In addition, in Study 2, I examine the complementarity hypotheses with partner-associate dyads who differ in how well they know each other (Hypothesis 2A-C) and test the hypotheses regarding the moderating role of organizational culture and the effect of congruent versus incongruent norms of authority (Hypothesis 4 and Hypothesis 5A-B).

Method

Participants

Eighty-seven partner-associates dyads at a premier multinational law firm participated in this study. The mean tenure for partners was 14 years ($SD = 8.2$) and their mean tenure in the position of partner was 8.9 years ($SD = 7.2$). The mean tenure for associates was 3.4 years ($SD = 2.2$). The response rate was 76.7% (65.9% of partners; 93.1% of associates).

Procedure

Data was collected from online surveys and firm performance evaluation records. Prior to the commencement of the study, the firm notified its lawyers about the research study and recommended their participation. Although there was no immediate incentive provided for participation in this study, participants were promised a copy of the report with the firm’s overall survey results.
Partner and associate surveys. There were two versions of the survey, one for partners and one for associates. Survey item order was randomized so that items from different scales were mixed together throughout the different sections. Prior to their administration, the surveys were piloted with PhD volunteers and Professional Development staff at the firm to determine the length of time they take to fill out (approximately 20 minutes) and remove potentially confusing language. The firm Professional Development staff also provided feedback on item content and the validity of the constructs.

Survey data was collected in two steps. First, partners were sent an email regarding the study which included the link to the partner version of the survey. After the partner data was collected, associates who were reported on by partners in the partner survey were then sent an email requesting their participation and containing the link to the associate version of the survey. Participants were given two weeks to fill out the surveys.

In the partner survey, partners were asked to rate an associate with whom they have worked closely and completed a performance evaluation in the most recent review cycle. To refresh their memory, they were provided with a list of the associates for whom they completed a performance evaluation. Specifically, I asked them to rate the associate’s style (dominant, submissive), whether the associate’s behavior fulfilled their normative expectations, the associate’s likeability, the associate’s competence, and the associate’s likelihood of success (e.g., ability to gain rewards, partnership potential). I also asked raters to clarify how well they knew the target, using a four-point scale, ranging from “not well at all” (1) to “extremely well” (4). The average score on the
familiarity measure was 2.83 (SD = 0.75). In addition, I asked partners to rate their leadership behaviors (empowering, controlling) and the organizational culture.

In the associate survey, associates were asked to rate their well being (i.e., job stress and burn out).

*Data from firm performance evaluation records.* Semi-annual performance evaluations play a significant role in decisions to retain and promote associates at the firm. The evaluations used in the study were the most recent and were completed five months prior to the survey data collection.

*Measures-Performance Evaluation Records*

*Performance appraisal.* On the firm's nine-item associate evaluation form, partners are asked to rate associates on four dimensions of job performance using a five-point Likert type scale from 1 (fails to meet expectations) to 5 (exceeds expectations): (1) Analysis (quality of work product, lawyering skills); (2) Communication (oral and written communication, influencing); (3) Achievement (productivity, taking initiative); (4) Relationships and teamwork (team player, interpersonal effectiveness, firm commitment). I used the mean of the nine items as an overall measure of performance.

*Measures-Partner Survey*

*Rewards.* Partners rated the extent to which they believed associates would achieve career-related rewards on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This four item scale contained the following representative items: "I believe that this associate has what it takes to make partner at this firm" and "This associate will have the potential to achieve future career-related success (such as awards, involvement in high-profile projects)." See Appendix E for a text of all the items for each dependent variable from the partner and associate surveys.
Liking. The three-item affect subscale from the previously validated LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) was used to measure partners’ liking of associates. A sample item is: “I like this associate very much as a person.” Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Competence. The three-item professional respect subscale from the previously validated LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998) was used to measure partners’ perceptions of associates’ competence. A sample item is: “I am impressed with this associate’s knowledge of his/her job.” Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Role expectations. Partners rated the extent to which associates met their expectations on four items using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree strongly) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item is: “This associate effectively fulfills job roles and responsibilities.”

Leadership style. I adapted the leadership style questionnaire used in Study 1 to measure leadership style. The revised leadership style questionnaire contained the best items from the original questionnaire in their original format (eight), slightly modified items (five) and new items (seven). As with the original items, the new items were derived via a content analysis of literature descriptions of the constructs (e.g., Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006) and of extant measures of the constructs (Stogdill et al., 1962; Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979; Yukl et al., 1990) to fit within the five category framework of empowering and controlling leadership styles: (1) Shares information freely versus shares information selectively; (2) Establishes and maintains informal relationships with subordinates versus establishes and maintains formal relationships with subordinates; (3)
Delegates to subordinates/encourages autonomy versus maintains authority over subordinates/maintains control; (4) Encourages subordinates to experiment with new approaches to work versus encourages subordinates to follow procedures, rules and standards; and (5) Encourages voice and nonconformity versus discourages voice and encourages conformity (see Appendix F).

The revised leadership style questionnaire contained 20 items on which partners were asked to rate, on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (almost always) the frequency with which they see themselves demonstrate each of the following leadership behaviors. Thirteen items measured the empowering style, including: “Encourage subordinates to speak up when they disagree;” and “Keep subordinates informed.” Seven items measured the controlling style, including: “Closely monitor what subordinates are doing” and “Tell subordinates what to do and how to do it.” (See Appendix G for the text of all items.) The coefficient alpha for the empowering subscale was .85, and the alpha for the controlling subscale was .69.

Leadership style was computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering style while lower scores indicate more of a controlling style.

Subordinate style. I developed a questionnaire to measure subordinate styles for the present research after a comprehensive review of the extant literature failed to find any measures that fully captured these constructs. Similarly to how I operationalized subordinate styles in the Chris Cunningham cases in Study 1, I derived items via a content analysis of literature descriptions of the constructs (e.g., Kiesler, 1985; Yukl, 2006) and of extant measures of the constructs (Kiesler, 1983; LaForge & Suczek, 1955;
Lorr & McNair, 1967; Wiggins et al., 1988) to fit within the four category framework of dominant and submissive subordinate styles: (1) Takes charge versus follows others’ leads; (2) Expresses self openly and confidently versus inhibits self-expression, meek; (3) Engages in confrontation versus avoids confrontation; (4) Persuades/influences others versus easily persuaded/influenced; and (5) Promotes self versus helps others (see Appendix H). Items were selected that fell within this framework.

The subordinate behavior questionnaire contained 20 items on which partners were asked to rate, on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (almost always) the frequency with which they see the associate demonstrate each behavior. Eleven items measured the dominant style, including: “Expresses firm personal preferences;” and “Takes charge of things.” Nine items measured the submissive style, including: “Avoids conflict” and “Goes out of his/her way to be of assistance to me.” (See Appendix I for the text of all items.) The coefficient alpha for the dominant subscale was .89, and the alpha for the submissive subscale was .74.

Subordinate style was computed as the mean of all items, with the submissive items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of a dominant style while lower scores indicate more of a submissive style.

Organizational culture. I developed a new organizational culture measure for the present research after a comprehensive review of the extant literature failed to find any measures that fully captured the constructs of empowering and controlling cultural styles. I selected relevant items from O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) Organizational Culture Profile and Cable and Judge’s (1997) revision of this instrument and wrote new items that fit within
the previously described five category framework of empowering and controlling styles (see Appendix J).

The organizational culture questionnaire contained 24 items on which partners were asked to rate, on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the extent to which they perceived their firm endorsing or supporting each value. Seventeen items measured the empowering cultural style, including: “Confronting conflict directly” and “Independent thinking.” Seven items measured the controlling cultural style, including: “Deferring to superiors” and “Predictability.” (See Appendix K for the text of all items.) The coefficient alpha for the empowering culture subscale was .90, and the alpha for the controlling culture subscale was .75.

Organizational style was computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering culture while lower scores indicate more of a controlling culture.

Measures-Associate Survey

Job stress. Three items from the previously validated work tension scale (House & Rizzo, 1972) were used to measure associates’ job stress. A sample item is: “Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.” Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Burnout. Seven items from the emotional exhaustion scale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) was used to measure associates’ burn out. A sample item is: “I feel like I’m at the end of my rope.”

Results

See Table 3 for a summary of the descriptive statistics, coefficient alphas and correlations among the variables in this study.
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations and Coefficient Alphas (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rewards</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Liking</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competence</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Stress</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Burnout</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Expectations</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leadership Style</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Subordinate Style</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organizational Culture</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 87. Correlations of scale scores are presented below the diagonal. Coefficient alphas are in italics on the diagonal. 
*p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01.

Testing the Effect of Style Complementarity on Subordinate Success

I tested whether subordinates’ success is contingent on the complementarity between their styles and their superiors’ styles, as set forth in Hypothesis 1A-1D.

Following Aiken and West (1991), I mean-centered each of my independent variables in order to minimize the impact of multicollinearity. I then conducted a moderated multivariate regression analysis using GLM, in which I regressed partners’ perceptions of associates’ performance, future rewards, likeability and competence and associates’ perceptions of job stress and burnout on partners’ leadership styles, associates’ subordinate styles, and the leadership style x subordinate style interaction. The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was significant (Wilks’ $A = .80, F(6, 74) = 3.15, p < .01, \eta^2 = .20$). There was also a significant main effect for subordinate style (Wilks’ $A = .66, F(6, 74) = 6.28, p < .01, \eta^2 = .34$). However, there was not a significant main effect for superior style (Wilks’ $A = .88, F(6, 74) = 1.75, p = .12, \eta^2 = .12$).
Next, I conducted a multivariate analysis using MPLUS 5.2 to obtain parameter estimates. A summary of this analysis is reported in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, the leadership style x subordinate style interaction was positively related to partners’ ratings of associates’ performance ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < .01$), associates’ likelihood of achieving future rewards ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < .05$), associates’ likeability ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < .01$) and associates’ competence ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < .01$). The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was negatively related to associates’ ratings of their job stress ($\beta = -0.33$, $p < .01$) and their burnout ($\beta = -0.23$, $p < .05$).

Table 4. Results of Moderated Multivariate Analysis for Leadership Style, Subordinate Style and Their Interaction Predicting Performance Appraisal, Rewards, Liking, Competence, Job Stress and Burnout on (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Style</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style x</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Style Interaction</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 87$. $^*p < .10$. $^*p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

To clarify the form of the interaction between leadership style and subordinate style, I followed the procedures set forth by Aiken and West (1991), in which I generated the predicted values of the relationship between subordinate style and each of the dependent variables (performance appraisal, rewards, liking, competence, job stress, burnout) at a high level of leadership style, i.e., empowering (one SD above the mean) and at a low level of leadership style, i.e., controlling (one SD below the mean).

As can be seen in Figure 9, partners with an empowering style rated associates with a dominant style significantly higher in performance than associates with a
submissive style ($\beta = 0.67, t (83) = 4.30, p < .01$). However, in contrast to Study 1, partners with a controlling style did not differ significantly in their performance appraisals of associates with a submissive style and those with a dominant style ($\beta = 0.18, t (83) = 1.35, p = .18$). If anything, the trend was for controlling partners to rate associates with a dominant style slightly higher than associates with a submissive style. Empowering partners rated dominant associates higher in performance than did controlling partners ($\beta = 0.25, t (83) = 1.74, p < .10$). Similarly, controlling partners rated submissive subordinates higher in performance than did empowering partners ($\beta = -0.24, t (83) = -1.72, p < .10$).

*Figure 9.* The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on performance appraisal (Study 2).

As shown in Figure 10, empowering partners rated dominant associates as significantly more likely to achieve future rewards than submissive associates ($\beta = 0.80, t (83) = 5.57, p < .01$). In contrast to predictions, controlling partners also rated dominant associates as significantly more likely to achieve future rewards than submissive associates ($\beta = 0.36, t (83) = 2.96, p < .01$). Controlling and empowering partners did not
differ in their ratings of dominant subordinates’ likelihood of achieving future rewards ($\beta = 0.13, t(83) = 0.98, p = .33$); however, the pattern of results was in the predicted direction. In line with predictions, controlling partners rated submissive associates as significantly more likely to achieve future rewards than did empowering partners ($\beta = -0.32, t(83) = -2.41, p < .05$).

*Figure 10.* The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on rewards (Study 2).

Empowering partners liked dominant associates significantly more than submissive associates ($\beta = 0.52, t(83) = 3.27, p < .01$), as can be seen in Figure 11. However, controlling partners did not differ in their liking of dominant and submissive associates ($\beta = 0.02, t(83) = 0.14, p = .89$). Empowering partners liked dominant associates significantly more than did controlling partners ($\beta = 0.42, t(83) = 2.82, p < .01$). Controlling and empowering partners did not significantly differ in their liking of submissive associates ($\beta = -0.09, t(83) = -0.61, p = .54$), although the pattern of results was in the predicted direction.
Figure 11. The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on liking (Study 2).

As illustrated in Figure 12, empowering partners rated dominant associates as significantly more competent than submissive associates ($\beta = 0.87$, $t(83) = 6.20$, $p < .01$). However, in contrast to predictions, controlling partners also rated dominant associates as significantly more competent than submissive associates ($\beta = 0.33$, $t(83) = 2.81$, $p < .01$). Empowering partners rated dominant associates as more competent than did controlling partners ($\beta = 0.22$, $t(83) = 1.70$, $p < .10$). In addition, controlling partners rated submissive associates as significantly more competent than did empowering partners ($\beta = -0.32$, $t(83) = -2.51$, $p < .05$).
Figure 12. The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on competence (Study 2).

As can be seen in Figure 13, of those associates who worked for empowering partners, dominant associates rated themselves significantly lower in job stress than did submissive associates ($\beta = -0.50, t(83) = -3.11, p < .01$). However, there was no significant difference in job stress between dominant and submissive associates who worked for controlling partners ($\beta = 0.13, t(83) = 0.92, p = .36$). Dominant associates who worked for empowering partners rated themselves significantly lower in job stress than did dominant associates who worked for controlling partners ($\beta = -0.44, t(83) = -2.84, p < .01$). There was also a trend for submissive associates who worked for controlling partners to rate themselves lower in job stress than did submissive associates who worked for empowering partners, but this was not significant ($\beta = 0.21, t(83) = 1.41, p = .16$).
Figure 13. The interactive effect of leadership style and subordinate style on subordinate job stress (Study 2).

As depicted in Figure 14, of those associates who worked for empowering partners, dominant associates rated themselves significantly lower in burnout than did submissive associates ($\beta = -0.47$, $t (83) = -2.87$, $p < .01$). However, there was no significant difference in burnout between dominant and submissive associates who worked for controlling partners ($\beta = -0.03$, $t (83) = -0.22$, $p = .83$). There was also no significant difference in burnout between dominant associates who worked for empowering partners and dominant associates who worked for controlling partners ($\beta = -0.07$, $t (83) = -0.46$, $p = .65$). Submissive associates who worked for controlling partners experienced significantly less burnout than did submissive associates who worked for empowering partners ($\beta = 0.38$, $t (83) = 2.50$, $p < .05$).
Summary of the effect of style complementarity on subordinate success. In support of Hypothesis 1A and consistent with Study 1, empowering partners gave dominant associates higher performance ratings, saw them as more likely to achieve future rewards, liked them more and viewed them as more competent than submissive associates. In addition, of those associates who worked for empowering partners, dominant associates rated themselves significantly lower in job stress and burnout than did submissive associates.

In contrast to Study 1, the results of Study 2 did not support Hypothesis 1B. Controlling partners did not differ in their performance ratings and liking of dominant and submissive associates. If anything, there was a trend for controlling partners to rate associates with a dominant style slightly higher than associates with a submissive style, in contrast to expectations and previous results. Moreover, controlling partners rated dominant associates as more likely to achieve future rewards and as more competent than
submissive associates. There was no difference in job stress and burnout between dominant and submissive associates who worked for controlling partners.

In line with Study 1, Hypothesis 1C was generally supported. Empowering partners liked dominant associates significantly more than did controlling partners. Empowering partners also rated dominant associates higher in performance and greater in competence than did controlling partners. Empowering and controlling partners did not differ significantly in their ratings of dominant subordinates' likelihood of achieving future rewards; however, the pattern of results was in the predicted direction. Dominant associates who worked for empowering partners rated themselves significantly lower in job stress than did dominant associates who worked for controlling partners. There was no significant difference in burnout between dominant associates who worked for empowering partners and dominant associates who worked for controlling partners, but again, the pattern of results was in the predicted direction.

The results of Study 2 also generally supported Hypothesis 1D. Controlling partners rated submissive associates higher in performance, the likelihood of achieving future rewards and competence than did empowering partners. Submissive associates who worked for controlling partners experienced significantly less burnout than did submissive associates who worked for empowering partners. There was also a trend for submissive associates who worked for controlling partners to rate themselves lower in job stress than did submissive associates who worked for empowering partners, but this was not significant. In contrast to Study 1, controlling and empowering partners did not differ in their liking of submissive associates.
Testing the Dynamics of Complementarity

In order to determine the number of superior-subordinate dyads with complementary versus non-complementary styles, I performed a median split on leadership style and subordinate style and then examined the number of associate-partner dyads that fell in each cell of the 2 x 2 complementarity matrix. As can be seen in Figure 15 and in support of Hypothesis 2A, there were a greater number of superior-subordinate dyads with complementary styles than superior-subordinate dyads with non-complementary styles. Specifically, 64% of the dyads (29 empowering, dominant; 27 controlling, submissive) exhibited style complementarity and 36% exhibited style non-complementarity (16 controlling, dominant; 15 empowering, submissive).

Figure 15. Number of dyads in each cell in the 2 x 2 leadership style by subordinate style complementarity matrix.

Note. Highlighted cells indicate complementarity.
To test Hypothesis 2B, I looked at whether there were more dyads with complementary styles among partners and associates who knew each other well than among partners and associates who did not know each other well. I examined the relationships with both associate and partner ratings of familiarity (see Table 5).

Table 5. Complementarity by familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Familiarity (Partner Ratings)</th>
<th>High Familiarity (Partner Ratings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-complementarity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Familiarity (Associate Ratings)</th>
<th>High Familiarity (Associate Ratings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-complementarity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers in each cell indicate the number of superior-subordinate dyads.

With the partner ratings, there were more dyads with complementary styles who knew each other well (n = 37) than who did not know each other well (n = 19). In addition, among the dyads who knew each other well, there were more dyads with complementary styles (n = 37) than dyads with non-complementary styles (n = 19). Likewise, with associate ratings, there were more dyads with complementary styles who knew each other well (n = 31) than who did not know each other well (n = 21). In addition, among the dyads who knew each other well, there were more dyads with complementary styles (n = 31) than dyads with non-complementary styles (n = 13). These results support Hypothesis

---

Note that I used ratings of familiarity rather than subordinates' length of time working with a partner, because associates may work with a partner on a matter for a long period of time but have little contact with that partner (e.g., they may be assigned work by a more senior associate on the team instead). Alternatively, they may work intensely with a partner on multiple matters interspersed over time making length of time working together difficult to measure. Accordingly, ratings of familiarity better capture the intensity and duration of the superior-subordinate relationship in law firms.
2B in showing that there is greater complementarity in the behavioral styles of subordinates and superiors who know each other well.

I then assessed whether the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate success is greater with increasing familiarity, as laid out in Hypothesis 2C. To compute superior-subordinate style complementarity, I performed a median split on leadership style and subordinate style as described above and derived four groups: (1) controlling partners (i.e., partners who were below the median on leadership style) and submissive associates (i.e., associates who were below the median on subordinate style); (2) controlling partners and dominant associates (i.e., associates who were above the median on subordinate style); (3) empowering partners (i.e., partners who were above the median on leadership style) and dominant associates; (4) empowering partners and submissive associates. The complementarity variable combined these groups based on whether there was complementarity. That is, I used a dummy code, in which groups 1 and 3 were coded 1 for complementarity, and groups 2 and 4 were coded 0 for non-complementarity. Following Aiken and West (1991), I mean-centered each of my independent variables in order to minimize the impact of multicollinearity. I then conducted a moderated multivariate regression analysis using GLM, in which I regressed partners' perceptions of associates' performance, future rewards, likeability and competence and associates' perceptions of job stress and burnout on complementarity, associates' ratings of familiarity\(^6\) and the complementarity x familiarity interaction. There was a significant interaction (Wilks' \(\Lambda = .85\), \(F(6, 72) = 2.21, p < .05, \eta^2 = .16\)). There were also trends toward significant main effects for

\(^6\) The results did not differ if I used associates' or partners' ratings of familiarity. Therefore, I used associates' ratings of familiarity in the analyses to minimize common method bias, because the complementarity variable was computed with partner data.
complementarity (Wilks' $\Lambda = .86$, $F(6, 72) = 1.90, p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .14$) and familiarity (Wilks' $\Lambda = .86$, $F(6, 72) = 1.91, p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .14$).

Next, I conducted a multivariate analysis using MPLUS 5.2 to obtain parameter estimates. A summary of this analysis is reported in Table 6. As shown in Table 6 and in support of Hypothesis 2C, the interaction of complementarity and familiarity was positively related to partners' liking for associates ($\beta = 0.53, p < .01$). However, the interaction of complementarity and familiarity was unrelated to the other dependent variables (performance appraisal, rewards, competence, job stress and burnout).

Table 6. Results of Moderated Multivariate Analysis for Complementarity, Familiarity and Their Interaction Predicting Performance Appraisal, Rewards, Liking, Competence, Job Stress and Burnout (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity x Familiarity Interaction</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 87$. Complementarity is a dummy variable coded 0 for a non-complementary dyad (controlling superior, dominant subordinate; empowering superior, submissive subordinate) and 1 for a complementary dyad (controlling superior, submissive subordinate; empowering superior, dominant subordinate). * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Testing the Mediating Role of Fulfillment of Role Expectations

I assessed whether partners' normative expectations for associates' behaviors accounted for the relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction (i.e., superior-subordinate style complementarity) and each of the subordinate success dependent variables as laid out in Hypothesis 3, drawing on the procedures specified by Baron and Kenny (1986). Because the mediation is of an interaction, the two main effects, leadership style and subordinate style are entered in the steps which include the interaction term (i.e., steps 1, 3 and 4).
The results for performance appraisal are shown in Figure 16: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of performance appraisal; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of performance appraisals; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and performance appraisal became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and performance appraisal remained highly significant; and (5) The Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on performance appraisal was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not ($t(82) = 2.46, p < .05$).

Figure 16. Mediation of the relationship between leadership x subordinate style interaction (complementarity) and performance appraisal by fulfillment of role expectations (Study 2).

The results for rewards are shown in Figure 17: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of rewards; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of rewards; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style
interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and rewards became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and rewards remained highly significant; and (5) the Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on rewards was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not ($t(82) = 2.71, p < .01$).

Figure 17. Mediation of the relationship between leadership x subordinate style interaction (complementarity) and rewards by fulfillment of role expectations (Study 2).

The results for liking are shown in Figure 18: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of liking; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of liking; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and liking became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and liking remained highly significant; and (5) the Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on liking was
significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not ($t(82) = 2.30, p < .05$).

**Figure 18.** Mediation of the relationship between leadership x subordinate style interaction (complementarity) and liking by fulfillment of role expectations (Study 2).

The results for competence are shown in Figure 19: (1) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of competence; (2) Role expectations was a significant predictor of competence; (3) The leadership style x subordinate style interaction was a significant predictor of role expectations; (4) The relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and competence became non-significant when role expectations was added to the model, whereas the relationship between role expectations and competence remained highly significant; and (5) the Sobel test showed that the effect of the leadership style x subordinate style interaction on competence was significantly lower when role expectations was controlled, relative to when it was not ($t(82) = 2.74, p < .01$).
Figure 19. Mediation of the relationship between leadership x subordinate style interaction (complementarity) and competence by fulfillment of role expectations (Study 2).

Role expectations did not mediate the relationships between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ job stress, and superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ burnout.

Thus, in support of Hypothesis 3, subordinates’ fulfillment of superiors’ role expectations mediated the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ success on four of the dependent variables. Specifically, the relationship between the leadership style x subordinate style interaction and the dependent variables of performance appraisal, rewards, liking and competence became non-significant when role expectations was controlled, which indicates that role expectations fully mediated the relationship between complementarity and each of these dependent variables. However, role expectations did not mediate the relationships between superior-style complementarity and subordinates’ job stress, and superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ burnout.
Testing the Moderating Role of Organizational Culture

To test whether organizational culture moderates the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinate outcomes as set forth in Hypothesis 4, I conducted a three-way moderated multivariate regression analysis using GLM, in which I regressed partners' perceptions of associates' performance, future rewards, likeability and competence and associates' perceptions of job stress and burnout on partners' leadership styles (mean-centered), associates' subordinate styles (mean-centered), partners' perceptions of the organizational culture (mean-centered), two-way interaction of leadership style x subordinate style, two-way interaction of leadership style x organizational culture, two-way interaction of subordinate style x organizational culture and three-way interaction of leadership style x subordinate style x organizational culture.

There was a significant main effect for subordinate style (Wilks' $A = .63, F (6, 70) = 6.73, p < .01, \eta^2 = .37$) and for organizational culture (Wilks' $A = .78, F (6, 70) = 3.35, p < .01, \eta^2 = .22$) but not for leadership style (Wilks' $A = .87, F (6, 70) = 1.76, p = .12, \eta^2 = .13$). There was also a significant two-way interaction of leadership style x subordinate style (Wilks' $A = .84, F (6, 70) = 2.23, p < .05, \eta^2 = .16$). However, there was not a significant two-way interaction of leadership style x organizational culture (Wilks' $A = .98, F (6, 70) = 0.29, p = .94, \eta^2 = .02$) or of subordinate style x organizational culture (Wilks' $A = .90, F (6, 70) = 1.33, p = .25, \eta^2 = .10$). In addition, the overall three-way interaction was not significant (Wilks' $A = .90, F (6, 70) = 4.58, p = .29, \eta^2 = .10$). However, the observed power for the overall equation was only .46, which increases the risk of a Type II error or the probability that the test will reject a false null hypothesis.
Therefore, I still interpreted the individual three-way interactions, which were significant for performance and burnout.\(^7\)

Next, I conducted the three-way moderated multivariate analysis using MPLUS 5.2 to obtain coefficient estimates. A summary of this analysis is reported in Table 7. As shown in Table 7, the three-way interaction of leadership style x subordinate style x organizational culture was negatively related to partners’ ratings of associates’ performance (\(\beta = -0.25, p < .05\)) and positively related to associates’ ratings of burnout (\(\beta = 0.27, p < .05\)). To clarify the form of the three-way interactions, I followed the procedures set forth by Aiken and West (1991), in which I regressed each dependent variable (performance appraisal, burnout) on subordinate style at the four combinations of leadership style and organizational culture one standard deviation above and below their means: (1) empowering leadership style (one SD above the mean), empowering culture (one SD above the mean); (2) controlling leadership style (one SD below the mean), empowering culture (one SD above the mean); (3) empowering leadership style (one SD above the mean), controlling culture (one SD below the mean); (4) controlling leadership style (one SD below the mean), controlling culture (one SD below the mean).

\(^7\) I also conducted a second three-way moderated regression analysis which only contained these two dependent variables, and the overall three-way interaction for this analysis was significant (Wilks’ \(\Lambda = .91, F (2, 74) = 3.75, p < .05, \eta^2 = .09\)).
Table 7. Results of Moderated Multivariate Analysis for Leadership Style, Subordinate Style, Organizational Culture and Their Interactions Predicting Performance Appraisal, Rewards, Liking, Competence, Job Stress and Burnout (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
<td>( \beta ) SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.20* (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.10)</td>
<td>-0.12 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Style</td>
<td>0.53** (0.10)</td>
<td>0.61** (0.10)</td>
<td>0.37** (0.11)</td>
<td>0.63** (0.09)</td>
<td>-0.26* (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.40** (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.24* (0.10)</td>
<td>0.24* (0.10)</td>
<td>-0.23* (0.11)</td>
<td>0.26** (0.10)</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style x Subordinate Style Interaction</td>
<td>0.21* (0.12)</td>
<td>0.22* (0.12)</td>
<td>0.32** (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.37** (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.27* (0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style x Organizational Culture Interaction</td>
<td>0.01 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Style x Organizational Culture Interaction</td>
<td>0.27* (0.12)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.14)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Way Interaction</td>
<td>-0.25* (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.13 (0.12)</td>
<td>-0.11 (0.13)</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.27* (0.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( N = 87 \). \(^1 p < .10. \) \(^* p < .05. \) \(^{**} p < .01. \)

The results for performance appraisal can be seen in Figure 20. The upper figure shows the interaction between leadership style and subordinate style for partners who perceive the organizational culture to be more empowering. The lower figure shows the interaction between leadership style and subordinate style for partners who perceive the organizational culture to be more controlling. The results reveal that the basic two-way interaction between leadership style and subordinate style is stronger when partners perceive the culture to be controlling than when partners perceive the culture to be empowering.
Figure 20. The three-way interactive effect of leadership style, subordinate style and culture on performance appraisal (Study 2).

Empowering Culture

Controlling Culture

The results for burnout can be seen in Figure 21. The upper figure shows the interaction between superior style and subordinate style for partners who perceive the organizational culture to be more empowering. The lower figure shows the interaction between superior style and subordinate style for partners who perceive the organizational culture to be more controlling. As with performance appraisals, the results reveal that the
basic two-way interaction between leadership style and subordinate style is stronger when partners perceive the culture to be controlling than when partners perceive the culture to be empowering.

Figure 21. The three-way interactive effect of leadership style, subordinate style and culture on subordinate burnout (Study 2).

In summary, in support of Hypothesis 4, organizational culture moderated the relationship between partner-associate style complementarity and associates'
performance appraisals and self-reported burnout. However, organizational culture did not moderate the relationship between partner-associate style complementarity and associates’ rewards, likeability, competence and self-reported job stress. Thus, Study 2 offers partial support for Hypothesis 4. The results of the three-way interactions reveal that the basic two-way interaction between leadership style and subordinate style is stronger when partners perceive the culture to be controlling than when partners perceive the culture to be empowering. Thus, it may be more important for subordinates to rigidly adjust their behaviors to their superiors’ behaviors in controlling cultures than in empowering cultures.

*Testing the effect of congruent versus incongruent norms of authority.* To examine whether associates are more successful when the norms of authority for their roles are congruent than incongruent and their behavior complements or does not complement these norms, as laid out in Hypothesis 5A-5B, I first performed a median split on leadership style, subordinate style and culture style and formed three groups: (1) Norms congruent, non-complementarity both \( n = 15 \); i.e., dominant subordinate, controlling superior, controlling culture; and submissive subordinate, empowering superior, empowering culture); (2) Norms incongruent, complementarity one but not the other \( n = 37 \); i.e., submissive subordinate, empowering superior, controlling culture; dominant subordinate, empowering superior, controlling culture; submissive subordinate, controlling superior, empowering culture; and dominant subordinate, controlling superior, empowering culture; (3) Norms congruent, complementarity both \( n = 31 \); i.e., dominant subordinate, empowering superior, empowering culture; and submissive subordinate, controlling superior, controlling culture. I then conducted a multivariate
regression analysis using GLM, in which I regressed partners’ perceptions of associates’ performance, future rewards, likeability and competence and associates’ perceptions of job stress and burnout on the norms grouping variable. The overall equation was not significant (Wilks’ $\Lambda = .90, F (6, 76) = 1.36, p = .24, \eta^2 = .10$); however, the observed power was only .50, which increases the risk of a Type II error. Therefore, I still interpreted the individual regression coefficients even though the overall equation was not significant.

I conducted the same analysis using MPLUS 5.2 to obtain coefficient estimates. A summary of this analysis is reported in Table 8. As shown in Table 8 and in support of Hypothesis 5A and 5B, there was a significant effect of the norms grouping variable on burnout ($\beta = -0.27, p < .01$). There was also a trend in the predicted direction for job stress ($\beta = -0.18, p < .10$). Table 9 shows the means and standard deviations of the dependent variables for each of the three groups.

Table 8. Results of Multivariate Analysis for Norms Predicting Performance Appraisal, Rewards, Liking, Competence, Job Stress and Burnout (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Liking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
<td>$\beta$ (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.17 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.09 (0.11)</td>
<td>0.13 (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.18* (0.11)</td>
<td>-0.27** (0.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 87. Norms is coded 0 for congruent norms, subordinate style non-complementarity with both; 1 for incongruent norms, subordinate style complementarity with one but not the other; and 2 for congruent norms, subordinate style complementarity with both. *$p < .10$. **$p < .01$.}
Table 9. Means and Standard Deviations for the Dependent Variables within Each of the Three Groups: Congruent Norms with No Subordinate Style Complementarity, Incongruent Norms with Partial Subordinate Style Complementarity and Congruent Norms with Full Subordinate Style Complementarity (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Performance Appraisal M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rewards M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Liking M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Competence M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Job Stress M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Burnout M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Norms: Non-Complementarity Both</td>
<td>3.85 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67 (1.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98 (0.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.02 (0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56 (0.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18 (0.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent Norms: One Complementarity, One Non-Complementarity</td>
<td>3.83 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57 (0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.04 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42 (0.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.01 (0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruent Norms: Complementarity Both</td>
<td>4.02 (0.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.81 (0.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08 (0.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19 (0.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.37 (0.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 (0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 87.

Taken together with the results of the multivariate analysis, the pattern of means support Hypothesis 5A: Associates received the highest ratings of performance, rewards, liking and competence from partners and reported the lowest levels of job stress and burnout when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent rather than incongruent and their behavior complements the norms of authority for their different roles. However, the results were not clear with respect to Hypothesis 5B. On the one hand, in support of Hypothesis 5B, partners liked associates least and associates reported the highest burnout and job stress when norms of authority for their different roles are congruent and their behavior does not complement the norms of authority for their congruent roles. On the other hand, in opposition to Hypothesis 5B, partners rated associates higher in performance, rewards and competence when the norms of authority for their different roles are incongruent and their behavior complements one norm but not
the other, than when the norms of authority for their different roles are congruent and their behavior did not complement either norm.

Additional Analyses

I examined the predicted values from the two-way interactions for each of the four cells of the two by two superior style by subordinate style matrix depicted in Figure 2 to determine how subordinates in the different combinations fared on the dependent variables. Although I did not make any predictions about how the different combinations of styles would lead to differential success, I thought this would be an interesting question to examine. Across the six dependent variables, the highest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, empowering superior cell (complementarity) and the lowest predicted values occurred in the submissive subordinate, empowering superior cell (non-complementarity). On the performance appraisal, rewards, competence and job stress dependent variables, the predicted values for the dominant subordinate, controlling superior (non-complementarity) were higher than the predicted values for the submissive subordinate, controlling superior (complementarity). However, on the liking and burnout dependent variables, there was no difference in the predicted values for these two cells.
CHAPTER 5

General Discussion

The primary objective of my dissertation was to determine whether different subordinate styles lead to greater success with superiors with different leadership styles, and whether these relationships are affected by other macro authority variables such as the organizational culture. Toward this end, I articulated a meso theory that was informed by relevant work on superior-subordinate dyadic processes, specified important contingencies that affect the relationship between subordinates’ behaviors with their superiors and their success, and provided new ways to conceptualize superior and subordinate styles. In two empirical studies—an experimental study with international MBA students and senior executives and a field study with partner-associate dyads at a law firm—I found support for my theory that subordinates whose styles complement their superiors’ styles are more successful and that the relationship between complementary superior-subordinate styles and subordinates’ success is mediated by the subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ role expectations and moderated by familiarity and the organizational culture.

Summary of Results

In both studies, dominant subordinates were more successful with empowering superiors (complementarity) than were submissive subordinates (non-complementarity), supporting Hypothesis 1A. Specifically, empowering superiors rated dominant subordinates higher in performance (Study 1 and 2), rewards (Study 1 and 2), liking (Study 1 and 2) and competence (Study 2) than submissive subordinates. Further, dominant subordinates who worked for empowering superiors rated themselves significantly lower in job stress and burnout than did submissive subordinates who
worked for empowering superiors (Study 2). Study 1 supported Hypothesis 1B that
submissive subordinates were more successful (i.e., rated higher in performance, rewards
and liking) with controlling superiors (complementarity) than were dominant
subordinates (non-complementarity). However, Hypothesis 1B was not supported in
Study 2. In fact, controlling superiors rated dominant subordinates higher in performance
(not statistically significant), rewards and competence than submissive subordinates.
Both Studies 1 and 2 supported Hypothesis 1C that dominant subordinates were more
successful with empowering superiors (complementarity) than with controlling superiors
(non-complementarity). Specifically, empowering superiors rated dominant subordinates
higher in performance (Study 1 and 2), rewards (Study 1, not statistically significant in
Study 2, but results were in the predicted direction), liking (Study 1 and 2) and
competence (Study 2) than did controlling superiors. In addition, dominant subordinates
who worked for empowering superiors rated themselves significantly lower in job stress
(but not burnout although the results were in the predicted direction) than did dominant
associates who worked for controlling superiors (Study 2). In both studies, submissive
subordinates were more successful with controlling superiors (complementarity) than
empowering superiors (non-complementarity), supporting Hypothesis 1D. Specifically,
controlling superiors rated submissive subordinates higher in performance (Study 2),
rewards (Study 2), liking (Study 1) and competence (Study 2) than did empowering
superiors. Further, submissive subordinates who worked for controlling superiors rated
themselves significantly lower in burnout and job stress than did submissive subordinates
who worked for empowering superiors (Study 2).
The mediating role of subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ role expectations, as laid out in Hypothesis 3, was supported in both studies. Subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ normative expectations fully mediated the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and performance appraisal (Study 1 and Study 2), rewards (Study 1 and Study 2), liking (Study 2), and competence (Study 2). In Study 1, subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ normative expectations partially mediated the relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and liking. However, subordinates’ fulfillment of their superiors’ normative expectations did not mediate the relationships between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ job stress and between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ burnout. In hindsight, it seems plausible that the links between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ psychological outcomes and between superior-subordinate style complementarity and subordinates’ work-related outcomes (i.e., superiors’ assessments) may be accounted for by different factors.

The hypotheses that complementarity is moderated by familiarity and organizational culture, which were only tested in Study 2, were generally supported. In support of Hypothesis 2A, there were a greater number of superior-subordinate dyads with complementary styles (64%) than superior-subordinate dyads with non-complementary styles (36%). Moreover, there were more dyads with complementary styles among partners and associates who knew each other well than among partners and associates who did not know each other well. In addition, among the dyads who knew each other well, there were more dyads with complementary styles than dyads with non-complementary styles. These findings are supportive of Hypothesis 2B. Moreover, the
relationship between superior-subordinate style complementarity and superiors’ liking of the subordinate was enhanced with increasing familiarity, which supports Hypothesis 2C. However, there was no support for Hypothesis 2C with the other dependent variables in this study.

In support of Hypothesis 4, organizational culture moderated the relationship between partner-associate style complementarity and associates’ performance appraisals and self-reported burnout, but not associates’ rewards, liking, competence and self-reported job stress. The results of the three-way interactions on performance appraisals and burnout reveal that the basic two-way interaction between leadership style and subordinate style is stronger when partners perceive the culture to be controlling than when partners perceive the culture to be empowering, which suggests that controlling cultures may be more rigid than empowering cultures.

Study 2 supported Hypothesis 5A by showing that associates were the most successful on all of the dependent variables when norms of authority for their different roles were congruent (rather than incongruent) and their behavior was complementary to the norms of authority for their different roles. However, Study 2 did not clearly indicate whether subordinates are least successful when their styles do not complement congruent norms, as Hypothesis 5B suggested, or whether they are least successful when their styles partially complement incongruent norms. On the one hand, on liking, job stress and burnout, associates were least successful when norms of authority for their different roles were congruent (rather than incongruent) and their behavior was not complementary to these norms. On the other hand, on performance, rewards and competence, subordinates
were least successful when norms of authority for their different roles were incongruent and their behavior was complementary to one norm but not the other.

As an empirical question in both studies, I also examined how the different combinations of superior and subordinate styles might lead to differential subordinate success. In Study 1, across all three dependent variables, the highest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, empowering superior cell (complementarity) and the lowest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, controlling superior cell (non-complementarity), with the other two cells falling in between, their rank order depending on the dependent variable. In Study 2, across all six dependent variables, the highest predicted values occurred in the dominant subordinate, empowering superior cell (complementarity) and the lowest predicted values occurred in the submissive subordinate, empowering superior cell (non-complementarity), with the other two cells falling in between. These results suggest that the dominant subordinate, empowering superior combination is more effective than the submissive subordinate, controlling superior combination; however, submissive subordinates are always more successful with controlling superiors than empowering superiors.

In short, the fact that I found converging evidence in two studies which differed in their populations, methodologies and operationalizations of key constructs provides support for my hypotheses. Although there were a few results that did not meet conventional significance levels, I reported those results when I replicated them across variables within and between studies. This is consistent with other researchers who have argued that replications, like those I observe within and across these studies are more important than significance level (Greenwald, Gonzalez, Harris, & Guthrie, 1996).
Theoretical Implications

Implications for Influence Literature

This dissertation expands upon previous research on subordinate upward influence by providing an empirically-supported meso theory that accomplishes three objectives. First, the present research reconciles conflicting findings on subordinate upward influence by specifying how micro and macro variables function as moderators and mediators of the relationship between subordinates' behaviors with their superiors and their success. Thus, it offers a promising framework for future research on subordinate upward influence behaviors.

Second, this dissertation extends previous research in the influence literature by providing a theoretically-derived classification scheme of subordinates' influence behaviors as two opposing styles of subordinateship on the interpersonal dimension of control—dominant and submissive behavioral styles. Dominant and submissive behavioral styles may be viewed as meta-categories that subsume previous tactics identified by popular typologies in the influence literature. These meta-categories can facilitate future theory and research because they imply specific, real behaviors, which can be measured (see Appendix I), and as the results of the studies show, have clear implications for subordinates' success.

Third, this work integrates and builds on other literatures that focus on superior-subordinate dyadic processes—contingency theory, complementarity theory, superior-subordinate fit and leader member exchange. In so doing, this research provides a more holistic understanding of the effects of superior-subordinate dyadic processes on subordinate success.

Implications for Contingency Theory Literature
In contrast to prior research in the contingency theory literature which has tended to focus on leader success as the dependent variable and to relegate characteristics of the subordinate and the superior-subordinate dyad to moderator variables, this work focused on subordinate success as the dependent variable and gave primacy to the superior-subordinate dyad. In addition, this paper also considered other authority structures such as culture which have not been examined before in the contingency theory literature. In line with the basic premise of the contingency theory literature, the results of the present study suggest that there is no one best subordinate style or leadership style or cultural style but that the optimal subordinate outcomes will depend on the specific combination of these styles.

**Implications for Complementarity Literature**

The current research contributes to work on complementarity in five ways. First, this research provides one of the first empirical examinations of complementarity effects with individuals who are in positions that differ in their hierarchical status. Counterintuitively, I proposed that in these hierarchically asymmetrical relationships complementarity can go in both directions, which was empirically supported in both studies. Controlling superiors keep authority to themselves, thereby adopting a more dominant role, and consequently submissive subordinates are most successful with them. In contrast, empowering superiors delegate authority to subordinates, thereby adopting a more submissive role, and consequently dominant subordinates are most successful with them.

Second, this research extends past laboratory research that has examined how complementarity often occurs unconsciously among individuals interacting with confederates, imagined interaction partners or strangers by examining how
complementarity tends to occur as a conscious process among people, i.e., superior-subordinate dyads, who are interpersonally important to each other. In interactions with new individuals, dominance complementarity is more likely to operate outside of awareness than in interactions with long-term partners where people may be more aware of their styles of relating to each other and the implications thereof. Indeed, the results of Study 2 indicated that the partners were aware of their own styles and the associates’ styles and this awareness affected their assessments of the associates.

Third, this research looks at complementarity dynamically to examine how people’s behavioral styles affect each other over the course of their relationship. Study 2 found that there were more partner-associate dyads with complementary than non-complementary styles and that the behavioral styles of associates became increasingly complementary to the partners’ styles with increasing familiarity. Interpersonal theory stresses that individuals’ behavioral styles will become more complementary as their relationship progresses if they are invested in and/or cannot leave the relationship (Kiesler, 1983). In the only other study that has looked at complementarity dynamically, Markey and Kurtz (2006) found that randomly paired college roommates’ perceptions of their behavioral styles became more complementary the longer they lived together, which supports that greater acquaintanceship leads to greater complementarity. In contrast to the Markey and Kurtz study, Study 2 examined complementarity among non-randomly paired superior-subordinate dyads. Specifically, in law firms, partners and associates have some choice over who they work with, and in particular over who they work with more than once and in close proximity. Thus, in the present study, the greater complementarity I saw between partners and associates, particularly in the long-term,
may have been due in large part to individuals' selection of complementary work partners. As such, these results suggest that complementarity may be an important determinant of long-term relationship outcomes. The finding that partners liked complementary associates more the better they knew them lends further support to the notion that complementarity leads to longer and stronger relationships.

Fourth, this research extends prior work on complementarity in dyadic relationships by examining complementarity at a different level of analysis, namely at the organizational culture level. The results of Study 2 indicate that complementarity can operate at different levels of analysis and that the basic two-way interaction between superiors' styles and subordinates' styles shows up more in controlling cultures than in empowering cultures. These results suggest that controlling cultures may be less forgiving of subordinates whose styles do not complement their superiors' styles while empowering cultures may better accept subordinates whose styles do not complement their superiors' styles. Thus, in controlling cultures, it may be more important for subordinates to rigidly adjust their styles to their superiors' styles. Similar processes should presumably apply with other macro authority structures that have implications for status conferral (e.g., culture, demographics), which opens up a new and interesting topic of inquiry.

Fifth, this research is the first to address the processes by which complementarity leads to beneficial outcomes. The results of both studies supported my proposition that subordinates' fulfillment of superiors' normative expectations about appropriate behaviors for the subordinates' role will account for the positive effects of complementarity on subordinates' success. By fulfilling their superiors' role
expectations, subordinates meet their superiors’ needs for the division of labor, coordination and productivity. In exchange, superiors fulfill subordinates’ needs by providing them with the resources they need to achieve their desired outcomes. Thus, dominance complementarity may be conceptualized as complementary fit, because through complementarity the relationship partners fulfill each others’ needs.

*Implications for Superior-Subordinate Fit Literature*

Accordingly, the results also have implications for the literature on superior-subordinate fit. Prior research on superior-subordinate fit has demonstrated that superior-subordinate perceptual congruence regarding role expectations is positively related to subordinate job satisfaction and performance (Bernardin, 1979; Greene, 1972). The present studies add to this research by suggesting that subordinates’ compliance with superiors’ normative expectations accounts for this effect and also by specifying the nature of superiors’ expectations as stemming from their leadership styles and underlying conceptions of authority.

*Implications for Leader-Member Exchange Literature*

This work extends research on leader-member exchange theory by providing a clear description of the nature of the exchange process between superiors and subordinates and by specifying the combinations of leader and subordinate behaviors that promote high quality relationships and optimal subordinate outcomes. Both studies provide evidence that subordinates meet superiors’ behavioral expectations, which in turn enables them to obtain desired psychological and work-related outcomes from superiors, and that complementary superior-subordinate styles on the interpersonal dimension of control lead to higher quality superior-subordinate relationships and greater subordinate success.
**Implications for Leadership and Authority Literatures**

This dissertation also integrates and extends research in the leadership and authority literatures by providing a conceptual framework that classifies leadership behaviors as two opposing styles on a dimension based on their underlying conceptions of authority—empowering cognitive behavioral style based on normative authority and controlling cognitive behavioral style based on rational authority. Empowering and controlling styles may be viewed as meta-categories that subsume previous conceptions of leadership styles in the leadership literature. The fact that these styles are based on fundamental differences in authority schemas provides support for my contention that they will be relatively stable across situations (e.g., with different subordinates and in different organizational cultures).

**Implications for Stereotypes and Status Literature**

This research brings together the complementarity literature and the stereotypes and status literatures and indicates how complementarity theory can be brought to bear on the stereotypes and status literatures to inform future research in these areas. Although the stereotypes and status literatures talk about people being penalized in terms of their social and work-related outcomes when they fail to meet the normative expectations for their status roles—which are relative to others’ status roles in the situation—by being inappropriately dominant or submissive—these effects have not been conceptualized in terms of complementarity. The consideration of these effects in terms of complementarity theory may enable researchers to better understand these processes.

**Implications for Role Congruity Theory Literature**

This work extends research on role congruity in two ways. First, it provides an alternative explanation for the backlash effect. Rudman (1998) argues that the backlash
effect is a person perception effect in which targets perceive the same behavior differently due to the different knowledge representations they have about the person who engaged in it and that their knowledge representations will be influenced by the person's social roles and associated status. For example, targets will respond to the same submissive behavior engaged in by a male or a female differently, because of their different mental models about what the behavior means when conducted by men versus women. In contrast to Rudman, I argue that people may engage in the same overt behaviors, but these behaviors may not serve the same strategic function, and when they do not serve the same strategic function they are not psychologically the same and will be experienced differently by the target. Accordingly, I view the backlash effect as a person x situation effect in which the effect of a behavior on a target depends on the targets' interpretation of the behavior and the strategy behind it, which is influenced by the targets' own systems (i.e., by their leadership styles and underlying theories of authority) and other authority characteristics present in the situation. Thus, subordinates may employ identical submissive or dominant behaviors with empowering and controlling superiors for different reasons, which may be obvious to their superiors. For example, the use of a submissive strategy with an empowering superior might indicate lack of knowledge of role expectations, unwillingness to do what it takes to get ahead or lack of competence, while the use of a submissive strategy with a controlling superior might indicate knowledge of role expectations, willingness to do what it takes to get ahead and competence.

Second, the present research adds to research on role congruity theory which has examined the effect of the congruity between gender roles and leadership roles on
leaders' outcomes by examining the effect of another form of congruity—that between subordinate roles (as dictated by superiors' styles) and organizational roles (as dictated by organizational cultures) on subordinates' outcomes. In support of role congruity theory and consistent with research on this theory, the results of Study 2 revealed that associates were less successful when norms of authority for their subordinate role and their organizational role were incongruent and their behavior complemented one role but not the other than when norms of authority for their subordinate role and their organizational role were congruent and their behavior complemented these congruent roles.

*Other Implications for Organizational Psychology Research*

More generally, this research answers House, Rousseau and Thomas-Hunt's (1995) call for more research that integrates micro and macro variables to more fully understand organizational phenomena. Specifically, Study 2 yields a more complete picture of how superior-subordinate style complementarity affects subordinate success by considering how this relationship is moderated by organizational culture and finds that the two-way interaction of superior style and subordinate style on subordinate success is stronger in controlling cultures than in empowering cultures. Thus, this research makes a more general contribution to the micro and macro organizational behavior literatures by specifying how micro variables are influenced by the organizational context.

*Practical Implications*

This dissertation provides a number of practical insights for organizations and their personnel to better understand the relationship between styles of subordinates and superiors and the probability of subordinates' success. Improving the subordinates' success is likely to improve the superiors' success and the organizations' overall performance.
In particular, the conclusions might help organizations with respect to recruiting decisions, staffing tasks, conducting leadership trainings and preparing team building exercises. Relying on the tools developed in this study, organizations can make an internal assessment of their people and culture to determine which cell in the matrix (i.e., empowering superior with dominant subordinate versus controlling superior with submissive subordinate) leads to the greatest subordinate success in their organizations. They can then use this information to hire subordinates and superiors whose styles are complementary to the organizational culture and to the personnel who they will be working with. Organizations can also utilize their knowledge about the success of subordinates in different superior-subordinate dominance complementarity combinations to make staffing decisions. Organizations should staff dominant subordinates with empowering superiors and submissive subordinates with controlling superiors, particularly if the culture is controlling, because the results of this study suggest that superior-subordinate style complementarity is especially important for subordinates’ success in controlling cultures. Organizations with empowering cultures may also consider staffing dominant subordinates with controlling superiors, since the results of this study suggest that dominant subordinates do equally well regardless of their superior in empowering cultures. By discussing these findings with employees in leadership trainings and team building exercises, organizations can increase their employees’ awareness about these processes and the benefit of building complementary superior-subordinate relationships. This should result in more positive and productive working relationships.
Employees who understand the importance of dominance complementarity can use this knowledge to work in organizations and with superiors who complement their styles in order to improve their success. Moreover, when they have the option, subordinates should attempt to work with the same complementary superiors on multiple projects, because the benefits of dominance complementarity on relationship quality (e.g., liking) increase with increasing familiarity. Even in situations where subordinates have to or want to work with non-complementary superiors, they can improve their likelihood of success by trying to adapt their styles to complement their superiors’ styles. An alternative might also be to address the situation with their superiors in order to see if they could both adjust their styles to meet somewhere in the middle. Subordinates who understand that they have a dominant style might aim to work in empowering cultures, because this will improve their probability of success with either empowering or controlling superiors.

*Future Directions*

While this research answered a lot of questions around superior-subordinate dominance complementarity and its implications for subordinate success, it also raises a number of questions that would be interesting for further exploration.

This work assumed that subordinates employ dominance and submissiveness strategically to establish complementarity to their superiors, but future research should explicitly test this assumption. Study 2 showed that there was greater dominance complementarity among partner-associate dyads who knew each other well. Since partners and associates have choices about who they work with and in particular about who they work with in long-term close relationships, I interpreted this result as indicating that this greater complementarity was likely due in large part to individuals’ selection of
complementary work partners. However, associates might also have been strategically altering their styles to complement the partners’ styles. Moreover, future research should test the assumption that leadership style will be more fixed and that subordinates will adapt their style more to their superiors’ style than vice versa. Longitudinal studies that track superior-subordinate relationships over time, starting when they begin working together, are necessary to better understand these processes and determine causality.

In this research, I also assumed subordinates are motivated to achieve success. In some organizations, employees may be purely motivated by a pay check and might not care about outcomes like relationships with superiors, job satisfaction and promotions. In such instances, superior-subordinate style complementarity may not affect subordinate outcomes in the manner found in this work. Future research should test whether subordinates’ motivation to achieve success presents a boundary condition for these results.

Another interesting question for future research might be to examine the characteristics of subordinates that enable them to establish dominance complementarity relationships with their superiors. Subordinate characteristics that seem particularly relevant to look at include self-monitoring (Snyder, 1987), political skill, Machiavellianism (Christie & Geis, 1970) and social skill, because these characteristics have all been shown to have implications for people’s ability to read contextual cues and adapt their behaviors accordingly.

Further, future research should determine whether subordinates are more successful when complementarity is the result of true or strategic behaviors. Complementarity will be true, or intrinsic, when subordinates behave consistently with
their dispositions in their interactions with their superiors and their behaviors are aligned with their superiors' expectations. Intrinsic complementarity occurs when subordinates behave according to prescribed roles, because they have internalized the social norms that go with them, and is normative, value-based commitment (i.e., internalization). The behavioral expectations for different social roles may become internalized through socialization and become part of the self-concept (Eagly, 1987). In contrast, strategic complementarity occurs when subordinates conform to prescribed roles out of compliance with social norms even when norms have not been internalized, and is instrumental, compliance-based commitment (i.e., compliance). It is possible that individuals whose complementarity is true rather than strategic may be more successful than those whose complementarity is strategic, because the former may appear more genuine to their superiors.

Another interesting area for future inquiry concerns the three-way interactions tested in the present work. It is notable that even with a sample size of 87 I found two significant three-way interactions for subordinate style x superior style x organizational culture and also a significant interaction for superior-subordinate style complementarity x familiarity. By using a larger sample size, additional significant three-way interactions might be found. Relatedly, future research should also examine the interactive effects of other macro authority variables on superior-subordinate complementarity processes, such as gender, ethnicity, age, education and societal culture. I did not have access to demographic data at the law firm in Study 2, which may have helped to further refine the results. For example, it could be possible that the reason the dominant subordinate, empowering superior combination fared best in both studies is because it was also
contingent on the unmeasured variable of gender. People generally assume that Chris Cunningham is a man when reading the case manipulation employed in Study 1, and there are more male than female associates in law firms, which was the field site for Study 2. Thus, it is possible that in female-dominated organizations, the submissive subordinate, controlling superior combination might fare best. The results of studies that examine additional authority moderators would make it possible for organizations to be even more precise in their decision-making regarding optimal superior-subordinate combinations given various situational contingencies.

Future research could also examine if these findings generalize across organizational echelons. It is possible that the complementary superior-subordinate style conditions which are optimal for subordinate success will vary at different hierarchical levels in the organization. At different levels, different qualities are required for both superiors and subordinates to be successful and different style combinations may be more or less optimal. For example, the controlling superior-submissive subordinate pairing may be optimal for middle managers and their employees because those employees might need more guidance and direct oversight whereas the empowering superior-dominant subordinate pairing may be optimal for CEOs and their heads of business units because those employees are more self-directed.

In addition, future research should examine why the basic two-way interaction between leadership style and subordinate style was stronger when partners perceived the culture to be controlling than when they perceived the culture to be empowering. I’ve proposed that controlling cultures may be more rigid and less accepting of subordinates
whose styles do not complement their superiors’ styles than are empowering cultures.

Future research is needed to empirically test this explanation.

The mechanism that mediates the effect of superior-subordinate style complementarity on the subordinate psychological success dependent variables, job stress and burnout would also be an interesting topic for future research. Perhaps it is not superiors’ perceptions that subordinates have fulfilled their role expectations that matters for subordinates’ psychological outcomes but rather subordinates’ perceptions that they have fulfilled their superiors’ expectations that accounts for these relationships.

Future research should also examine the effect of superior-subordinate style complementarity on superiors’ success and how this relationship may be moderated by other authority structures, such as organizational culture. Although the focus of this dissertation was on the effect of superior-subordinate style complementarity on subordinates’ success, it has also shown that superiors have their expectations met by subordinates who exhibit dominance complementarity and that superiors have better relationships with complementary subordinates, particularly in the long-term. Superiors whose styles are complementary to their subordinates benefit from more harmonious relationships with subordinates and from the greater task coordination and productivity that result from the division of labor in these relationships. Accordingly, I would expect that superiors in dominance complementary relationships would also have better performance outcomes, and more generally, would be better able to realize their psychological and work-related objectives. Research that examines superior-subordinate dyads longitudinally, as discussed above, would help to determine if complementarity also facilitates superiors’ success.
Conclusion

The findings of this dissertation suggest that subordinates whose styles are complementary to their superiors’ styles with respect to the interpersonal dimension of control (i.e., dominance-submissiveness) are more successful, because these subordinates meet their superiors’ normative role expectations. Moreover, this research indicates that the extent to which superior-subordinate dominance complementarity leads to greater subordinate success is a function of the organizational culture, specifically complementarity is more important for subordinate success in controlling cultures than empowering cultures, and of familiarity, which can enhance the tendency of complementarity to lead to greater liking. Subordinates are able to achieve the greatest success when norms of authority for their subordinate roles (dictated by their superiors’ style) and organizational roles (dictated by the organizational culture) are congruent and their behavior complements these congruent norms. Accordingly, there is not one best subordinate style for subordinate success; instead the optimal subordinate style for subordinate success will depend on the superiors’ style and other authority characteristics present in the situation. The examination of contingencies that affect the relationship between subordinates’ behaviors with their superiors and their success holds significant promise for enhancing our understanding of how subordinates achieve their preferred psychological and work-related outcomes in organizations.
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Appendix A: Chris Cunningham, Dominance

Mr. John Stover was the president of Stover Industries, an amalgamation of several small companies in the electrical parts industry. He had inherited one of the groups of companies from, his father in law. Mr. Stover, an engineer, elected to run the company. In addition to the original inheritance, Mr. Stover had purchased three other companies to make the present Stover Industries. Mr. Stover was 42 years old. He was a dynamic individual, full of ideas and drive. In the space of a year he had welded Stover Industries into a profitable organization known for its aggressiveness. The key to profitability had been a strong strategic focus on the timely delivery to customers of high quality products.

Mr. Stover integrated the four companies into a unified organization by welding the individual managements into one unit. Some individuals were let go in each organization as it was purchased and became part of Stover Industries. In several other instances executives of the newly purchased companies resigned because of difficulties in working for such a driving boss. The four plants continued as individual manufacturing units of the company, and together employed approximately 475 production workers. Some problems arose in integrating the individual sales staffs since the original companies had been competing with each other. Consequently, the salespeople had overlapping territories. This was gradually being worked out but the salespeople were permitted to keep their own old customers, making it next to impossible to assign exclusive territories to each salesperson.

The sales staff included seventeen salespeople and the sales director. The sales director had been with the original Stover Company as sales manager. He knew John Stover well and was able to work as his complacent subordinate. Most of his time and energy was devoted to routine direction and coordination of the sales team. Although a trusted lieutenant of Mr. Stover the sales director was not much more than titular head of the sales force. Mr. Stover provided the active leadership.

Recently, Mr. Stover had personally hired Chris Cunningham, a college classmate, as a salesperson for the organization. Chris shared some of Mr. Stover's drive and enthusiasm and, in a short time, had justified Mr. Stover's choice with a sensational sales record. In terms of sales performance, Chris Cunningham's record left little to be desired.

Yet, Chris represented a thorny problem to Mr. Stover. The problem, as outlined by Mr. Stover, appeared to him to shape up in the following fashion:

"I hired Chris because we knew and admired each other in our college days. Chris was always a leader on campus and we had worked well together in campus affairs. Chris has a strong personality. Chris was just the kind of person I wanted in this organization -- a lot of drive and originality combined with tremendous loyalty. Chris is

8 Bold font indicates dominance manipulation.
very active and takes the initiative to get things done. The way I operate I need a loyal organization of people who will pitch right in on the projects we develop.

"Chris has already been proven a top notch performer and will probably be our best salesperson in a year or two. Chris is self-confident, independent, decisive and ambitious. Could one ask for anything better than that?

"Here is where the rub comes in. Chris is the sort of person who has absolutely no respect for organization. A hot order will come in, for example, and Chris will go straight to the plant with it and raise hell until that order is delivered. Chris never gives up easily and stands up well under pressure. It doesn't make any difference that our production schedule has been knocked to pieces. The order is out and Chris has a satisfied customer. Of course, that sort of thing gets repeat business and does show well on Chris's sales record. But it has made running our plants a constant headache. It is not only the production people who have felt the impact of Cunningham on the operations. Chris gets mixed up with our engineering department on new designs and has even made the purchasing department furious by needling them to hurry supplies on special orders.

"You can just imagine how the rest of the organization feels about all this. The other salespeople are pretty upset that their orders get pushed aside -- and are probably a bit jealous too. The production people, the engineers, the purchasing agent and most of the rest of the staff have constantly complained to me about how Chris gets in their hair. On a personal level, the staff say they like Chris a lot but that they just cannot work with such a competitive, troublemaker in the organization.

"I have talked with Chris many times about this. I have tried raising hell over the issue, pleading for change, and patient rational discussion. For maybe a week after one of these sessions Chris seems like a reformed character, everyone relaxes a bit, and then bang -- off we go again in the same old pattern.

"I suppose that in many ways Chris is just like me -- I must admit I would probably be inclined to act in much the same way. You see, I have lot of sympathy for Chris's point of view.

"I think you can see now what my problem is. Should I fire Chris and lose a star salesperson? That does not make too much sense. In fact, Chris is probably the person who should be our sales director, if not immediately, at least in a few years. But without the ability to get along with the organization, to understand the meaning of "channels" and "procedures," Chris is not only a valuable and talented addition to the company, but a liability as well. Should I take a chance on things eventually working out and Chris getting educated to the organization? Should I put on a lot of pressure and force a change? What would that do to Chris's enthusiasm and sales record? If I just let things go, then there is a real danger to my organization. My executives will think I have given Chris the green light and they will transfer their antagonism to me; I certainly cannot afford that.
Chris's response to Mr. Stover

Chris defended this behavior as justifiable given the performance results. Chris argued that it was necessary to work this way to get the job done. Chris tried to persuade Mr. Stover of this point of view. Chris offered suggestions and recommendations about what could be done to make the job more effective.
Appendix B: Chris Cunningham, Submissiveness

Mr. John Stover was the president of Stover Industries, an amalgamation of several small companies in the electrical parts industry. He had inherited one of the groups of companies from his father in law. Mr. Stover, an engineer, elected to run the company. In addition to the original inheritance, Mr. Stover had purchased three other companies to make the present Stover Industries. Mr. Stover was 42 years old. He was a dynamic individual, full of ideas and drive. In the space of a year he had welded Stover Industries into a profitable organization known for its aggressiveness. The key to profitability had been a strong strategic focus on the timely delivery to customers of high quality products.

Mr. Stover integrated the four companies into a unified organization by welding the individual managements into one unit. Some individuals were let go in each organization as it was purchased and became part of Stover Industries. In several other instances executives of the newly purchased companies resigned because of difficulties in working for such a driving boss. The four plants continued as individual manufacturing units of the company, and together employed approximately 475 production workers. Some problems arose in integrating the individual sales staffs since the original companies had been competing with each other. Consequently, the salespeople had overlapping territories. This was gradually being worked out but the salespeople were permitted to keep their own old customers, making it next to impossible to assign exclusive territories to each salesperson.

The sales staff included seventeen salespeople and the sales director. The sales director had been with the original Stover Company as sales manager. He knew John Stover well and was able to work as his complacent subordinate. Most of his time and energy was devoted to routine direction and coordination of the sales team. Although a trusted lieutenant of Mr. Stover the sales director was not much more than titular head of the sales force. Mr. Stover provided the active leadership.

Recently, Mr. Stover had personally hired Chris Cunningham, a college classmate, as a salesperson for the organization. Chris shared some of Mr. Stover's drive and enthusiasm and, in a short time, had justified Mr. Stover's choice with a sensational sales record. In terms of sales performance, Chris Cunningham's record left little to be desired.

Yet, Chris represented a thorny problem to Mr. Stover. The problem, as outlined by Mr. Stover, appeared to him to shape up in the following fashion:

"I hired Chris because we knew and admired each other in our college days. Chris was always a leader on campus and we had worked well together in campus affairs. **Chris was very warm and personable.** Chris was just the kind of person I wanted in this organization -- a lot of drive and originality combined with tremendous loyalty. **Chris is very accommodating and frequently volunteers to take on additional**

---
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responsibilities. The way I operate I need a loyal organization of people who will pitch right in on the projects we develop.

"Chris has already been proven a top notch performer and will probably be our best salesperson in a year or two. Could one ask for anything better than that?

"Here is where the rub comes in. Chris is the sort of person who has absolutely no respect for organization. A hot order will come in, for example, and Chris will go straight to the plant with it and raise hell until that order is delivered. It doesn't make any difference that our production schedule has been knocked to pieces. The order is out and Chris has a satisfied customer. Of course, that sort of thing gets repeat business and does show well on Chris's sales record. But it has made running our plants a constant headache. It is not only the production people who have felt the impact of Cunningham on the operations. Chris gets mixed up with our engineering department on new designs and has even made the purchasing department furious by needling them to hurry supplies on special orders.

"You can just imagine how the rest of the organization feels about all this. The other salespeople are pretty upset that their orders get pushed aside -- and are probably a bit jealous too. The production people, the engineers, the purchasing agent and most of the rest of the staff have constantly complained to me about how Chris gets in their hair.

"Chris is aware of others' negative feelings and tries hard to soothe them. Chris is sensitive to the needs of others and goes out of the way to be helpful. Chris is very collegial and does favors for everyone. Despite Chris's status as a top notch performer, Chris is very modest and humble.

"On a personal level, the staff say they like Chris a lot but that they just cannot work with such a troublemaker in the organization.

"I have talked with Chris many times about this. I have tried raising hell over the issue, pleading for change, and patient rational discussion. For maybe a week after one of these sessions Chris seems like a reformed character, everyone relaxes a bit, and then bang -- off we go again in the same old pattern.

"I suppose that in many ways Chris is just like me -- I must admit I would probably be inclined to act in much the same way. You see, I have lot of sympathy for Chris's point of view.

"I think you can see now what my problem is. Should I fire Chris and lose a star salesperson? That does not make too much sense. In fact, Chris is probably the person who should be our sales director, if not immediately, at least in a few years. But without the ability to get along with the organization, to understand the meaning of "channels" and "procedures," Chris is not only a valuable and talented addition to the company, but a liability as well. Should I take a chance on things eventually working out and Chris getting educated to the organization? Should I put on a lot of pressure and force a
change? What would that do to Chris's enthusiasm and sales record? If I just let things go, then there is a real danger to my organization. My executives will think I have given Chris the green light and they will transfer their antagonism to me; I certainly cannot afford that.

**Chris’s response to Mr. Stover**

Chris listened attentively to Mr. Stover’s concerns. Chris apologized profusely and repeatedly on multiple occasions. Chris was sympathetic to Mr. Stover’s point of view and eager to appease him. Chris promised to change this behavior to be in alignment with the organization.
## Appendix C: Content Analysis of Empowering and Controlling Styles (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Empowering</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shares information freely</td>
<td>Keep subordinates informed</td>
<td>Share information selectively, often on a need-to-know basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes and maintains informal relationships with subordinates</td>
<td>Socialize with subordinates to build relationships; facilitate mutual trust</td>
<td>Establish and maintain formal relationships with subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to subordinates/Encourages autonomy over work activities</td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches</td>
<td>Treat subordinates as equals; be willing to help with personal problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages subordinates to adopt their own approach to work</td>
<td>Allow subordinates to define their work</td>
<td>Specify how tasks will be accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage subordinates to adopt their own approach to work</td>
<td>Allow subordinates to adopt their own approach to their work</td>
<td>Provide close supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches for achieving objectives</td>
<td>Encourage risk-taking</td>
<td>Enforce rules, policies and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches for achieving objectives</td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to adopt their own approach to work</td>
<td>Insist on adherence to standards and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve subordinates in making decisions</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Make leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Empowering** refers to leadership styles that encourage subordinates to participate actively in decision making and allow them to take initiative. These styles are characterized by transparency, autonomy, and trust. Examples include sharing information freely, allowing subordinates to define their work, and encouraging risk-taking.

- **Controlling** refers to leadership styles that emphasize control and hierarchy. These styles are characterized by a top-down approach, such as strict rules and procedures, close supervision, and maintaining authority. Examples include giving subordinates detailed task instructions, monitoring their work, and enforcing rules and standards.
Appendix D: Leadership Style Questionnaire

1. Involve subordinates in making decisions
2. Monitor what subordinates are doing
3. Allow subordinates to adopt their own approach to their work
4. Maintain control over subordinates
5. Encourage subordinates to follow rules and procedures
6. Make leader and subordinate roles explicit
7. Give subordinates a chance to express their ideas and opinions
8. Encourage subordinates to engage in initiative taking behavior
9. Socialize with subordinates to build relationships
10. Provide close rather than general supervision
11. Encourage risk taking
12. Provide detailed task instructions to subordinates
13. Keep subordinates informed
14. Enforce rules, policies and regulations
15. Involve subordinates in goal-setting
16. Facilitate mutual trust
17. Treat subordinates as equals
18. Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches for achieving objectives
19. Be willing to help with personal problems
20. Allow subordinates to define their work
21. Insist on adherence to standards and procedures
22. Specify how tasks will be accomplished
23. Allow subordinates to bend rules to perform better

Scoring. Empowering is computed as the mean of items 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 23. Controlling is computed as the mean of items 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 21, and 22. Leadership style is computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering style while lower scores indicate more of a controlling style.
Appendix E: Study 2 Dependent Variables

Rewards

1. This associate has the potential to advance in the firm.
2. This associate has the potential to achieve future career-related success (such as awards, involvement in high-profile projects).
3. I believe that this associate has what it takes to make partner at this firm.
4. This associate has higher potential than other associates at the same level that I’ve supervised before.

Liking

1. I like this associate very much as a person.
2. This associate is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.
3. This associate is a lot of fun to work with.

Competence

1. I am impressed with this associate’s knowledge of his/her job.
2. I respect this associate’s knowledge of and competence on the job.
3. I admire this associate’s professional skills.

Role Expectations

1. This associate’s role performance meets my expectations.
2. This associate effectively fulfills job roles and responsibilities.
3. This associate’s behavior reflects my norms and values.
4. This associate exhibits appropriate conduct.

Job Stress

1. I work under a great deal of tension.
2. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.
3. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.

Burnout

1. Working in a service-oriented industry is really a strain for me.
2. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
3. I feel burned out from my work.
4. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
5. I feel I’m working too hard on my job.
6. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope.
7. I feel frustrated by my job.
## Appendix F: Content Analysis of Empowering and Controlling Styles (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>EMPOWERING</th>
<th>CONTROLLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shares Information Freely</td>
<td>Keep subordinates informed</td>
<td>Shares information relevant only if information may contribute to a need to know basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes and Maintains Informal Relationships with Subordinates</td>
<td>Take a personal interest in subordinates</td>
<td>Establishes and maintains formal relationships with subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates to Subordinates</td>
<td>Encourages subordinates over work activities</td>
<td>Makes leader and subordinate roles explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let subordinates do their work the way they think best</td>
<td>Closely monitors what subordinates are doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to use their own judgment in solving problems</td>
<td>Maintains authority over subordinates and controls over work activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage initiative in subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow subordinates to define their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegate considerable authority to subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow subordinates to select their own approach to their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches for achieving objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves Subordinates in Goal Setting</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in goal-setting</td>
<td>Involves subordinates in making decisions, rules, and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to speak up when they disagree</td>
<td>Maintain adherence to firm rules and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage subordinates to express their ideas and opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Information</td>
<td>Involve subordinates in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make the important decisions myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Leadership Style Questionnaire-Revised

1. Closely monitor what subordinates are doing
2. Encourage subordinates to use their own judgment in solving problems
3. Delegate considerable authority to subordinates
4. Encourage subordinates to speak up when they disagree
5. Insist on adherence to firm rules and policies
6. Make the important decisions myself
7. Maintain control over subordinates
8. Encourage initiative in subordinates
9. Keep subordinates informed
10. Tell subordinates what to do and how to do it
11. Allow subordinates to define their work
12. Take time to listen to subordinates
13. Involve subordinates in goal-setting
14. Encourage subordinates to experiment with new approaches for achieving objectives
15. Make leader and subordinate roles explicit
16. Let subordinates do their work the way they think best
17. Take a personal interest in subordinates
18. Allow subordinates to adopt their own approach to their work
19. Encourage subordinates to express their ideas and opinions
20. Provide detailed task instructions to subordinates

Scoring. Empowering is computed as the mean of items 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 19. Controlling is computed as the mean of items 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 15 and 20. Leadership style is computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering style while lower scores indicate more of a controlling style.

a Items from leader behavior questionnaire used in Study 1.
b Modified items adapted from leader behavior questionnaire used in Study 1.
Appendix H: Content Analysis of Dominant and Submissive Styles (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMINANT</th>
<th>SUBMISSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes charge</td>
<td>Takes charge of things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Works autonomously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decides on his/her own how to do his/her work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses openly &amp; confidently</td>
<td>Expresses firm personal preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actively participates in meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in confrontation</td>
<td>Stands up to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaks up when he/she disagrees with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuades/influences others</td>
<td>Persuades me to his/her viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes self</td>
<td>Pushes hard to get his or her own way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lets me know what he/she wants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Subordinate Style Questionnaire

1. Decides on his/her own how to do his/her work
2. Lets me know what he/she wants
3. Persuades me to his/her viewpoint
4. Expresses firm personal preferences
5. Speaks tentatively
6. Often seeks direction
7. Leads conversations
8. Takes charge of things
9. Stands up to others
10. Pushes hard to get his/her own way
11. Avoids conflict
12. Is quick to agree
13. Works autonomously
14. Follows my lead
15. Volunteers to help me in my work
16. Goes out of his/her way to be of assistance to me
17. Speaks up when he/she disagrees with me
18. Concedes to my wishes
19. Actively participates in meetings
20. Adheres strictly to firm firms and policies

Scoring. Dominant is computed as the mean of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 17 and 19. Submissive is computed as the mean of items 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 20. Subordinate style is computed as the mean of all items, with the submissive items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of a dominant style while lower scores indicate more of a submissive style.
### Appendix J: Content Analysis of Empowering and Controlling Cultures (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowering</th>
<th>Controlling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing information freely</strong></td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and maintaining informal relationships with subordinates</td>
<td>Sharing and maintaining information more to need to know basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering - Informality</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing and maintaining formal relationships with subordinates</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being people-oriented</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing and maintaining informal relationships with subordinates</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being people-oriented</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping subordinates to grow and develop</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating authority</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging subordinates to follow procedures, rules and standards</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking initiative</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating authority</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging subordinates to follow procedures, rules and standards</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being innovative</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving authority to subordinates/Delegating authority</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and creativity</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent thinking</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking up</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting conflict directly</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizing differences of opinion</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being participatory</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a maverick</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging voice and expression of dissent</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with dissent and expressing dissent constructively</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting in</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in agreement</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not rocking the boat</td>
<td>Sharing information freely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Bold** indicates empowering behaviors.
- **Italic** indicates controlling behaviors.
Appendix K: Organizational Culture Questionnaire

1. Sharing information freely
2. Informality
3. Being people-oriented
4. Mentorship
5. Helping subordinates to grow and develop
6. Maintaining professional distance
7. Taking initiative
8. Delegating authority
9. Deferring to superiors
10. Being innovative
11. Speaking up
12. Originality and creativity
13. Fitting in
14. Confronting conflict directly
15. Being distinctive or different from others
16. Doing what is expected
17. Being in agreement
18. Independent thinking
19. Predictability
20. Expressing differences of opinion
21. Being participatory
22. Tolerance
23. Not ‘rocking the boat’
24. Being a maverick

Scoring. Empowering culture is computed as the mean of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 24. Controlling culture is computed as the mean of items 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 23. Organizational culture is computed as the mean of all items, with the controlling items reverse-coded. Accordingly, higher scores indicate more of an empowering culture while lower scores indicate more of a controlling culture.