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(ABSTRACT)

Several recent experiments have suggested that high versus low esteem persons differ in the extent to which they use interpersonal behaviors to cope with negative feedback from others. In particular, it has been suggested that low self-esteem persons attempt to enhance themselves in public but not privately whereas this difference does not exist for high self-esteem persons. The present study tested a proposed model of interpersonal reactions to performance feedback. The model was investigated through two experimental designs. Design 1a examined high self-esteem (HSE) and low self-esteem (LSE) subordinate's reactions to positive and negative performance feedback in a public versus private settings. Design 1b examined whether information about the subordinate's reactions affected the supervisor's ratings of the subordinate. Overall, the proposed model gained some empirical support. The predic-
tion that LSE subordinates would engage in self-presentational behaviors as a means of self-enhancement was partially supported in the positive feedback conditions, but not in the negative feedback conditions. As predicted, HSE subordinates showed no differences in reactions obtained in the public versus private setting, and as predicted, showed no increases in resultant esteem. The most striking support for the model comes from the correspondence between subordinate’s reactions and subsequent supervisor ratings of the subordinate. This relationship emerged only when the supervisor had knowledge of the subordinate’s reactions. The longer term effects of subordinates’ reactions to feedback are discussed in reference to subordinate participation in performance appraisal meetings.
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INTRODUCTION

Employees are constantly evaluated in the workplace, whether it be by supervisors, coworkers, or subordinates. Formal evaluations, however, are usually delivered by supervisors to subordinates. In fact, ninety-five percent of managerial appraisals are based upon information both generated and communicated by the subordinates' immediate supervisor (Lazer & Wilkstrom, 1977). These formal evaluations provide feedback to the employee about the appropriateness of his or her past behavior (Ilgen, Fisher, and Taylor, 1979). Knowing how subordinates react to feedback would be beneficial to supervisors, who could then deliver feedback in the most constructive manner. In addition, supervisors could anticipate and prepare for the subordinate’s response.

Formal feedback from supervisors to subordinates is usually delivered interpersonally in performance appraisal meetings. Due to the interpersonal nature of these interactions, it is possible to draw from the social psychology research on reactions to interpersonal evaluation.

In a recent study, Baumgardner and Levy (1987) found differences in reactions to interpersonal evaluations based on level of self-esteem. These researchers randomly assigned subjects high and low in self-esteem to receive either positive or negative feedback from another person.
with whom they had recently interacted. Subsequently they were asked to evaluate that person directly, and in public, or privately.

Results of the study showed that low self-esteem (LSE) individuals complimented publicly the source of positive feedback, and derogated publicly the source of negative feedback. However, high self-esteem (HSE) subordinates did not rate their partners differently between public and private settings. In a second experiment, when LSE individuals were induced to compliment publicly the source of positive feedback or to derogate publicly the source of negative feedback, the subjects reported a rise in self-esteem. LSE subjects who were induced to compliment (derogate) the source of positive (negative) feedback in private, did not report a rise in esteem. HSE individuals, in contrast, showed no differences in level of esteem after being induced to compliment or derogate their partner, in either public or private settings.

According to Baumgardner and Levy (1987) the public, self-presentational, behaviors of low esteem individuals mentioned above serve a self-enhancing purpose. This is evidenced by the LSE subject's rise in esteem after engaging in the public behaviors. Self-enhancement theory states that individuals want to see themselves in the best possible light (Jones, 1973; Shrauger, 1975). Baumgardner and Levy (1987) infer that LSE individuals must mitigate
the impact of negative information and bolster the believability of positive information to see themselves favorably. The subjects in the Baumgardner and Levy study were able to accomplish these goals by publicly expressing approval (disapproval) of positive (negative) feedback agents.

Baumgardner and Levy (1987) further hypothesize that LSE persons must rely on a public, interpersonal means, to deal with negative feedback, while HSE individuals mitigate the impact of negative information on a private, cognitive, or intrapersonal level. This explains why HSE subordinates showed no differences in esteem between public and private settings, while LSE subordinates did show differences in esteem between public and private settings.

The implications of this research for the workplace are clear. A worker producing below expected levels of performance will probably receive a poor performance rating. The worker’s reaction to the negative evaluation will partly be determined by his or her level of esteem, and the performance appraisal situation. HSE workers are expected to react to a negative evaluation in a similar manner, regardless of whether the appraisal situation allows a high or low degrees of participation. However, LSE workers are expected to react to negative feedback more extremely (more negatively) in situations where they are
allowed to participate as compared to situations where no participation is allowed.

The worker's public reactions may, in turn, affect future interactions with the supervisor in a reciprocal manner. Because supervisors and subordinates interact on an ongoing basis, the subordinate's negative reaction to a negative appraisal may be detrimental to the boss-subordinate relationship. Reciprocal influences have been demonstrated in leadership research. For instance, Lowin and Craig (1966) found that subordinate performance affected the supervisor's behavior toward the subordinate. In addition, Fisher (1979) found that supervisors who administered negative feedback expected their subordinates to 1) react in an unpleasant manner, and 2) like them less. When public derogation is added to the already expected negative reaction, the relationship may likely deteriorate. It is hypothesized that the supervisor may react to the subordinate's derogatory remarks by giving the person a negative rating on future performance evaluations.

Baumgardner and Levy (1987) did not assess the reciprocal effect the subject's reaction to the feedback had on their partner. Because ongoing interactions are common among people in organizations, this study attempted to assess the interpersonal results of public reactions to feedback. Although this study did not assess long term effects, it clearly demonstrates a "next step" in ongoing
interactions.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. First, I extended Baumgardner and Levy’s (1987) methods to an experimental supervisor-subordinate performance situation. Second, I investigated whether supervisor’s knowledge of their subordinate’s reactions to feedback affected supervisor’s ratings of the subordinate in a reciprocal manner.

Overview of Thesis

The hypotheses of the study reported here were based on two lines of research: (a) organizational feedback theory, and (b) reactions to interpersonal evaluation. First, a general overview of performance and organizational feedback theory is presented. The second major area to be discussed are the social psychological theories of reactions to interpersonal evaluation. The third section integrates the organizational and interpersonal evaluation literatures. In section four, the specific hypotheses of the study are delineated. Section five presents the methodology used in the study. Section six reports the results and the final section includes a discussion of the results within the framework of performance feedback, interpersonal feedback, and performance appraisal theories.
Overview of Feedback Theories: A Literature Review

Process Model of Feedback

Ilgen, Fisher, and Taylor (1979) present a process-oriented feedback model. According to the authors, feedback is considered a special case of the general communication process in which a sender (source) conveys a message to a recipient. Their review focuses on the multidimensional nature of feedback as a stimulus and addresses the psychological process by which feedback influences behavior. This model stresses characteristics of the individual and his or her responses in the absence of a specific context. Therefore, I consider this an individual level model. In a later section I present Control theory, an organizational level model (Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984).

Elements of Communication Process. The communication process begins with the source. Although the source is technically not a part of feedback, it is difficult to separate the message from the source (Ilgen et. al., 1979). Sources of feedback include: self, others, and the task. The source communicates a message to the recipient. Message is defined as the feedback about the appropriateness of past behavior. The final element in the feedback process is the recipient. The recipient processes the information conveyed in the message. Characteristics of the recipient interact with source and message character-
istics to produce the recipient's reaction to the performance feedback.

Stages in the Process Model. According to the Ilgen et al. (1979) process model, recipients process feedback in four stages: (1) perception of feedback, (2) acceptance of feedback, (3) desire to respond to feedback, and (4) intended response. Source, message and recipient characteristics may affect the feedback process at each stage. I will outline the model, focusing on message and recipient characteristics relevant to the proposed study, namely feedback valence, and self-esteem.

Perception of Feedback. The first stage, feedback perception, involves the accuracy with which the recipient perceives the feedback. Many factors influence feedback perception, especially feedback valence. Ilgen et al. (1979) concluded that in general, positive feedback is more readily and accurately perceived than negative feedback (Bannister, 1986; Feather, 1968; Ilgen, 1971; Ilgen & Hamstra, 1972). This conclusion is consistent with self-enhancement theory, which states people are motivated to view themselves in the most positive light (Jones, 1973).

In contrast, self-consistency theorists argue that LSE individuals do not perceive positive information as more accurate. These theorists provide research demonstrating feedback consistent with one's self-view is perceived as more accurate (Korman, 1970, 1976; Shrauger, 1975, 1982;
Swann, Griffin, Predmore, and Gaines, 1987; Swann & Read, 1981)

To date, this controversy has not been resolved, for some researchers have supported both self-enhancement and self-consistency theories in the same study (cf. Arkin & Appleman, 1983; Lake & Arkin, 1985; Shrauger, 1975; Swann, 1984; Swann et. al., 1987). The dispute between the two theories is not new in the Industrial/Organizational literature (cf. Dipboye, 1977; Korman 1970, 1976 regarding occupational choice and task performance).

Feedback perceptions are also affected by the recipient’s expectancies and how he or she views their work. Meyer (1975) found that 70% to 80% of all employees rated their performance in the top 25% of their cohort group. Evidently, many employees view their work as better than it actually is. This misperception manifests itself in performance appraisal settings. Typically, subordinates rate their performance more highly than do their supervisors (Ilgen, Peterson, Martin, & Boeschen, 1981; Parker, Taylor, Barrett, & Martens, 1959; Smircich & Chesser, 1981). Subordinates therefore perceive "average" performance ratings as negative in some situations (Smircich & Chesser, 1981). From these results, it is evident that feedback perception is affected by many factors, demonstrating that feedback sent does not always equal feedback received (Ilgen et. al., 1979).
Acceptance of Feedback. Once feedback is perceived, it must be accepted in order to affect behavior. Acceptance or rejection is based on the recipient's belief that the feedback is an accurate portrayal of his or her performance. Again, feedback valence also affects feedback acceptance. Many investigations have shown that positive feedback is perceived as being more accurate and therefore is more readily accepted than is negative feedback in a number of cases (e.g., Bannister, 1986; Jacobs, Jacobs, Feldman & Cavior, 1973; Johnson & Nawrocki, 1967; Landy Barnes-Farrell & Cleveland, 1980; Stone & Stone, 1984; Stone & Stone, 1985). Although these results appear to support self-enhancement theory, it must be remembered that workers generally view their work as above average (Meyer, 1975). Therefore, the positive information may be accepted because it is consistent with their self-view rather than because it is self-enhancing. With the exception of Stone and Stone (1985), researchers reported above did not address level of self-esteem. Stone and Stone (1985) found no support for self-esteem as a moderator between perceived favorability of feedback and its perceived accuracy. Thus, this controversy between esteem and consistency needs cannot be adequately resolved at this point.

In support of self-consistency theory, Shrauger and Rosenberg (1970) found HSE subjects raised their self-competence evaluations more after success and lowered them
less after failure than did LSE subjects. Changes in self-perception, or acceptance of feedback, was greater when the feedback was consistent with subject's overall level of self-evaluation.

The last two stages of the process model, desire to respond, and intended response are not discussed here because research on those stages are not directly relevant to the present study. The interested reader is referred to Ilgen et. al. (1979) for a complete discussion.

Control Theory of Feedback

Control theory of feedback presented by Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen (1984) examines individuals' reactions to performance feedback in an organizational context. Control, or cybernetic theory, is traced to Wiener (1948), but Carver and Scheier (1981) were the first to develop this self-regulation theory systematically. The entire model is not relevant to the present investigation, so I will focus only on subordinate responses to feedback. Research addressing subordinate responses to feedback falls into three categories: cognitive, behavioral, and affective responses. I will discuss these responses in more detail after presenting a review of Control Theory.

Control theory has four essential features: (1) inputs from outside the system which create action within the system; (2) processing of inputs from the outside environ-
ment; (3) products, or outputs, which are the result from processing inputs; and (4) a feedback loop which provides information to the system about the nature of its products or outputs. This last feature, the feedback loop, is most relevant to this investigation.

Stated simply, control theory involves processing inputs from the environment and comparing them to a standard value. If a discrepancy is perceived between the input and the standard value, a response will occur in an attempt to reduce the discrepancy. Discrepancies between the input and the standard may be modified by three types of responses: behaviors, cognitions, and affects.

**Cognitive Responses.** The major cognitive responses assessed in this study are subordinate ratings of supervisor credibility, and subordinate ratings of feedback accuracy. These ratings are obtained in a public and in a private setting. In the private setting, subordinate ratings of the supervisor are considered cognitive responses because the source of feedback is not aware of these ratings. In the next section I present subordinate’s public ratings of their supervisor as a behavior because ratings are actually communicated to the feedback source.

Research has shown that assessments of source credibility are greatly affected by feedback sign. Sources of positive feedback, rather than negative feedback are likely to be seen as more credible, more accurate, and more
skilled (Snyder & Shenkel, 1976; Steiner, 1968; Stone & Stone, 1982). Because cognitive responses may be an important predictor of behavior, these responses warrant testing even though they rely on self-report measures for validation.

**Behavioral Responses.** Behavioral responses to feedback may be moderated by the cognitive responses above (Taylor et al., 1984). While cognitive responses are unobservable, behavioral responses are observable, and public in nature. The response most relevant to this research is the self-presentational behavior of responding against the feedback source. This behavior is operationalized by asking the feedback recipient to rate the source of evaluation in a public setting, where the source would be aware of the rating. Ratings of feedback sources have been used in industrial/organizational literature to assess peer ratings (DeNisi, Randolph, & Blencoe, 1983), leadership style ratings (Bernardin, 1980) and in social psychology to assess interpersonal evaluations (Baumgardner & Levy, 1987; Lake & Arkin, 1985).

Support for the effect of cognitive responses on behavioral ratings is found in leadership research. Behavioral ratings of leaders are often affected by the rater's cognitions rather than the leaders behavior alone (Fleishman, 1973; Kerr and Schreisheim, 1974; Schriesheim, Kinicki, and Schriesheim, 1979). Results from these
studies support what Bernardin (1980) terms "reciprocal leniency," or evaluating the source of positive feedback favorably (complimenting) and rating the source of negative feedback unfavorably (derogation). This underscores the importance of cognitions for behaviors. Assessing the reciprocity between how subordinates rate supervisors after receiving feedback, and how it affects their relationship is a main premise of this research.

Affective Responses. Valence, or sign of feedback, largely determines the general tone of affective responses (Taylor et. al., 1984). Studies have shown that receiving positive feedback is more satisfying than receiving negative feedback (e.g., Ilgen & Hamstra, 1972; Locke, 1967; Morran & Stockton, 1980).

Expectancies also impact affective responses to feedback. "Good" feedback may produce different affective reactions for a person expecting a "poor" rating and one expecting an "outstanding" rating (Taylor et. al., 1984). If one is expecting outstanding feedback and receives average feedback it will be perceived as negative. As stated elsewhere, negative feedback is associated with dissatisfaction with feedback, while positive feedback leads to greater satisfaction (Morran and Stockton, 1980; Pavett, 1983). Ilgen & Hamstra (1972) found that both deviations below expectation and absolute favorability of feedback affected satisfaction with performance. It has
also been shown that HSE individuals have high expectancies in general (Sorenson & Franks, 1972), therefore HSE as opposed to LSE subordinates are expected to be more dissatisfied with negative feedback than LSE subordinates.

Affective responses toward the appraisal system are also determined by feedback valence. Positive feedback produces favorable reactions toward the performance appraisal interview and evaluation system (as indexed by private ratings), while negative evaluations cause unfavorable reactions (i.e., perceived unfairness of appraisal system) (Dipboye & Pontbriand, 1981; Landy, Barnes-Farrell & Cleveland, 1980; Pearce & Porter, 1986).

It is evident that cognitive responses may affect behaviors as well as affective responses. Therefore the three types of responses should not be considered independent of each other. Cognitive and behavioral responses to feedback are measured in the present study by obtaining ratings in private and public settings respectively.

Supervisor's Role in Feedback Delivery

The two theories presented focus on the recipient or subordinate, but fail to incorporate the source of feedback, or supervisor. Because the proposed research involves a subordinate-supervisor relationship, I will review findings of how supervisors react to their responsibility of administering feedback.
The research involving how supervisors administer feedback parallels Tesser and Rosen's (1975) finding that people do not like to transmit negative information. Fisher (1979) found that supervisors who gave negative feedback expected less pleasant reactions by the subordinate and believed the subordinate liked them less in return. Fisher (1979) also found that supervisors inflated negative performance ratings more when they were to be delivered to the subordinate than when they were for the experimenters use only. Ilgen and Knowlton (1980) found similar results in a field setting. Larson (1984) found that supervisors give feedback about poor performance less often than about good performance, but when they did give feedback it contained specific behaviors or examples of poor performance. Additionally, Dorfman et. al. (1986) found that in performance appraisals supervisors demonstrated more consideration behaviors to high performers, and stressed improvement efforts for low performers. Because feedback is often delivered interpersonally in a formal performance appraisal session, the literature on reactions to interpersonal feedback is relevant. The focus now shifts to discuss the relevant social psychology literature on interpersonal evaluations.
Recent Social Psychological Developments

Feedback research in the Industrial/Organizational literature can be supplemented by social psychology research on interpersonal evaluations. Research on self-esteem as a moderating variable of how people react to evaluations is especially relevant to this research. Two theories predict these reactions to evaluations from others based on level of confidence: (1) self-consistency, and (2) self-enhancement. Self-enhancement theory postulates that people attempt to view themselves in the best possible light (Baumgardner & Arkin, 1987; Baumgardner & Levy, 1987; Jones, 1973). Self-consistency however, asserts that people strive to maintain a stable self-concept (Shrauger, 1975, 1982; Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979; Swann, 1984, 1985).

Both theories agree that HSE individuals will prefer positive feedback, however the predictions concerning LSE individuals differ. Both theories have received empirical support, so recent research has focused on determining the boundary conditions of each theory. In this section, I will present the theories, their predictions and supporting empirical evidence, and discuss a reconciliation of the two theories.

Self-Consistency

The central notion of self-consistency theory is that
an individual's receptivity to evaluations from others is affected by his or her desire to create and maintain a stable self concept. (cf. Festinger, 1957; Shrauger, 1975, 1982; Schrauger & Schoeneman, 1979; Swann 1984, 1985). In other words, individuals accept information that is consistent with their self concepts, and reject information that is inconsistent with their self-concepts. This theory therefore predicts that individuals with high self-evaluations will react more favorably to positive feedback (relative to negative) and that low self-evaluators will react more favorably to negative (relative to positive) feedback because in both cases they strive toward consistency.

According to Swann (1985), once people have developed their self-concepts, they engage in cognitive and behavioral activities to confirm these conceptions. These self-verification processes allow people to shape their social environments in such a way that they verify and validate their self concepts (cf. Lecky, 1945; Secord & Backman, 1961, 1965). For instance, according to self-consistency theory, a HSE individual might always seek the opinion of one supervisor who typically gives him positive feedback. In contrast, a LSE individual may seek the advice of a supervisor who typically gives him negative feedback. This prediction runs counter to self-enhancement theory presented in the following section.
Self-Enhancement

Self-enhancement theory assumes individuals have a need to enhance their self-evaluations, and to increase, maintain, or confirm feelings of personal satisfaction (Jones, 1973). Because individuals wish to view themselves in the best possible light, they respond more favorably to positive evaluations from others and unfavorably to negative evaluations from others. According to Jones (1973), the need for self-enhancement is greater among people with negative self-concepts. Therefore, both HSE and LSE workers will seek the advice of a positive feedback agents. The next sections outlines the current empirical status of these competing theories.

Consistency vs Enhancement: A reconciliation

In an attempt to reconcile the two theories, Shrauger (1975) concluded that some dependent variables tended to produce consistency effects and others tended to produce self-enhancement effects. In particular, measures of cognitive processes (e.g., recall, perceptions of self-descriptive feedback) seemed to support self-consistency theories. In contrast, measures that were more affective in nature (e.g., pleasure or disappointment with feedback) seemed to support the self-enhancement position. Shrauger's (1975) proposal that affective and cognitive reactions were independent, seemed to fit the data, but there
was little empirical support for his idea.

Recent investigations have tried to provide empirical evidence to support Shrauger's conclusions by measuring cognitive and affective responses in the same experiment (McFarlin and Blascovich, 1981; Moreland and Sweeney, 1984). These studies did not provide support for Shrauger's proposed independence between cognition and affect.

A better investigation of the independence of the cognitive and affective factors was conducted by Swann, Griffin, Predmore, and Gaines (1987). In this study HSE and LSE subjects were presented with either favorable or unfavorable social feedback. Next, subjects were given a cognitive measure (e.g., perceived self-descriptiveness), and a measure of affective reactions to the feedback (e.g., mood states). Results showed that (1) cognitive responses were primarily driven by the consistency of the feedback and affective responses were controlled by how enhancing it was; (2) cognitive reactions persisted over time but affective reactions faded; and (3) a factor analysis suggested that cognitive and affective reactions were orthogonal. Swann et al. (1987) concluded that people are sometimes caught in a crossfire between their cognitions and their affects. For example even though people with negative self-views value unfavorable feedback on a cognitive level, they find it affectively abhorrent.

Further, researchers have called for stricter specifi-
cations of when one theory will prevail over the other (Regan, 1976). To this end, Baumgardner and Levy (1987) suggested that LSE individuals will opt for enhancement when situations allow them to regulate their esteem. This exemplifies the attempt to qualify when one theory is a better predictor of behavior, a necessity according to Regan (1976).

The hypotheses of this research are drawn from self-enhancement theory, therefore a more in-depth discussion of the theory will be presented. The discussion will focus on how individuals high and low in self-esteem cope with social disapproval.

Coping with Negative Evaluations as a Function of Self-Esteem

Negative information or feedback can not always be avoided. Consequently, people develop mechanisms to deal with the unfavorable information they encounter. Baumgardner and Arkin (1987) outline two basic strategies for dealing with social disapproval, and the strategy chosen is partly based one's self-concept. HSE individuals opt for the first strategy which involves adapting to or managing disapproval. Because this strategy is cognitively-based and passive, it is considered an "intrapersonal" strategy.

LSE individuals engage in the second strategy which
involves diverting or avoiding disapproval. This strategy is active and behavioral, and is considered an "interpersonal" strategy.

Self-Enhancement Strategies of High vs Low Esteem Persons

Baumgardner and Levy (1987) assert that LSE individuals must engage in direct and observable means of convincing themselves that they possess favorable attributes. Further, the authors assert that these self-presentational behaviors act as a means of self-enhancement. HSE individuals appear to have cognitive defenses to ward off negative information that those with LSE seem to lack.

For instance, HSE persons are more (privately) complimentary of the source of favorable feedback and more (privately) derogatory of the source of negative feedback than are LSE counterparts (Regan, 1976). HSE individuals also exhibit the self-serving bias in causal attribution (Baumgardner, Heppner, & Arkin, 1986; Tennen & Herzberger, 1987), overestimate the occurrence of past successes (Nelson & Craighead, 1977), avoid focusing upon future failures (Pyszczynski & Greenberg, 1987; Weinstein, 1980), and perceive a sense of personal control when none may realistically exist (Baumgardner et. al., 1986).

Because LSE individuals either do not possess these cognitive mechanisms, or do not utilize them, they need to convince themselves and others that self-enhancing informa-
tion is true in order to believe it themselves. Means by which they may accomplish this include: (1) self-handicapping (Harris & Snyder, 1986); (2) failing strategically (Baumgardner & Brownlee, 1987); (3) socially comparing downward (Wills, 1981); and (4) publicly degrading the source of negative feedback, and publicly complimenting the source of positive feedback (Baumgardner & Levy, 1987). It is thus evident that all persons attempt to enhance their self view; however the means by which they accomplish this may differ as a function of self-confidence.

Integration of Interpersonal and Organizational Feedback Theory: A Preliminary Model

Description of Model

The model begins with factors that may affect performance (e.g., motivation, ability and task difficulty), and ends with the resulting subordinate-supervisor relationship. The stages most relevant to the present research include: 1) poor (good) performance by the subordinate which leads to positive (negative) feedback from the supervisor; 2) PRIVATE: cognitive reaction of the subordinate (view feedback as accurate or inaccurate, view source as credible or not credible); 2a) HSE subordinates regulate their esteem, while LSE subordinates do not regulate their esteem; 3) PUBLIC: self-presentational behavior of the subordinate (derogate/compliment feedback source); 4)
affective reaction (i.e., rise in resultant self-esteem) of LSE subordinate (a response directly related to engaging in the self-presentational behavior); 5) supervisor’s response to knowledge of the subordinate’s self-presentational behavior.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Supporting Research

The first four stages of this model were tested by Baumgardner and Levy (1987; Experiment 1) in an interpersonal setting. In their study, two individuals participated in an interpersonal encounter. After the interaction, each person was informed that their partner either liked them or did not like them. Subjects were then given the opportunity to evaluate their interaction partner in either a public or private setting. In the public setting the subject’s were told that their ratings would be made known to the other person. In the private setting, they were told their partner would not have access to their reaction. After rating their partner subjects completed a measure of resultant esteem. As discussed previously, the results showed differential responses to positive and negative interpersonal feedback as a function of self-esteem.
Extension of Model

In addition to addressing reactions to feedback and resultant esteem, the present research addresses the "next step" after source evaluation, namely the reaction of the source. The predictions for the first four steps of the model are the same as in Baumgardner & Levy (1987). The formal hypotheses of the proposed research are presented in the next section, but in this section I will briefly describe the rationale for proposing the model's feedback loop.

Based on the norm of reciprocity, supervisors who are publicly derogated (complimented) may respond in kind, with decreased (increased) liking of the subordinate (Bernardin, 1980). This reaction of the source addresses the "next step" in the model. In addition, supervisors may evaluate the subordinate negatively (positively) in the future, representing the "longer term" effect of the subordinate's self-presentational behavior, as denoted as a feedback loop in the model.

Research conducted in the leadership area has shown that the subordinate's performance affects the supervisor's behaviors toward the subordinate (Lowin & Craig, 1968; Greene, 1975). While this research does not focus on the supervisor's behavior towards the subordinate, this research extends the research on reciprocal influences by examining how the subordinate's reactions to feedback
affects the supervisor's ratings of the subordinate. Further, Fisher (1979) has shown that supervisor's who give negative feedback expect negative reactions from their subordinate. When the expected negative reactions are confirmed by being made known to the supervisor, it may likely affect the supervisor's impression of the subordinate as indexed by the supervisor's ratings of the subordinate.

Overview of Present Study

This investigation involved two experimental designs, however data for both designs was collected in the same experimental session. Design 1a examined how the subordinate's level of self-esteem, the valence of performance feedback, and whether supervisors were privy to the subordinate's reaction (public/private), affect subordinates' reactions to feedback. Two levels of each independent variable were employed: high and low self-esteem, positive and negative performance feedback, and public and private response publicity. The research contained two primary dependent variables: the subordinate's evaluation of the supervisor, and the subordinates' level of resultant esteem.

Design 1b tested how supervisors responded to knowledge of the subordinate's reaction to the feedback. Two levels of each independent variable were employed: high
and low supervisor self-esteem, positive and negative performance feedback, and information of subordinate’s response to feedback and no information. The major dependent variable was the supervisors’ evaluations of the subordinate.

From theories of feedback, interpersonal reactions to evaluation, and self-presentation, the following hypotheses were generated:

Design 1a: Subordinate’s reactions to feedback

Hypothesis 1a: LSE subordinates will engage in self-presentational behaviors. More specifically, LSE subordinates will rate the supervisor who gave positive feedback as more competent in public as compared to in private. Similarly, LSE subordinates will rate the supervisor who gave negative feedback as less competent in public as compared to in private.

Hypothesis 1b: HSE subordinates will not rate the supervisor differently in public relative to in private conditions.

Hypothesis 2a: LSE subordinates in public conditions who received positive feedback and complimented the supervisor would show higher levels of RSE relative to LSE subordinates who derogated the supervisor who gave positive feedback. Similarly, LSE subordinates in the public conditions who received negative feedback and derogated the
supervisor would show higher levels of RSE relative to LSE subordinates who publicly complimented the supervisor who gave negative feedback. In addition, LSE subordinates reacting in private would not show these differences in esteem based on how they rated the supervisor.

**Hypothesis 2b:** HSE subordinates would not show differences in RSE based on how they rated their supervisor, regardless whether the reaction took place in public or in private.

**Design 1b: Supervisor’s Reactions to Subordinate’s Ratings**

**Hypothesis 3a:** Supervisors who administered negative feedback and had information of the subordinate’s reactions to the feedback will rate subordinates as less informed, likable, recommendable to another supervisor, and more difficult to work with than supervisors who administered negative feedback in the no information conditions.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Supervisors who administered positive feedback and had information of the subordinate’s reactions to the feedback will rate subordinates higher than supervisors who administered positive feedback in the no information conditions. These hypotheses test the reciprocal relationship between subordinates and supervisors.
METHOD

Overview of Method

This study examined subordinate’s reactions to feedback, and how information about the subordinate’s reactions affected supervisor’s ratings of the subordinate. More specifically, Design 1a examined high and low self-esteem subordinates’ public versus private reactions to positive and negative feedback administered by supervisors. Design 1b examined supervisor’s ratings of subordinates based on supervisor’s self-esteem, feedback valence, and knowledge of subordinates reactions to the feedback. The data for each design was collected in the same experimental session but the designs are presented separately for clarity.

Individuals high and low in esteem were randomly assigned to a supervisor or subordinate role in a simulated organizational setting. The subordinates and supervisors were separated into different rooms in accordance with the experimental cover story.

Design 1a: Subordinate’s Reactions to Feedback

Subordinates performed a task and were told their supervisor in the other room would evaluate their performance. In actuality, subordinates received bogus positive or negative feedback from their supervisor.

After subordinates received their bogus performance
feedback, they rated their supervisors on a number of dimensions. These ratings were obtained in two conditions: private and public. In the private condition, subordinates were told their ratings would be confidential. However, in the public condition, subordinates were told their ratings would be shown to their supervisor. Immediately after rating their supervisor, all subordinates completed a measure of resultant self-esteem (RSE) and a series of manipulation check items.

**Design 1b: Supervisor’s Reactions to Subordinates’ Ratings**

Supervisors evaluated bogus performance data and were induced to administer positive or negative feedback to the subordinate. Supervisors were led to believe the bogus performance data was their subordinates’ actual performance. After evaluating the subordinate’s performance, the experimenter manipulated supervisor’s knowledge of subordinate’s reactions to the feedback. Half the supervisors received information about how their subordinate reacted to the feedback, while the other supervisors received no information.

The information and no information conditions in design 1b were linked to the public and private conditions in design 1a respectively. The following relationship was therefore created between the two designs: supervisors in the information condition of design 1b were actually shown
the subordinate's public ratings. Relatedly, supervisors in the no information condition of design 1b were never shown the subordinate’s private ratings.

Lastly, all supervisors rated their subordinate on a series of dimensions, completed a measure of resultant self-esteem, and answered a series of manipulation check items. After all experimental measures were completed, supervisors and subordinates were debriefed thoroughly.

Subjects

Psychology students volunteered to be subjects in exchange for one extra credit toward their final grade. Two hundred male students were employed as subjects.

Design

The study consisted of two experimental designs. Design la: Subordinate’s reactions to feedback, consisted of a 2 (subordinate self-esteem: high vs. low) X 2 (publicity of reaction: public vs. private) X 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) between groups factorial design. Major dependent measures included: (1) subordinate's evaluation of their supervisor and (2) subordinate's resultant self-esteem.

Design 1b: Supervisor's reactions to subordinate's ratings consisted of a 2 (supervisor self-esteem: high vs. low) X 2 (supervisor's knowledge of subordinate's ratings: information vs. no information) X 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) between groups factorial design.
Major dependent measures included: (1) supervisor's ratings of their subordinate and (2) supervisor's resultant self-esteem.

Procedure for Design 1a: Subordinate Reactions to Feedback

As stated previously, data for designs 1a and 1b were collected in the same experimental session. Therefore, this description presents the entire experimental procedure as it was conducted rather than the method for each design separately.

Subjects entered the experimental room and were seated between dividers to prevent interpersonal contact. Subjects were tested in supervisor-subordinate pairs, with the number of pairs ranging from 1 to 3. Approximately twenty five percent of the experimental sessions had one pair of subjects, 50 percent had two pairs, and 25 percent contained 3 pairs of subjects.

All subjects completed a consent form (see Appendix A) and were assured of confidentiality. Next, subjects completed two self-esteem questionnaires described as measures being used by another faculty member.

Self-esteem measures. The first measure of self-esteem was the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965) (see Appendix B). The Rosenberg scale consisted of ten items written in a four point Likert-type format anchored by strongly agree and strongly disagree. The second measure of self-esteem used was developed by Fleming and Courtney
This scale consisted of 36 items on a seven point Likert-type format with various anchors (e.g., yes to no, not at all confident to very confident). A median split on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale divided the sample of subjects into high and low self-esteem groups. The mean score on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for LSE subordinates was 2.74, while the mean score for HSE subordinates was 3.41.

After subjects completed the consent form and self-esteem measures, the experimenter read an overview of the study and a description of the events that were to follow (see Appendix D & E for full public & private protocols respectively). Subjects were told the purpose of the study was to assess the effects of written vs. oral communication between supervisors and subordinates. Next, the experimenter explained the task that the subordinates would be performing and the supervisors would be evaluating.

Task. The task (see Appendix F) was described as the "Work Related Problem Solving Task" which was designed to assess management potential. The task required subordinates to generate a list of solutions to a series of management problems within a 12-minute time frame.

Role Assignment. Subjects were led to believe the experimenter accessed their application files prior to the experimental session. Subjects were told that role assignment was based on the number of extracurricular activi-
ties listed on their application to Virginia Tech. They were informed that those with more (less) activities listed were assigned the supervisor (subordinate) role. In actuality, subjects were randomly assigned to roles.

To enhance the cover story and demonstrate the need for physical separation of the subordinates from the supervisors, all subjects were told they were assigned to the written communication condition. All subjects were also told that the physical separation would prevent all communication other than the written form. Subordinates remained seated while the supervisors stood up and moved to the door. The experimenter distributed the task to the subordinates and instructed the subordinates to begin. Next, the experimenter escorted the supervisors to the an adjacent experimental room.

After supervisors were seated between dividers in the other room, the experimenter explained how the supervisors were to evaluate their subordinates' performance. Supervisors were given three items to aid evaluation of their subordinate's performance: (1) criteria for evaluating the task (norms of how other students have performed on the task) (see Appendix G), (2) an evaluation work sheet including instructions to help score the performance (see Appendix H) and (3) a performance evaluation form (see Appendix I). Supervisors were instructed to evaluate their subordinate's performance using the norms given. Next,
Supervisors were asked to write a paragraph describing their leadership abilities. Supervisors were told that this description would be shown to their subordinate to give him more information about the supervisor. Supervisors were also told that subordinates would write a similar description about themselves, which the supervisors would be shown at a later point in the process.

After twelve minutes, the experimenter then returned to the subordinates' room and collected the completed tasks. While the subordinates were waiting for their supervisors to evaluate their performance, the subordinates were asked to write a paragraph describing their leadership abilities. Subordinates were also told their description would be shown to their supervisor in the other room. The experimenter explained that she would give the subordinates' tasks to their supervisors and left the room. Unbeknownst to the subordinates and supervisors, the experimenter substituted bogus (good or poor) performance data in place of the actual task performance. The experimenter then delivered the bogus performance to the supervisors.

Task Performance Data (Bogus). All supervisors received bogus subordinate performance data to evaluate (see Appendix J). One half of the experimental sessions were assigned randomly to the poor performance condition, while the other half were assigned to the good performance
condition. All supervisors in each session received the same bogus performance data (good or poor) to facilitate debriefing. The bogus performance data, the evaluation criteria, and the norms provided, induced the supervisor to administer below average or above average performance feedback. The below average feedback and above average feedback were designed for the subordinates to interpret as negative and positive respectively.

**Performance feedback.** Supervisors completed a performance evaluation that required them to rate the quantity of alternatives listed by their subordinate on the "Work Related Problem Solving Task." Quantity was based on the average number of alternatives listed. While the form completed by the supervisors contained only the quantity dimension, the subordinates were actually given a performance evaluation form containing ratings on two dimensions: Quantity and Quality. (see Appendix K for the actual feedback form given to the subordinates. The quality rating always mirrored the quantity rating. The quantity scale included the following anchors: low, moderately low, average, moderately high, and high. The quality scale was anchored by: below average, average, slightly above average, extremely above average, and outstanding. The experimenter collected the completed performance feedback and the leadership description from the supervisors and pretended to deliver it to the subordinates in the
other room. In actuality, the experimenter replaced the feedback and leadership description with bogus feedback and a leadership description composed by the experimenter.

**Supervisor's and Subordinate's Leadership Description.** (see Appendices L and M respectively). This paragraph was supposedly written by the supervisor/subordinate while he was in the other room. In actuality, it was written by the experimenter prior to the experimental session. This description was included to create more of a relationship between the supervisor and subordinate by providing more information about each other. The supervisor/subordinate descriptions were constant across all conditions. Descriptions contained neutral statements to ensure the subjects could interpret the information any way they wanted.

The experimenter returned to the subordinates' room to distribute the feedback. First subordinates read the supervisor's leadership description followed by the bogus performance feedback form. The experimenter then explained how supervisors rated quantity and quality and answered any questions. Next, subordinates completed the "Information Accuracy/Impressions of Supervisor" form.

**Information Accuracy/Impressions of Supervisor Form.** (See Appendix N). Questions on this scale assessed: (1) subordinate's perceptions of the feedback, and (2) subordinate's impressions of their supervisor. The subordinate's perceptions of the feedback were assessed on 5-point
Likert-type scales, and included filler questions to bolster the cover story. Questions which assessed subordinate's impressions of their supervisor consisted of nine adjectives on 9-point Likert-type scales. Adjectives designed to measure supervisor competence included: smart, bright, competent, informed; those designed to measure supervisor likableness included: likable, enjoyable, and interesting. Several additional adjectives were included to assess supervisor insight: insightful and accurate.

Publicity of Reaction Manipulation. The public/private conditions were created by manipulating the anonymity of the subordinates' reactions to feedback. In the private condition, subordinates were told their supervisors would not have access to their ratings of their supervisor. Subordinates were assured the questionnaires were for the experimenter's knowledge only. In accordance with the anonymity of the reactions, subjects were told not to put their name on their questionnaire.

In the public condition however, the subordinates were informed that their supervisor would see their information accuracy and impressions ratings. Subordinates were asked to put their name and social security number at the top of the questionnaire to create ownership of their ratings.

After subordinates in both public and private conditions reacted to the feedback, they completed a measure of resultant self-esteem (Baumgardner, Lake and Arkin, 1985;
Baumgardner and Levy, 1987; McFarland & Ross, 1982). This survey was described as a questionnaire being used by the psychology department to assess how people feel after participating in experiments. The experimenter emphasized that the survey was unrelated to the study.

Resultant Self-esteem. The measure of resultant esteem was condensed from the original 77-question inventory addressing both temporary self-esteem as well as various affects. The abridged version contained 16 adjectives loading highly on resultant self-esteem in the earlier investigations (see Appendix O).

After completing the measure of resultant self-esteem, subordinates in both public and private conditions completed manipulation check questionnaires. Subordinates in both conditions completed these forms at equal time intervals after rating their supervisor.

Subordinate Manipulation Check. Manipulation check items were embedded in a questionnaire entitled "General Perceptions" (see Appendix P). Several 9-point manipulation check items were included to assess the impact and believability of the experimental manipulations. In addition, several open ended questions were included to determine if any subjects were suspicious of experimental manipulations. This completes the description of design 1a. The following section explains the procedures used to collect the data for design 1b.
Procedure for Design lb: Supervisor's Reactions to Subordinate Ratings

The experimental manipulations for design lb began during design la and are summarized below (see the previous section for the exact procedure). Supervisors were led to believe they were evaluating their subordinate's performance, but were actually given bogus performance data to evaluate. This bogus performance data induced supervisors to administer positive or negative feedback. This feedback was delivered to the subordinates who then rated their supervisors either in public (ratings were to be shown to the supervisor) or in private (ratings were not to be shown to the supervisor).

Designs la and lb are linked in the following manner: subordinate's ratings of their supervisor in the public reaction conditions of design la were actually shown to their supervisor in the other room. The label for this condition in design lb is the "information condition." Similarly, subordinate’s ratings of their supervisors in private reaction conditions of design la were never shown to their supervisors in the other room. This condition in design lb is labeled the "no information condition." In addition, the feedback manipulation (i.e., positive or negative) for subordinates was always congruent with the feedback manipulation for supervisors.

Supervisors in No Information Condition. After the
supervisors in the no information condition evaluated their subordinate’s performance, they read their subordinate’s leadership description (see Appendix L). Next, supervisors completed a series of questionnaires: (1) "Supervisor’s Impressions"; (2) Resultant Self-Esteem; (3) "Supervisor’s General Perceptions."

Supervisor’s Impressions Form. This questionnaire contained a series of questions on 9-point Likert-type scales. These items were designed to assess the supervisor’s impressions of his subordinate (see Appendix Q).

Resultant Self-Esteem. The measure of resultant esteem (see above) was also used in an exploratory fashion to assess supervisors’ esteem (see Appendix O).

Supervisor’s General Perceptions (No Information Condition Manipulation Check). Items designed to assess the impact and believability of the experimental manipulations were included in a questionnaire entitled "General Perceptions" (see Appendix R).

Supervisors in the Information Condition. After the supervisors in the information condition evaluated their subordinate’s performance, the supervisors read their subordinate’s leadership description (see Appendix L). Next, supervisors in the information condition examined their subordinate’s "information accuracy/impressions of supervisor form." It was on this manipulation that the information and no information conditions differed. After
looking at the subordinates’ reactions, the supervisor completed a set of questionnaires. These questionnaires were similar to the series of questionnaires completed by supervisors in the no information conditions. The questionnaires were administered in the same order. However, the manipulation check questionnaire completed by the supervisors in the information condition contained a few additional items.

**Supervisor’s General Perceptions (Information Condition Manipulation Check).** These items were identical to the manipulation check items for the private condition. Additional items were included to assess the supervisors’ reactions to receiving the subordinates’ reactions to the feedback. These 9-point manipulation check items were embedded in a questionnaire entitled "General Perceptions" (see Appendix S).

After supervisors completed the final manipulation check questionnaire, they were escorted back to the original room for debriefing.

**Debriefing.** Supervisors and subordinates were debriefed together. All were debriefed verbally as well as formally through a written debriefing statement which was signed by all subjects (see Appendix T). Debriefing followed the guidelines established by Mills (1976).
Data Analysis

Design 1a: Subordinate's Reactions to Feedback

Hypothesis 1a: LSE subordinates will engage in self-presentational behaviors. More specifically, LSE subordinates will rate the supervisor who gave positive feedback as more competent in public than in private. Similarly, LSE subordinates will rate the supervisor who gave negative feedback as less competent in public than in private.

Hypothesis 1b: HSE subordinates will not rate their supervisor different in public than in private conditions.

To test Hypothesis 1a and 1b, subordinates' ratings of their supervisors were analyzed using a 2 (subordinate self-esteem: high vs. low) X 2 (publicity of reaction: public vs. private) X 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Hypothesis 2a: LSE subordinates who publicly engaged in self-enhancing behaviors (complimented/derogated supervisors who gave positive/negative feedback) will report an increase in RSE relative to subordinates who rated their supervisor in private.

Hypothesis 2b: HSE subordinates will show no differences in RSE in public or private based on the ratings they gave their supervisor.

To test hypothesis 2a and 2b, correlations by condition were computed. Correlations between subordinates' ratings of supervisors and subordinates' RSE were
analyzed by condition: 2 (subordinate self-esteem: high vs. low) X 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) X 2 (publicity of reaction: public vs. private).

**Design 1b: Supervisors Reactions to Subordinate’s Ratings**

**Hypothesis 3a:** Supervisors who administered negative feedback in public conditions will rate subordinates as less informed, likable, recommendable to another supervisor, and more difficult to work with than will supervisors who administered negative feedback in private conditions.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Supervisors who administered positive feedback in public conditions will rate subordinates higher than will supervisors who administered positive feedback in private.

To test the above hypotheses, the data were analyzed using a 2 (supervisor self-esteem: high vs. low) X 2 (supervisors’ knowledge of subordinates’ ratings: information vs. no information) X 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) ANOVA. These analyses were performed on supervisors’ ratings of their subordinate. Exploratory analyses were performed on the supervisors’ RSE.

To further test Hypotheses 3a and 3b, correlations between subordinates’ evaluations of supervisors and supervisor’s evaluation of subordinates were computed. Data for this analysis were collapsed across supervisor and subordinate self-esteem, resulting in correlations being
conducted within the following conditions: 2 (performance feedback: positive vs. negative) X 2 (supervisors’ knowledge of subordinates’ ratings: information vs. no information). These correlations attempted to address predicted reciprocal influence between subordinates and supervisors. A positive correlation would indicate that subordinates who rated their supervisor favorably (unfavorably) received favorable (unfavorable) ratings from their supervisor in return.
RESULTS

Design 1a

Manipulation Checks

Items designed to assess experimental manipulations were included in two questionnaires: "Information Adequacy Questionnaire," "Subordinate's General Perceptions." All manipulation check items were analyzed using two (subordinate self-esteem: high vs low) x 2 (feedback: positive vs negative) x 2 (publicity of reaction: public vs private) Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs). Summary tables for these analyses are presented in Appendix U.

Suspicion. Subordinates who were suspicious of experimental hypotheses and procedures were identified by their responses to the following questions: (1) who completed the performance evaluation? and (2) what was the purpose of the study? Eleven of 100 subjects were found to be suspicious of the evaluation source (i.e., indicated the experimenter filled out the performance evaluation form). In addition, 5 subjects guessed the experimental hypothesis (i.e., indicated the study was testing how peoples' moods were affected by different kinds of feedback).

All manipulation check items and major dependent variables were analyzed using 3-way ANOVAs with two sets of subjects: (1) all subjects (n = 100); and (2) non suspicious subjects (n = 84). Analyses on both groups produced
similar patterns of means. However, the significance levels varied from nonsignificant to marginally significant for some items.

Results discussed in the following sections are based on the analyses of all subjects. Analyses of non suspicious subjects are reported in appendices as indicated in the text. All subjects were included in the major analyses to avoid losing data and power after removing suspicious subjects.

**Feedback.** Two items assessed the feedback (positive vs negative) manipulation. Subordinates were asked to rate: (1) the type of rating they received; and (2) the valence of the evaluation.

Expected main effects of feedback emerged on both checks for this manipulation. Subordinates in the positive conditions reported receiving higher ratings ($M = 5.00$) than did those assigned to the negative feedback conditions ($M = 2.00$) (see Table U-1). Similarly, subordinates in the positive feedback conditions indicated they received a more positive rating ($M = 8.60$) than did those in the negative conditions ($M = 3.06$) (see Table U-2). In general, it appears that the feedback manipulation had the desired effect on subordinates.

**Publicity of Reaction.** One item was included to assess the publicity of the reaction to feedback (public vs private). This item asked subordinates to indicate the
probability that their ratings of their supervisor would actually be shown to their supervisor. A main effect emerged on this item. Subordinates in the public condition reported it was more likely their supervisor would see their ratings ($M = 6.76$) than did those in the private conditions ($M = 4.88$) (see Table U-4). In general, it appears that the experimental manipulation for the publicity of reaction had the desired effect.

**Major Dependent Variables - Subordinates**

**Subordinates' Ratings of Supervisors.** Hypothesis 1a predicted LSE subordinates would engage in self-presentation (i.e., rate the supervisor who gave positive (negative) feedback as more (less) competent in public relative to in private conditions. Hypothesis 1b postulated HSE subordinates would not engage in such behaviors to a greater extent in public relative to private.

**Factor Analysis.** Subordinates rated supervisors on 9 dimensions including: smart, informed, bright, competent, interesting, enjoyable, likable, insightful, and accurate. Because each rating was not expected to measure a unique construct, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to demonstrate three underlying constructs. The ratings were thought to tap three supervisory characteristics: competence, likableness, and insightfulness. Baumgardner and Levy (1987) used similar rating dimensions but
classified ratings into 2 categories: competence and likableness. The dimensions used in this study are similar to dimensions used in previous research on interpersonal evaluations, thus indicating the three factor structure was appropriate.

To confirm the three a priori clusters, an initial unrotated principle components analysis was conducted, suggesting three factors with eigenvalues above .50 (see Table V-1 for a summary of factor loadings).

Next, the ratings were subjected to a varimax (orthogonal) rotation. Finally, the ratings were subjected to the varimax rotation specifying three factors. This analysis revealed the following factor structure: (1) competent: smart, informed, bright, competent; (2) likable: interesting enjoyable, and likable; (3) insightful: insightful, accurate. Items loading .60 or higher were included in the factors. The first factor, labelled competence, had an eigenvalue of 6.67 and accounted for 2.9% of the variance; while the second factor, likable, had an eigenvalue of .64 and accounted for 2.5% of the variance. The third factor, insight, accounted for 2.3% of the variance with an eigenvalue of .51. Analyses on the three factors are based on the mean of the ratings that comprise each of the factors.

To test the hypothesized three-way interaction proposed by Hypotheses 1a and 1b, two (subordinate self-
Ratings of Supervisor Competence. A main effect of feedback emerged for the subordinates’ ratings of supervisor competence. Subordinates who received positive performance feedback rated their supervisor as more competent (M = 7.83) than did subordinates who received negative performance feedback (M = 6.27) (see Table V-2). In addition, a marginally significant three-way interaction among esteem, publicity of reaction, and feedback qualified this main effect (see Table V-2). Although this interaction is not statistically significant, the pattern of means showed differences between HSE and LSE subordinates’ ratings and therefore warranted further investigation.

First, Hypothesis 1a, which predicted that LSE subordinates would engage in self-presentational behaviors (i.e., compliment the source of positive feedback; derogate the source of negative feedback) in public but not in private was not supported. However, hypothesis 1b, that HSE subordinates would not engage in self-presentational behaviors in public was supported. Simple effects analyses of subordinate ratings of supervisor competence indicated
that both LSE and HSE subordinates in public conditions rated the supervisor as being more competent after receiving positive feedback ($M = 8.02; 8.27$ respectively) than did their counterparts who received negative feedback ($M = 5.93; 6.38$ respectively), $F(1,92) = 16.87, 14.90, p's < .01$ (see Table V-3).

Interestingly, and in line with the model proposed at the outset, this difference between reactions to positive and negative feedback emerged in private for HSE subjects, but not for LSE subjects. HSE subordinates in the private condition rated their supervisor as more competent after receiving positive feedback ($M = 7.65$) than they did after receiving negative feedback ($M = 5.86$), $F(1,99) = 12.37, p < .01$. Thus, it appears that LSE subordinates reacted differently to positive versus negative feedback in the public setting while no differences were found between reactions to positive versus negative feedback in private. Their HSE counterparts reacted to positive and negative feedback the same regardless of whether their supervisor would see their ratings.

ANOVA's conducted after removing suspicious subjects produced a pattern of means similar to the analyses performed using all subjects. Although the patterns of means were the same, the significance level of the hypothesized three-way interaction was clearly nonsignificant $F(1,74) = 1.63, p < .21$ (see Table V-4 & V-5).
Likable ratings. For subordinate ratings of supervisor likableness, hypotheses 1a and 1b were not supported. The hypothesized three-way interaction was not significant. A main effect of feedback emerged for the subordinates' ratings of supervisor likableness (see Table V-6). Subordinates who received positive feedback rated their supervisor as more likable ($M = 7.43$) than did subordinates who received negative feedback ($M = 5.46$). Overall there were no hypothesized effects for ratings of supervisor likableness except for the profound effect of feedback. Analyses performed after excluding suspicious subjects produced results similar to the analysis including all subjects (see Table V-8 and V-9).

Insightful ratings. A significant main effect of feedback emerged for subordinate ratings of the supervisor's insightfulness (see Table V-10). Subordinates who received positive feedback rated the supervisor as more insightful ($M = 7.43$) than did subordinates who received negative performance feedback ($M = 5.12$).

For subordinate ratings of supervisor insightfulness, a marginally significant interaction of esteem, response publicity, and feedback was found. Although the interaction was not significant, and cannot be interpreted as strong support for the hypothesis, further comparisons were conducted to further explore the cause of the interaction.

With respect to subordinate ratings of supervisor
insightfulness, hypothesis 1a was not confirmed, while hypothesis 1b was partially confirmed. Simple effects F tests revealed three reliable differences between means. LSE subordinates in the public reaction condition who received positive feedback rated supervisors as more insightful (M = 7.77) than did those who received negative feedback (M = 4.64), F (1,92) = 19.50, p < .01. However, LSE subordinates who reacted in private did not show a comparable difference as a function of feedback valence (see Table V-11).

In both the public and private conditions, HSE subordinates rated supervisors as more insightful after receiving positive feedback (M's = 7.46; 7.54) than after receiving negative feedback (M's = 5.32; 4.68), F, (1,92) = 9.54; 16.28, p's < .01. These ratings of supervisor insight concur with ratings of supervisor competence; HSE subjects reacted by rating the source of positive (negative) feedback as more (less) insightful in both public and private unlike LSE subjects who showed this pattern only in public.

ANOVA's on insight ratings performed after removing suspicious subjects produced the same pattern of means as did analyses including all subjects. Removing suspicious subjects resulted in a significance level that was non reliable (see Tables V-12 and V-13).

In summary, there appears to be no direct support for
hypotheses 1a. Although the predicted differences between public and private conditions did not emerge, a marginally significant 3-way interaction occurred for ratings of supervisor insight (p < .06). Simple effects analyses revealed that LSE subordinates reacted the same to positive and negative feedback in private, but reacted differently to positive and negative feedback in public. Thus, although Hypothesis 1a was not supported directly, there were sensible differences in the way LSE subordinates reacted to feedback.

Hypothesis 1b was partially supported however. HSE subordinates rated supervisors who gave positive feedback higher than supervisors who gave negative feedback regardless of whether the supervisor would see the subordinates’ ratings. Thus, HSE subordinates showed different reactions to positive and negative feedback, but the pattern of ratings were similar in public and in private settings.

In general, there was a large effect of feedback for all variables. Subordinates in positive feedback conditions rated supervisors higher on all dimensions than did subordinates in negative feedback conditions.

Subordinate Resultant Self-Esteem. Hypothesis 2a stated that those LSE subordinates in the public, positive conditions who rated the supervisor favorably would report higher levels of RSE relative to those LSE subordinates in
the same condition who did not rate their supervisor favorably. Similarly, those LSE subordinates in the public, negative conditions who rated the supervisor unfavorably would report higher levels of RSE relative to those LSE subordinates in the same condition who did not rate the supervisor favorably. In addition, LSE subordinates in private conditions were not expected to report increases in RSE based on how they rated their supervisor.

Hypothesis 2b stated that HSE subordinates would not show differences in RSE based on how they rated their supervisor, regardless whether the reaction took place in public and private. The three-way ANOVA tested the effect that the opportunity to publicly or privately evaluate the feedback source had on the subordinate's esteem. These results are presented, although they do not directly test hypothesis 2a and 2b. A main effect of feedback was found for subordinates' ratings of resultant self-esteem (RSE) (see Table V-14). Subordinates who received positive feedback reported higher RSE ($M = 5.43$) than did those who received negative feedback ($M = 4.70$).

In addition to the main effect of feedback, a significant three-way interaction among esteem, response publicity, and feedback emerged on subordinates' ratings of RSE (see Table V-14). Simple effects $F$ tests of this interaction revealed the interaction was accounted for by one group of subjects. LSE subordinates who publicly reacted
to negative feedback reported lower RSE ($M = 3.90$) than did any of their counterparts: LSE subordinates who reacted publicly to a positive feedback agent ($M = 5.05$), $F (1,92) = 6.32$, $p < .05$; LSE subordinates who reacted privately to negative performance feedback ($M = 5.03$), $F (1,92) = 6.32$, $p < .05$; and HSE subordinates who publicly reacted to negative feedback ($M = 5.33$), $F (1,92) = 10.10$, $p < .01$.

In addition, HSE subordinates who privately reacted to negative feedback reported lower RSE ($M = 4.31$) than did two of their counterparts: HSE subordinates who reacted publicly to negative feedback ($M = 5.33$), $F (1,92) = 5.14$, $p < .05$; and HSE subordinates who reacted privately to positive feedback ($M = 5.74$), $F (1,92) = 9.77$, $p < .01$.

The ANOVA performed after removing suspicious subjects produced results similar to the ones reported above (see Tables V-16 and V-17).

It appears that after receiving negative feedback and having the opportunity to rate the supervisor publicly, LSE subordinates reported lower levels of RSE. However, HSE subordinates reported lower levels of RSE after being given the opportunity to rate the supervisor in private. After receiving positive feedback, HSE and LSE subjects reported no differences in levels of RSE, regardless of the opportunity to respond in public or in private.

Although the ANOVA results above appear inconsistent with Hypotheses 2a and 2b, the more appropriate test for
Hypothesis 2a is correlations by condition rather than ANOVA. This distinction is made because Hypotheses 2a and 2b were dependent upon the subordinate's behavior of rating the supervisor in a complimentary fashion after receiving positive feedback, and rating the supervisor in a derogatory fashion after receiving negative feedback. The ANOVA does not take into account how the subordinate rated the supervisor, only the subordinates' reported level of esteem. Correlations between subordinates' level of RSE and subordinates' ratings of supervisor's competence, likableness, and insightfulness are presented in Tables V-18 through V-20.

**Correlations: Subordinates' Ratings of Supervisors and Subordinates' RSE**

**Positive Feedback.** As predicted, in the public, positive feedback conditions, significant positive correlations were found between LSE subordinates' ratings of supervisors and their reported RSE (see Tables V-18 through V-20). Therefore, when publicly reacting to positive feedback, the more LSE subordinates complimented the supervisor, the higher was their reported RSE. Although not predicted, one significant correlation was found in the HSE public positive feedback condition. A significant positive correlation was obtained between HSE subordinates' RSE and subordinates' ratings of supervisor insight (r = 56). All other correlations within the
positive feedback conditions were nonsignificant as predicted. Thus, Hypothesis 2a and 2b was supported in the positive feedback conditions.

**Negative Feedback.** With respect to negative feedback, no support was found for Hypothesis 2a which predicted LSE subordinates who publicly derogated a negative feedback agent would report higher levels of esteem than LSE subordinates who publicly complimented a negative feedback agent. Significant negative correlations within the LSE negative public condition were predicted but not obtained. Consequently, it appears that there was no association between how LSE subordinates publicly rated the source of negative feedback and their subsequent level of RSE.

To test whether correlations by conditions were statistically different, Fisher’s Z’s were performed. All correlations between subordinate ratings of the supervisor (3 factors: competence, likableness, and insight) and RSE were compared by condition. Significant differences in correlations were expected between the LSE-public-positive condition and the LSE-public-negative condition only. Results of these analyses are presented as subscripts in Tables V-18 through V-20.

Two correlations were significantly different: the LSE-public-positive condition versus the LSE-public-negative condition. Correlations between subordinate RSE and ratings of supervisor likableness and insightfulness
were significantly different (see Tables V-18 through V-20 respectively). It appears that in public, the relationship between LSE subordinates' ratings of their supervisor and the subordinates' RSE is reliably different between the positive and negative feedback conditions. In addition, an unpredicted significant difference was found between the correlation of subordinate RSE and ratings of supervisor insight in the HSE-private-positive condition and the HSE-private-negative condition (see Table V-20).

In summary, Hypothesis 2a was supported in the negative conditions but not in the positive conditions. It appears that in the positive feedback condition, the more LSE subordinates complimented the feedback agent, the higher their reported level of RSE. However, with respect to public reactions to negative feedback, no relationship was found between subordinates' ratings of supervisors and subordinates' reported level of RSE. Hypothesis 2b was also supported. HSE subordinates ratings of their supervisor were not correlated with their RSE, with one exception.

Design 1b

Manipulation Checks

Items designed to assess experimental manipulations for design 1b were included in the "Supervisor's General Perceptions" questionnaire. Manipulation check items were analyzed using 2 (supervisor self-esteem: high vs low) by
2 (supervisors' knowledge of subordinates' reactions to feedback: information vs no information) by 2 (feedback: positive vs negative) ANOVAs. Summary tables for these analyses are presented in Appendix W.

Suspicion. To identify supervisors suspicious about the experimental hypotheses and procedures, supervisors were also asked to indicate the purpose of the study. Two of 100 subjects guessed the experimental hypothesis (i.e., indicated the study was designed to test how supervisors reacted after finding out how subordinates rated them). Analyses conducted with and without, suspicious subjects yielded similar results, therefore all supervisors are included in the reported analyses.

Feedback. One question was included to assess the feedback manipulation for supervisors. This item asked supervisors to rate the positivity of the performance feedback they delivered. A predicted main effect emerged for feedback on this item. Supervisors assigned to the positive feedback conditions reported giving higher ratings (\(M = 6.88\)) than did those assigned to negative conditions (\(M = 4.90\)) (see Table W-1). In general, it appears that the feedback manipulation was effective for both subordinates and supervisors.

Supervisors Ratings of Subordinates

Hypothesis 3 predicted that supervisors who administered positive (negative) feedback and had knowledge of
the subordinate's reactions to feedback will rate the subordinate more (less) favorably. To assess supervisors' perceptions of subordinates after evaluating the subordinates' performance, supervisors were asked to complete a series of 9-point Likert-type ratings of the subordinate on two dimensions: (1) intelligence and (2) informed. Supervisors also answered questions concerning: (1) How much the supervisor would like to continue working with the subordinate; (2) How highly would they recommend hiring this subordinate to another supervisor; (3) How easy the subordinate would be to work with; and (4) How much the supervisor liked the subordinate.

Two (supervisor self-esteem: high vs low) by 2 (feedback: positive vs negative) by 2 (supervisors' knowledge of subordinates' reactions to feedback: information vs no information) ANOVAs were performed on each of the following measures.

**Informed.** A significant main effect of feedback was found for supervisors' ratings of how informed they reported the subordinate to be (see Table X-1). Supervisors in the positive feedback conditions rated the subordinate as more informed ($M = 6.78$) than did supervisors in the negative feedback conditions ($M = 4.40$). This finding suggests that based on the subordinates' specific task performance supervisors generalized their perceptions of the subordinate to dimensions not explicitly tested on
the task. The means for this rating are presented in Table X-2.

**Intelligence.** Three main effects (feedback, supervisor self-esteem, and supervisor knowledge of the subordinate reactions) emerged for supervisors' ratings of subordinate intelligence (see Table X-3). LSE supervisors rated the subordinate as more intelligent (M = 7.40) than did HSE supervisors (M = 6.70). Supervisors assigned to the positive feedback condition rated the subordinate as more intelligent (M = 7.68), than did supervisors in the negative feedback condition (M = 6.48). Also, supervisors in the information conditions rated the subordinate as more intelligent (M = 7.40) than did supervisors in the no information condition (M = 6.70).

A significant two-way interaction between feedback and supervisor knowledge of subordinate reactions qualified these main effects. Two simple effects F tests were significant in this interaction. The first F tests indicated that in the supervisor knowledge condition, supervisors who gave positive feedback rated subordinates as more intelligent (M = 8.28) than did supervisors who gave negative feedback (M = 6.52), F (1,92) = 24.28, p < .01 (see Table X-4). The second significant simple effect revealed that after administering positive feedback, supervisors rated the subordinate as more intelligent in the public condition (M = 8.28) as compared to supervisors
in the private condition (M = 7.08), F (1,92) = 11.29, p < .01. In effect, these differences were accounted for by supervisors who gave positive feedback and had information about how their subordinate reacted. This group of supervisors rated the subordinate as more intelligent than did those in all other conditions.

Therefore, it appears that supervisors who had initially delivered positive feedback and were exposed to the subordinates' reactions to that feedback, rated the subordinate as more intelligent than did supervisors who delivered positive feedback but were not exposed to the subordinates' reactions. No corresponding effect was found for negative feedback however.

Desire to continue working with the subordinate. A significant main effect of feedback emerged for the supervisors' ratings of desire to continue working with the subordinate (see Table X-5). Supervisors in the positive feedback conditions indicated they would like to continue working with the subordinate more (M = 7.96) than did supervisors assigned to the negative feedback conditions (M = 6.46) (see Table X-6). This finding suggests that supervisors prefer to continue working with subordinates who initially perform well, a finding that is not particularly surprising.

Recommendation for hiring the subordinate. Main effects of feedback and supervisor knowledge of subordi-
nates' reactions emerged for this variable. First, the main effect of feedback showed that supervisors in the positive feedback condition recommended hiring the subordinate more so ($M = 7.44$) than did supervisors in the negative feedback condition ($M = 6.10$) (see Tables X-7 and X-8). This suggests that supervisors are more likely to recommend hiring a subordinate who performed well than a subordinate who performed poorly.

Second, a main effect of supervisor knowledge of subordinates' reactions emerged for this variable. Supervisors who knew how the subordinate reacted recommended hiring the subordinate to another supervisor to a greater extent ($M = 7.14$), than did supervisors who had no knowledge of how the subordinate reacted ($M = 6.40$) (see Table X-7).

These findings suggest two conclusions: first, knowledge of how the subordinate reacted may give the supervisor more information about the subordinate. Second, since there was a tendency to rate the supervisor highly in general (i.e., all means were above the midpoint), supervisors may have been pleased to find out this information and thus more likely to recommend hiring the subordinate.

Ease of Working with the subordinate. A main effect of feedback was evident for the supervisors' rating of how easy the subordinate would be to work with. Supervisors who administered positive feedback rated the subordinate
as easier to work with (M = 7.54) than did supervisors who gave negative feedback (M = 6.66) (see Table X-9). A significant 2-way interaction between feedback and knowledge of subordinates' reactions also emerged for this variable.

Simple effects analyses revealed that one condition accounted for the significant interaction. Supervisors who administered positive feedback and had knowledge of the subordinates' reactions rated subordinates as easier to work with (M = 8.08) than did supervisors in the knowledge of reaction condition who administered negative feedback (M = 6.40), F (1,92) = 16.77, p < .01; and the supervisors who had no knowledge of subordinates' reactions and administered positive feedback (M = 7.00), F (1,92) = 6.92, p < .05 (see Table X-10). Taken in conjunction, these findings suggest that supervisors who received subordinate reactions to feedback changed their perceptions of the subordinate within the positive conditions, but not in the negative conditions.

Liking of Subordinate. The supervisors were also asked how much they liked the subordinate. A main effect of feedback emerged on this measure. In the positive feedback conditions, supervisors reported liking the subordinate more (M = 7.57) than did supervisors in the negative feedback conditions (M = 6.06) (see Tables X-11 and X-12).
In summary, it appears that the supervisors' level of self-esteem had no effect on how supervisors rated their subordinates. However, feedback valence and supervisor knowledge of subordinates' reactions did have selective effects on supervisors' ratings. In general, supervisors in positive feedback conditions tended to rate the subordinate more positively than did supervisors in the negative feedback conditions.

With regard to supervisor knowledge of the subordinates' reactions, supervisors' ratings of subordinate intelligence and recommendation for hiring, tended to be higher in the information conditions relative to the no information conditions. For the remaining four items, knowledge of the subordinates' reaction had no effect. Thus, finding out how their subordinate reacted to the feedback did not always affect the supervisors' impressions of the subordinate. Perhaps some questions tap different aspects of the supervisor-subordinate relationship and are therefore more affected by knowledge of the subordinates' reactions.

Perhaps in cases where there were no differences in ratings as a function of knowledge of the subordinates' reactions, the mere expectation of the subordinates' reaction was enough to minimize the difference between public and private conditions. When a supervisor administers negative (positive) feedback, perhaps they expect an
unfavorable (favorable) reaction by the subordinate. This expectation of the subordinates’ reaction in no information conditions may affect the supervisors’ ratings in a manner similar to finding out how the subordinate actually reacted to the feedback.

**Resultant Self-Esteem - Supervisor.**

To assess how supervisors felt after administering feedback, supervisors rated their level of RSE. This measure was analyzed using a 2 (supervisor self-esteem: high vs low) by 2 (feedback: positive vs negative) by 2 (supervisors’ knowledge of subordinates’ reactions to feedback: information vs no information) ANOVA (see Tables X-13 and X-14). No significant main effects or interactions emerged for supervisor RSE.

**Longer Term Effects of Knowing Subordinates’ Reactions.**

The relationship between how subordinates rated supervisors and how supervisors subsequently rated the subordinate was tested by computing correlations within the information and no information conditions. It was decided to collapse across supervisor and subordinate self-esteem for two reasons: to increase the cell size, and because no three way interactions emerged for supervisors’ ratings of subordinates. These correlations are presented in Tables X-15 through X-17.

**Correlations within the Information Condition.**
Subordinates' ratings of supervisor likableness were correlated positively with all supervisors' ratings of subordinates: informed, intelligence, desire to continue working with, recommendation for hiring, ease to work with, and liking of subordinate. Correlations were significant in both positive and negative feedback conditions (see Table X-15).

Subordinates' ratings of supervisor competence correlated positively with supervisor ratings of subordinates on the following variables: intelligence, desire to continue working with, recommendation for hiring, ease to work with, and liking of subordinate. These correlations were significant in both positive and negative feedback conditions (See Table X-16).

Finally, subordinate ratings of supervisor insight were correlated significantly with only a few supervisor ratings of subordinates. In the positive feedback condition, the following variables were correlated with subordinate ratings of supervisor insight: intelligence, recommendation for hiring, ease to work with, and liking of subordinate. In the negative feedback conditions, subordinates' ratings of supervisor insight were correlated with supervisors' ratings of: ease to work with, and liking of subordinate (see Table X-17).

These correlations provide support for the proposed longer term effects of the supervisor finding out how the
subordinate reacted to feedback. Within both the positive and negative feedback conditions, those supervisors who received positive reactions to feedback in turn rated the subordinate higher than did those who received negative reactions to feedback.

Correlations within the No Information Condition. In the no information condition, no significant correlations were found between subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor and supervisor’s ratings of the subordinate. This finding, along with the strong correlations in the information condition, emphasizes the reciprocity between how the subordinate’s rated their supervisor and how the supervisor rated the subordinate. Thus, there is strong evidence for the feedback loop proposed at the outset.
DISCUSSION

At the outset, a model of interpersonal reactions to performance feedback was proposed (see page 22 for a description of the model and Figure 1 for a diagram). The model was investigated through two experimental designs. Design 1a measured subordinates’ reactions to performance feedback (c.f., Baumgardner and Levy, 1987), while Design 1b investigated how knowledge of subordinate’s reactions affected supervisor’s impressions of the subordinate.

Design 1a: Subordinate’s Reactions to Feedback

Subordinate’s Ratings of Supervisors

Hypothesis 1a predicted LSE subordinates would engage in self-presentational behaviors when reacting to feedback in public. More specifically, after receiving positive feedback, those subordinates who rated the supervisor publicly were expected to rate the supervisor more favorably than were subordinates who rated the supervisor privately. Conversely, subordinates who received negative feedback and reacted in public, were expected to rate the supervisor less favorably than were subordinates who rated their supervisor in private. On the other hand, HSE subordinates were not expected to rate their supervisor differently in public than in private.

The results from Design 1a did not support the predictions for LSE subordinates. The predicted differ-
ences in supervisory ratings between public and private conditions did not emerge. However, the pattern of means showed some interesting differences in the way LSE subordinates rated their supervisors. LSE subordinates reacted differently to positive and negative feedback within the public condition, but reacted similarly to positive and negative feedback in the private condition. This finding was evidenced by the marginally significant 3-way interaction (p < .06) for subordinate ratings of supervisor insight. This pattern of means was replicated for ratings of supervisor competence (p < .09).

With respect to HSE subordinates, the hypotheses were supported. HSE subordinates showed no differences in ratings obtained in public as compared to in private settings. However, simple effects analyses showed an effect of feedback on all ratings. HSE subordinates who received positive feedback rated the supervisor more favorably than did subordinates who received negative feedback.

The unexpected results of LSE subordinates may be explained by the differences between ratings obtained in the public versus private setting. In private, the ratings were confidential and therefore "cognitive" in nature. However, because in the public setting the ratings were to be shown to the supervisor, the ratings are both "cognitive" and "behavioral." By making this distinction, the
above results can be explained by the different coping mechanisms of HSE and LSE individuals (c.f., Baumgardner and Arkin, 1987).

According to Baumgardner and Arkin (1987), HSE individuals are able to cope with negative feedback on a cognitive level, while LSE individuals rely on more behavioral means to cope with negative feedback. In the private conditions, LSE subordinates rated supervisors who gave negative feedback no differently from supervisors who gave positive feedback. This demonstrates the LSE subordinate's inability to reject negative feedback or accept positive feedback on a cognitive level. LSE subordinates did not rate the negative feedback agent unfavorably because they could not deny the credibility of the source of the feedback in private. However, in public where the ratings were more "behavioral," the LSE individuals were able to deny the credibility of the supervisor by derogating him or her, and therefore rejecting the negative feedback.

As predicted, HSE individuals showed similar patterns of ratings in both private and public conditions. HSE subordinates who received positive feedback rated supervisors more favorably than did HSE who received negative feedback, regardless of reaction publicity.

It appears that in private, where the ratings were "cognitive," LSE subordinate's ratings supported self--
consistency theory which states that people prefer and accept feedback that confirms their self-views (c.f., Swann, 1984; Swann & Read, 1981; Swann et. al., 1987). In private, LSE subordinates who received negative feedback did not deny the supervisor's credibility by rating him unfavorably, nor did LSE subordinates who received negative feedback increase the supervisor's credibility by rating him unfavorably. In effect, in private LSE subordinates seemingly accepted negative feedback and rejected positive feedback, thus supporting self-consistency theory.

However, in the public conditions the ratings of LSE subordinates supported self-enhancement theory (c.f., Jones, 1973). Self-enhancement theory states that individuals prefer and accept positive feedback in order to view themselves favorably (Jones, 1973). LSE subordinates who received positive feedback complimented the supervisor more so than those who received negative feedback. In both instances, the ratings were a form of self-enhancement. Those subordinates who received positive feedback increased the credibility of the feedback source, accepted the positive feedback, and increased their self-view. However, those subordinates who received negative feedback denied the credibility of the supervisor, thus rejecting the negative feedback, and maintaining their positive self-view. It appears that the public conditions allowed LSE individuals to utilize an "interpersonal," or "behavioral"
strategy to deal with feedback (Baumgardner and Arkin, 1987).

Taken together, the reactions of HSE and LSE subordinates provide partial support for the first steps of the model presented at the outset (Baumgardner and Levy, 1987). HSE subordinates reacted as predicted while the LSE subordinates did not replicate the findings of Baumgardner and Levy (1987). The results are however taken as support for self-presentational behaviors of LSE individuals, which are not always consonant with private conceptions of the self. Reasons for not replicating the results of the previous research are discussed in a later section.

More generally, an overall main effect of feedback indicated that both LSE and HSE subordinates rated supervisors who gave positive feedback more favorably than those supervisors who gave negative feedback. This finding has many implications for appraisal situations, especially subordinate appraisals of supervisors. In line with the unfavorable reactions to negative feedback found in this research, a supervisor who delivers negative feedback to subordinates may likely receive a negative appraisal from the subordinate in return. Conversely, superiors who deliver positive feedback may likely be rated positively by the subordinates as was found in the present research.

These findings support what Bernardin (1980) terms "reciprocal leniency" in his leadership research. Bernar-
din found that subordinate ratings of their manager on the "consideration" dimension of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-X11) were influenced by subordinate performance. Subordinates who performed well tended to rate their supervisor higher on the "consideration" factor, while those who performed poorly tended to rate their supervisor lower on that dimension (Fleishman, 1973; Kerr and Schriesheim, 1974; Schriesheim, Kinicki and Schriesheim, 1979). Thus, those who perform well are likely to receive positive feedback, and in turn likely to rate the supervisor favorably. The reverse is true for those who perform poorly; the poor performer who receives negative feedback is likely to rate the leader unfavorably.

In addition, subordinates who received positive feedback reported it was more accurate than did those who received negative feedback. Subordinates' self-esteem and response publicity (whether or not the supervisors were shown the subordinates' reactions) did not qualify this trend to believe positive information and disregard negative information. This finding supports self-enhancement theory which states individuals wish to see themselves in the best possible light (Jones, 1973). By accepting positive feedback and rejecting negative feedback, subordinates may have been attempting to enhance their self-views. The main effects of feedback in this study confirm the findings of other researchers regarding the valence of
performance evaluations. According to Taylor et. al. (1984), the sign of feedback is one of the most important factors influencing feedback perception. Further, subordinates who receive positive feedback are generally more satisfied with the appraisal, and perceive the appraisal system as more fair, than do those who receive negative feedback (Pearce and Porter, 1986).

Subordinate’s Level of Resultant Esteem

Why do LSE subordinates engage in these "interpersonal" self-presentational behaviors? This question is addressed by Hypothesis 2a, which predicted in public conditions, those LSE subordinates who engaged in self-presentational behaviors would report a rise in resultant self-esteem (RSE) relative to those who did not engage in self-presentational behaviors. However, Hypothesis 2b predicted that HSE subordinates would not report a rise in RSE.

The reasoning behind these predictions also rests on the differences between HSE and LSE individuals’ mechanisms for coping with feedback (Baumgardner & Arkin, 1987). LSE individuals must rely on public, interpersonal, and behavioral means to convince themselves that they are worthwhile individuals. One means by which they can accomplish this is to derogate the source of negative feedback and compliment the source of positive feedback as demonstrated above. HSE individuals on the other hand,
need not engage in these public, interpersonal, and behavioral means to ward off negative information, and incorporate positive information. HSE individuals can maintain their self-view by cognitive efforts (i.e., self-serving bias) that LSE individuals seem to lack (Bradley, 1978; Sackheim, 1983).

The results obtained for the subordinates’ reported level of RSE were unexpected; LSE subordinates who received negative feedback and who had the opportunity to rate their supervisor publicly, reported lower RSE than all other groups. The resulting pattern of means are opposite the predicted direction and are puzzling.

However, because Hypothesis 2a predicts, the behavior or act of rating the supervisor in a self-presentational fashion is the key factor leading to a reported rise in RSE, ANOVA is an inappropriate test of the hypothesis. The opportunity to rate the supervisor publicly is not enough; self-enhancement is contingent upon engaging in self-presentational behaviors. If this is true, one would not expect all LSE subordinates in the public conditions to report rises in RSE, just those who actually complimented the positive feedback source and derogated the negative feedback source.

Correlations by condition provided partial support for Hypothesis 2a and moderate support for Hypothesis 2b. In the public positive feedback conditions, significant
positive correlations were found between LSE subordinate’s ratings of their supervisor and their reported level of esteem. It appears that when publicly reacting to positive feedback, the more LSE subordinates complimented their supervisor, the higher was their reported RSE. With respect to negative feedback, there was no support for hypothesis 2a. There was no relationship between how LSE subordinates rated supervisors who gave negative feedback and their reported level of RSE.

Hypothesis 2b was supported. HSE subordinates were not expected to report rises in RSE in any of the conditions. Because only one of six possible correlations was significantly different from zero, it was concluded that the hypothesis was supported. Taken together, the hypotheses about HSE subordinates were generally supported, however the hypotheses regarding LSE subordinates were generally inconclusive. Although I cannot definitively explain why hypothesis 2a was not totally confirmed, I can speculate about possible reasons for the nonsupportive results.

Perhaps one reason why the present results were different from the results found by Baumgardner and Levy (1987) lies in differences between the experimental settings. Baumgardner and Levy (1987) used feedback about personal traits (i.e., friendliness, smart, sincere). The feedback used in the present study was feedback based on
task performance. This feedback was more specific in nature, and less personal. The differences between the two types of feedback may lead to different types of attributions: global (e.g., ability) vs. specific (e.g., performance on one test) (Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale, 1978). Global attributions are made across a broad range of situations, while specific attributions are made to a narrow range of situations (Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale, 1978).

Feedback about one's personality may easily generalize to situations beyond the experimental setting, especially for depressed subjects (Hammen and Krantz, 1976). If one argues that individuals low in esteem show some similarities to depressed individuals, parallels may be drawn between the way both groups of individuals act. Therefore, LSE individuals may be able to deny the veridicality of their partner's perceptions by recalling instances where the feedback is false. Further, instances that disconfirm the feedback may more easily come to mind. For example, a subordinate who receives feedback from his supervisor that he is lazy, may think of many work related instances that indicate he is not lazy (i.e., I worked 5 hours of overtime last week, I always get my monthly reports in on time, etc.). Thus, LSE subordinates can deny the credibility of the supervisor and deny the global feedback as well. These behaviors may allow the LSE subordinate to regulate
Feedback based on task performance is more specific, less personal and attributed to the task performance situation. If the subordinate believes the feedback was based on his performance, he can not easily deny the feedback, no matter how much he discredits the supervisor. The fact remains the feedback was based on his performance, which cannot be altered. An example from a work situation illustrates this point. Take for instance, a subordinate who received feedback from his supervisor that the last sales report he wrote contained inaccurate figures. The subordinate cannot deny the feedback, no matter how the subordinate derogates his boss. An incorrect sales figure is verifiable from other sources and cannot be refuted. Thus, this LSE subordinate may not be able to raise his level of esteem under these circumstances, even though they may try.

It appears in the present study that LSE subordinates may have at least initially attempted to engage in self-presentational behaviors as a means toward self-enhancement. But, when they were unable to deny the credibility of feedback they received, they may have been unable to regulate their esteem.

In addition, the roles in the present study differed from those used by Baumgardner and Levy (1987). They used peer interactions while the present study used roles
unequal in stature. Although subjects were assigned randomly to the subordinate and supervisor roles, the subjects were led to believe the students most active in school were assigned to be supervisors. While this manipulation was included to increase the credibility of the supervisor, the procedure may have produced some unanticipated consequences. Perhaps the combination of being assigned to the subordinate role and receiving negative feedback was severe enough to prevent the LSE individuals to regulate their esteem.

Design 1b: Supervisor’s Reactions to Subordinate’s Ratings

To investigate the longer term effects of the LSE subordinate’s self-presentational behaviors, supervisors’ perceptions of subordinates were assessed in two conditions that manipulated supervisors’ knowledge of the subordinates’ reactions. In the no information conditions, supervisor’s ratings of their subordinate were a function of the type of feedback administered. However, in the information conditions supervisor’s ratings were affected by the feedback delivered and the subordinate’s responses communicated to the supervisor.

Supervisors’ Ratings of Subordinates

It has been shown that supervisors who give negative feedback expect negative reactions from subordinates (Fisher, 1979). This design attempted to see if finding
out how the subordinate’s actually reacted affected the supervisors perceptions of the subordinate beyond the effect of the feedback administered. Supervisors rated subordinates on several work related dimensions.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that supervisors who gave negative feedback and had knowledge of their subordinate’s negative reactions would rate the subordinate lower on all dimensions, than would supervisors who had no knowledge of their subordinate’s reactions. Conversely, supervisors who gave positive feedback and received positive reactions from the subordinate would rate the subordinate more favorably than would supervisors who had no information about how the subordinate reacted. These hypotheses were supported for some dimensions, but not for others.

Although knowledge of the subordinate’s reactions affected some ratings of the subordinate, there was a predominant main effect of feedback on all ratings. Supervisors who gave positive feedback rated subordinates more favorably on all dimensions, relative to supervisors who gave negative feedback. This supports previous empirical findings (c.f. Fisher, 1979; Taylor et al., 1984). Supervisors’ level of self-esteem did not affect their ratings of the subordinate on any dimension.

However, as predicted, knowledge of the subordinates’ reactions had selective effects on supervisor ratings.

Actually finding out how the subordinate reacted to
feedback affected supervisors' ratings of the subordinate on three dimensions: recommending the subordinate for employment, ease of working with the subordinate, and subordinate intelligence. Supervisors in the positive, information conditions rated the subordinate as more intelligent, and easier to work with, than did supervisors in the positive no information conditions. In addition, supervisors who received information about the subordinates' reaction, recommended hiring the subordinate to a greater extent than did supervisors who received no information about the subordinates' reactions. Supervisor ratings on the other 3 dimensions, however, were not affected by information of how the subordinate reacted. This suggests that at least for some ratings measured here, knowledge of the subordinates' responses did not cause supervisors to rate the subordinate different from supervisors that had no knowledge of the subordinates' reactions. Future research should investigate which dimensions are more likely to be affected by knowledge of the subordinates' reactions.

To further assess the interactional process between how subordinates reacted to feedback and how supervisors subsequently rated the subordinates, correlations by response publicity and feedback conditions were computed. It was predicted that subordinates' ratings of supervisors would be positively correlated with supervisors' ratings of
subordinates in the information condition, but not correlated in the no information condition.

These correlations show strong support for the longer term effects of the subordinate's reactions proposed in the model. In the positive feedback conditions where supervisors had information about the subordinate's reaction, all correlations between subordinate and supervisor ratings were positive, and 13 of 18 correlations were significant. Similarly, within the negative feedback condition all correlations were positive, and 15 of 18 correlations between ratings were significant.

Correlations between ratings in the subordinate private condition and supervisor no information conditions were nonsignificant. The correlations within this condition acted as a quasi-control group. Because most of the correlations in the information group were significant, a strong relationship is evident between how the subordinate rated the supervisor and how the supervisor in turn rated the subordinate. Thus, the longer term effects of the subordinates' reactions to feedback are evident in the correspondence between the subordinates' ratings and the supervisors subsequent ratings.

In essence, poor performance induced the supervisor to administer negative feedback; subsequently, those subordinates who reacted positively (negatively) in public were likely to receive favorable (unfavorable) ratings from the
supervisor. Similarly, positive feedback induced positive reactions by the subordinate, and if their reactions were public, it produced corresponding reactions by the supervisor. Thus the effect of the subordinates’ reactions on the supervisors’ ratings of the subordinate have been established.

The high relationship between subordinate ratings and supervisor ratings supports Bernardin’s (1980) reciprocal leniency concept, although from a the supervisor’s perspective rather than the subordinate’s perspective. Supervisors who give negative performance reviews are likely to be met with negative subordinate appraisals. In addition, those subordinates who react publicly to supervisor feedback are likely to be rated in a similar manner by the supervisor. If the subordinate reacts positively, he is likely to be rated favorably, but if the subordinate reacts negatively, he is likely to be rated negatively in return.

Overall, the hypothesized model gained some support. The most striking support comes from the correlations between subordinates’ ratings of the supervisor and supervisors’ ratings of the subordinate; implying possible longer term effects of the subordinates’ reactions to feedback. It appears that positive subordinate reactions in public induced positive reactions from the supervisor. Similarly, negative subordinate reactions in public induced negative reactions by the supervisor.
The prediction that LSE subordinates who adopted a public self-presentation strategy (e.g., derogated/complimented the negative/positive feedback agent more in public relative to in private) as a means of self-enhancement was not strongly supported. There was some evidence in positive feedback conditions but not in negative feedback conditions. The lack of support for self-enhancement may have been due to the reasons speculated earlier, such as the differences between the types of feedback: global (i.e. personality) and specific (i.e., task), and subordinate role in the study. Although the self-enhancement results were inconclusive, there was evidence for self-presentation behaviors for LSE subordinates, but not for HSE subordinates.

The implications of these findings for subordinate participation in performance appraisals is clear: subordinates' reactions in the interview may affect the supervisor's ratings of the subordinate on the next performance appraisal. While participation has long been thought to have positive effects on work-related perceptions, attitudes, and behavior, the results from empirical studies has been mixed (see Locke and Schweiger, 1979 for a review of the literature). The findings here may be added to the research that does not suggest the positive effects of worker participation in performance appraisal interviews.
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APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FORM

Department of Psychology

In this study, you will be asked to pretend you are either a supervisor or a subordinate in an organization. In this organizational setting, the subordinate will perform a task, and the supervisor will evaluate the performance. This will take about 10 minutes or so. Then the supervisor will provide the subordinate with information about how they performed. This information will be delivered in written or oral fashion. Later you will be asked some questions about how you feel.

Before getting started, you will be asked to complete 2 brief questionnaires being used by another faculty member. This survey is totally unrelated to the present study. We ask you to do this so we can help our fellow researchers. Your responses to these questionnaires are confidential.

If you wish to participate in this research project, please know that:
1. You may cease your participation at any time without penalty.
2. You will be given (1) credit toward your final grade in Psych 2000 for satisfactory completion of the study.
3. This research project has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee of the Psychology Department; questions should be directed to the chair of that committee or the research director of this project.
4. Due to a variety of factors, such as time pressure, experimental procedure, etc., the purpose of the study may not be fully explained at the outset. However, you may ask extensive questions at a later time.
5. If you would like a copy of this form, you may have one.
6. If you are interested in the final analysis of the results, they will be available from the research director in about 6 weeks. However, since individual data is anonymous and it will be analyzed as such, you will not be able to obtain information directly pertinent to any responses you make. Only a summary of the final data (i.e., average responses) will be available.

If you wish to participate, please SIGN YOUR NAME BELOW. Thank you very much.

Dr. Ann Baumgardner X-7030 Joanne Mac X-6851
Research Director Graduate Assistant

Dr. Stephen Zaccaro X-7916 Chuck Waring X-5284
Human Subjects Committee Chair Institutional Review Board

SIGNED:
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: __________/________/_________
APPENDIX B
ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SURVEY
Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

1  2  3  4
1  STRONGLY AGREE
2  STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. I'm very confident that future success in my chosen career is assured.
2. I often feel upset at the work that I do.
3. I'm not that proud of my schoolwork.
4. Failure just makes me try harder.
5. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if not successful.
6. When I set important goals for myself, I usually achieve them.
7. I rarely get discouraged at what I'm doing.
8. It is hard for me to make new friends.
9. I feel insecure about my ability to do things.
10. Failure usually makes me give up.

11. What is your sex?
   1=male; 2=female

12. What is your age?
   1=18 or less; 2=19; 3=20; 4=21 or older

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
APPENDIX C

FLEMING & COURTNEY SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
SELF-DESCRIPTION INVENTORY

Instructions: Please place an "X" in the space that best represents how you view yourself.

1. How often do you feel inferior to most of the people you know?
   Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ very often

2. Do you ever think that you are a worthless individual?
   No ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Yes

3. How confident do you feel that someday the people you know will look up to you and respect you?
   Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ very confident

4. Do you ever feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether you are a worthwhile person?
   No ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Yes

5. How often do you dislike yourself?
   Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ very often

6. In general, how confident do you feel about your abilities?
   Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ very confident

7. How often do you have the feeling that there is nothing you can do well?
   Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ very often
8. How much do you worry about how well you get along with other people?

very little ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ much

9. How often do you worry about criticisms that might be made of your work by your teacher or employer?

Not at all ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ often very often

10. Do you ever feel afraid or anxious when you are going into a room by yourself where other people have already gathered and are talking?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes

11. How often do you feel self-conscious?

Not at all ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ often very often

12. How much do you worry about whether other people will regard you as a success or failure in your job or in school?

very little ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ much

13. When in a group of people, do you have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes

14. When you make an embarrassing mistake or have done something that makes you look foolish, how long does it take you to get over it?

very little ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ much time ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ a lot of time

15. Do you often feel uncomfortable meeting new people?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes
16. How often do you worry about whether other people like to be with you?

Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ often

17. How often are you troubled with shyness?

Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ often

18. When you think that some of the people you meet might have an unfavorable opinion of you, how concerned or worried do you feel about it?

Not at all very concerned/ worried ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ worried

19. How often do you feel worried or bothered about what other people think about you?

Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ often

20. When you have to read an essay and understand it for a class assignment, how worried or concerned do you feel about it?

Not at all very concerned/ worried ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ worried

21. When you have to write an argument to convince your teacher who may disagree with your ideas, how concerned or worried to do you feel about it?

Not at all very concerned/ worried ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ worried

22. How often do you have trouble expressing your ideas when you try to put them into writing as an assignment?

Not at all ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ often
23. How often do you have trouble understanding things you read for class assignments?

Not at all ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ often very

24. How often do you imagine that you have less scholastic ability than your classmates?

Not at all ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ often very

25. In turning in a major assignment such as a term paper, how often do you feel you did an excellent job on it?

Not at all ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ often very

26. Compared with classmates, how often do you feel you must study more than they do to get the same grades?

Not at all ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ often very

27. Have you ever felt ashamed of your physique or figure?

No ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ Yes

28. Do you often feel that most of your friends or peers are more physically attractive than yourself?

No ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ Yes

29. Do you often wish or fantasize that you were better looking?

No ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ Yes

30. Have you ever been concerned or worried about your ability to attract members of the opposite sex?

No ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ ______ Yes

31. How confident are you that others see you as being physically appealing?

Not at all very
32. Have you ever thought of yourself as physically uncoordinated?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes

33. Have you ever felt inferior to most other people in athletic ability?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes

34. When involved in sports requiring physical coordination, are you often concerned that you will do well?

Not at all ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ often very

35. Have you ever thought that you lacked the ability to be a good dancer or do well at recreational activities involving coordination?

No ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Yes

36. When trying to do well at a sport and you know other people are watching, how rattled or flustered do you get?

Not at all rattled/ flustered very rattled/ flustered ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
APPENDIX D

PUBLIC PROTOCOL
Hello, my name is ' ' and I am a graduate student here in the Psychology Department. First, I’d like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

Before we get started, I’d like to tell you a little about the study. I think you’ll find it interesting; most people do. The purpose of this study is pretty straightforward. You may be familiar with Industrial/Organizational psychology from your intro course. Are you?

Well, industrial psychologists study how people act in organizations, and how organizations affect how people perform their particular job. I’m working with an applied psychology professor here and we are looking at the differences between receiving oral or written evaluations in the workplace. More specifically, we are looking at how supervisors and subordinates react to written versus orally transmitted information, and how this affects their relationship with one another. In order to do this, we are going to ask half of you to act as supervisors, and the other half to be subordinates. You as a group will either be assigned to the written or oral evaluation condition. To assess how people feel about the type of evaluation they receive, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires asking about your perceptions and feelings at different times during the experimental session.

Psychologists are just beginning to study how written and oral (face to face) evaluation affects people in organizations. To study this, we ask questions like how it makes them feel to receive a certain type of communication, how it affects their performance, and which type they prefer etc.

Most of us are quite aware that people who enjoy their work are generally more satisfied and perform better. I/O psychologists make a living studying how people feel about their job. They therefore wish to systematically study how evaluation mode, oral or written, affects how people feel about their job. They also wish to develop precise predictions of how these processes occur.

Tonight (today) we are going to ask you to pretend you are hired by an organization like AT & T, to be either a subordinate or supervisor. It is important that you act according to the role you will be assigned to at a later point in the experiment. The subordinates will perform a task, and the supervisors will be asked to evaluate the
subordinate’s performance.

Besides evaluating the task, the supervisor will also be asked to provide the subordinate with some information about how they performed. These interactions will take place face to face in the oral condition, but on paper without face to face contact in the written condition.

All these procedures are trying to do is determine if written evaluation is more accurate than oral evaluation, and which type of evaluation is preferred by the subordinates. We make you interact as supervisors and subordinates to get you comfortable playing the role of supervisor or subordinate. This role playing makes the study more realistic so we can generalize to people in real organizations (like AT & T). This is why it is important to always stay in your role throughout the study.

Before we begin, I’m going to ask you to complete a questionnaire being used by another professor. We often include surveys not relevant to our research to help other professors out. If you have already filled out this form in another experiment, don’t worry about it, just fill it out again to be sure. We do this at the beginning so it won’t interfere with our purpose here. Please read the consent form I have given you, fill out the appropriate information, and answer the survey questions on the following pages.

HAND OUT CONSENT FORM (A), ROSENBERG SCALE (B), FLEMING/CRTNY(C)

***Wait until everyone is done and collect the materials***

Now we can begin with our study. First I will explain the task the subordinates will perform, and the supervisors will evaluate, then I will randomly assign half of you to each role: subordinate or supervisor.

HAND OUT EXAMPLE OF TASK TO EVERYONE (F)

***Explain task to all***
This task is designed to measure "management potential." Some people are going to be good at this task, meaning they have high MP, but others will not. Performance on this test will indicate how much of this ability you have. Any questions? Now I’m going to divide you into two groups. Does anyone here know each other?

(If anyone does, we have to make sure you are not paired up with someone you know. To do this, we have to make sure you are either both supervisors, or both subordinates. I will flip a coin to determine which group you will be in.)
Assign half of the subjects to be supervisors based on the list of activities presented on their application to Tech. Since the last group was assigned to the oral evaluation condition, this group has been assigned to the written evaluation condition. To ensure that the only communication between the supervisors and subordinates is in the written form, the supervisors will be escorted to another room, while the subordinates will remain here. Remember, neither the supervisors, nor the subordinates will know with whom they are interacting in the other room.

Will all the supervisors please stand up and move to the door. I will take you to another room where you will wait for the subordinates to perform the task.

I will be back in a minute when I situate the supervisors in the other room.

***Escort the supervisors to the other room***
Please take a seat between the dividers. I’ll be back in a few minutes to explain the rest of your instructions.

Return to the subordinates

HAND OUT TASK (F)

Now, I’m going to give you a task very similar to the one I explained a few minutes ago. I want you to do your best in the amount of time given. You will be given 5 minutes to complete the task, at which point I will collect your answers and deliver them to the supervisors in the other room who will be evaluating your performance. Any questions? Please begin.

Return to the supervisors

HAND OUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SHEET (H), EVALUATION CRITERIA (G), AND THE TASK THE SUBORDINATES ARE PERFORMING (J).

Here is the task the subordinates will be performing and you will be evaluating. Your evaluation of the subordinate’s performance should be indicated on this evaluation form. I want you to rate quantity and quality of their performance on a scale from extremely below average to extremely above average. You are to base your evaluations on the criteria provided on the third sheet. These norms of management potential have been developed from other college students like you, completing the same task. Your evaluation should reflect where your subordinate stands in relation to the norms given to you on the sheet. Any
questions? Please look over this information until you receive the subordinate's performance data.

While you are waiting, please write a short description of your leadership abilities.

Return to the subordinates

***Collect the task results after the 10 minutes is up***

Now while you are waiting for the supervisor to evaluate your performance, please write a short description about your leadership abilities. You are given this to do because we want the supervisor to know more about you. While I’m gone, please do not talk. I’m going to deliver the results to the supervisors in the other room.

***Leave room and get bogus performance data- randomly assign each session to receive above average performance, or to receive average performance. Next, deliver it to the supervisors in the other room***

Return to the supervisors:

Here is the results of the MP task performed by the subordinates.

HAND OUT BOGUS PERFORMANCE DATA (J)

Please complete the rating form you have been looking over for the last few minutes. Remember, you are rating the subordinates performance against how other college students have done in the past. You get this information from the criteria sheet I gave you. Any questions? When you are finished, turn over your paper so I know when you are all done.

***When they are finished, make sure their seat # is on their evaluation, and it is complete.***

I’m going to bring your evaluations to the subordinates in the other room. After the subordinates look at their evaluations, they will be evaluating the accuracy of the information you provided about their performance. The subordinates will also fill out an impressions scale based on their perceptions of you. When the subordinates are finished, I will bring this scale back for you to look at. We get the subordinate's impressions of their supervisor because we are interested in how the mode of evaluation affects impression formation. At that time, I will ask you to fill out some questionnaires. While I’m gone, please do not talk, and write a short description of your leadership abilities. (Give same reason as above)
BRING COMPLETED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM TO THE SUBORDINATES

**Assign each subordinate the evaluation form of the supervisor in their corresponding seat (1-4)**
Here are the supervisor's evaluation of the task you just completed. I want you to look them over to see how accurate you think they are.

HAND OUT COMPLETED PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK (I)
***Collect evaluation form in 2 minutes***

HAND OUT DESCRIPTION OF SUPERVISOR (M)

I also asked the supervisors to write a short description of themselves while you were performing the task. Since most supervisors and subordinates in organizations know each other personally, I am providing you with this information to best approximate an organizational setting. The next phase of the experiment will involve filling out a questionnaire indicating your impressions of the supervisor.

***Collect in a few minutes***

HAND OUT SUBORDINATE'S IMPRESSIONS/ACCURACY RATING FORM (N)

Now I want you to fill out a form designed to measure your overall impressions of your supervisor. Please place the last 4 digits of your SS# on the sheet. We are also interested in how the mode of evaluation affects impression formation. These rating will be shown to your supervisor, so be as honest as you can. The reason we show the supervisor these ratings, is because we want them to know how well they communicated in the written form. Remember, this information will be shown to your supervisor in the other room, and it is helpful for them to know how they communicate, so be as honest as you can.

***Collect the form***

***HAND OUT RESULTANT ESTEEM QUESTIONNAIRE (O)***

Now the experiment is over, I'd like you to answer a few questions concerning the experiment and also fill out another questionnaire for the psychology department. The department is interested in how people feel after participating in psychology experiments. Again, we often help out fellow researchers by including surveys not relevant to our study at the end as well as the beginning. This is to ensure it does not interfere with our purposes here. You
don't have to put your name on this paper, just put your last 4 digits of your social security #. Collect all materials.

HAND OUT GENERAL PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING MANIPULATION CHECK (P)***
Please complete these questions about the experiment. I’ll be back in a few minutes to pick them up.

Return to supervisors

**Collect leadership description**

HAND OUT SUBORDINATE’S LEADERSHIP DESCRIPTION (L)
HAND OUT COMPLETED IMPRESSIONS SCALE (M)

Here are the impressions the subordinates formed of you during the experiment. We asked them to fill these out because we are interested in how supervisors are perceived by the subordinates. This information is for your own use, because we wanted you to know how well you communicated in written form. I’d like you to look over the impressions your partner had of you for a few minutes.

***Collect Impression scale****

HAND OUT THE SUPERVISOR GENERAL PERCEPTION FORM (S)

Now the experiment is over, I’d like you to answer a few questions concerning the experiment.

Return to the subordinates’ room and **Collect the GEN PERCEPTION QUEST***

Now I’m going to bring back the supervisors in the other room to debrief you all together. I’ll be back in a minute with the supervisors.

Return to the supervisors’ room

***Collect the GENERAL PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRES***

I’m going to take you into the other room and debrief you with the subordinates. (T)

ESCORT THEM BACK TO THE ORIGINAL ROOM

Now that I have you all together I’m going to tell you what we were looking for in this experiment. Hand out confirmation of debriefing form. Sign credit slips and dismiss the subjects.
APPENDIX E
PRIVATE PROTOCOL
Private Condition Protocol

Hello, my name is ' ' and I am a graduate student here in the Psychology Department. First, I’d like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

Before we get started, I’d like to tell you a little about the study. I think you’ll find it interesting; most people do. The purpose of this study is pretty straightforward. You may be familiar with Industrial/Organizational psychology from your intro course. Are you?

Well, industrial psychologists study how people act in organizations, and how organizations affect how people perform their particular job. I’m working with an applied psychology professor here and we are looking at the differences between receiving oral or written evaluations in the workplace. More specifically, we are looking at how supervisors and subordinates react to written versus orally transmitted information, and how this affects their relationship with one another. In order to do this, we are going to ask half of you to act as supervisors, and the other half to be subordinates. You as a group will either be assigned to the written or oral evaluation condition. To assess how people feel about the type of evaluation they receive, you will be asked to fill out questionnaires asking about your perceptions and feelings at different times during the experimental session.

Psychologists are just beginning to study how written and oral (face to face) evaluation affects people in organizations. To study this, we ask questions like how it makes them feel to receive a certain type of communication, how it affects their performance, and which type they prefer etc.

Most of us are quite aware that people who enjoy their work are generally more satisfied and perform better. I/O psychologists make a living studying how people feel about their job. They therefore wish to systematically study how evaluation mode, oral or written, affects how people feel about their job. They also wish to develop precise predictions of how these processes occur.

Tonight (today) we are going to ask you to pretend you are hired by an organization like AT & T, to be either a subordinate or supervisor. It is important that you act according to the role you will be assigned to at a later point in the experiment. The subordinates will perform a task, and the supervisors will be asked to evaluate the subordinate’s performance.
Besides evaluating the task, the supervisor will also be asked to provide the subordinate with some information about how they performed. These interactions will take place face to face in the oral condition, but on paper without face to face contact in the written condition.

All these procedures are trying to do is determine if written evaluation is more accurate than oral evaluation, and which type of evaluation is preferred by the subordinates. We make you interact as supervisors and subordinates to get you comfortable playing the role of supervisor or subordinate. This role playing makes the study more realistic so we can generalize to people in real organizations (like AT & T). This is why it is important to always stay in your role throughout the study.

Before we begin, I’m going to ask you to complete a questionnaire being used by another professor. We often include surveys not relevant to our research to help other professors out. If you have already filled out this form in another experiment, don’t worry about it, just fill it out again to be sure. We do this at the beginning so it won’t interfere with our purpose here. Please read the consent form I have given you, fill out the appropriate information, and answer the survey questions on the following pages.

HAND OUT CONSENT FORM (A), ROSENBERG SCALE (B), FLEMING/CRTNY (C)

***Wait until everyone is done and collect the materials***

Now we can begin with our study. First I will explain the task the subordinates will perform, and the supervisors will evaluate, then I will randomly assign half of you to each role: subordinate or supervisor.

HAND OUT EXAMPLE OF TASK TO EVERYONE (F)

***Explain task to all***
This task is designed to measure "management potential." Some people are going to be good at this task, meaning they have high MP, but others will not. Performance on this test will indicate how much of this ability you have. Any questions? Now I’m going to divide you into two groups. Does anyone here know each other?

(If anyone does, we have to make sure you are not paired up with someone you know. To do this, we have to make sure you are either both supervisors, or both subordinates. I will flip a coin to determine which group you will be in.)

Assign half of the subjects to be supervisors based on the
list of activities presented on their application to Tech. Since the last group was assigned to the oral evaluation condition, this group has been assigned to the written evaluation condition. To ensure that the only communication between the supervisors and subordinates is in the written form, the supervisors will be escorted to another room, while the subordinates will remain here. Remember, neither the supervisors, nor the subordinates will know with whom they are interacting in the other room.

Will all the supervisors please stand up and move to the door. I will take you to another room where you will wait for the subordinates to perform the task.

I will be back in a minute when I situate the supervisors in the other room.

***Escort the supervisors to the other room***
Please take a seat between the dividers. I’ll be back in a few minutes to explain the rest of your instructions.

Return to the subordinates

HAND OUT TASK (F)

Now, I’m going to give you a task very similar to the one I explained a few minutes ago. I want you to do your best in the amount of time given. You will be given 5 minutes to complete the task, at which point I will collect your answers and deliver them to the supervisors in the other room who will be evaluating your performance. Any questions? Please begin.

Return to the supervisors

HAND OUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SHEET (H), EVALUATION CRITERIA (G), AND THE TASK THE SUBORDINATES ARE PERFORMING (J).

Here is the task the subordinates will be performing and you will be evaluating. Your evaluation of the subordinate’s performance should be indicated on this evaluation form. I want you to rate quantity and quality of their performance on a scale from extremely below average to extremely above average. You are to base your evaluations on the criteria provided on the third sheet. These norms of management potential have been developed from other college students like you, completing the same task. Your evaluation should reflect where your subordinate stands in relation to the norms given to you on the sheet. Any questions? Please look over this information until you receive the subordinate’s performance data.
While you are waiting, please write a short description of your leadership abilities.

Return to the subordinates

***Collect the task results after the 10 minutes is up***

Now while you are waiting for the supervisor to evaluate your performance, please write a short description about your leadership abilities. You are given this to do because we want the supervisor to know more about you. While I’m gone, please do not talk. I’m going to deliver the results to the supervisors in the other room.

***Leave room and get bogus performance data—randomly assign each session to receive above average performance, or to receive average performance. Next, deliver it to the supervisors in the other room***

Return to the supervisors:

Here is the results of the MP task performed by the subordinates.

HAND OUT BOGUS PERFORMANCE DATA (J)

Please complete the rating form you have been looking over for the last few minutes. Remember, you are rating the subordinates performance against how other college students have done in the past. You get this information from the criteria sheet I gave you. Any questions? When you are finished, turn over your paper so I know when you are all done.

***When they are finished, make sure their seat # is on their evaluation, and it is complete.***

I’m going to bring your evaluations to the subordinates in the other room. After the subordinates look at their evaluations, they will be evaluating the accuracy of the information you provided about their performance. The subordinates will also fill out an impressions scale based on their perceptions of you. When the subordinates are finished, I will bring this scale back for you to look at. We get the subordinate’s impressions of their supervisor because we are interested in how the mode of evaluation affects impression formation. At that time, I will ask you to fill out some questionnaires. While I’m gone, please do not talk, and write a short description of your leadership abilities. (Give same reason as above)

BRING COMPLETED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM TO THE SUBORDI-
**Assign each subordinate the evaluation form of the supervisor in their corresponding seat (1-4)**

Here are the supervisor's evaluation of the task you just completed. I want you to look them over to see how accurate you think they are.

HAND OUT COMPLETED PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK (I)

***Collect evaluation form in 2 minutes***

HAND OUT DESCRIPTION OF SUPERVISOR (M)

I also asked the supervisors to write a short description of themselves while you were performing the task. Since most supervisors and subordinates in organizations know each other personally, I am providing you with this information to best approximate an organizational setting. The next phase of the experiment will involve filling out a questionnaire indicating your impressions of the supervisor.

***Collect in a few minutes***

HAND OUT SUBORDINATE'S IMPRESSIONS/ACCURACY RATING FORM (N)

Now I want you to fill out a form designed to measure your overall impressions of your supervisor. Please place the last 4 digits of your SS# on the sheet. We are also interested in how the mode of evaluation affects impression formation. These rating will NOT be shown to your supervisor, so be as honest as you can. The ratings are for experimental use only. Remember, this information will NOT be shown to your supervisor in the other room, and it is helpful for us, so be as honest as you can.

***Collect the form***

***HAND OUT RESULTANT ESTEEM QUESTIONNAIRE (O)***

Now the experiment is over, I'd like you to answer a few questions concerning the experiment and also fill out another questionnaire for the psychology department. The department is interested in how people feel after participating in psychology experiments. Again, we often help out fellow researchers by including surveys not relevant to our study at the end as well as the beginning. This is to ensure it does not interfere with our purposes here. You don't have to put your name on this paper, just put your last 4 digits of your social security #. Collect all materials.
HAND OUT GENERAL PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING MANIPULATION CHECK (P)***
Please complete these questions about the experiment. I’ll be back in a few minutes to pick them up.

Return to supervisors

**Collect leadership description**

HAND OUT SUBORDINATE’S LEADERSHIP DESCRIPTION (L)

***Collect leadership description****

HAND OUT THE SUPERVISOR GENERAL PERCEPTION FORM (R)

Now the experiment is over, I’d like you to answer a few questions concerning the experiment.

Return to the subordinates’ room and

**Collect the GEN PERCEPTION QUEST***

Now I’m going to bring back the supervisors in the other room to debrief you all together. I’ll be back in a minute with the supervisors.

Return to the supervisors’ room

***Collect the GENERAL PERCEPTIONS QUESTIONNAIRES***

I’m going to take you into the other room and debrief you with the subordinates. (T)

ESCORT THEM BACK TO THE ORIGINAL ROOM

Now that I have you all together I’m going to tell you what we were looking for in this experiment. Hand out confirmation of debriefing form. Sign credit slips and dismiss the subjects.
APPENDIX F

WORK RELATED PROBLEM SOLVING TASK
Directions: Read the scenarios given below. In the space below each question, list as many alternative solutions to the problem you can think of. Make sure you generate ideas for all scenarios. If you cannot think of any alternatives for a scenario, indicate that in the space provided.

1) You have a deadline to produce 1000 units of output by Friday at 5:00. It is now Wednesday afternoon, and you have 250 units to go. You must meet this deadline or you will lose the account. What alternatives are available to meet the production deadline?

Example Alternatives:

1- Have everyone work mandatory overtime
2- Have voluntary overtime
3- Subcontract production to another division/company
4- Try to negotiate for a later deadline
WORK RELATED PROBLEM SOLVING TASK
ASSESSMENT OF MANAGEMENT ABILITY

Directions: Read each of the scenarios given below. In the space below each question, list as many alternative solutions to the problem you can think of. Make sure you generate ideas for all scenarios. If you cannot think of any alternatives for a scenario, indicate that in the space provided.

1) A co-worker comes to you, and accuses another co-worker of stealing money from the cash register. What alternative solutions can you think of to solve this problem?

2) Your subordinate has called in sick twice a week for the past month. His performance has also declined. What alternatives can you think of to solve the absenteeism problem?

3) An employee is constantly coming to work intoxicated. You are concerned with the safety of the employee and his/her coworkers. What alternatives do you have to ensure the employee does not endanger himself or fellow coworkers?

4) You have just found out that an employee has AIDS. Employees have complained to you that they don’t want to work with this person. Generate alternatives to deal with this problem.

5) A subordinate asks you for a raise because she has another, better paying job offer. She is a good performer, but you don’t have enough money in the budget for a raise. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this situation?

6) A co-worker is constantly late for work, and asks you to cover for her during early hours. What alternatives are available to deal with this tardiness problem?

7) A subordinate has confided in you that another supervisor (the same level as you) is falsifying records. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this problem?

8) A married couple works in your department. They are fighting at work, and it is disturbing others. What alternatives do you have to stop the fighting?
APPENDIX G

EVALUATION NORMS
QUANTITY OF ALTERNATIVES LISTED FOR EACH SITUATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) If the subordinate listed 0 - 1 alternatives for each situation, assign them the QUANTITY performance rating of LOW.

2) If the subordinate listed 2 alternatives for each situation, assign them the QUANTITY performance rating of MODERATELY LOW.

3) If the subordinate listed 3 alternatives for each situation, assign them the QUANTITY performance rating of AVERAGE.

4) If the subordinate listed 4 alternatives for each situation, assign them the QUANTITY performance rating of MODERATELY HIGH.

5) If the subordinate listed 5 or more alternatives for each situation, assign them the QUANTITY performance rating of HIGH.
APPENDIX H

EVALUATION WORK SHEET
EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS

1. Count the number of alternatives generated on each scenario of this task. Place these #'s on the work sheet provided.

2. Add this total number up in the space provided on the work sheet.

3. Divide this number by 8 to get an average number of alternatives generated for the entire task.

4. Compare the average number of alternative generated by the subordinate against the following norms derived from undergraduate students who have completed the WRPST.

5. Assign a QUANTITY evaluation to the subordinate’s performance, and fill it in on the evaluation sheet.

******************************************************************************

EVALUATION WORK SHEET

Number of alternatives for question 1 __________
Number of alternatives for question 2 __________
Number of alternatives for question 3 __________
Number of alternatives for question 4 __________
Number of alternatives for question 5 __________
Number of alternatives for question 6 __________
Number of alternatives for question 7 __________
Number of alternatives for question 8 __________

Total number of alternatives generated ________

Divide the # above by 8 ________

Average # of alternatives ________

Compare this # against the norms provided on the instructions sheet to get a QUANTITY of alternatives rating.
APPENDIX I

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM (BOGUS)
Based on your performance on the Work Related Problem Solving Task (WRPST) which assesses management potential, you have received the following ratings.

Based on norms determined by how other undergraduates performed on this task, your supervisor has given you the following rating for Quantity of alternatives listed:

QUANTITY OF ALTERNATIVES LISTED:

Quantity is determined by: Average number of alternatives listed.
APPENDIX J

BOGUS TASK PERFORMANCE
Directions: Read each of the scenarios given below. In the space below each question, list as many alternative solutions to the problem you can think of. Make sure you generate ideas for all scenarios. If you cannot think of any alternatives for a scenario, indicate that in the space provided.

1) A co-worker comes to you, and accuses another co-worker of stealing money from the cash register. What alternative solutions can you think of to solve this problem?

1- Interview both workers separately
2- Ask other coworkers about the situation
3- Do nothing
4- Call the police

2) Your subordinate has called in sick twice a week for the past month. His performance has also declined. What alternatives can you think of to solve the absenteeism problem?

1- Call the subordinate into your office and ask why they are absent
2- Suggest employment counselling
3- Fire the worker
4- Warn the worker once, and then fire the employee

3) An employee is constantly coming to work intoxicated. You are concerned with the safety of the employee and his/her coworkers. What alternatives do you have to ensure the employee does not endanger himself or fellow coworkers?

1- Suspend until the employee "dries up"
2- Call them into your office and ask why he is doing this
3- Fire the employee
4- Do nothing
5- Warn once and fire if it happens again
6- Suggest seeing a counsellor
4) You have just found out that an employee has AIDS. Employees have complained to you that they don’t want to work with this person. Generate alternatives to deal with this problem.
1- Consult the company lawyer about legal rights
2- Fire the inflicted worker
3- Do nothing
4- Transfer the worker to another section
5- Institute an information seminar about AIDS

5) A subordinate asks you for a raise because she has another, better paying job offer. She is a good performer, but you don’t have enough money in the budget for a raise. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this situation?
1- Deny the raise, explaining that you don’t have the money
2- Deny the raise with no explanation
3- Say when the money becomes available you’ll think about it
4- Say you’ll talk to your superiors
5- Fire her for asking for a raise

6) A coworker is constantly late for work, and asks you to cover for her during early hours. What alternatives are available to deal with this tardiness problem?
1- Try to find out why she’s late
2- Say you’ll cover this time but not next time
3- Talk to her supervisor about it
4- Do nothing

7) A subordinate has confided in you that another supervisor (the same level as you) is falsifying records. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this problem?
1- Do nothing
2- Confront the colleague
3- Go to a supervisor
4- Try to get more proof
5- Report it to the police

8) A married couple works in your department. They are fighting at work, and it is disturbing others. What alternatives do you have to stop the fighting?
1- Suggest both transfer to different departments
2- Fire both of them
3- Suggest seeing a company counsellor
4- Talk to both workers together to try and solve the problem
BOGUS POOR PERFORMANCE

WORK RELATED PROBLEM SOLVING TASK
ASSESSMENT OF MANAGEMENT ABILITY

Directions: Read each of the scenarios given below. In the space below each question, list as many alternative solutions to the problem you can think of. Make sure you generate ideas for all scenarios. If you cannot think of any alternatives for a scenario, indicate that in the space provided.

1) A co-worker comes to you, and accuses another co-worker of stealing money from the cash register. What alternative solutions can you think of to solve this problem?

1- Interview both workers separately
2- Ask other coworkers about the situation

2) Your subordinate has called in sick twice a week for the past month. His performance has also declined. What alternatives can you think of to solve the absenteeism problem?

1- Call the subordinate into your office and ask why they are absent
2- Suggest employment counselling
3- Fire the worker

3) An employee is constantly coming to work intoxicated. You are concerned with the safety of the employee and his/her coworkers. What alternatives do you have to ensure the employee does not endanger himself or fellow coworkers?

1- Suspend until the employee "dries up"
2- Call them into your office and ask why he is doing this
3- Suggest seeing a counsellor

4) You have just found out that an employee has AIDS. Employees have complained to you that they don't want to work with this person. Generate alternatives to deal with this problem.

1- Consult the company lawyer about legal rights
2- Institute an information seminar about AIDS
5) A subordinate asks you for a raise because she has another, better paying job offer. She is a good performer, but you don’t have enough money in the budget for a raise. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this situation?

1- Deny the raise, explaining that you don’t have the money
3- Say when the money becomes available you’ll think about it

6) A coworker is constantly late for work, and asks you to cover for her during early hours. What alternatives are available to deal with this tardiness problem?

1- Try to find out why she’s late
2- Say you’ll cover this time but not next time

7) A subordinate has confided in you that another supervisor (the same level as you) is falsifying records. What alternatives are available to you to deal with this problem?

1- I cannot think of anything to do

8) A married couple works in your department. They are fighting at work, and it is disturbing others. What alternatives do you have to stop the fighting?

1- Suggest both transfer to different departments
2- Suggest seeing a company counsellor
APPENDIX K

ACTUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
Based on your performance on the Work Related Problem Solving Task (WRPST) which assesses management potential, you have received the following ratings.

Based on norms determined by how other undergraduates performed on this task, your supervisor has given you the following rating for **Quantity of alternatives listed**:

**QUANTITY OF ALTERNATIVES LISTED:**

Quantity is determined by: Average number of alternatives listed.

---

Based on your supervisor’s experience in managerial and supervisory positions, he has given you the following rating for **Quality of alternatives listed**:

**QUALITY OF ALTERNATIVES LISTED:**

Quality is determined by:
- Originality of alternatives generated
- Feasibility of implementation in an organization
- Diversity of alternatives listed etc.

---

Reasons for giving the following ratings:
APPENDIX L

DESCRIPTION OF SUBORDINATE’S LEADERSHIP ABILITIES
SUBORDINATE'S LEADERSHIP ABILITIES

Hand Written by a male

In high school I was very active in the student government organization. In fact, I was treasurer for 2 years. I really enjoyed planning school functions, and think I was pretty good at getting my ideas implemented. Some of the activities I planned included: the senior prom, the senior/faculty volleyball game, and various fund raising events.

Since I've been at Tech I have not been as active as I was in high school. I do hope to join some clubs next quarter, and possibly a fraternity. Overall, I feel I have average leadership abilities in some situations, but not in others.
APPENDIX M

DESCRIPTION OF SUPERVISOR’S LEADERSHIP ABILITIES
SUPERVISOR'S LEADERSHIP ABILITIES

Hand Written by a male

In high school I was very active in the student government organization. In fact, I was vice-president for 2 years. I really enjoyed planning school functions, and think I was pretty good at getting my ideas implemented. Some of the activities I planned included: the senior prom, the senior/faculty volleyball game, and various fund raising events.

I feel I have had some management experiences in the past. For instance I had an internship last summer at a major newspaper in my hometown. I worked in the circulation department and supervised a number of workers. I also was a part-time night manager at a store in the mall. I worked there all through high school.

Since I've been at Tech I have not been as active as I was in high school. I do hope to join some clubs next quarter, and possibly a fraternity. Overall, I feel I have average leadership abilities in some situations, but not in others.
APPENDIX N

INFORMATION ACCURACY/IMPRESSIONS OF SUPERVISOR FORM
INFORMATION ADEQUACY RATING FORM

For the questions below, please circle the number that best describes how you feel.

(1) How accurate do you think your evaluation was?
not at all 1 2 3 4 5 very accurate

(2) How satisfied are you with your written evaluation?
not at all 1 2 3 4 5 very much satisfied

(3) Do you prefer written communication more than oral communication?
prefer written 1 2 3 4 5 prefer oral

(4) How enjoyable is it to receive written communication?
not at all 1 2 3 4 5 very enjoyable

(5) What type of rating did you receive from your supervisor?
negative 1 2 3 4 5 positive

SUBORDINATES IMPRESSIONS OF SUPERVISOR EVALUATION FORM

My impression of my supervisor in this study is that he or she seemed: (Note: higher numbers mean greater agreement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interesting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleased</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insightful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

RESULTANT SELF-ESTEEM QUESTIONNAIRE
AFFECT ASSESSMENT INVENTORY

List three words that describe what feelings you are having right now. For example, "lonely" and "affectionate" are words that describe feelings people can have.

1. 
2. 
3. 

After completing this page, please do not turn back to it.
Resultant Self-Esteem Questionnaire

Please circle the number on the scale which best represents how you feel right now. Work quickly. Do not dwell on any single item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. competent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. confident</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. boastful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. inadequate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. effective</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. self-centered</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. egotistic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. incompetent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. efficient</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. pride</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. smart</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. shame</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. worthless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. resourceful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. conceited</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. stupid</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P

SUBORDINATE'S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS FORM
DESIGN 1a MANIPULATION CHECK
SUBORDINATE'S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

For the following questions, please circle one number that best characterizes how you feel.

(1) How good an impression do you feel you made on your supervisor?
   not at all good
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(2) How good an impression did your supervisor make on you?
   not at all good
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(3) How difficult was the task?
   not at all difficult
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(4) How hard did you try at the task?
   tried very hard
   tried very little
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(5) How well do you think you performed on the task?
   not at all well
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(6) How enjoyable did you find receiving the written communication about your performance?
   not at all enjoyable
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(7) How accurate were your supervisor's ratings of you?
   not at all accurate
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(8) How much do you like your supervisor?
not at all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(9) How good do you feel about yourself?
not at all
good
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(10) How would you rate your general mood now, as opposed to when you entered the room prior to the experiment?
much worse
about the
same
much worse
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(11) If you received feedback, how positive, or negative was it?
very negative
neutral
very positive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(12) How accurate was the supervisor’s evaluation of your performance?
not at all
accurate
very accurate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(13) How likely is it that your supervisor will see your ratings of him or her?
not at all
likely
very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(14) How likely is it that your supervisor will know exactly who completed the ratings of him or her?
not at all
likely
very likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(15) Who filled out the "performance evaluation form" rating your performance?

the experimenter          your supervisor          do not know

(16) What was your role in the study?

subordinate            supervisor            do not know

(17) What was the main purpose of this study?

(18) Were there any other purposes that you can think of? If so, what were they?
APPENDIX Q

SUPERVISORS' IMPRESSIONS FORM
SUPERVISORS' IMPRESSIONS FORM

For the questions that follow, please circle the number that best describes how you feel.

(1) As a supervisor, would you like this person to continue working for you?

like to 1 2 3 4 5  like to continue working
discontinue working

(2) How much do you like this person as a subordinate?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very much

(3) How do you like to give written communication?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very much

(4) How adequate do you feel your written communication was?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very adequate
adequate

(5) How informed do you think this person is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very informed
informed

(6) How intelligent do you think this person is?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very intelligent
intelligent

(7) How highly would you recommend hiring this person to fellow supervisor?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very highly
highly

(8) How easy is this person to work with?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5  very easy
easy
APPENDIX R

SUPERVISOR'S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS FORM
NO INFORMATION CONDITION MANIPULATION CHECK
SUPERVISOR’S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

For the questions that follow, please circle the number that best describes how you feel.

(1) As a supervisor, would you like this person to continue working for you?

like to continue working
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(2) How much do you like this person as a subordinate?

not at all very much
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(3) How much do you like this person as a friend?

not at all very much
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(4) Do you like to give written communication?

not at all very much
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(5) How accurate do you feel your written communication was?

not at all very accurate
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(6) How informed do you think the subordinate is?

not at all very informed
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(7) How intelligent do you think this subordinate is?

not at all very intelligent
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(8) How highly would you recommend hiring this subordinate to a fellow supervisor?

| not at all | very  
| highly    | highly |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(9) How easy do you think this person would be to work with?

| not at all | very  
| easy      | easy  |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(10) How difficult was the task?

| not at all | very  
| difficult | difficult |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(11) How difficult was evaluating the performance?

| not at all | very  
| difficult | difficult |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(12) How well did the subordinate perform on the task?

| not at all | very  
| well      | well  |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(13) How hard did the subordinate try to perform the task?

| not at all | very  
| hard      | hard  |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(14) How would you rate your subordinate’s performance skills?

| not at all | very  
| skilled   | skilled |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

(15) How much do you like your subordinate?

| not at all | very  
| much      | much  |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |
(16) How much do you think your subordinate likes you?

not at all  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(17) How good do you feel about yourself?

not at all  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(18) How would you rate your general mood now, as opposed to when you entered the room prior to the experiment?

much worse about the same much better  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(19) If you gave feedback, how positive, or negative was it?

very negative neutral very positive  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(20) How likely is it that your subordinate will see your ratings of him or her?

not at all likely  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(21) How likely is it that your subordinate will know exactly who completed the ratings of him or her?

not at all likely  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(22) What was your role in this study?

subordinate supervisor do not know

(23) What was the main purpose of this study?

(24) Were there any other purposes that you can think of? If so, what were they?
APPENDIX S

SUPERVISOR’S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS FORM
INFORMATION CONDITION MANIPULATION CHECK
SUPERVISOR'S GENERAL PERCEPTIONS

For the questions that follow, please circle the number that best describes how you feel.

(1) As a supervisor, would you like this person to continue working for you?

like to like to
discontinue continue
working working
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(2) How much do you like this person as a subordinate?

not at all very much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(3) How much do you like this person as a friend?

not at all very much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(4) Do you like to give written communication?

not at all very much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(5) How accurate do you feel your written communication was?

not at all very accurate
accurate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(6) How informed do you think the subordinate is?

not at all very informed
informed
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(7) How intelligent do you think this subordinate is?

not at all very intelligent
intelligent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(8) How highly would you recommend hiring this subordinate to a fellow supervisor?

not at all highly
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(9) How easy do you think this person would be to work with?

not at all easy
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(10) How difficult was the task?

not at all difficult
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(11) How difficult was evaluating the performance?

not at all difficult
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(12) How well did the subordinate perform on the task?

not at all well
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(13) How hard did the subordinate try to perform the task?

not at all hard
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(14) How would you rate your subordinate’s performance skills?

not at all skilled
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(15) How much do you like your subordinate?

not at all much
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(16) How much do you think your subordinate likes you?
(17) How good do you feel about yourself?

not at all  very
   good

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(18) How enjoyable was receiving the subordinate’s perceptions of you?

not at all  very
   enjoyable

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(19) How much do your subordinate’s ratings of you match how you would rate yourself?

not at all  very much

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(20) How accurate were your subordinate’s impressions of you?

not at all  very
   accurate

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(21) How would you rate your general mood now, as opposed to when you entered the room prior to the experiment?

much  about the  much
worse  same  better

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(22) If you gave feedback, how positive, or negative was it?

very  neutral  very
negative  positive

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
(23) How likely is it that your subordinate will see your ratings of him or her?

not at all  very likely
likely
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

(24) How likely is it that your subordinate will know exactly who completed the ratings of him or her?

not at all  very likely
likely
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

(25) What was your role in this study?

subordinate  supervisor  do not know

(26) What was the main purpose of this study?

(27) Were there any other purposes that you can think of? If so, what were they?
APPENDIX T

CONFIRMATION OF DEBRIEFING
CONFIRMATION OF DEBRIEFING

In this study, there was more to it than I told you at the beginning. This is often necessary in certain experiments. We do not tell participants the full purpose at the beginning because this might affect the way people act, and would not be an indication of every day life.

Now I would like to explain what we are trying to get at in this study. Actually, what we are really interested in how people react to different types of evaluations from others.

To be a bit more particular, each person who participates in this study is randomly assigned to one of two conditions. Good performance (GP) or Bad performance (BP). The subordinate performed the task, but the supervisor never saw their actual performance. Every supervisor received fake performance data that was either GP or BP. Those of you who were supervisors, remember the performance data you looked at? So you were randomly assigned (by a flip of the coin) to the GP or BP condition.

So this experiment has involved some deception. You probably thought, that the performance data you looked at was real and that your subordinate actually performed in that way. This is a very normal response. We pretested this study a lot to make sure people would believe it. So the performance data you based your evaluation on was not based on your subordinate at all. In fact, one-half of the people in this study got performance data that was identical to yours, while the other half got data that was opposite to yours.

Now, the subordinates must understand that the feedback they received was not based on their performance at all, but rather based on the condition they were assigned to GP or BP. Once again, this was done randomly.

In some conditions in the study, the subordinate’s impressions were shown to the supervisors (public), and in the other conditions they were not (private). If this group was assigned to the private group, rest assured that the supervisor never saw your ratings. If you were in the public condition, we showed the impressions to the supervisor. Remember that the impressions form the subordinate’s filled out after receiving GP or BP were influenced by the type of feedback they received, which was randomly decided. Therefore, the subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor did not have anything to do with the supervisors personally, but were based on evaluations about performance, which were fake, and unrelated to the subordinates performance.

Some people come away from this sort of study with a negative feeling about psychology experiments. Well, we don’t always pull the wool over people’s eyes. But sometimes it is necessary. One thing we are most adamant in avoiding is you feeling worse because of being in the
experiment. We have found in the past that sometimes people who receive negative feedback feel worse even when they realize later that the feedback was false. This is because the negative feedback may put them in a bad mood. So, if you got negative feedback, I'd like you to take a moment and look at this performance data sheet, which is the one assigned to people in the positive conditions, and think about how you would feel if you received it.

Before you go, I want you to realize the purpose of this study in a bit more depth. Let me tell you a little about the significance of this research and why all this is necessary. You've probably guessed by now that we are not interested in how written or oral evaluation affects supervisor-subordinate relationships. Actually, we are interested in how people react to negative feedback, that is how they react to people thinking they did not perform well. After you received the feedback, you were asked to complete some questionnaires. We are interested in differences in how you viewed yourself depending upon the feedback you received. We are interested in the effects of GP and BP ratings on self-esteem, or how you define yourself.

In addition, we were interested in how you would react to the supervisors who rated your performance was good versus not-so-good. We asked you to evaluate your partner after you received the ratings. Our hypothesis is that you would have rated the subordinate less favorably when his or her performance was supposedly poor rather than good. Not all people react this way. But on the average, that is what we are hypothesizing. We are also interested in how the supervisor reacts to subordinates who have good and bad impressions of them, which is similar to receiving negative or positive feedback.

So let me tie all this together. We were interested in how people react to positive and negative evaluations from others. This research, as you may have guessed, has lots of applications to the study of interpersonal relationships in organizations. What we might find is that people tend to be resilient to criticism from others. So if someone criticizes you, you may just reject them back and then not feel any worse about yourself. But those who might accept the criticism, and not reject their partner, might feel worse. This is one of the many possible things that might happen in this study.

If you are interested in the results of this study, please feel free to contact us in about 10 weeks. This is when we should be done with the study. We also ask that you not talk about the true purpose of this study with anyone who might participate. If you did, and someone was familiar with it, then it would probably lead to an invalid study.

Thank you very much for participating in this study.
I understand that the feedback I received in this study was bogus and that it was necessary in order to study the phenomenon of interest to the experimenter. In addition, I agree not to discuss the procedures and hypotheses of this study for at least ten weeks with anyone who might participate, or know someone who might participate.

Signed: _____________________________

Date: ______________________________
APPENDIX U

SUMMARY TABLES FOR DESIGN 1a MANIPULATION CHECKS
Table U-1

Summary of ANOVA for Subordinates’ Performance Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>225.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
### Table U-2

**Summary of ANOVA for Subordinates' rating of Feedback**

**Valence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>772.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>530.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>133.88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>914.11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05  
** P < .01
Table U-3

Summary of ANOVA for Subordinates' rating of Evaluation

Publicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>549.40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>658.76</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
APPENDIX V

SUMMARY TABLES FOR DESIGN 1a DEPENDENT VARIABLES
Table V-1
Summary of Factor Loadings for Subordinates' ratings of the Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Likableness</th>
<th>Insight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insightful</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained By Each Factor
2.95 % 2.52 % 2.34 %
Table V-2

Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor (all subjects included)

Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>60.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>141.95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214.92</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .09

** p < .01
Table V-3
Mean Subordinates’ Ratings of Supervisor Competence: by Subordinate Self-esteem, Feedback, and Response Publicity (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5.93a</td>
<td>6.73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.02b</td>
<td>7.35ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of subjects in each condition.
Table V-4
Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor (all suspicious subjects removed)

Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>94.89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159.16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table V-5
Mean Subordinates' Ratings of supervisor Competence: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, & response publicity (all suspicious subjects removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.38a</td>
<td>6.68a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.28b</td>
<td>7.29ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table V-6
Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor (all subjects included)

Likableness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>97.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>172.80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277.16</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table V-7
Mean Subordinates' Ratings of supervisor Likableness: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the \( p < .05 \) level of significance.
Table V-8
Summary of ANOVA for subordinate's ratings of the supervisor (all suspicious subjects removed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>96.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>120.34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227.36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table V-9
Mean Subordinates' Ratings of supervisor Likableness: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, & response publicity (all suspicious subjects removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the $p < .05$ level of significance.
Table V-10

Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor (all subjects included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>133.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>275.38</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422.69</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .06

**p < .01
Table V-11
Mean Subordinates’ Ratings of Supervisor Insight: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.64a</td>
<td>5.64a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7.77b</td>
<td>6.92ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.32a</td>
<td>4.68a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.46b</td>
<td>7.54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the $p < .05$ level of significance.
Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of the supervisor (all suspicious removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>124.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>195.63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>332.56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
Table V-13
Mean Subordinates' Ratings of Supervisor Insight: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, & response publicity (all suspicious subjects removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table V-14
Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of resultant self-esteem (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>114.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146.64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table V-15

Mean Subordinates’ Ratings of Resultant Self-Esteem by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3.90a (11)</td>
<td>5.33b (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.03bc (14)</td>
<td>4.31c (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5.05b (13)</td>
<td>5.55b (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40b (12)</td>
<td>5.74b (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the $p < .05$ level of significance.
Table V-16

Summary of ANOVA for subordinate’s ratings of resultant self-esteem (all suspicious subjects removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Esteem (E)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity of Reaction (P)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x P</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x P</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113.31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table V-17
Mean Subordinates’ Ratings of Resultant Self-Esteem: by subordinate self-esteem, feedback, & response publicity (all suspicious subjects removed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>3.86 (9)</td>
<td>5.11 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5.27 (10)</td>
<td>5.26 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the \( p < .05 \) level of significance.
Table V-18

Correlations between Subordinates Resultant Self-Esteem and Subordinate Ratings of Supervisor Competency: by condition (subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05

** p < .01

Correlations with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table V-19
Correlations between Subordinates Resultant Self-Esteem and Subordinate Ratings of Supervisor Likableness: by condition (subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.14a</td>
<td>.18a</td>
<td>.81**b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05
** p < .01

Correlations with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table V-20
Correlations between Subordinates Resultant Self-Esteem and Subordinate Ratings of Supervisor Insight: by condition (subordinate self-esteem, feedback, and response publicity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
<td>Response Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.00a</td>
<td>.56a</td>
<td>.72**b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05
** p < .01
Correlations with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
APPENDIX W

SUMMARY TABLES FOR DESIGN 1b MANIPULATION CHECKS
Table W-1

Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors Rating of Performance Evaluation given to the Subordinate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>95.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction (K)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>294.59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408.52</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
APPENDIX X

SUMMARY TABLES FOR DESIGN 1b DEPENDENT VARIABLES
Table X-1
Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors' Ratings of "How informed is the Subordinate" (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>142.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's Reaction (K)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>413.45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>576.19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table X-2
Mean Supervisors’ Ratings of "How informed the subordinate is": by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
### Table X-3
Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors’ Ratings of Subordinate Intelligence (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction (K)</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x P</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>146.74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211.36</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01
Table X-4
Mean Supervisors’ Ratings of subordinate Intelligence: by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate’s reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td>Info.</td>
<td>No Info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table X-5

Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors' Ratings: "Would you like this person to continue work for you"?
(all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>57.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction (K)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>237.25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304.59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table X-6
Mean Supervisors' Ratings of subordinate: "Would you like this person to continue work for you"? by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate's reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Reaction</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.50 6.75</td>
<td>6.73 5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) (12)</td>
<td>(11) (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.07 8.30</td>
<td>8.18 7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) (10)</td>
<td>(11) (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table X-7
Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors' Ratings of "How highly would you recommend hiring this subordinate to a fellow supervisor"? (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>46.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's Reaction (K)</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>181.18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253.71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

** p < .01
Table X-8
Mean Supervisors' Ratings of subordinate: "How highly would you recommend hiring this person to another supervisor"? by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate's reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the $p < .05$ level of significance.
Table X-9
Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors' Ratings of "How easy do you think this person would be to work with?"
(all subjects included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's Reaction (K)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>193.58</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
Table X-10
Mean Supervisors' Ratings of subordinate: "How easy do you think this person would be to work with"? (all subjects included) by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate's reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table X-11

Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors' Ratings of "How much do you like the supervisor"? (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction (K)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>224.40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295.35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
Table X-12
Mean Supervisors' Ratings of subordinate: "How much do you like the subordinate?" by supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate's reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td>Info.</td>
<td>No Info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the $p < .05$ level of significance.
Table X-13
Summary of ANOVA for Supervisors’ Ratings of Resultant Self-Esteem (all subjects included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Esteem (E)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (F)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Subordinate’s Reaction (K)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x K</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x K</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x F x K</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>128.03</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129.48</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
Table X-14

Mean Supervisors’ Ratings of Resultant Self-Esteem by Supervisor self-esteem, feedback, & knowledge of subordinate’s reaction (all subjects included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative 5.36 (14)</td>
<td>5.19 (12)</td>
<td>5.13 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive 5.12 (14)</td>
<td>5.27 (10)</td>
<td>5.34 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. High numbers indicate more agreement with the item. Means with common letters, for each item, do not differ at the p < .05 level of significance.
Table X-15
Correlations between Subordinates' Ratings of supervisor (Likable) and Supervisor ratings of Subordinate within the Information and no Information Conditions by Feedback Valence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Subordinate's Reaction</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>No Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's Rating of</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to Work with</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for Hiring</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease to Work with</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking of Subordinate</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05
** p < .01
Table X-16
Correlations between Subordinates Ratings of supervisor (Competence) and Supervisor ratings of Subordinate within the Information and no Information Conditions by Feedback Valence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Subordinate’s Reaction</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>No Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Rating of</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to Work with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for Hiring</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease to Work with</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking of Subordinate</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05
** p < .01
Table X-17

Correlations between Subordinates Ratings of supervisor (Insight) and Supervisor ratings of Subordinate within the Information and no Information Conditions by Feedback Valence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor’s Rating of</th>
<th>Knowledge of Subordinate’s Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to Work with</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation for Hiring</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease to Work with</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking of Subordinate</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05  
** p < .01
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