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Abstract

The purpose of this set of studies was to investigate the linkage between interpersonally just or unjust behavior on the part of a supervisor and the perception of referent, coercive, and legitimate power as perceived by subordinates. It was proposed that lower levels of interpersonal justice on the part of a supervisor would result in the perception that the supervisor possessed a greater degree of coercive power and a lower degree of referent power. It was furthermore proposed that, consistent with prior research, referent power would be positively related to task commitment; coercive power would be positively related to reactance; and legitimate power would be positively related to compliance. Additionally, the personality variable of Social Dominance Orientation was proposed as a moderator of the relationships between interpersonal justice and power perception; and between power perception and commitment, compliance, and reactance.

Two studies were used to test the hypotheses. The first study utilized a correlational design and asked participants to rate a past or current supervisor in terms of the supervisor’s justice behavior and power and regarding the participant’s behavioral and attitudinal reactions. The second study manipulated interpersonal justice in written scenarios involving a supervisor and subordinate and asked the participants to rate the supervisor’s power and to predict the subordinate’s reactions. The justice manipulations utilized had a basis in politeness theory.

The main effects hypothesized regarding interpersonal justice, power perception, and subordinate reactions were supported. There was minimal support for any of the hypotheses proposing Social Dominance Orientation as a moderator of the relationships
investigated. However, the results did indicate that positive and negative politeness as described in politeness theory are highly related to interpersonal justice.

The results indicate a strong relationship between interpersonal justice, power perception, and employee reactions. However, future research is warranted to validate the current findings and extend them to more diverse populations, as well as to investigate other possible individual difference variables which may affect the relationships between these variables. Suggested future research is discussed, as are implications for theory and practice.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Statement of the Problem
Modern management theory and research informs us that employees are more committed to their work when they are treated with dignity and respect, a concept now known as interpersonal justice (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). Nevertheless low interpersonal justice seems to be a continuing problem in the modern workplace. Johnson and Indvik (2001) report that as many as 20% of workers are verbally harassed by their managers, so the prevalence of mere disrespect and assaults on dignity are most likely even higher. Interpersonal justice has been linked to important outcomes such as turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Cohen-Charish & Spector, 2001). One must then ask the question, why does low interpersonal justice continue to be such a widespread problem?

Low interpersonal justice may take the form of rude or berating behaviors towards an individual (Bies, 1985; Bies, 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986). The resulting perception of low interpersonal justice will likely lead to negative outcomes that will affect the supervisor; nevertheless, many supervisors engage in such behaviors. When a behavior continues to occur, despite having deleterious consequences, it implies there may be some real, or imagined, benefits of the behavior (Emans, Lourdes, Klaver, & Van de Vliert, 2003; Thorndike, 1933). In terms of interpersonal justice, it may be the case that some people associate rude and low interpersonal justice behavior with high levels of power (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990; Tedeschi, 1994). In this case, when a supervisor behaves disrespectfully, this could result in others perceiving the supervisor as powerful, which may be the impression the supervisor is hoping to produce (Raven, 1992; Schopler & Layton, 1972). This perception could then also lead to an increase in short-term compliance with requests made in this manner, thus reinforcing the behavior in the short
term. Indeed, Ferris et al. (2007) suggest that some politically skilled managers intentionally use “strategic bullying” with selected employees to increase their own reputed power and gain short term compliance. Unfortunately, humans are often more sensitive to short-term effects than long-term ones (Platt, 1973). In fact, there may be concomitant negative long term effects of threatening, low-interpersonal justice coercive behavior (Benfari, Wilkinson & Orth, 1986; Warren, 1968). For example, when subordinates feel forced into doing something this may result in “reactance”, a term coined by Brehm (Brehm, 1966; Brehm & Brehm, 1981) to describe a person’s desire to resist a request or order that seems to undermine his or her freedom.

Publicizing the deleterious effects of low interpersonal justice has not eliminated it, so perhaps in order to reduce it, it is necessary to learn more about its causes and effects. Those who are using low interpersonal justice to signal power and in the hopes of getting compliance may be able to learn that more respectful behavior could lead to longer term commitment of employees to tasks, which is preferable to mere compliance (Mossholder, Bennet, Kemery & Wesolowksy, 1998). Therefore it is one purpose of the current study to explore the relationship between interpersonal justice, power, and employee reactions. Specifically, how is the level of interpersonal justice with which one is treated by a supervisor related to the nature of the power one ascribes to the supervisor, and how does the perceived power of one’s supervisor in turn relate to compliance, reactance and commitment?

Interpersonal justice has been studied within the framework of organizational justice, which also examines the importance of other types of fair treatment in the workplace, such as the fairness of outcomes. Much of the work on organizational justice
has been criticized as lacking adequate theory (Greenberg, 1993a). The current literature on interpersonal justice often does not delve into the mechanisms through which justice affects work attitudes and performance. It also rarely looks into the personality moderators which may influence the nature of these effects. Lastly, much of the literature on interpersonal justice lacks integration with existing literature on related topics. Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) deals with constructs that appear to overlap with interpersonal justice, and it provides a richer theoretical background concerning the underlying processes as well as providing details about exactly what elements serve to make a request appear polite or impolite. Nevertheless, less than a handful of studies on interpersonal justice even mention politeness theory. Thus, another aim of the current study is to explore the relationship between interpersonal justice and politeness and to examine the influence of individual differences in attitudes towards power on reactions to interpersonal justice. According to politeness theory, relative power and attitudes towards power play a key role in how people go about making requests and how the target reacts to these requests.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature
Although interpersonal justice is a relatively recent construct (Colquitt, 2001), theory and research on power has a long history. Thus the next section will begin with a summary of the relevant research on power bases, followed by a review of influence tactics, a more behaviorally observable construct, and a discussion of how influence tactics may affect the perception of power. This section is followed by a discussion of how power and politeness perceptions may affect each other, and the relationship between the constructs of interpersonal justice and politeness. Next, outcomes associated with power and interpersonal justice are discussed. Lastly, individual differences are considered that may moderate the relationships between interpersonal justice, power, and outcomes.

**Power and Power Bases**

Power has been defined as the ability to bring about desired outcomes (Vecchio, 2007; Yukl, 2002). Although dictionary definitions of power tend to imply the use of force and punishments, research on power has shown that there are actually several varieties of power. French and Raven (1959), in a seminal work, divided power into five main types: coercive, reward, legitimate, referent and expert. Coercive power refers to the ability to punish and reward power to the ability to give rewards; legitimate power refers to the authority a person has to give orders; expert power refers to the possession of a superior level of relevant knowledge; and referent power is held by those whom others want to emulate. French and Raven also originally discussed a sixth type, informational power, based on control of information needed by others, but this construct has been combined with expert power in nearly all subsequent literature (Percy, 1996). The ability to bring about desired outcomes makes power of paramount importance for a leader.
However, the bases of power that one employs to bring about these outcomes are also important for the long-term success of a leader. Expert and referent power are usually associated with positive outcomes such as subordinate satisfaction and performance (Shetty, 1978; Slocum 1970); correlations of these outcomes with legitimate, reward, and coercive power are less consistent, and often found to be negative or non-significant (Slocum, 1970; Yukl, 2002).

The power bases have sometimes been separated into position power, which stems from someone’s hierarchical rank; as opposed to personal power bases, which derive more from aspects of the individual (Kipnis, 1972; Koslowsky, Scwarzwald, & Ashuri, 2001; Shetty, 1978). Coercive and reward power are generally classed as positional power bases; expert and referent power are generally classed as personal power bases (e.g. Rahim, Anonioni, & Senaka 2001 in Corzine 2005). Legitimate power is classified as a positional power base by most researchers (Yukl & Falbe, 1991) but is sometimes admitted to be something that may depend as much on the personality of the perceiver as it does on the behavior and position of the powerholder (Percy, 1996; Wexley & Snell, 1987; Yukl, 2002). Use of and reliance on personal power bases tends to be related to more positive outcomes (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Falbe, 1991). Personal power may be more inherently kept in check, because it is reliant on respect from subordinates which would likely be lost by supervisors who abuse their power (Yukl, 2002).

Several researchers have found relationships between the power bases, although the results of different studies have not always been consistent (Aguinas, 1994; Gaski, 1986). Kipnis (1976) suggests that in most circumstances, powerholders will only resort
to reward or coercive power when the target is not expected to perform an action and when simply talking to the target is not expected to be sufficient to bring about the desired result; thus the use of reward or coercive power may imply a deficiency in the other power bases such as expert, legitimate, and referent. Warren (1968) found a positive relationship between coercive and reward power, and between expert and referent power. This coincides well with the frequent grouping of expert and referent power as personal power bases and with coercive and reward power as positional power bases.

In the traditional conception, power is something someone “has”, as opposed to referring directly to something one does. Although the types of power a person has may affect his or her behavior (Kipnis, 1972; Tedeschi, 2001), there is not a perfect relationship. For example, having the ability to punish people does not mean that one necessarily goes around threatening people with punishments; in fact a reputation for having such power may make threats unnecessary (Brass & Burkhardt, 1993; Koslowsky, Schwarzwald & Ashui, 2001). In a study by Sheley and Shaw (1979), when participants knew the leader had reward power, they worked harder when the leader applied the rewards, but when participants knew the leader had coercive power, they worked harder when the leader refrained from using punishments. In this study participants were made aware of the types of power possessed by the leader, but outside the lab power can often only be inferred indirectly, based on reputation or behavior.

**Influence Tactics and the Perception of Power**

In order to deal more directly with observable behaviors, many researchers have relied on the concept of influence tactics: the methods one uses to “get their way”
Influence tactics include such things as threats, bargaining, ingratiation, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, forming coalitions, and appealing to a higher power (Yukl, Chavez & Seifert, 2005). Some have referred to power bases as potential or “resting” power (Kipnis, 1972), and influence tactics as “power in motion” or “kinetic power” (Raven, 1965).

Nevertheless, some researchers measure influence tactics by simply asking people what power bases are relied on to influence people. Note that the term influence here refers to causing someone to perform an action, and the degree of influence is sometimes referred to as the likelihood a person will perform an action in the presence of a certain influence attempt minus the probability the person would have performed the action in the first place (Schopler & Layton, 1972). However, except in the case of an isolated incident and a simple behavior, there are generally more possible outcomes of interest of an influence attempt than simply whether or not the person performs the action (Sussman & Vecchio, 1982). Yukl and Falbe (1991) identified three outcomes of influence attempts: resistance, compliance, and commitment. Resistance occurs when the person refuses to perform, or avoids performing, the action. Compliance occurs when the person performs the action but without enthusiasm. Commitment occurs when the person performs the action whole-heartedly. Warren (1968) likewise distinguishes between outward compliance, such as carrying out required policies; as compared to attitudinal commitment, agreeing with these policies; and attitudinal shifts, agreeing more with policies than one did before a relevant influence attempt.

Considerable research has been done linking influence tactics, and combinations of tactics, to outcomes (e.g. Bachman, Smith & Slesinger, 1966; Koslowsky,
Schwarzwald & Ashuri, 2001). The influence tactics are often divided into hard tactics (for example, punishment and pressure, upward appeal, coalitions), soft tactics (for example, ingratiation, inspirational appeals, bargaining), and rational tactics (such reasoning, Brass & Burkhardt, 1993; Yukl & Falbe, 1991). Evidence suggests that rational tactics are often the most successful at producing commitment (Yukl, 2002); that hard tactics more often lead to resistance and mere compliance (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Tracey, 1992); and that the proper choice of tactics in a particular situation depends on elements of the situation such as the relative power of the target of the influence tactic and the need for a continued positive relationship with the target person (Kipnis, 1972; Yukl, 2002).

Because power itself is often not directly observable, people may make inferences about power bases by observing the influence tactics used. Hinkin and Schriesheim (1990) asked employed undergraduates how their supervisor influenced them and for their perception of the power available to the supervisor. Rational tactics were positively associated with legitimate, expert, and referent power and were the most commonly used tactics. Assertiveness (a hard tactic) was positively associated with coercive power and negatively associated with expert and referent power. Upward appeal (obtaining intervention from someone at a higher organizational level) and sanctions were negatively related to expert, legitimate and referent power but not related to reward or coercive power and were the least used tactics. Ingratiation, offers of exchange, and coalitions did not have any significant relationship to perceived power bases.

The use of a single type of influence tactic may affect perceptions regarding multiple power bases. Goia and Sims (1983) showed management students videotapes
where supervisors delivering performance appraisals that emphasized either rewards or punishments. Emphasis on reward behavior resulted in higher ratings on reward, expert and referent power, and lower levels of legitimate and coercive power. When punishment was emphasized in the videotaped behavior, this was associated with lower perceived levels of reward, expert and referent power and with higher levels of legitimate and coercive power. In a related study, the researchers videotaped actual performance appraisals; coders rated the behaviors of the managers, and the actual subordinates rated the power exercised. The pattern of correlations between behaviors and power bases were similar to those in the videotape study.

Litman-Adizes, Fontaine and Raven (1978) examined the effect of power use in simulated scenarios in which supervisors tried to get their subordinates to change the way a procedure was carried out. The competence ratings of the supervisors were highest when they used information and referent power and lowest when they used coercive power. Thus the use of referent and coercive power bases affected the expert power of the supervisor, which is based on knowledge and expertise. Supervisors were also liked better after the use of referent, reward, information, and expert power, and the least following the use of coercive power. Because referent power is based on liking, the use of other power tactics which might affect the liking of supervisors results in changes to referent power as well.

**Power and Politeness**

Different influence tactics and power bases are also related to interpersonal justice and politeness. Certain influence tactics are generally interpreted as being more polite, and thus more interpersonally just, than others. Likewise, certain levels of interpersonal
justice and politeness may be seen as signifying different types and levels of power.

Although interpersonal justice and politeness are not the same construct, they appear to be closely related. Therefore, the existing research and theory regarding the relationship between politeness and power may be very relevant to understanding the relationship between interpersonal justice and power as well.

Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987) suggests that making requests and giving criticism represent Face Threatening Acts or “FTA’s”. These acts may threaten the target’s sense of esteem (“positive face”) and autonomy (“negative face”—the ability to refuse a request or order). According to this theory, being “polite” means acting to reduce these threats, thus helping others to save face.

In order to reduce threats, a person making requests may employ negative politeness strategies in order to reduce the imposition on the target’s autonomy, thus reducing negative face threats. The requestor may also engage in positive politeness strategies, in order to reduce the threat to the target’s sense of esteem, thereby reducing positive face threats. Politeness theory spells out specific methods that may be used, such as “going off record” (making a request indirectly, a form of negative politeness often rated as extremely polite, such as hinting someone get the mail by asking “Do you think the mail came yet?”); acknowledging the imposition and giving the target person an option to decline (“I know you’re busy and you can totally say no but do you think you could possibly…?”); and offering friendliness, praise and utilizing an informal attitude, a form of positive politeness which resembles the ingratiating and personal appeals tactics (“Hey, we’re good friends, so … ”). In terms of politeness theory, threats and other “hard tactics”, such as direct orders, would be considered high in threats to autonomy and thus
low in negative politeness. The theory spells out specific linguistic forms that may be used and the politeness rankings usually associated with them (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990). The use of negative politeness usually increases perceived politeness of requests the most, because the use of positive politeness may backfire and be perceived as false and manipulative if it is not based on an ongoing positive relationship between the people involved (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990).

The relationship between power and politeness is often proposed to be bidirectional (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990). Having more power may lead to the powerholder becoming less polite (Holtgraves & Yang, 1992). Conversely, when impolite requests are made, the requestor is thought to be more powerful than when the same requests are made more politely. Schopler and Layton (1972) suggest that people who want to be perceived as powerful will tend to use demands, directives and threats rather than hints and requests. Because this type of manner tends to be perceived as rude, the suggestion is that people will behave less politely in order to be perceived as more powerful. Moreover, Jessmer and Anderson (2001) found that written email messages with impolite wording caused the sender to be perceived as having more power than when polite wording was used. Similarly, Holtgraves and Yang (1992) had participants read scenarios where the same requests (such as getting the mail and switching work shifts) were presented with different wordings. When the wordings associated with lower degrees of politeness were used, the person making the request was rated as more powerful.

Several studies have also found support for this relationship from the position of the person making the request and not just the person receiving the request. Holtgraves and Yang (1992) found that people predicted they would use less polite behaviors when
in a position of greater relative power. Likewise, in a study by Baxter (1984), participants read scenarios and chose which tactics they would be likely to use in informing another student in a group project that work needed to be redone. The participant was to imagine himself as the team leader, able to grade the team (thus presumably high on reward, coercive and legitimate power), or merely a team member. The possession of more reward, coercive and legitimate power led to the choice of less polite tactics.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that increased power makes a powerholder less attentive to others’ emotions, less inhibited, and more likely to see others as a means to one’s own ends (e.g. Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003). Thus increased power can lead to increased displays of aggression, rudeness, and disrespect. Those with power are more likely to intrude on someone else’s personal space and even to engage in rude nonverbal behaviors such as speaking with a full mouth (Ward & Keltner, 1998, cited in Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003).

Similarly, in a study by Morand (1996), participants were told they would be dealing with someone two levels below or above them in hierarchical rank, and asked to role play Face Threatening Acts (FTA’s) such as interrupting to ask about a meeting location or requesting to use a phone already in use by another person. Those in a lower power position were more likely to avoid performing the FTA completely or to go "off record" (be very indirect), and were rated more polite overall by coders. Those in higher power position were more likely to make the request baldly (using a direct order) and also were more likely to use positive politeness strategies, like being very familiar and slurring words. Thus, position power affected the level of politeness and types of politeness strategies participants employed.
Because people tend to behave more politely when they have less power and less politely when they have more power, they may make the inference that people whom they observe are also following similar rules. Thus, they may perceive those who behave less politely as possessing more power. It is likely that the relationships that have been found to exist between power and politeness also extend to the relationships between power and interpersonal justice, because politeness and interpersonal justice appear to be overlapping constructs.

**Politeness and Interpersonal Justice**

In industrial/organizational psychology, constructs related to politeness have more frequently been investigated under the related rubrics of interpersonal and interactional justice. These constructs grew out of research on fairness and justice in organizations, an area of research now known as organizational justice. While studying issues regarding fairness in organizations and reactions to negative events, researchers discovered that the manner in which people were treated interpersonally was very important in determining their reactions to these events (Greenberg, 1993b). Reactions to events such as layoffs (Tyler, 2001), pay cuts (Greenberg, 1993c), and smoking bans (Greenberg, 1994) were very much affected by the manner in which the decisions were conveyed to employees. In addition to affecting people’s attitudes, the fairness of the interpersonal treatment also affected behavioral reactions such as, in the case of layoffs, intentions to pursue legal action on the part of those who were fired and turnover intentions on the part of the remaining employees (Tyler, 2001). The terms interactional and interpersonal justice were coined to describe the fairness and quality of the personal interactions in an
organization, as opposed to the fairness of the procedures (procedural justice) or to the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice).

Interpersonal justice (Colquitt et al., 2001) refers specifically to the degree of dignity, respect and politeness with which one is treated and the degree to which an authority figure refrains from improper remarks and comments. Until recently, interpersonal justice was grouped with informational justice, the fairness of information received, into the umbrella category of interactional justice, and some researchers still group the two together as interactional justice. Other researchers, such as Bies, distinguish between interpersonal justice and interactional justice (Bies, 2001). (Within this document the terms interactional and interpersonal will be used interchangeably, because the current research is concerned more generally with the respect with which people feel they are treated rather than how the sharing of information may affect this perception.) Like politeness, interpersonal justice has been said to send a signal about one’s value and position in the social order (Bies, 2001; Bies & Moag, 1986; Tyler, 2001).

Interpersonal justice theory conceptually has a great deal of overlap with politeness theory and thus they appear to be related constructs, if not part of the same overarching construct, although politeness theory has been studied largely in the areas of communications and linguistic psychology by a different set of researchers than those studying justice. Politeness is an important aspect of interpersonal justice. In fact, one of the most accepted measures of interpersonal justice is Colquitt’s four-item measure (2001), and out of the four items in this scale, one deals specifically with politeness. Likewise, Bies (2001) also describes rudeness as one aspect of interpersonal injustice.
Moreover, Tyler (2001) describes being treated with dignity and respect as important in communicating to people their status within the group and helping people maintain self-esteem and self-worth, a description very similar to the face-saving aspects of politeness theory.

Moreover, the literature on politeness theory often discusses the components of interpersonal justice, specifically the dignity and respect with which people are treated (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990). In addition, politeness literature sometimes discusses the use of explanations, which Bies (2001) describes as an aspect of the consideration portion of interactional justice. Because politeness theory and interactional justice theory have complementary strengths for the purpose of the current study it will be assumed that much of what has shown to be true of politeness is also true for interpersonal justice and vice versa. However, strictly speaking as measured, “politeness” is a single component of interpersonal justice and may not always include all of its other components. Positive politeness, focusing on esteem, also appears to be closer to the construct of interpersonal justice than negative politeness. Negative politeness focuses on the notion of autonomy, an element that has not thus far been central to interpersonal justice theory.

Research on interpersonal justice itself has focused on measurement of the construct (e.g. Colquitt, 2001; Roch & Shanock, 2006) and its relationship to other forms of justice and to organizational outcomes (e.g. Colquitt et al., 2001). However, politeness theory and research has followed a different path. Rather than focusing on the consequences of politeness, politeness theory has focused on its antecedents. On the linguistic side, politeness theory has spelled out and investigated explicitly the way that statements and requests can be stated in polite and impolite manners and the ways that
very small changes in wording and even body language may affect the perception of politeness (LaPlante, 2001). Therefore, the literature from the politeness arena can be used to inform interpersonal justice research and practice by helping to suggest specific wording that can be used to make requests more polite and thus more interpersonally just.

Furthermore, although organizational justice research often neglects individual difference variables (Greenberg, 2001), politeness theory does not. Research on politeness theory has confirmed several universals in politeness perception, but it has also investigated important moderating variables that vary individually as well as cross-culturally. Unlike interpersonal justice research, however, politeness research has not developed or validated extensive measures of politeness itself, most often measuring politeness as a dependent variable with a simple one-item scale. Although research in the politeness arena has dealt with how relative power affects the politeness of requests made and the perception of politeness, research on politeness tends to measure and define power as a unidimensional construct rather than breaking power down into the individual power bases as defined by French and Raven. Research on politeness has also infrequently focused on the attitudinal and behavioral consequences of different levels of politeness and different types of power. However, luckily these relationships have been investigated in organizational psychology, under the rubrics of organizational justice and social power. Findings support a positive relationship between interpersonal justice and organizational outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2001). The relationship between power and outcomes is more complex.
Power, Compliance, and Commitment

Although being perceived as powerful at first glance seems like a good thing for a supervisor, some types of power may actually be more harmful than helpful in the long run. Wexley and Snell (1987) performed a longitudinal field study in a department store, using sales managers and their subordinate salespeople. In phase one, three months before their performance appraisal, salespeople rated their manager's power bases using a French and Raven type model. In Phase two, the manager and subordinates participated in performance appraisal sessions and subordinates answered surveys about the sessions. Three months after the sessions, the managers rated how much the subordinates had tried to improve. The subordinate reactions to performance appraisal were rated in terms of participation, criticism, goal setting, and career development. It seems very likely some of these measures would correlate well with interpersonal justice measure. For example, the criticism scale included a question "My sales manager insulted me during the performance appraisal interview”, which fits with Bies’s (2001) conceptualization of interactional justice. Subordinates were also asked about the accuracy of the feedback and their motivation to improve. Because of the high intercorrelations among reward, referent and expert power, these were combined into one measure of "positive" power. This composite measure of positive power related positively with goal setting, career development, reactions to feedback accuracy, and motivation to improve, and negatively with criticism. Coercive power negatively correlated with goal setting, subordinate reactions about the accuracy of feedback, and motivation to improve. Legitimate power did not significantly correlate with the process measures, but it correlated positively with accuracy and self-rated motivation to improve. Interestingly, only perceptions of
legitimate power correlated significantly with the manager's rating of subordinates’ efforts to improve. The authors suggest that subordinates who perceived their manager as having the right to make requests felt obligated to comply, regardless of how the performance appraisal was carried out. In summary, coercive power was associated with several negative attitudinal outcomes; a composite of reward, referent and expert power (“positive power”) was associated with positive attitudinal outcomes; and legitimate power was associated with fewer positive attitudinal outcomes than positive power but more associated with supervisor-rated efforts to improve, indicating that legitimate power may have a complex set of outcomes.

Other studies have also found organizational outcomes to be related to the use of different power bases. Bachman, Smith and Slesinger (1966), in a study of salesmen and their managers, found positive relationships at the group level between compliance based on reward and expert power and outcomes such as job satisfaction and performance; for coercive and legitimate power, the relationship to these outcomes was negative. Rahim (1989) found that expert, referent and legitimate power were all positively associated with compliance, but coercive power was negatively associated with satisfaction, whereas the satisfaction-power relationship was positive for expert and referent power. Thus coercive and legitimate power may reduce satisfaction even though they increase compliance.

Kelman (1958) performed a now-classic study on the relationship between power bases and attitude change. During the civil rights movement, an important issue arose regarding whether after desegregation, some all-black colleges should continue to exist for the benefit of the students and their heritage. Kelman performed the study among
black students, who were previously found to be generally against the policy. Students were presented with recordings of a radio show with a guest speaking in favor of the policy. The speaker was either represented as having coercive/reward power, referent power; or expert power. Control conditions were also used involving speakers without any such power. After hearing the show, students were surveyed on their opinions in various conditions. In the “high surveillance” condition, students were told the expert would be aware of the survey results and students had to sign their names to the surveys. In the other conditions, the surveys were anonymous. In one condition referred to as “low salience”, the survey was not given immediately after hearing the broadcast but at a later date and interspersed with other questions. As hypothesized, students exposed to the coercive/reward power manipulation reacted with more positively to the policy in the high vs. low surveillance conditions, suggesting that they were compliant rather than committed to the professed attitude. Students exposed to the expert power base manipulation were equally positive regardless of the level of surveillance or salience, seemingly because they had internalized the new attitude and become convinced of its correctness. Students exposed to the referent power manipulation showed positive attitudes in the high salience conditions, regardless of surveillance, but a decrease in the low salience condition, attributed by Kelman to their attitude change being due to personal identification with the speaker, which disappeared when the speaker was no longer salient, rather than internalization of the attitude. Students exposed to the low power speaker displayed no differences in their attitudes across questionnaire conditions and were generally less positive towards the policy. Thus, in this study, coercive power resulted in behavioral compliance without long-term commitment; expert power resulted
in commitment as well as compliance; and referent power resulted in compliance and commitment but the commitment was short-lived.

In another study on power and compliance, Shaw and Condelli (1986) asked participants to rate likely outcomes after the use of different power bases. As compared to other power bases, the use of coercive power was rated as likely to result in requiring surveillance to make sure the request was carried out, less likely to induce private acceptance, and to result in less ability of the powerholder to use power in the future. Similarly, Litman-Adizes, Fontaine and Raven’s (1978) study with simulated scenarios found that people were most likely to change their private opinion about a method after an influence attempt based on information power (which is related to expert power), and least likely if coercive or legitimate power was used. In this study, supervisors were trying to get subordinates to change from using an old work method to using a new one. Those taking the role of subordinates actually rated the new work method as worse than the original method when coercive or legitimate power was employed, perhaps due to reactance. Participants also rated the likelihood of employing the new method at a new job (after surveillance from the original supervisor had ended). Once again, information power was predicted to lead to the most continued compliance with no surveillance, whereas legitimate and coercive power were least likely to be effective under those circumstances.

Thus, based on a variety of studies, expert and referent power are often associated with positive outcomes. Coercive power is often associated with negative outcomes. The outcomes resulting from reward and legitimate power are of a more complex nature.
In addition to behavioral outcomes, power may also be related to perceptions of justice, but the relationship between power and justice has not been examined directly in many studies. One exception is a study by Mossholder et al. (1998) that did examine the relationship between perceived power bases and procedural justice. Correlations of power with procedural justice were significantly positive for expert, legitimate, and referent power and negative for coercive power. Although Mossholder et al. suggest that procedural justice plays a mediating role between power and attitudinal outcomes, they also suggest that the actual process may be different and that experiments would be useful in determining the chain of causality. The current study addresses these issues by investigating directly the relationship between interpersonal justice, power perceptions, and outcomes using both cross-sectional and experimental methods.

**Moderators of the Interpersonal Justice-Power-Commitment Relationship**

Another missing element in many studies of interpersonal justice is the effect of individual difference variables. Individuals’ expectations about how a superior should (and should not) behave also influence how interpersonally just and how powerful a person seems to be (Bond, Wan, Kwok & Giacalone, 1985). For example, if one expects a superior to be direct and decisive and to make unilateral decisions, behavior fitting this mold may be perceived as polite, interpersonally just and worthy of admiration (referent power). If on the other hand one expects a more democratic leader, the same behavior could be perceived as rude (Bond et al., 1985), low on interpersonal justice and low in referent power. Individual difference variables are also infrequently examined in studies concerning reactions to different power bases and may be one reason why findings regarding reactions to several of the power bases are not always consistent.
The belief that strong hierarchies should exist may also affect the relationship between interpersonal justice and power. Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth and Malle (1994) studied this individual difference variable, which they call Social Dominance Orientation and which they describe as the preference for social relations as superior-inferior as opposed to equal. This construct is related to but distinct from authoritarianism, as the latter was conceived as more indicative of clinical disorders and unresolved childhood problems (Pratto et. al., 1994). Durieza and Van Hielb (2002) also have described Social Dominance Orientation as a more modern form of authoritarianism.

People high in Social Dominance Orientation support the existence of hierarchies between groups. Thus they may be more likely to infer a higher level of overall power based on lower levels of interpersonal justice. Those high in Social Dominance Orientation have also been found to support punitive “law and order” policies such as the death penalty (Pratto et. al., 1994). Therefore, they may see coercive power as more of an essential aspect of power. Additionally, because they view coercion and hierarchical behavior as appropriate, they may not necessarily perceive certain behaviors from their supervisor as low in interpersonal justice, even though others with lower levels of Social Dominance Orientation might take offense at the same behavior. Thus, compared to those lower in Social Dominance Orientation, they may be more committed to their tasks under high levels of coercive power.

To date, not many studies have directly investigated the relationship between Social Dominance Orientation and power perceptions. However, it may be possible to draw inferences based on the more developed literature regarding a related construct, power distance.
Hofstede (1984) coined the term “power distance” to refer to how much it is expected that power is distributed unequally. Originally, the term was used to distinguish between the dominant modes of different countries and cultures, but there have also been found to be meaningful individual differences in power distance between members of the same country or culture (Jung & Kellaris, 2006). Reactions to different sorts of behavior may be more related to a person’s own view of power distance than the broader one ascribed to the culture from which the person comes.

For example, Jung and Kellaris (2006) examined reactions to advertising scenarios among French and American students. The scenarios featured a person describing a product and recommending it based on personal experience; in some scenarios the person making the recommendation was of a “higher” level (boss, parent, teacher), and in others the person was of the same or lower level (subordinate, daughter, student). For those with high power distance, the “higher” level person was associated with better reactions, but those with low power distance had a more negative attitude (and to a lesser extent, purchase intentions) when the ad featured a higher level person. In sum, the lower the power distance, the more negative the reaction to an influence attempt based on position power.

Dorfman and Howell (1988) used samples of workers in Mexico and Taiwan, where power distance is typically high. For workers who subscribed strongly to their culture’s values, positive outcomes (like satisfaction with supervision and commitment) were associated with directive leadership, contingent reward and contingent punishment; on the other hand, for those who were low in this type of national association, the relationships between positive outcomes and these leadership behaviors were negative or
non-significant. Thus, once again, reward and coercive power were associated with positive outcomes for those with high power distance, but the relationship was negative or non-existent for those low on power distance.

A few studies have examined power distance and politeness specifically. Holtgraves and Yang (1992) asked participants to describe how they would make requests. They manipulated the relative position power of the target of the request, who was described as either a professor, a fellow college student, or a grade school student. Participants used more polite strategies when making a request of someone with more power, but the power effects were greater for Koreans, from a high power distance culture, than for Americans, from a lower power distance culture. In other words, people from a high power distance culture have a greater tendency to vary their politeness depending on the power level of the person they are trying to influence.

Because people with high power distance are more likely to adjust the politeness of their requests based on their relative power, those with high power distance may be more likely to infer a higher level of power in a target who behaves with lower levels of politeness and interpersonal justice. Thus, it appears that power-distance moderates the relationship between the interpersonal justice of the requests one makes and the power one is perceived to have; the relationship is stronger for those high in power distance. This suggests that similar moderating relationships may also exist for Social Dominance Orientation.
Chapter 3

Hypotheses
The current study addresses the relationship between interpersonal justice, power perception, task commitment/compliance/reactance, and individual attitudes towards power. It is hypothesized that lower levels of interpersonal justice are associated with perceptions of higher levels of certain types of power. Even though supervisors who treat subordinates with low interpersonal justice may be perceived as having more of certain types of power, these may not be the types of power that result in task commitment, except perhaps among individuals who are strongly supportive of power imbalances.

**Referent Power**

Referent power exists when the target person feels a similarity to the powerholder or sees this person as a role model. According to politeness theory, one way of being perceived as polite, positive politeness, involves emphasizing similarities between the subject and target of the request, and making the target feel esteemed. Mossholder et al. (1998) also described referent power as leading subordinates to feel personally accepted, which is similar to the esteem aspect of politeness. Thus politeness, and by extension interpersonal justice, should be positively associated with referent power.

In terms of interpersonal justice theory, people are perceived as behaving in an interpersonally just way when they are polite and treat the target with dignity and respect. Because justice sends a signal about one’s place in the social order (Bies, 2001), refraining from improper remarks and comments should reduce the distance between the target and subject, thus increasing referent power. Benfari, Wilkinson and Orth (1986) suggest that treating people respectfully is an important part of building referent power. In addition, most people tend to like people better who are polite (Jessmer & Anderson, 2001) and have more of a tendency to want to be like that person. Seeing a person as a
role model is one of the bases of referent power. Thus, being treated in an interpersonally just manner may lead the recipient of the treatment to feel that the person treating them in this manner has referent power.

Hypothesis 1a: A person who is perceived to behave with more interpersonal justice will be perceived as possessing more referent power.

Though there is a supposition that most people would want to feel close to the leader and want to model themselves on a polite leader, in some cases this may not be true. If a person believes that large differences between groups are acceptable, as is the case for those high in Social Dominance Orientation, the personal closeness aspect of referent power and positive politeness may not be as important. In fact, if one subscribes to the idea that there should be large differences between people in different hierarchical levels, things which would reduce the distance between powerholder and target, such as positive politeness, might backfire. Although little research on this specific topic has been done with regard to the construct of Social Dominance Orientation, Social Dominance Orientation is similar to power distance in that they both are related to support of differences between groups; therefore some of the findings related to power distance have relevance to Social Dominance Orientation. White, Tanksy, and Baik (1995) found that students with a higher power distance perceived less interactional injustice in a scenario in which a teacher was rude to a student wanting to meet and discuss a grade. Likewise Bond et al. (1985) found that although low-power distance participants found insulting remarks to be rude regardless of the power position of the person making the insults, those high in power distance considered such insults much less rude when made by a boss. Thus, it is likely also the case that behavior which low Social
Dominance Orientation individuals may view as rude is likely to reduce referent power; for those high Social Dominance Orientation, the same exact behavior on the part of a superior may not reduce the referent power of the authority figure and may not even be perceived as rude in the first place.

Those high in Social Dominance Orientation subscribe to the belief that some groups are just better than others and that we should not try so hard to make everyone seem equal, whereas those low on this personality trait believe more strongly in equality between groups. Thus, it seems logical that people high on Social Dominance Orientation would react differently to being treated as somewhat “lowly” by an authority figure than those low in Social Dominance Orientation. Those low in Social Dominance Orientation are more likely to be offended by what they would perceive as disrespectful treatment and see that person as less of a role model. Thus, those low in Social Dominance Orientation should be less likely to perceive people who behave disrespectfully as role models, thus reducing referent power because referent power is in part based on seeing the target as a role model. Indeed, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) state that Social Dominance theory is predicated on the idea that hierarchies are maintained in part by the deferential and obsequious behavior of subordinates. People in “lowly” groups who are high on Social Dominance Orientation may subscribe to the negative stereotypes regarding their own group, and therefore may not react as negatively to mistreatment from higher groups. Additionally, people high in SDO are more likely to engage in workplace bullying themselves (Parkins, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006), so disrespectful behavior would not necessarily cause them to see others who act in a disrespectful manner as inappropriate role models.
Hypothesis 1b: The relationship between interpersonal justice and the referent power of a supervisor is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. The relationship will be stronger among those low in Social Dominance Orientation than those relatively high in Social Dominance Orientation.

Because supervisors with referent power are trusted and seen as role models, subordinates should be more internally motivated and committed to carry out the requests of supervisors with referent power. Previous literature supports this connection (Kelman, 1958; Shetty, 1978; Slocum, 1970; Yukl, 2002).

Hypothesis 1c: The perceived referent power of a supervisor is positively related to the task commitment of the subordinate.

Although people high and low on Social Dominance Orientation may tend to see different types of people as role models and thus may ascribe referent power to different sorts of people, there is thus far no reason to believe there is a difference in the relationship between referent power and commitment for people differing in Social Dominance Orientation. Therefore no moderating relationship between referent power and commitment is hypothesized.

**Coercive Power**

When a powerholder has coercive power, the powerholder can punish others and can make people’s lives unpleasant. In terms of politeness theory, a reliance on punishment would tend to decrease the target’s sense of autonomy and thus would be low on negative politeness because negative politeness acts to decrease threats to one’s autonomy (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Thus, coercive power should be negatively related to politeness and thus negatively related to interpersonal justice. Bies (2001) also
associates coercion with low interactional justice. In addition, Kipnis (1976) states that the use of coercive power is often associated with depersonalization of the target, the sort of loss of dignity and respect that is often associated with low interpersonal justice. He suggests that those who have access to coercive power will tend to use it. Those who use coercive power will tend to devalue the target and view the target with less respect, feeling that any good performance of the target is due to the powerholder’s influence rather than the target’s ability and internal motivation. The relationship may also be bidirectional and even circular, with supervisors utilizing more coercive power on those subordinates they feel lack internal motivation. Kipnis (1972) suggests that when a target complies after the use of coercive power and strong tactics, the target is seen as an object, an “it”, rather than an active and equal person. Likewise, Warren (1968) describes coercive power as functioning in atmospheres involving close supervision and low professionalism. Litman-Adizes, Fontaine and Raven (1978) also found that subordinates and supervisors report less liking for each other after a simulated use of coercive power and that the resulting compliance is attributed more to the will of the supervisor than the worker.

The fact that the powerholder can punish the target would tend to emphasize differences between the target and the powerholder, thus resulting in low positive politeness and by extension low interpersonal justice. Those holding coercive as opposed to reward power have reported feeling disliked by subordinates (Kipnis, 1976), and Kipnis (1972) reports that the use of this type of tactic does indeed often result in dislike for the powerholder. Warren (1968) likewise associates coercive power with indifference, at best, towards the authority figure. The use of coercive power (and hard influence
tactics) has been shown to be associated with lower levels of perceived procedural justice. In turn, people with higher degrees of coercive power have been found to show less concern for propriety (Ward & Keltner, 1998 in Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). Kipnis (1972) suggests that agents use coercive power more frequently with those they dislike and see as dissimilar to themselves, because they trust such people less and expect less compliance from them. In fact, Kipnis (1976) includes a poisonous tongue that can belittle and insult as one source of coercive power and states that those without access to coercive power tend to exhibit patient and appeasing behaviors. Moreover, Tedeschi (2001) describes insults, an aspect of low interpersonal justice, as a form of coercive power and says that they are experienced as lowering the relative power of the recipient. Because people with coercive power tend to act with low interpersonal justice, people may assume that the converse is true: that people who behave with low interpersonal justice possess the coercive power that so often accompanies this type of behavior.

Rude, low interpersonal justice behavior often seems to carry an implied threat and thus may be perceived as a pressuring tactic. Likewise, the use of pressure tactics may be seen as reducing the autonomy of the target of the pressure, thus decreasing negative politeness and by extension decreasing interpersonal justice. When supervisors behave in an interpersonally unjust manner, there may be a sense that they have the power to back up the implied threats they are making.

Hypothesis 2a: A person who is perceived to behave with low interpersonal justice will be perceived as possessing more coercive power.
Raven (1965) describes coercive power as one form of “public, dependent power”. By this, he means that it is effective only when the target of the power can be watched to make sure he complies. Litman-Adizes, Fontaine and Raven’s (1978) scenario study found this to be the case as well. Thus, as Robbins and Judge (2007) state, behavioral compliance may occur but actual commitment is unlikely as a reaction to coercive power. People also often react to coercive power by resisting when possible and by having a negative attitudinal reaction (“reactance”) even when they must comply behaviorally (Sheley & Shaw, 1979; Shetty, 1978; Slocum, 1970; Yukl, 2002). This finding is supported by considerable literature and the results from the current study are expected to be consistent with this robust effect. Moreover, when people are reactant, they are unlikely to be committed.

However, people high in Social Dominance Orientation tend to be more supportive of punitive law and order tactics (Pratto, Sidanius & Levin, 2006). Thus, they are less likely to have a negative reaction to coercive power. Shetty (1978) states that people who personally or culturally subscribe to the importance of positional power will react very differently to displays of hard power, such as coercive and legitimate power. Those high in Social Dominance Orientation may be committed to tasks even when the person making the request is perceived to have coercive power and may not have reactance in this situation, because they do not react negatively to the display of coercive power; whereas those low in Social Dominance Orientation are more likely to see displays of coercive power as abhorrent and thus display reactance and reduced commitment.
Hypothesis 2b: The negative relationship between coercive power and commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. The negative relationship will be stronger in those who are low in Social Dominance Orientation than for those relatively high in Social Dominance Orientation. (Note that in order to avoid further complicating the model, for each type of power only the one main effect expected to be strongest is hypothesized. Therefore, because reactance is expected to be the “primary” effect of coercive power, no main effect of coercive power on commitment is explicitly hypothesized, although such a relationship may exist.)

Hypothesis 2c: There is a positive relationship between the perceived coercive power of a supervisor and resulting reactance in a subordinate.

Hypothesis 2d: The relationship between coercive power and reactance is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. The positive relationship between coercive power and reactance will be stronger in those who are low in Social Dominance Orientation than for those relatively high in Social Dominance Orientation.

**Legitimate Power**

Legitimate power refers to the “right” of the powerholder to have his or her requests obeyed, due to the powerholder’s position. Because this type of power would tend to emphasize the distances between the powerholder and the target, it would tend to decrease negative politeness (which relies on the target’s feelings of autonomy) and by extension, interpersonal justice. However, it may be the case that such interpersonal justice is in the eye of the beholder; if one sees the powerholder as legitimately having the right to make requests, the powerholder’s requests may tend to be seen as more proper. Personality should be an important factor in attitudes regarding legitimate power.
Some people may see authorities as having the right to make requests and demands that are obeyed (Yukl, 2002), whereas others may resent such a situation. For those high in Social Dominance Orientation, someone behaving in a demanding manner, who is assumed to be on a higher level, may not be perceived as low in interpersonal justice in the first place, regardless of the objective behavior. In fact, the low interpersonal justice behavior may make the supervisor seem more like a legitimate authority for those high in Social Dominance Orientation, because it emphasizes group differences, consistent with the person’s world view. However, people low in Social Dominance Orientation are more believers in group equality. Rude and interpersonally unjust behavior, which emphasize differences in group levels, may for Low Social Dominance Orientation people induce some reactance (Brehm, 1981), wherein such individuals immediately question the right of the interpersonally unjust person to give them orders and speak to them in such a manner, thus reducing the perception of legitimate power.

Hypothesis 3a. The relationship between legitimate power and interpersonal justice is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. Those low in Social Dominance Orientation have a stronger tendency to perceive a person behaving with lower interpersonal justice as having a lower degree of legitimate power than those relatively high on Social Dominance Orientation.

Based on past literature, legitimate power should result in compliance in most cases, but not necessarily in commitment (Yukl, 2002; Yukl & Falbe, 1991; – but see Kipnis 1970 and Warren 1968 for a different and more positive interpretation of legitimate power). Providing that a supervisor is perceived to have the legitimate right to have his requests obeyed, this should result in an outward compliance to these requests.
Hypothesis 3b: There is a positive relationship between legitimate power and compliance.

However, though people may feel that they have to comply, or should comply, with a request from a supervisor with legitimate power, they may not feel that they want to comply. Thus, even though they may carry out a task if not doing so would have negative consequences, they will not be committed to putting forth more effort than is necessary. Legitimate power may pose a threat to autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1987), an aspect of negative politeness, and eliminate the need to justify one’s behavior to oneself by claiming to like a task or agree with a request. People low in Social Dominance Orientation should be more resistant to legitimate power because they tend to believe that all people are equal and thus one person is unlikely, simply by group membership, to properly have the right to give orders. Previous studies have often been inconsistent in the relationships between legitimate power and commitment (e.g. Bachman, Smith & Slesinger 1966; Litman-Adizes, Fontaine & Raven, 1978; Wexley & Snell, 1987); personality, specifically Social Dominance Orientation, may be an important moderator.

Hypothesis 3c. The relationship between legitimate power and task commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. There will be a stronger negative correlation between legitimate power and commitment among those low in Social Dominance Orientation than for those relatively high in Social Dominance Orientation.

For an overview of the model of the main effects hypotheses proposed, see Figure 1. For an overview of the moderated model proposed, see Figure 2. For a table of the Hypotheses tested, see Table 1.
Figure 1. Main effects model.
Figure 2. Moderated model.
Table 1

*Hypotheses Tested*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referent Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1A: A supervisor who behaves with more interpersonal justice will be perceived as having more referent power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1B: The relationship between interpersonal justice and referent power is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1C: The perceived referent power of a supervisor is positively related to the task commitment of the subordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2A: A supervisor who behaves with less interpersonal justice will be perceived as possessing more coercive power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2B: The relationship between coercive power and task commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2C: There is a positive relationship between the perceived coercive power of a supervisor and reactance in a subordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2D: The relationship between coercive power and reactance is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3A: The relationship between interpersonal justice and legitimate power is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3B: There is a positive relationship between the perceived legitimate power of a supervisor and compliance in a subordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3C: The relationship between legitimate power and task commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Method
Study Overview

The current research was comprised of two studies. The first study (study 1) consisted of a survey designed to measure the relationship between how people feel they are treated by their supervisors with regard to interpersonal justice and the types of power they ascribe to their supervisors, along with their own task commitment, compliance, and reactance. It also examined Social Dominance Orientation as a moderator of these relationships.

However, this survey could not establish cause and effect. Therefore, study two was an experiment in which interpersonal justice was manipulated in written scenarios to investigate the effects of different levels of interpersonal justice on the perception of power. As with study 1, this study also investigated Social Dominance Orientation as a moderating variable.

Some participants completed both study one and study two. The order of the studies was counterbalanced for these participants.

Study 1 Methods

Participants

Attempts were made to recruit participants using the following methods: Posting on SUNY Albany Sona-Systems research pool for undergraduate participants who held paying jobs; in-person recruiting at a small organization; personal email from management at a small- to- moderate sized organization; advertisements on the Dilbert Web site, on the Volunteer section on Craigslist, and on the web and printed version of Metroland (a newspaper local to the Albany-NY metropolitan area), also in the Volunteer section; postings on several Facebook user-groups; and postings in several Linked-In
groups. (Note that depending on the options chosen by LinkedIn group members, postings may also have resulted in emails to some LinkedIn group members). For more details regarding the content and timing of these postings, advertisements, emails, and recruiting scripts, see Appendix A.

At least part of study 1 was completed by 541 participants; 490 of these participants completed enough of the study to be included in analyses of the focal variables and hypotheses. Of the participants who began but did not fully complete the study, the vast majority were non-student participants who started but did not complete the online study, which consisted of 97 questions. For the purposes of demographic analysis, participants were included in the summary of demographic results if they completed the 12th question of the survey, which was the beginning point for the variables of interest used in the analysis of hypotheses. In investigating each hypothesis, all participants who completed the survey items involved in the hypothesis were included in the analyses.

Student research pool participants were specified in the recruiting post on the Sona System to be limited to those who worked at least 5 hours per week at a paying job, but student participants who reported no current job but having had a recent job they remembered well were also permitted to participate. The research pool made up 75.7% (371) of the participants completing study 1. In terms of non-research pool participants, of the 119 online participants completing the study, 72.3% (86) reported coming from LinkedIn; 4.2% (5) reported the source as Facebook; 12.6% (15) reported responding to a personal email; and 10.9% (13) reported the source as “Other. Participants were not asked to which specific posting they responded, but based on the timing of responses as
related to the timings of postings, it is believed that the most successful posting was LinkedIn HR, particularly the LinkedIn HR:Global group, followed by the LinkedIn HR: Staffing posting.

Regarding demographics, 64.4% (315) of the participants who completed the study described themselves as female; 35.4% (173) described themselves as male; one participant bubbled in an invalid choice for gender on the bubble sheet; and one participant failed to report a gender. Regarding ethnicity, 7.8% (38) of the participants described themselves as Asian American; 11.2% (55) described themselves as African-American; 58.2% (285) described themselves as Caucasian; 11.6% (57) reported being Latino, 10.2% (50) described themselves as Other, and 5 (1%) failed to provide a response regarding ethnicity.

Approximately 68% of the overall sample reported being 24 years of age or younger; approximately 11% reported being 25-35 years of age; and approximately 21% reported being 35 or older. The research pool sample was, as expected, considerably younger than the non-research pool sample: 79% of the research-pool sample reported being 20 years of age or younger, but among the non-research pool sample 91.6% were over 25, and 47% were over 45.

As far as the demographics of the supervisors described in the survey, approximately 46.6% (228) reported that the supervisor in question was male; 51.9% (254) reported that the supervisor in question was female; and seven bubbled in an invalid response regarding the gender of the supervisor. Approximately 9% (44) reported that the supervisor was 25 years of age or under; 26.3% (129) reported that the supervisor was 26-35; 26.9% (132) reported that the supervisor was 36-45; 26.5% (130)...
reported that the supervisor was 46-55; and 11.2% (55) reported that the supervisor was 55 or over.

Regarding work history, 32% (157) of the sample reported working in service industries such as restaurants; 21.1% (104) reported working on retail industries; 4.5% (22) reported working in the government or military; 11.2% (55) reported working in another non-government business or industry; and 30.6% (150) reported that their work area was “Other”. For the overall sample, 52% (255) reported having worked for the supervisor in question a year or less; as expected the research-pool sample reported shorter tenures than the non-research pool sample.

Measures

See Appendices B, C and D for survey items.

Except where otherwise noted, participants rated items on a 1-5 Likert scale with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 representing strongly agree. In order to increase the range of interpersonal justice levels in the study, study 1 was comprised of three versions, A, B and C. In version A (coded as Version 1), participants were asked to think of their most interpersonally just supervisor when answering the survey. In Version B (coded as Version 2), participants were asked to think of their least interpersonally just supervisor when answering the survey. In version C (Coded as Version 3), participants in study 1 were told to think of their current (or most recent) supervisor when completing supervisor-related questions. In both Versions A and B, participants were also told that if they could not think of a supervisor they remembered well who fit the most interpersonally just or least interpersonally just description, they could just use their current supervisor. The exact wording for these instructions can be found in Appendix E.
**Interpersonal justice.** Colquitt’s (2001) four-item interpersonal justice scale was used to measure interpersonal justice. This scale includes items such as “My manager treats me with dignity” and “My manager treats me with respect.” At the current time, this is the most widely accepted measure of interpersonal justice, and Colquitt (2001) has reported a coefficient alpha of .92 for this measure. In the current study, this measure achieved a coefficient alpha of .93.

**Politeness.** Politeness was measured via 14 items measuring positive and negative politeness from Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000). The Goldsmith and MacGeorge study is one of very few to explicitly measure positive and negative politeness; however, the authors did not report internal consistency results for their measure. Positive politeness includes such items as “How much did you feel identified with?” Negative politeness includes items such as “How much did you feel respected in the right to make your own decision?”. In the current study, positive politeness achieved a coefficient alpha of .91 and negative politeness .78. There was a .71 correlation between positive and negative politeness.

**Power bases.** Hinkin and Schreisheim’s (1989) 20-item measure was used. Based on work by Littlepage, Van Hein, Cohen and Janiec (1993) comparing several different measures of power, this scale has shown the best psychometric properties, with coefficient alphas ranging from a low of .74 for reward power to a high of .92 for referent power. In the current study, all three focal power base measures achieved acceptable coefficient alphas, from a high of .92 for referent power to a low of .82 for legitimate power. Referent power was measured with items such as “My supervisor could make me feel valued.” Coercive power was measured with items such as “My supervisor could
give me undesirable job assignments.” Legitimate power was measured with items such as “My supervisor could make me feel that I have commitments to meet.

**Social Dominance Orientation.** Scale II of Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth and Malle’s (1994) Social Dominance Orientation Scale was used. This scale has 14 items. Items measure agreement with statements such as “Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.” Pratto et al. achieved a .83 coefficient alpha with a similar version of this scale. In the current study, the coefficient alpha for this measure was .84.

**Commitment.** Participants also completed Yukl, Chavez and Seifert’s (2005) one-item measure concerning task commitment to requests. This item asks “How many influence attempts by your supervisor result in complete commitment? (strong enthusiasm and special effort beyond what is normally expected).”

**Compliance.** Compliance was measured using the five behavioral compliance items from Rahim’s Compliance with Supervisor’s Wishes scale (used with permission from the © Center for Advanced Studies in Management. Further use or reproduction of the instrument without written permission is prohibited.) This includes items such as “I follow my supervisor's orders.” In the current study, the coefficient alpha for this scale was .87.

**Reactance.** Reactance was measured using Blickle’s (2003) three item reactance measure. This scale includes items such as “The way this person acts if he or she wants another person to do something makes you say ‘No’ inwardly”. The coefficient alpha for the scale in this study was .92.

**Work history.** This was a custom scale created for this study. Participants answered questions about the length of time they have worked at the job and supervisor
in question, the number of hours they work per week, and the type of industry in which they worked.

**Demographics.** As possible control variables, participants were asked for their age range, race, gender, and for the gender and approximate age of their supervisor.

**Manipulation check.** Participants were asked what type of supervisor they used to complete the study— their most polite supervisor, their least polite supervisor, or simply their current supervisor.

**Careless responding.** In order to detect careless response patterns on the part of participants, three questions were added to study one reflecting statements participants should be unlikely to strongly agree with. Careless responding questions included items such as “I make all my own clothes and shoes.”

**Procedure**

Participants recruited from the participant pool of undergraduate students were signed up using a computerized system (“Sona Systems”). These participants were run in small groups of 1-7, depending on participant and room availability. Participants received a participant information sheet with the necessary information about the study and assuring them of their anonymity. Undergraduate research assistants or the first author greeted the participants, presented them with the information sheets, and led the participants through the necessary steps of the study.

The non-research pool participants were recruited at their worksite, through an email from their management, via the web, or through advertisements in printed publications. Participants recruited via the web were given a website address to use to complete the survey. Participants recruited directly in the workplace were given the
survey to complete at home and a stamped envelope to mail to the experimenter. They were also given the option to complete the survey on the web. Participants recruited via an email from the manager at their organization were given the website address and also given the option to request a paper survey by contacting the first author (although one of these participants did request a paper survey, it was never returned). In order to use the same website address but send web participants randomly to the different interpersonal justice-level versions of the supervisor survey, the numbers 1, 2 and 3 were shown in random order (for example 2 1 3) and the participant was instructed to select the first number shown. The number chosen led the participant to the corresponding justice condition (1 for most interpersonally just, 2 for least interpersonally just, and 3 for current supervisor).

For the participants completing the survey on paper, participants were given paper surveys and computer scantrons on which to bubble their answers. Participants answered questions related to how interpersonally just their supervisor is or was; the degree of and the nature of the power they believe the supervisor possessed; and their own task commitment, compliance, and reactance. For student participants taking the survey in a lab, for simplicity, all participants in one lab session were assigned to the same justice condition (justice conditions thus were randomized between sessions). The directions assured the participants about the confidentiality of their responses. This study took approximately 15-30 minutes.
Study 2 Methods

Participants

Study 2 utilized 372 undergraduate students from the research pool at the University at Albany, SUNY. Analysis for the pilot data conducted prior to this study showed most of the effect sizes to be small (approximately .20), although the manipulation of interpersonal justice for this study was expected to be stronger based on changes made as a result of the pilot study. This sample size was chosen to enable small to moderate effects to be detected at a significance level of .05 with at least 80% power using a repeated measures design.

The recruitment of research-pool participants for study 2 was the same as study 1; student participants were expected to take part in both studies. Thus student research pool participants were specified in the recruiting literature to be limited to those who worked at least 5 hours per week at a paying job, but student participants who reported no current job but having had a recent job they remembered well were also permitted to participate.

For the purposes of demographic analysis, participants were included in the summary of demographic results if they completed any of survey 2. All participants did complete at least part of study 2 and completion of the questions regarding even one scenario would mean their data was utilized to investigate the hypotheses. Research pool participants often did not have time to complete all of the scenarios; the total time set for study 1 and 2 was fixed at one hour to grant research pool participants a fixed amount of research participation credit, and participants were encouraged to leave after the hour was up even if they had not completed the study. Therefore, where data is missing, it is more likely to have been due to running out of time than to dropping out of the study.
In terms of gender, 36.6% (136) of the participants in study 2 reported being male and 63.2% (235) reported being female; data was missing for this variable for .3% of the sample (one participant). Regarding ethnicity, 9.4% (35) reported being Asian American, 13.4% (50) were African-American, 54.8% (204) were Caucasian, 13.4% (50) were Latino, 7.8% (29) selected the “Other” ethnicity category, and ethnic data was missing for 1.1% of participants (4). Regarding year in school, 44.1% (164) reported being freshman, 28.0% (104) were sophomores, 14.2% (53) were juniors, 12.4% (46) were seniors, and information on school year was missing for 1.3% of participants (5). In terms of age, 78.8% (293) were 20 or under; 18% (67) were 21-24; 2.4% (9) were 25-28; .3% (1) were 29-32; .3% (1) were 33 or over; and age information was missing for .3% of participants (1).

**Measures**

**Scenarios.** Six different types of task requests were created. A high and low interpersonal justice level version of each task request was created, for a total of 12 scenarios. (From here on, the phrase “Task request” will be used to refer to the particular physical task the target is being requested to carry out, for example, to clean the bathroom; “Justice Level” --high or low-- will be used to refer to the manner in which the request is being made; and “Scenario” will be used to refer to a particular combination of Task request and Justice Level --for example the Low Justice Level version of the request to clean the bathroom represents one particular scenario).

Participants were instructed to refer to the supervisor portrayed in the scenarios rather than any supervisor from their own work history. Four of the task requests required the participant to imagine being a server in a restaurant. These tasks involved requests
being made by the person’s supervisor to clean the bathroom, to switch shifts with another server, to act as a hostperson instead of a server, or to wear a new uniform and report reactions. The other two task requests required the participant to imagine working in a store. In one of these task requests, the supervisor asked the participant to straighten shirts on a rack; in the other task request, the supervisor requested the person to do inventory. These settings were chosen in consultation with undergraduate research assistants as representing typical job settings for undergraduates who held jobs while attending college.

The task requests were chosen in consultation to represent realistic task requests that might occur in these settings and to cover a wide range of types of requests, from very unpleasant (clean the bathroom) to more neutral (wear a different uniform). For each task request, the participant saw only the high or low justice version of that particular task request. Thus, each participant saw only 6 scenarios. The scenarios presented to participants alternated in the level of justice depicted. An example of a high justice scenario is “You are a server in a restaurant. Cleaning the bathrooms is not normally part of your responsibility but there is a bad smell coming from there. One day your boss comes over and says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner ‘I know you don’t normally do this, but you’ll clean out that bathroom, won’t you?’” An example of a low justice scenario depicting the same task request is “You are a server in a restaurant. Cleaning the bathrooms is not normally part of your responsibility but there is a bad smell coming from there. One day your boss comes over and says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner, ‘Go clean out that bathroom!’”
The four restaurant-related task requests (cleaning the bathroom, being a host person, switching shifts, and wearing a new uniform) were pre-tested in the pilot study, which will be discussed at the beginning of the results section. The task requests that were pre-tested were retained. Based on discussions with undergraduate and graduate students and observation of people working in retail stores, two task requests were added. Although the two retail-store related task requests were not pre-tested on participants regarding their believability, the undergraduate research assistants who had retail experience attested that these two new task requests were very realistic.

**Interpersonal justice.** Same as for study 1, but the wording was changed so that it would be clear participants should rate the supervisor/employee portrayed in the scenarios. (See Appendix C for exact wording.) In study 2, averaging the coefficient alphas for each scenario, the overall coefficient alpha for this scale was .93.

**Politeness.** Same as for study 1. In study 2, the average coefficient alpha was .89 for positive politeness and .87 for negative politeness. The correlation between positive and negative politeness was .77.

**Power bases.** Same as for study 1. In study 2, the average coefficient alphas were .91 for referent power, .89 for coercive power, and .86 for legitimate power.

**Social Dominance Orientation.** Same as for study 1. The average coefficient alpha for Social Dominance Orientation for study 2 was .83.

**Commitment.** Commitment was measured with 7 items adapted from the Hollenback and Williams (1989) Goal commitment scale by changing the word “goal” to “task” and by dropping two items which seemed inapplicable to tasks. The average coefficient alpha for the resulting scale was .87.
Compliance. Same as for study 1. For study 2, the average coefficient alpha was .85.

Reactance. Same as for study 1. For study 2, the average coefficient alpha for reactance was .93.

Careless responding. Similarly to study 1, three items intended to detect careless response patterns were included with each scenario. See Appendix D for the exact working of these careless response items.

Procedures

For study two, participants were given six scenarios depicting influence attempts by a person behaving in a low or high interpersonally just manner while making work-related requests. The wording of the justice manipulations was based on politeness theory and literature. Participants answered survey items about their reactions to each scenario directly after reading the scenario. The reactions measured included estimation of the types of power the influencer in the scenario possessed and the expected reaction of the focal person in the scenario in terms of reactance, compliance and commitment to carrying out the request. Each participant was presented with either a low or high interpersonal-justice version of each of the six task requests; three of the scenarios presented to each participant were interpersonally unjust and three of the scenarios presented were interpersonally just. For each task request, participants saw only either the high or low interpersonal justice version of that task request. The interpersonal justice levels of the scenarios presented to each participant alternated, and the interpersonal justice level of the first scenario presented was counterbalanced between participants. Also, because it was expected that participants might not finish all the
scenarios or might become bored or careless as the study wore on, the order of the task requests shown was partially counterbalanced; the two scenarios depicting task requests that took place in a store were presented last in approximately 50% of the sessions and presented first in the remaining sessions.

When responding to questions regarding these hypothetical scenarios, participants were told to use their best judgment concerning the supervisor portrayed in the scenarios. See Appendix F for detailed instructions given to the participants. Participants also filled out surveys concerning their own Social Dominance Orientation and demographics as part of study 1, and this data was also utilized in the analysis of study 2. Study 2 took approximately 30-45 minutes. Students completed both study 1 and study 2 in one experimental session. As mentioned earlier, the order of the studies was counterbalanced.

**Analyses**

For study 1, correlation and multiple regression were used to determine the relationships between interpersonal justice, power bases, and compliance, reactance, and task commitment. Social Dominance Orientation was examined as a moderator. Additionally, ANOVA was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the dependent variables in the different survey versions.

For study 2, mixed methods repeated-measures generalized linear modeling was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the low and high justice conditions for the perception of the various power bases; whether there were significant relationships between power bases and expected compliance, reactance, and
task commitment; and whether these relationships were moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.
Chapter 5

Results
Prior to finalizing the methods for the dissertation, a combined pilot study was run for both study 1 and study 2 using sample survey items and scenarios. The results of the pilot study and changes made to the studies based on the results of the pilot study are presented below, followed by the results of the dissertation studies.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study using nearly all of the survey questions proposed for study 1 and four preliminary scenarios for study 2 was run using 155 undergraduate students. See Table 2 for descriptive statistics for the Survey 1 variables in the pilot study, including measure reliabilities.

In the pilot study significant positive correlations were found between interpersonal justice and referent power, between interpersonal justice and legitimate power, and between interpersonal justice and task commitment; a non-significant correlation was found between interpersonal justice and coercive power. Positive significant correlations were also found between task commitment and referent power and between task commitment and legitimate power; a non-significant correlation was found between task commitment and coercive power.

The pilot study also presented an initial version of the restaurant-based task requests used for study 2. All participants in the pilot study saw the same five scenarios in the same order. The scenarios were rated for their realism and believability; for the level of interpersonal justice depicted; and for the level of coercive, referent, and reward power attributed to the person making the requests. The scenarios depicted a high interpersonal justice request from a supervisor for a server in a restaurant to clean the
Table 2

*Pilot Study Descriptives and Correlations for Study 1 Variables (N = 153)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Interpersonal justice</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Referent power</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Coercive power</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Legitimate power</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Social dominance orientation</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Commitment</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.
bathroom; a low interpersonal justice request by a coworker to switch shifts; a low interpersonal justice request from a supervisor to act as a hostperson instead of a server; a high interpersonal justice request from a supervisor to wear a new uniform; and a high interpersonal justice request from a senior coworker to act as a hostperson. After the pilot study was conducted, the decision was made to focus the dissertation study on requests from supervisors rather than coworkers; therefore the two scenarios involving requests from coworkers were excluded from further analysis. Additionally, the two task requests that were set in a retail store were created after the pilot study had been conducted and thus were not included in the pilot study. See Table 3 for information regarding the perceived believability, interpersonal justice, and power associated with the relevant scenarios depicted in the pilot study.
Table 3

*Pilot Study Scenarios (N = 92)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clean bathroom</th>
<th>New uniform High Interpersonal Justice</th>
<th>Be hostperson Low Interpersonal Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believability</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent Power</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Means are on 5-point scales with 1 indicating the low point and 5 indicating the high point. Means with no subscript in common significantly differ as indicated by a pairwise comparison (LSD), \( p < 0.05 \).
The task requests used in the pre-test were developed through discussions with undergraduate and graduate students regarding their work experiences. All of the relevant scenarios tested in the pilot study had means above 3.5 on a scale of 1-5 for realism/believability. In the pilot study, based on repeated measures ANOVA, the scenarios describing a supervisor's behavior did result in significantly different mean ratings for perceived interpersonal justice (3.28 for a high interpersonal justice request to clean a bathroom, 3.70 for a high interpersonal justice request to try out a new uniform, and 2.49 for a low interpersonal justice request to be a host person). In the pilot study, the level of interpersonal justice was manipulated simply by describing the manner of each request as very polite or very impolite. For the dissertation, more vivid wording was added to the scenario studies to describe the exact words the supervisor used to make the request, and the wording was based on politeness request strategies as described in the literature from politeness theory. Two task requests (each with a low and high interpersonally just scenario version) were also added based on observation of employees in retail stores and discussion with undergraduate research assistants who had held retail jobs. Also, in contrast to the pilot study, in the dissertation study an attempt was made to reduce the boredom demand characteristics that could result from seeing multiple versions of the same task request and to increase the range of task requests studied. For these purposes, the dissertation experiment was designed so that each participant saw only one version of each task request; low and high justice level scenarios were created for each task request but they were shown to different sets of participants. Because the range of time taken to complete the pilot study varied for participants, the dissertation study included six task request scenarios per participant, but
with the order of presentation partially counterbalanced so that even if participants did not complete all scenarios, the study would still provide sufficient data to enable analysis of each of task request.

Additionally, for the dissertation, multi-item measures of commitment were used in study 2; measures of reactance and compliance were also added to both studies. These measures were described in the relevant sections of the method section.

Furthermore, it was found in the pilot that a considerable number of the participants completed the study in an unrealistically short amount of time and sometimes appeared to be text messaging or talking to each other during the study. In the dissertation study, the undergraduate assistants running the sessions were instructed to stay in the room with the participants whenever possible. To encourage the participants to attend to the task, the assistants told the participants that it was okay if they did not finish the entire survey but to “plan to be here for an hour to earn your credit”. They also made an attempt whenever possible to separate into different rooms those participants who came to the session together and appeared to be friends. Moreover, in the dissertation study, questions were added to the study to help identify careless responding, and an attempt was made to recruit non-students for study 1 in the hopes they might take the study more seriously, given that they are participating completely voluntarily rather than for course credit, and in order to represent a broader sample of the population as a whole.
Study 1

Data Screening

Prior to analysis, the focal variables of the study were examined for out of range values, distribution normality, and missing values. The participant data was evaluated for patterns of careless responding.

With regard to out-of-range data, defined as data that did not correspond to any of the choices listed on the survey forms, eleven out of range values were found for the question regarding demographics. It is assumed that these responses were due to the participant misreading the question or answer sheet or to careless responding. In all such cases, the responses were recoded to system-missing in subsequent analyses. Given that the number of cases is quite small as a proportion of the total number of valid responses for these questions (over 450 in each case), recoding to system-missing should not unduly affect the results (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2001).

Even though 527 participants gave valid responses to the first question of the survey, regarding gender, when looking at the final, 97th question of Survey 1, there are only 455 responses, three of them invalid. Most missing data likely originated from online (non-research pool) participants lacking interest or time to complete the study. For the most part, the amount of data missing increased from the beginning to the end of the study rather than seeming to represent a reluctance to respond to any particular questions.

Because the participants who had sufficient time and interest to complete a 97-question survey on the interpersonal justice level of their supervisor may have differed from those who did not complete the survey fully and because a considerable proportion of the online sample dropped out at some point, mean-substitution for the missing data
was deemed inappropriate (Dabchick & Fidel, 2001). However, because the dropout pattern was gradual after the first demographic screens and because the participants who did not answer all of the questions may have represented a more full and representative picture of the population at large, the decision was made to retain data for those 119 online participants who at least completed the questions regarding supervisor power types (questions 12-31). Data analysis regarding variables that had higher drop-out rates and thus reflect smaller sample sizes may suffer some reduction in statistical power. Because the demographic questions appeared early in the survey and many online participants responded to these questions but dropped out before answering the questions relevant to the analyses of hypotheses, online participants who did not complete at least the first hypothesis-related question (Question 12) are excluded from the demographic analysis in order to most accurately describe the demographic breakdown of the sample used to test the hypotheses.

Regarding normality, the focal data variables were also examined regarding skewness and kurtosis. Focal variables appearing to depart from normality include the one item commitment scale (Mean = 3.25; skewness = -.21, kurtosis = -1.11); coercive power (Mean = 3.1, skewness = .00, kurtosis = -.98); compliance (Mean = 4.04, skewness = -.76; kurtosis = 1.4); and legitimate power (Mean = 3.90, skewness = -1.09, kurtosis = 2.12). Due to the large sample size, several of the focal variables were found to be significantly “non-normal” in terms of statistical significance, but also due to the large sample size, such divergences from normality should have very limited effects on the results of the analysis. Attempts to re-scale the affected variables via transformations
would likely have made the results difficult to interpret (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Therefore, it was decided to leave the variables in their original scales.

Three questions were included in study 1 in an attempt to detect careless responding by participants, with the expectation that someone reading the questions carefully would be unlikely to express much agreement with these statements. The statements were: Questions 51: “This supervisor has traveled to the moon several times”; Question 76: “I liked it when this supervisor treated me in a rude manner”; and Question 95: “I make all my own clothes and shoes”. However, there is some question whether all of these questions measured careless responding as well as was intended; therefore, some degree of caution was warranted in deletion of participants due to their responses to these questions. Several of the student participants asked about Question 51 during the debriefing; some of them appeared to think it might be slang for “acting crazy”. Also, some of the undergraduate assistants agreed that this is a phrase they’ve heard used and 19.6% (95) of the participants responded neutrally to this statement, and another 8.7% (42) reported some level of agreement with this statement. Participants also might have interpreted agreeing/failing to disagree strongly with “I like it when this supervisor treated me in a rude manner” as being easy-going/not getting too thrown by rude behavior; 6.4% (30) of the participants answering this question responded neutrally and another 4.6% (22) responded with some level of agreement with this question. Given possibly differing interpretations of these two questions, it was decided not to delete participants based on the responses to these questions.

However, Q95 should have been less subject to interpretation. Only 1.3% (6) of participants answering this question chose “agree strongly”; 3.7% (17) chose “agree
somewhat”, and 8.1% (37) responded neutrally. To determine whether participants agreeing at least somewhat with this statement and thus possibly responding carelessly to other questions might be unduly influencing the results, correlations for the focal variables were run both with and without the 5% of participants (23) who displayed some agreement with the statement. It was determined that the correlations found between focal variables with and without these participants were nearly identical, regardless of the whether or not these participants were included; the maximum difference between r’s in each case was .03. Therefore analyses of hypotheses would have been unaffected and therefore in the interest of completeness these participants were retained in the final analysis of study 1 data.

**Manipulation Checks**

A series of one-way ANOVAs were used to examine the manipulation checks for whether participants thought of their most polite supervisor, least polite supervisor, or current supervisor when answering the questions. Because many participants assigned to the least interpersonally just and most interpersonally just conditions reported that they were just using their current supervisor, the “supervisor used” variable was used to divide the groups because the condition variable (instruction to think of least interpersonally just, most interpersonally just, or current supervisor) would not have given accurate results.

Even though random assignment of participants to conditions should have resulted in a nearly equal number of participants to each condition, the option given to use one’s current supervisor was attractive to many participants. The question regarding the type of supervisor participants thought of when completing the study was the final
question in study 1. (In the interest of being succinct and understandable to participants, this question was phrased in terms of rude vs. polite supervisors rather than in terms of interpersonal justice.) The results showed that 86 people dropped out prior to the final question or failed to answer the final question; three participants gave invalid responses to this question; and of the remaining 452 valid responses, only 103 (22.8%) reported using their most polite supervisor, 99 (21.9%) reported using their least polite supervisor, and the largest group, 250 (55.3%), reported using their current supervisor.

Overall, based on the results of an ANOVA analysis, there was a significant difference among the least polite, most polite, and current supervisor conditions for both interpersonal justice $F(2, 440) = 152.89, p < .001$ and the one item rudeness measure $F(2,442) = 118.13, p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons to examine the a priori hypotheses related to the manipulation checks showed that the mean levels of intrapersonal justice were significantly different between the groups. That is, for the 100 participants who reported using their most polite supervisor, the mean level of interpersonal justice was 4.48, $SD = .59$; significantly higher than the mean for the 97 participants reporting using the least polite supervisor, $M = 2.39, SD = .87$; the mean for the 246 participants reporting using the current supervisor was closer to the most polite supervisor group but in between the means for the other two groups, $M = 3.93; SD = .99$. The differences in all pairs was significant at the $p < .001$ level utilizing the Bonferonni correction. Thus, although a large number of participants reported that they chose to think about their current supervisor to complete the survey even when requested to think of their most or least interpersonally just supervisor, the manipulation of supervisor type appears to be
have been successful with respect to the type of supervisor the participants reported that they did choose to use.

**Counterbalance Tests**

As previously noted, for student participants recruited from the research pool, approximately half the participants participated first in study 2, the scenario study concerning hypothetical supervisors, before completing study 1. Analyses comparing participants based on which study they completed first indicated that when supervisor types was controlled for, there were no significant differences in the means of the key dependent variables in study 1 due to the order of the studies; the inclusion of a variable representing the study order does not affect the results of the analyses of hypotheses. Therefore, for simplicity’s sake, the results of the analysis of hypotheses for study 1 are presented without the study order as a covariate.

**Control Variables**

In order to investigate the possible effects of demographic and work history covariates, all ANOVA and regression analyses investigating the hypotheses were first conducted controlling for these variables. Because the results indicated that these control variables did not change the outcome of the analyses of the hypotheses, the results are presented without controlling for these variables for the sake of simplicity.

**Factor Analysis**

The pattern of correlation indicated strong relationships between interpersonal justice and positive and negative politeness. Based on pearson correlations, interpersonal justice correlated .79 with positive politeness, and .65 with negative politeness, and there
was a .71 correlation between positive and negative politeness; all these correlations were significant at the $p < .001$ level.

An exploratory factor analysis, using principal axis factoring extraction and a direct oblimin rotation, was run using the questions designed to measure interpersonal justice, positive politeness and negative politeness. The results indicated that interpersonal justice and positive and negative politeness all overlapped and could be adequately represented by one factor representing 49.36% of the variance with an initial eigenvalue of 9.24. There were two other factors with eigenvalues above 1 but these were substantially smaller (1.50 and 1.08 respectively), and did not cleanly divide into positive vs. negative politeness factors. After rotation, items loading most strongly on the first factor included the interpersonal justice items and one positive politeness item; the second factor included positively-worded items from both the positive and negative politeness scales; the third factor consisted mostly of the reverse scored items from both the positive and negative politeness scales. Therefore, in order to be consistent with the majority of organizational psychology research and the wording of the hypotheses, the interpersonal justice scale was utilized in the analyses of hypotheses. For details regarding the results of this factor analysis, see Table 3.
Table 4

*Pattern Matrix Factor Loadings for Interpersonal Justice and Positive and Negative Politeness Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix Factor Loadings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(IJ) This supervisor treats me with respect</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IJ) This supervisor treats me with dignity</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IJ) This supervisor treats me in a polite manner</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IJ) This supervisor refrains from improper remarks or comments</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt liked and accepted</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt like you could choose whether or not to carry out the request</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt free to do what you want</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt left with a choice about what to do</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt respected in the right to make your own decision</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt identified with</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt empathized with</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt thought highly of</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt criticized (Reverse-Scored)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt disapproved of (Reverse-Scored)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt told what to do (Reverse-Scored)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt made to look bad (Reverse-Scored)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PP) Felt made to feel bad (Reverse-Scored)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NP) Felt imposed on (Reverse Scored)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance Explained</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
Analyses of hypotheses. The means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values of study 1 variables are listed in Table 5, and correlations among study variables are listed in Table 6.

Preliminary tests of the main effects/correlational Hypotheses (1a, 1c, 2a, 2c, and 3b) were performed using the first-order correlations and ANOVA. Hypothesis 1a proposed a positive relationship between interpersonal justice and referent power; this is strongly supported by the strong first order correlations between referent power and interpersonal justice itself ($r = .61, p < 001$).
Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics for Study 1 Variables (N = 490)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal justice</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive politeness</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative politeness</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent power</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive power</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate power</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactance</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dominance orientation</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Correlations Between Study Variables (N = 490)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Interpersonal justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Positive politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Negative politeness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Referent power</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coercive power</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Legitimate power</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reactance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Social dominance orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01.*
Hypothesis 1c proposed a positive relationship between the perceived referent power of a supervisor and the task commitment of the subordinate. This hypothesis was also supported in the first order correlations, \( r = .45, p < .001 \).

Hypothesis 2a proposed a negative relationship between interpersonal justice and coercive power. This was also strongly supported in the first-order correlations, which showed a strong negative correlation between coercive power and interpersonal justice \( (r = -.56, p < .001) \).

Hypothesis 2c proposed a positive relationship between the perceived coercive power of a supervisor and reactance in a subordinate. The first order correlations strongly support this hypothesis, showing a positive relationship between coercive power and reactance \( (r = .57, p < .001) \).

Hypothesis 3b proposed a positive relationship between legitimate power and compliance. This hypothesis is supported, although the relationship is not as strong as for the other hypotheses previously discussed \( (r = .36, p < .001) \).

Where applicable, these main effects hypotheses were also investigated using a series of ANOVA analyses to determine if there was a difference in the outcome variables between groups rating their most polite (and thus most interpersonally just), least polite (and thus least interpersonally just), or current supervisor. ANOVA is applicable for those hypotheses proposing simple relationships between justice level and outcome variables. This includes Hypothesis 1a, proposing a positive relationship between interpersonal justice and referent power, and Hypothesis 2a, proposing a negative relationship between interpersonal justice and coercive power.
Analyses comparing the supervisor conditions reported by the participant resulted in significant results for both of these hypotheses in the expected directions. The referent power was highest in the “most polite” supervisor group ($M = 4.36, SD = .66$), lowest in the “least polite” supervisor group ($M = 3.17, SD = 1.11$), and in between in the “current supervisor” group ($M = 3.96, SD = .81$), with an overall ANOVA $F(2, 442) = 50.62$, significant at the $p < .001$ level. All the group differences are also significant at that level for the pairwise comparisons utilizing the Bonferroni correction, supporting Hypothesis 1a. Similarly, regarding coercive power, the least coercive power was attributed in the most polite supervisor group ($M= 2.52, SD = 1.01$), the most coercive power was attributed in the least polite supervisor group ($M = 4.08, SD = .78$), with the current supervisor group in between ($M = 2.95, SD = 1.02$). All of these differences were significant at the $p<.001$ level, supporting hypothesis 2a; $F (2, 441) = 66.51$. These were the only main effects hypotheses related to the interpersonal justice of the supervisor.

The hypotheses involving Social Dominance Orientation as a moderator were investigated using a series of stepwise hierarchical multiple regressions. To investigate Hypothesis 1b, which proposed that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship between referent power and interpersonal justice, first, following the advice of Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003), the Social Dominance Orientation and interpersonal justice variables were centered around their respective means and entered in the first step of a regression with referent power as the dependent variable. As predicted in the main effects hypothesis 1a, interpersonal justice was positively related to referent power. Next, the interaction between these two centered variables was entered in the next step of the regression. However, this resulted in no significant $R$ square change. Thus,
for study 1, hypothesis 1b was not supported. For details of the results of this hierarchical regression, see Table 7.
Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Referent Power

Study 1 (N = 430)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation X</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R squared=.396 for step 1 (p < .001); R squared change =.001 for step 2 (p = .39, n.s).

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.*
To investigate Hypothesis 2b, which proposed that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship between coercive power and task commitment, a similar procedure was followed as in the above moderation analysis, substituting the appropriate variables. When entered in the last step of the regression equation, the interaction between coercive power and Social Dominance Orientation resulted in a non-significant $R^2$ square change. Thus for study 1, hypothesis 2b was also not supported. For details regarding this analysis, see Table 8.
### Table 8

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Commitment*

*Study 1 (N = 431)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Social Dominance Orientation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation X</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R squared=.16 for step 1 (p < .001); R squared change = .00 for step 2 (p = .89, n.s.)*  

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.*
To investigate Hypothesis 2d, which proposed that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship between coercive power and reactance, a similar procedure was followed as in the first moderation analysis, substituting the appropriate variables. When entered in the last step of the regression equation, the interaction between coercive power and Social Dominance Orientation resulted in a non-significant $R^2$ change; thus for study 1, hypothesis 2d was not supported. For details regarding this analysis, see Table 9.
Table 9

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Reactance Study*

1 (N = 436)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation X</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2$ squared = .34 for step 1 ($p<.001$); $R^2$ squared change = .00 for step 2 ($p=.80$, n.s.)

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.*
To investigate hypothesis 3a, which proposed that the relationship between legitimate power and interpersonal justice would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation, a similar procedure was used as in the above moderation analysis, substituting the appropriate variables. The addition of the interaction term in the final step of the regression resulted in no significant $R$ square change. Thus, for study 1, hypothesis 3a was not supported. For details regarding the results of this analysis, see Table 10.
Table 10

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Legitimate Power*

*Study 1 (N = 427)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation X</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R squared = .11 for step 1 (p < .001); R squared change = .00 for step 2 (p = .87, n.s.).*

*p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01.*
To investigate hypothesis 3c, which proposed that the relationship between legitimate power and task commitment would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation, first the Social Dominance Orientation and Legitimate Power variables were centered around their respective means and entered in the first step of a regression with the one item task commitment variable as the dependent variable. In step 1, legitimate power was significantly, positively related to task commitment. Next, the interaction between these two centered variables was entered in the next step of the regression equation. This resulted in a small but significant change in $R^2$, $p < .01$. Thus there was a significant interaction, but the direction of the relationship between commitment and legitimate power was opposite to that proposed in Hypothesis 3c, so Hypothesis 3c was not supported. For details regarding this regression analysis, see Table 11.
Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Commitment

Study 1 (N = 431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation X</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R squared = .064 for step 1 (p < .001); R squared change = .015 for step 2 (p < .01)

*p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01.
Follow up investigations of the simple slopes of the effects of legitimate power on commitment at social dominance orientation levels at -1 and +1 standard deviations from the mean (Cohen et. al., 2003) indicate that although the relationship between legitimate power and commitment was significantly positive at the mean (see Table 13) and when Social Dominance Orientation was low (standardized beta=.37, $p < .001$), the relationship was not significant when Social Dominance Orientation was high (standardized beta = .10, $p = .16$, n.s.). See Figure 3 for a graph of this interaction.
Figure 3. Legitimate power X SDO interaction predicting commitment.
Thus, despite the significant interaction, Hypothesis 3c was not supported. Hypothesis 3c specifically proposed that there would be a more strongly negative relationship between legitimate power and commitment for those low in Social Dominance Orientation as compared to those high in it. Consistent with the hypothesis, the relationship between legitimate power and commitment was stronger for those low in Social Dominance Orientation; however, the relationship between commitment and legitimate power for those low in Social Dominance Orientation was proposed to be negative but was found to be positive.

Thus, in summary for study 1, both of the main effects hypotheses (Hypotheses 1a and 2a) regarding the relationship between interpersonal justice and the perception of power types were supported: as predicted, supervisors who behaved with less interpersonal justice were indeed perceived as having more coercive power but less referent power. The hypotheses regarding the main effect relationships between power types and compliance, reactance and commitment were also supported (Hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3b). That is, perceived referent power was positively related to task commitment; coercive power was positively related to reactance; and legitimate power was positively related to compliance. However, the hypotheses regarding Social Dominance Orientation as a variable moderating these relationships were not supported (Hypotheses 1b, 2b, 2d, and 3a). The investigation of Hypothesis 3c, which predicted that the relationship between legitimate power and task commitment would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation, revealed that there was a significant interaction between Social Dominance Orientation and legitimate power in predicting task commitment, but the
relationship between task commitment and legitimate power was in the opposite direction to the one predicted.

**Mediational Tests**

Although mediating relationships were not specifically hypothesized, the proposed model implied that power base perceptions would mediate the relationships between interpersonal justice and attitudinal and behavioral reactions, and an examination of the correlations between variables supported the possibility of mediation as well. Therefore the Monte Carlo or “boostrapping” test was used to assess several mediational paths, using the procedure and tool provided by Selig and Preacher (2008).

Regarding referent power as a mediator of the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and commitment, first a regression was run with interpersonal justice as the independent variable and commitment as the dependent variable; interpersonal justice was a significant predictor of commitment, standardized beta=.47, \( p < .001 \). When referent power was added as another predictor to the equation, the effect of interpersonal justice was reduced but still significant (standardized beta=.30, \( p < .001 \)), consistent with a possible partially mediated effect wherein interpersonal justice has both a direct effect on commitment and an indirect one through referent power. Based on the Monte Carlo method, utilizing the unstandardized coefficients and standard errors resulting from the regression of referent power on interpersonal justice and the regression of commitment on interpersonal justice and referent power, a 95\% confidence interval for the indirect effect of interpersonal justice on commitment ranges from .12 to .27, indicating a significant effect at the \( p < .05 \) level.
Next, the Monte Carlo method was used to test for the significance of coercive power as a mediator between interpersonal justice and reactance. First a regression was run with interpersonal justice as the independent variable and reactance as the dependent variable; interpersonal justice was a significant predictor of reactance with a standardized beta = -.67, \( p < .001 \). When coercive power was added to the equation as another predictor, the effect of interpersonal justice was reduced but still significant (standardized beta = -.50, \( p < .001 \)), consistent with the proposition of a partially mediated effect in that interpersonal justice had both a direct effect on reactance and an indirect one through coercive power. Then, the procedures required for the Monte Carlo method were followed, similar to the ones described above but substituting coercive power and reactance; the resulting 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect ranged from .13 to .23, indicating a significant effect at the \( p < .05 \) level.

The zero order correlations also suggested that coercive power might mediate the relationship between interpersonal justice and commitment-- that is, one mechanism through which low interpersonal justice might reduce commitment is through the perception of high coercive power. A regression was run with interpersonal justice as the independent variable and task commitment as the dependent variable, resulting in a standardized beta = .47, \( p < .001 \). When coercive power was added to the regression, the standardized beta for interpersonal justice was reduced to .35 but was still significant at the \( p < .001 \) level, consistent with a partial mediating effect. When the Monte Carlo simulation method as described above was employed, the resulting 95% confidence interval for the indirect effect of interpersonal justice on commitment through coercive power was from .06 to .19.
Additionally, the zero order correlations and hypothesis tests indicated that legitimate power may mediate the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and compliance. A regression was run with interpersonal justice as the independent variable and compliance as the dependent variable, resulting in a standardized beta of .44, \( p < .001 \). When legitimate power was added to this regression, the standardized beta for interpersonal justice was reduced but still significant, (standardized beta = .37, \( p < .001 \)), consistent with a partial mediation effect. Based on the Monte Carlo method described above, there was a small estimated indirect effect, with the 95% confidence interval ranging from .03 to .07.

Thus these analyses demonstrate that the relationships between interpersonal justice and several outcomes were partially mediated by power base perceptions. Specifically, the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and task commitment was partially mediated by referent power and by coercive power; the negative relationship between interpersonal justice and reactance was also partially mediated by coercive power; and the positive relationship between interpersonal justice and compliance was partially mediated by legitimate power. Therefore the level of interpersonal justice displayed by a supervisor appears to have both a direct effect on subordinate reactions, and an indirect effect via its effect on power base perceptions.
Study 2

Data Screening

Prior to analyses, the focal variables of the study were examined for distribution normality and missing values, and the participant data was evaluated for patterns of careless responding.

For study 2, the number of participants answering each question decreased fairly steadily throughout the study. Therefore the missing responses appeared to be due to participants running out of time to complete the study rather than reluctance to answer any particular questions. Because all participants in study 2 provided responses for the focal variables for one or more scenarios and are included in at least some of the analyses, all study 2 participants were included for the purposes of describing the demographic breakdown of the study. The level of interpersonal justice presented first in the scenarios was counterbalanced so that in half of the sessions, participants were presented with a high interpersonal justice scenario first, and in the other half of the sessions, the first scenario was a low justice one. The task request setting (restaurant vs. retail store) was also counterbalanced so that in half of the sessions, the participants attending the session were presented with the four restaurant-based task requests first (requests 1-4), followed by the two retail-store based task requests (requests 5 and 6); in the other half of the sessions, the participants responded to the two retail store based task requests first (task requests 5 and 6) followed by the restaurant based task requests (task requests 1-4). Within each setting -- restaurant or retail-- the order of the task requests was constant (i.e. the clean the bathroom task request was always followed by the switch
shifts task request). Thus, the order of the task requests was only partially counterbalanced. Because some participants did not complete the entire study, the number of participants providing data on focal variables differs for each task request, with the task requests which came earliest in each setting tending to provide the largest amount of data. For example, the earliest focal variable presented in each scenario, reactance, is available for 96% of the participants (357) for task request 1 (Clean the bathroom); 92% (343) in task request 2 (Switch Shifts); 81% (303) in task request 3 (Be a Host Person); 69% (256) in task request 4 (Wear New Uniform); 90% for task request 5 (Fold Shirts); and 75% (280) in task request 6 (Do Inventory). Therefore, where averaged across scenarios, it is to be kept in mind that the overall results are somewhat disproportionately based on the scenarios providing the highest proportion of complete cases.

Three questions were included in each scenario in an attempt to detect careless responding by participants, with the expectation that someone reading the questions carefully would be unlikely to express much agreement with these statements. The participants answered 60 questions concerning each scenario. The careless responding statements were: Question 25: “I make all my own clothes and shoes “; Question 31: “have traveled to the moon several times“, and Question 41, “I like it when my supervisor treats me in a rude manner.” These are the same careless responding questions used for study 1, and a participant who completed all six scenarios would see the careless responding questions a total of 7 times each. (Due to a typographical error, in study 2 at the beginning of Question 31 the word “have” was inadvertently substituted for the
phrase “My supervisor has.” In Study 1 the question appeared in its correctly worded version.)

It was expected that careless responding might be more of a problem for study 2 as compared to study 1, due to the repetitive nature of the study. This proved to be the case to a small degree, with a slightly larger proportion of careless response patterns indicated in study 2 in general.

As with study 1, there is some question whether all of these questions really measured careless responding as well as was intended; therefore some degree of caution was warranted in any deletion of participants due to their responses to these questions. As mentioned earlier, several of the student participants asked about question 31 during the debriefing; some of them appeared to think it might be slang for “acting crazy”. Some of the undergraduate assistants agreed that this is a phrase they have heard used. As mentioned, the pronoun was inadvertently omitted from this question in all the scenarios used in study 2. The percentage of participants reporting at least some agreement with this statement ranged from a high of 6.2% (16) for task request 4 to a low of 3.6% (11) for task request 5.

Participants also might have interpreted agreeing/failing to disagree strongly with Q41, “I like it when this supervisor treated me in a rude manner” as being easy-going/not getting too thrown by rude behavior. Regarding Q41, the percentage of participants reporting at least some degree of agreement with this statement ranged from a high of 10.5% (29) for task request 6 to a low of 6.2% (22) for task request 1. Due to the possibility of different interpretations of this question, it was decided not to delete participants based on responses to this question.
Regarding the percentage of participants agreeing at least somewhat with Question 25 (I make all my own clothes and shoes), which should have been less subject to interpretation, 4.2% (15) participants agreed at least somewhat with this statement in task request 1; 3.6% (12) in task request 2, 4.5% (13) in task request 3, 7.5% (19) in task request 4, 3.2% (10) in task request 5 and 6.2% (17) in task request 6. In order to assess possible deleterious effects of these participants, the hypothesis tests for study 2 were run both with and without the scenario data for participants who agreed at least somewhat with the statement for that scenario, and it was found that the pattern of significance was identical regardless of whether these participants were included; therefore in the interest of completeness the data for these participants was retained.

Regarding normality, the focal data variables were also examined regarding skewness and kurtosis, averaging across scenarios. Focal variables appearing to depart from normality include interpersonal justice (mean=3.16, skewness = -.13, kurtosis= -1.39); reactance (mean = 2.92, skewness = .11, kurtosis = -1.24); and compliance (mean = 3.65, skewness = -.84, kurtosis = 1.00). Due to the large sample size, several of the focal variables were found to be significantly “non-normal” in terms of statistical significance, but also due to the large sample size, such divergences from normality should have very limited effects on the results of the analysis. Attempts to re-scale the affected variables via transformations would likely have made the results difficult to interpret (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Therefore, as with study 1, it was decided to leave the variables in their original scales.
Control Variables

In order to investigate the possible effects of demographic variables, analyses were first conducted controlling for these variables. Because the results indicated that these control variables did not change the outcome of the analyses of the hypotheses, for the sake of simplicity the results are presented without controlling for these variables.

Manipulation Checks

A test for the manipulation of interpersonal justice in each scenario was tested with a mixed models repeated measures generalized linear analysis. Linear mixed models are “statistical models for continuous outcome variables in which the residuals are normally distributed but may not be independent or have constant variance” (West, Welch & Galecki, 2007, p. 1). This method of analysis was chosen due to its ability to handle a considerable amount of missing data in addition to supporting both within subjects and between subjects effects. As noted by Howell (2008) and West et al. (2007), among others, traditional repeated measures ANOVA drops cases that have missing data and can result in the loss of a great deal of potentially useful and usable data. In the current study, only 211 of the participants completed all six scenarios, and due to counterbalancing of the order the scenarios in the study, there is no simple, logical solution to the missing data problem, such as dropping “later” scenarios. Additionally, those who did complete all six scenarios might have been rushing more than participants who completed fewer scenarios, or may have differed from the other participants in meaningful ways, so it is particularly advantageous to use the mixed models procedure because it allows the analysis of all the usable data. This method of analysis has a long history although the wide availability of the method in popular statistical software tools is
fairly recent; for example it has been included in SPSS since 2001 (West et al., 2007). The term “mixed-model” refers to the ability of this method to include both fixed effects such as experimental conditions and random effects such as the subject-effects, which may cause error terms and repeated factors to be correlated within participants.

Following the procedure described by Yaffee, the Mixed Models-Linear method was chosen (which can also be accessed via the “Mixed” command in SPSS syntax). The participant number was entered as the subject variable; the task request as a repeated factor; the perceived level of interpersonal justice was entered as the dependent variable, and the scenario justice level (high vs. low) as a between groups factor. The model was specified to include fixed effects for justice level, task request, and their interaction. The REML method of covariance estimation was used, because this is preferred for unbalanced designs (West et al., 2007). For details regarding the overall results of this analysis, see Table 12. For details regarding the mean perceived interpersonal justice for each task request and justice level, see Table 13.

The overall analysis showed a significant main effect for justice level, $F(1, 1451.81) = 1983.05, p < .001$, and pairwise comparisons of the means utilizing the Bonferroni correction show that the high justice condition scenarios resulted in a higher mean perceived level of interpersonal justice ($M = 4.23, SD = .83$) as compared to the low justice condition scenarios ($M = 2.12, SD = 1.06$). Thus the manipulation of interpersonal justice in the scenarios was successful.
Table 12

*Study 2: Mixed Models General Linear Analysis Predicting Interpersonal Justice (N = 350)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Request</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1983.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Request * Justice Level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.67**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.*
Table 13

Study 2: Perceived Interpersonal Justice Level by Task Request and Scenario Justice

Levels (N = 350)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task request</th>
<th>Low justice scenarios</th>
<th>High justice scenarios</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean bathroom</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch shifts</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be host person</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear new uniform</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fold shirts</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do inventory</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over all tasks</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall analysis revealed no significant effect of task request on perceived interpersonal justice, $F(5,425.92) = 2.84, p = .10, n.s.$ However, the analysis did show a significant interaction of task request and scenario justice level on perceived interpersonal justice, $F(5,425.92) = 7.67, p < .001$.

To investigate the interaction between task request and justice level in predicting perceived interpersonal justice, mixed models linear analyses were run separately for high and low justice scenarios. In the low justice scenarios, there was no significant effect of task request, $F(1,228.30) = 2.26, p = .05, n.s.$ In the high justice scenarios however, there was a significant effect of task request, $F(1, 228.48) = 10.16, p < .001$.

Pairwise comparisons of the mean perceived interpersonal justice level for each task request in the high justice condition revealed that the least just task, clean the bathroom, had a mean level of perceived interpersonal justice ($M = 3.81, SD = .83$) which was significantly lower than each of the other task requests at the $p < .001$ significance level utilizing the Bonferonni correction.

**Counterbalance Tests**

As previously noted, approximately half the participants participated first in study 2, the scenario study concerning hypothetical supervisors, before completing study 1. Analyses of hypotheses showed that the results were not changed by including the order of the studies as a control variable; therefore for the sake of simplicity the results are presented without controlling for this variable.
Analyses of hypotheses.

The means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values of study 2 focal variables, averaged across scenarios, are listed in Table 14, and correlations among study variables are listed in Table 15.
Table 14

*Study 2: Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (All Scenarios)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Politeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal justice</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive politeness</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative politeness</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent power</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive power</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate power</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactance</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social dominance orientation</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Correlations Between Study 2 Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Interpersonal justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Positive politeness</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Negative politeness</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Referent power</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Coercive power</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Legitimate power</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reactance</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Commitment</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Compliance</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Social dominance orientation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Correlations of .15 or greater are significant at the $p < .05$ level but may be misleading due to the repeated measures design.
All hypotheses were tested with a series of mixed model generalized linear analyses using the same methodology as described in the discussion of the manipulation checks for this study. As previously mentioned, this method of analysis was chosen due to its ability to handle considerably unequal cell sizes without the dropping of incomplete cases, in addition to supporting both within subjects and between subjects effects (West, Welch & Galecki, 2007). Because the manipulation check revealed that task request in some cases influenced the perception of interpersonal justice, all hypotheses were first investigated including effects for task request, and where appropriate, its interaction with justice level. However, because the results of the investigation of hypotheses were the same regardless of whether task request was included, for the sake of simplicity task request was excluded from the final analyses.

The methodology and options utilized for the analyses of Hypotheses 1a and 1b was similar to that described in the description of the manipulation check analysis for study 2. In order to test hypotheses 1a and 1b regarding referent power, first a generalized mixed model repeated measures linear analysis was run with referent power as the dependent variable, scenario justice level as a between groups factor, and Social Dominance Orientation as a covariate. This was accomplished via SPSS syntax utilizing the MIXED procedure, the BY command for the Justice level, and the WITH command for the Social Dominance Orientation covariate. Social Dominance Orientation was centered on the grand mean before its use in this analysis. The model was specified to include fixed effects for justice level, Social Dominance Orientation, and the interaction between justice level and Social Dominance Orientation (via use of the FIXED keyword and the inclusion of the scenario justice level, the Social Dominance Orientation variable,
and the multiplicative product of these variables). In SPSS generalized mixed models, no special syntax is required to utilize cross-level interaction terms, because the results depend upon the underlying covariance structure, which is detected in the analysis. For details regarding the overall results of the analyses of Hypothesis 1a and 1b, see Table 16.
Table 16

*Study 2: Mixed Models Linear Analysis Predicting Referent Power Based on Justice Level (N = 322)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>405.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Level* SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.
Hypotheses 1a proposed a positive relationship between interpersonal justice and referent power. The overall analysis showed a significant main effect of justice level, $F(1, 1520.80) = 405.54, p < .001$, and pairwise comparisons of the means show that the high justice condition scenarios resulted in a higher perceived level of referent power ($M = 3.88, SD = .77$) as compared to the low justice condition scenarios ($M = 2.94, SD = 1.06$). Thus, consistent with the results of study 1, hypothesis 1a was also strongly supported in study 2.

Hypothesis 1b proposed that the relationship between referent power and interpersonal justice would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. However, the results of the mixed models linear analysis showed no significant effect of the interaction term between Social Dominance Orientation and Justice Level, $F(1, 1522.71) = 1.77, p = .18$, n.s. Thus, as with study 1, in study 2 Hypothesis 1b was not supported. Additionally, there was no main effect found for Social Dominance Orientation.

Hypothesis 1c proposed a positive relationship between referent power and task commitment. In order to test this hypothesis, a mixed models linear model procedure similar to the above was carried out, using task commitment as the dependent variable and referent power as a covariate. Referent power was centered around its grand mean before use in this analysis. The results revealed a significant main effect for referent power, $F(1, 1572.32) = 565.55, p < .001$, with higher task commitment being associated with higher referent power. Therefore, consistent with the results of study 1, Hypothesis 1c was supported.

Hypothesis 2a proposed a negative relationship between interpersonal justice and coercive power. In order to test this hypothesis, a mixed models linear model procedure
similar to procedure described above was carried out, using coercive power as the
dependent variable and justice condition as the independent variable. The results
revealed a significant main effect for justice level, $F(1, 1678.38) = 336.21, p < .001$.
Moreover, the overall mean level of coercive power was significantly higher in the low
justice condition ($M = 3.83, SD = .93$) as compared to the high justice condition ($M =
2.98, SD = .99$). Therefore, consistent with study 1, Hypothesis 2a was supported.

Hypothesis 2b predicted that the relationship between coercive power and task
commitment would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. In order to test this
hypothesis, a mixed model general linear analysis was run with task commitment as the
dependent variable, and coercive power and Social Dominance Orientation as a covariate.
Social Dominance Orientation and coercive power were both centered on the grand mean
before use in this analysis. The model was specified to include main effects of coercive
power and Social Dominance Orientation and the interaction between coercive power and
Social Dominance Orientation. For details regarding the overall results of this analysis,
see Table 17. The results revealed a significant main effect for coercive power but no
significant interaction. Specifically, the predicted interaction between coercive power and
Social Dominance Orientation in predicting task commitment was not significant, $F$
$(1,1447.21) = .35, p = .56, n.s$. Therefore, consistent with the results of study 1,
Hypothesis 2b was not supported.
Table 17

_Study 2: Mixed Models General Linear Analysis Predicting Task Commitment Based on Coercive Power and Social Dominance Orientation (N=327)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>448.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power * SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.
Hypothesis 2c predicted a positive relationship between coercive power and reactance, and Hypothesis 2d predicted that the relationship between coercive power and reactance would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. In order to test these hypotheses, a mixed model general linear analysis was conducted with reactance as the dependent variable, with a methodology otherwise identical to that described above regarding the analysis of hypothesis 2b. For details regarding the overall results of this analysis, see Table 18.

The results revealed a significant main effect for coercive power but no significant interaction. Specifically, the predicted main-effect relationship between coercive power and reactance was significant, $F(1,1519.52)=601.22, p<.001$, with higher levels of coercive power being associated with higher levels of reactance. However, the predicted interaction between coercive power and Social Dominance Orientation in predicting reactance was not significant, $F(1,1493.61)= 1.64, p=.20, n.s.$ Therefore, consistent with the results of study 1, Hypothesis 2c was supported but Hypothesis 2d was not supported.
Table 18

*Study 2: Mixed Models General Linear Analysis Predicting Reactance Based on Coercive Power and Social Dominance Orientation (N = 322)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>601.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power * SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.
Hypothesis 3a predicted that the relationship between legitimate power and interpersonal justice would be moderated by Social Dominance Orientation. To investigate this hypothesis, a mixed model repeated measures general linear analysis was conducted similar to the analyses described above, with legitimate power as the dependent variable, scenario interpersonal justice level as a fixed factor, Social Dominance Orientation as a covariate, and the model including main effects for interpersonal justice, Social Dominance Orientation, and their interaction. The Social Dominance Orientation variable was centered before its use in this analysis. Consistent with the results of study 1, the interaction between Social Dominance Orientation and interpersonal justice was not a significant predictor of legitimate power; Hypothesis 3a was once again not supported. For details regarding the results of this analysis, see Table 18.
Table 19

Mixed Models Linear Analysis Predicting Legitimate Power Based on Justice Level and Social Dominance Orientation (N = 320)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$Df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Level * SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. **p < 0.01.
However, the scenario justice level was a significant predictor of legitimate power. An examination of the mean levels of legitimate power for high and low justice scenarios revealed that the level of legitimate power perceived was significantly higher in the high justice scenarios, $M = 3.86$, $SD = .71$, than in the low justice scenarios, $M = 3.47$, $SD = .92$, $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 3b predicted a positive relationship between legitimate power and compliance. To test this hypothesis, a mixed model repeated measures generalized linear analysis similar to those described above was conducted, with compliance as the dependent variable and legitimate power as a covariate. Legitimate power was centered around its grand mean before its use in this analysis. The results indicated a significant positive main effect of legitimate power on compliance, $F (1,600.53)= 506.74$, $p<.001$. Thus, consistent with the results of study 1, Hypothesis 3b was once again supported.

Hypothesis 3c predicted that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship between legitimate power and task commitment. In order to test this hypothesis, mixed models repeated measures linear analysis was conducted using a similar methodology as was used to investigate the other moderated hypotheses. Task commitment was entered as the dependent variable, and legitimate power and Social Dominance Orientation were entered as covariates, with the model including main effects for legitimate power, Social Dominance Orientation, and their interaction. Legitimate power and Social Dominance Orientation were centered around their respective means before being used in this analysis. The results of this analysis indicated significant a main effect for legitimate power; no other main effects or interactions were found to be significant. Thus, as with study 1, study 2 did not support Hypothesis 3c; however the
interaction effect which was directionally opposite to Hypothesis 3c which was found to be significant in study 1 was not replicated in study 2. For details regarding the results of this analysis, see Table 19.
Table 20

*Mixed Models Linear Analysis Predicting Commitment Based on Legitimate Power and Social Dominance Orientation (N = 327)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power * SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01.
As a final step, in order to compare the results of study 2 to study 1, the zero-order correlations involved in the main effects hypotheses found in study 2 were compared to those found in study 1 using a Fischer $r$ to $z$ transformation. Utilizing a Bonferonni correction, the only main effect hypothesis found to have a significantly different correlation in study 2 as compared to study 1 was the correlation between legitimate power and compliance, which was found to be $0.49$ ($N=1635$) in study 2 as compared to $0.36$ ($N=464$) in study 1. According to the Fischer test, this results in a $z$ of $3.02$, which utilizing the Bonferonni correction indicates that the correlation is higher in study 2 than study 1 at the $p<0.05$ level of significance.

Overall, for study 2, all of the main effects hypotheses were supported, but none of the hypotheses regarding interactions were supported
Chapter VI

Discussion
Summary of Hypotheses, Implications, and Suggestions for Future Research

This study contributes to the research knowledge regarding interpersonal justice, politeness, and power. The main effects hypotheses related to the relationship between the interpersonal justice, perceived power, compliance, reactance, and commitment were all supported. Although there was little support for the role of Social Dominance Orientation in moderating these relationships, this study contributes to the literature by shedding light on perceptions of power, utilizing experimental methods that allow cause and effect determinations to be made, and simultaneously providing support for similar relationships using correlational studies. Additionally, the study increases our understanding of the relationship between the constructs of interpersonal justice and positive and negative politeness. For a summary of the support for each hypothesis, see Table 20.

Support for Main Effects Hypotheses

Based on a review of the literature, including both research and theoretical work, a model was proposed linking supervisor interpersonal justice, the perception of three types of power, and subordinate reactions. The unmoderated version of this model is presented in Figure 1. This model proposed that higher levels of interpersonal justice would be related to higher levels of referent power and lower levels of coercive power. It also proposed that referent power would be positively related to task commitment; that coercive power would be positively related to reactance; and that legitimate power would be positively related to compliance. These hypotheses were all supported in both studies.
Table 21

**Hypothesis and Results Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1A</strong> A supervisor who behaves with more interpersonaljustice will be perceived as having more referent power.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1B</strong>: The relationship between interpersonal justice and referent power is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1C</strong>: The perceived referent power of a supervisor is positively related to the task commitment of the subordinate.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2A</strong>: A supervisor who behaves with less interpersonal justice will be perceived as possessing more coercive power.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2B</strong>: The relationship between coercive power and task commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2C</strong>: There is a positive relationship between the perceived coercive power of a supervisor and reactance in a subordinate.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2D</strong>: The relationship between coercive power and reactance is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3A</strong>: The relationship between interpersonal justice and legitimate power is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3B</strong>: There is a positive relationship between the perceived legitimate power of a supervisor and compliance in a subordinate</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3C</strong>: The relationship between legitimate power and task commitment is moderated by Social Dominance Orientation.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of this writing, this is the first study to investigate the constructs of perceived interpersonal justice, politeness, power bases, and the behavioral and attitudinal reactions of compliance, commitment and reactance, as well as Social Dominance Orientation, in the same study. The results of the current study suggest that variations in justice behavior will likely be accompanied by changes in the perception of power, and with the behavioral and attitudinal reactions that have been found to correspond to reactions to those different types of power. In understanding reactions to interpersonal justice, it is thus important to keep the role of power in mind, and the understanding of interpersonal justice may in future be much enriched by reference to the considerable extant literature on power. Similarly, this study contributes to the theoretical knowledge of power perception. Interpersonal justice seems to play a large role in the perception of referent, coercive, and legitimate power, and this should thus be kept in mind when investigating power perception. Additionally, reactions to interpersonal justice may need to be kept in mind in studies of reactions to power, because interpersonal justice may be playing a role in what have heretofore been studied as strictly reactions to different varieties of power.

Study 2, utilizing an experimental scenario method, demonstrated that manipulating the interpersonal justice of task requests made by supervisors resulted in changes in the perception of the referent, coercive, and legitimate power that the supervisors seemed to possess. Therefore, unlike most previous studies involving these variables, this study was able to establish a cause and effect relationship in which changes in levels of interpersonal justice produced changes in perceptions of referent, coercive, and legitimate power. Most previous studies involving these or related variables have either been correlational or have investigated the reverse causational direction; that
is, that the possession of certain types of power affects supervisory behavior (e.g. Baxter, 1984; Morand, 1996). The few studies that have investigated behavior as a cause of power perception (e.g. Holtgraves & Yang, 1992; Jessmer & Anderson, 2001; Tedeschi, 1994) have looked at power as a unitary construct and have not investigated the effect of the behavior on the perception of individual types of power. Therefore, this study contributes to the literature by providing support that supervisory interpersonal justice behavior can affect the perception of referent, coercive, and legitimate power. This set of studies illustrates that a person who behaves with high interpersonal justice will tend to be perceived to have less coercive power, more referent power, and perhaps most surprisingly, a greater degree of legitimate power as well.

Study 1 provided support for the same relationships investigated in study 2, but utilizing surveys regarding participants’ actual experiences with their own supervisors. The findings regarding the hypotheses, and the magnitude of the relationships between the focal variables involved in the hypotheses, were very similar in both studies. Because study 1 was correlational, it can not establish cause and effect the way that study 2 can. However, because it asked about actual supervisory situations the participants had encountered, it suggests that the relationships between variables established in study 2 are not limited to hypothetical situations but can be generalized to actual working situations. Therefore whereas study 2 is strong in internal validity in terms of the cause and effect relationships proposed, study 1 complements the findings by providing evidence for external validity.
Moderational Hypotheses

Although the main effects hypotheses proposed were strongly supported in both studies, there was no support in either study for the hypotheses proposing Social Dominance Orientation as a moderating individual difference variable. Specifically, there was no support for the hypotheses that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship between referent power and interpersonal justice; between coercive power and task commitment or reactance; and between legitimate power and interpersonal justice. In study 1 only, a significant moderation effect of Social Dominance Orientation was found regarding the relationship between legitimate power and commitment, such that the relationship was stronger for those low rather than high in Social Dominance Orientation. Hypothesis 3c predicted that Social Dominance Orientation would moderate the relationship, but the predicted relationship between legitimate power and commitment for those low in Social Dominance Orientation was negative whereas the relationship which was found in Study 1 was positive. Therefore hypothesis 3c was also not supported, but the results suggest that people who are low in Social Dominance, that is people who are not strongly supportive of group differences, may actually be more sensitive than others in their reaction to legitimate power. Low Social Dominance Orientation people may indeed become more committed to tasks if they do perceive that their supervisor possesses legitimate power. However, bearing in mind their opinion on group differences, this perception of legitimate power may not occur automatically based on the position of their supervisor but may need to be earned based on more individual supervisory characteristics such as high interpersonal justice. Because the findings regarding this moderational hypothesis resulted in a small or non-existent effect and are
counter in direction to the hypothesized relationship, more research on this topic is warranted before drawing any firm conclusions.

Regarding the other, inconclusive findings regarding Social Dominance Orientation, it is possible that despite the relatively large number of participants utilized in the study, there was insufficient power to detect moderating effects of Social Dominance Orientation. One possibility is that the limited strength of the manipulation of interpersonal justice through short written scenarios and the reliance on self-reported hypothetical reactions, or reactions to supervisors from the past, may have weakened the measurable effects. Studies utilizing live actors, video or audiotapes, or more involving scenarios, might result in stronger effects. Observation of actual behavior in simulations or actual work situations might provide stronger measures of effects, rather than relying on self-reports.

Another likely potential cause is might be the range restriction of Social Dominance Orientation found in the sample. Social Dominance Orientation exhibited a standard deviation of only .55 in both studies, the lowest standard deviation of any of the focal variables. Social Dominance Orientation, strong support of hierarchies, may simply not exhibit much variability in the type of sample utilized, which was largely young, female, and from the New York area; but a more diverse sample might have resulted in larger variation of this variable and aided in the detection of its effects. The measurement of Social Dominance Orientation might also have been problematic. Achieving a high score on this scale requires agreeing strongly with statements supporting social inequalities, and it may be perceived as socially undesirable to do so, especially among the predominantly young, female, Northeastern sample utilized, particularly when taking
part in a study in a group setting. A forced choice method or a more covert measure of Social Dominance Orientation might yield more promising results. Note that an ANOVA analyses of the relationship between demographic variables and the Social Dominance Orientation of participants in study 1 (the more demographically diverse study of the two included here) revealed no significant difference in Social Dominance Orientation between the student sample \( (M = 2.49, SD = .55) \) and non-student sample \( (M = 2.45, SD = .57) \), \( F (1,439) = .345, p = .58, n.s. \); and no significant effects for ethnic group on Social Dominance Orientation, \( F (4,431) = .459, n.s. \). However, Social Dominance Orientation was significantly higher for men \( (M = 2.66, SD = .57) \) than for women \( (M = 2.38, SD = .51) \), \( F (1,437) = 3.61, p < .001 \).

It might also be that Social Dominance Orientation, which deals with general social inequalities rather than hierarchical power differences, is too distal a personality construct to closely affect the relationships involved in the study. More closely power-related constructs, such as authoritarianism or power distance, might have yielded more informative results; see for example Lian, Ferris and Brown (2012) for a study finding that power distance moderates the effects of abusive supervision. It is also possible that the Social Dominance Orientation- moderated relationships between interpersonal justice, power perception, and reactions to supervisory power bases do not operate in the manner hypothesized. The fact that the one positive finding for a moderational relationship runs directionally counter to the hypothesis suggest that this may be the case.

**Utilizing Politeness Theory to Inform Interpersonal Justice Theory and Practice**

In addition to investigating the main hypotheses, another aim of the current research was to investigate the relationship between the constructs of interpersonal justice
and positive and negative politeness as described in politeness theory. Based on correlations and factor analysis, the study indicated that interpersonal justice, as defined in the organizational justice research (Colquitt et al., 2001a) and politeness, as defined in politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), are very much overlapping constructs. Additionally, the scenarios utilized in study 2 demonstrated that the wording described in the linguistic literature regarding politeness theory could be successfully used to manipulate the level of perceived interpersonal justice of requests. Therefore, politeness theory and research may provide a useful background to the research and interventions related to interpersonal justice.

The overlap found between the constructs of politeness and interpersonal justice has implications for theory, research and practice. These two research areas both include a large set of theoretical and empirical articles. Interpersonal justice research has focused largely on workplace issues and has a strong empirical framework but has been criticized for lacking supporting theory (Greenberg, 1993a). Politeness research is stronger on theory and has a broader base in research in terms of utilizing a wider variety of social settings. However, politeness studies are often qualitative. Even when quantitative, they do not always include some of the more advanced statistical methods employed in interpersonal justice literature and could at times benefit from the statistical and methodological rigor associated with interpersonal justice research. For example, much of the politeness literature is posited on the two constructs of negative and positive politeness. However, few studies have actually examined whether these concepts are actually distinct. The few that have factor analyzed the two constructs have not found support for them as two distinct constructs; similarly the current study provided evidence
that politeness is more likely a unitary construct. If the constructs of positive and negative politeness are indeed distinct, measures more sensitive to the underlying differences may need to be developed.

In view of the apparent overlap between politeness and interpersonal justice, politeness theory could potentially help inform the interpersonal justice domain in both theory and practice. Interpersonal justice is at some levels an abstract concept. Dignity, respect, improper remarks, and even “politeness” could be subject to differing individual interpretations. In fact, when supervisors behave in a manner which their subordinates perceive as low in interpersonal justice, it is possible that the supervisors themselves actually perceive their own behavior as interpersonally just. Thus, one of the reasons why publicizing the negative effects of interpersonal justice does not necessarily reduce its occurrence may be that many supervisors are unaware of their own disrespectful behavior or how to improve it. Politeness theory, on the other hand, provides very specific, actionable methods to improve the politeness of communications (Holtgraves & Yang, 1990), and these methods may be found to aid in perceived interpersonal justice as well.

There has been an interest in training supervisors to increase the interpersonal justice of their behavior (Greenberg, 2006); providing specific examples of how requests may be politely worded may be extremely helpful in this endeavor. In fact managers could potentially learn how to improve the politeness and interpersonal justice of written and verbal communications by reading about politeness theory. However, if supervisors are instead told simply to treat their subordinates with “dignity and respect”, this directive is likely harder for them to correctly interpret and implement.
Additionally, experiments that endeavor to manipulate interpersonal justice often vary widely in how this manipulation is carried out and may often contaminate the variable with potentially confounding manipulations of other types of organizational justice. By basing experimental manipulations of interpersonal justice on recommendations from politeness theory without changing the nature of the actual request, it may become easier to tease apart the effects of interpersonal justice as distinct from other types of organizational justice.

**Study Limitations**

Although the two-pronged nature of the current set of research studies was designed to increase the validity of the conclusions, there are several potential limitations inherent in the studies. One potential limit on the generalizability of the findings is the nature of the sample. The sample was predominantly young, white, and female. Even though inclusion of demographic covariates in preliminary analyses did not affect the results of the investigation of hypotheses, it is still possible that the results would have been different given a more diverse sample. The sample was largely composed of students who due to their age, inexperience, and status as students, may not react the same way to their supervisors as older people do. Students usually lack long-term work experience and may not have the same expectations for a job, or commitment to a job, as older, more experienced people do. Their power relationships with their supervisors may be by nature different than those of older people. The generally lower-level and temporary nature of their jobs may limit the degree of commitment they have to their work tasks, and the frequently low-skill, closely supervised nature of their jobs may reduce their ability to be non-compliant. Their short histories with their supervisors may
limit the depth of their reactions to the supervisor’s behavior. An effort was made to recruit from a more diverse population for study 1, and this effort was met with some limited success. However, most of the non-student responses to study 1 followed closely a posting on a Human-Resources related interest group, and therefore most of those responding were also likely from a rather specialized set of the population. In the future, attempts to reach a more representative sample of the population may be warranted and may increase the potential of the study to detect the moderating effects of personality variables.

Additionally, combining the two distinct samples from research-pool and non-research pool groups, and recruiting from so many different sources, might have resulted in undesirable heterogeneity in the sample in the sample and provided sources of extraneous or confounding variance. For example, if the research pool sample tended to have supervisors who were lower in interpersonal justice and higher in coercive power as compared to the non-research pool sample, this could have resulted in correlations which were actually due to sample group membership rather than to the focal variables, thus posing a threat to internal validity.

In order to assess whether the means for the focal variables were different for the research pool vs. non research pool groups, it was first determined that there were differences between the groups in proportions of participants choosing to use their most polite, least polite, or current supervisor. In fact, for the research pool group, 19.8% (67) used their most polite supervisor, 24.0% (81) used their least polite supervisor, and 56.2% (191) used their current supervisor; for the non- research pool group, 32.0% (33) used their most polite supervisor, 15.5% (16) used their least polite supervisor, and
52.4% (54) used their current supervisor. Because the type of supervisor chosen was strongly related to the focal variables in the sample as a whole, examination of differences between the research pool and non-research pool participants needed to take supervisor type into account. Therefore a series of exploratory two-way factorial ANOVAs were run to examine the effect on the focal variables based on sample type (research pool vs. non-research pool), supervisor type (polite, rude, or current), and their interaction. Utilizing a Bonferroni correction, none of these analyses revealed any significant differences in the focal variables based on sample type or the interaction of sample type with supervisor chosen. Although the differences in the proportions of the type of supervisor the research pool vs. non-research pool participants chose to use may reflect a difference in the type of jobs that research pool vs. non-research pool participants hold, the difference between the two sample groups regarding the proportions choosing to use their least polite supervisor was not significant at the p<.05 level based on an r to z transformation (z=1.81, p=.08)

Additionally, factors regarding the design of the current set of studies may warrant caution in interpreting the results. The studies were based solely on self-reports of participants’ own perceptions, attitudes, personality and behavior, including predictions of their own behavior in hypothetical situations. The size of the relationships between variables may have been inflated due to common method bias caused by factors such as the need for participants to portray themselves consistently, to reflect their own implicit theories about the relationships between the variables being studied, to respond in ways that reflect their current mood, and to respond in a socially desirable manner; participants may also have been subject to item-priming effects due to the fact that
information related to interpersonal justice appeared early in the surveys (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podskoff, 2003). Thus, for example, some people may not want to portray themselves as reacting in a positive manner to disrespectful behavior, although some may also not want to portray themselves as less than conscientious under any circumstances.

Although many of the findings of the current studies were consistent with other related studies, the response bias problem may explain some findings that are at odds with some other studies. For example, the current studies found a small to moderate, but significant, negative correlation between perceived coercive power and compliance; but previous studies (e.g., Kelman 1958) involving observations of actual behavior have often found a positive relationship between compliance and coercive power. Logically, it seems unlikely that people would actually refuse to comply when they thought there would be negative consequences from doing so. However, past research also indicates that the increase in compliance due to coercive power may be limited to situations in which non-compliance could be observed. Future studies regarding interpersonal justice, power, and compliance could involve observation of actual behaviors, responses from additional sources, and more information about whether the person’s non-compliance could be observed (Shaw & Condelli, 1986). However, based on the types of jobs most students are employed in and based on the scenarios depicted in study 2, it seems likely that participants believed their non-compliance could be observable. In the two studies, the mean levels for compliance was relatively high and the standard deviation relatively low (for study 1, $M = 4.04, SD = .68$; for study 2, $M = 3.65, SD = .81$).
In addition, even though the task requests presented in study 2 were chosen to represent a range from very unpleasant (clean a bad smelling bathroom) to more neutral (wear a different uniform), it seems unlikely for any of these types of tasks to inspire a large degree of commitment. Future research could be conducted utilizing tasks more subject to varying degrees of commitment and ones where non-compliance or passive-aggressive behavior could be engaged in by the participants and measured by the researchers. Utilizing a more diverse sample, including more professionals with jobs more likely to result in outcomes including strong commitment and hidden resistance, could also help ameliorate this measurement issue.

Other aspects of the study may have contributed to response bias and demand characteristics, wherein the participants guess some of the purposes of the study and attempt to respond consistently with the hypotheses. This is particularly likely to have been the case in study 2. The repetitive manipulation of interpersonal justice likely made it apparent to the participants that interpersonal justice was the main variable of interest to the researchers. It was also particularly likely to be apparent in study 1 for the participants who were asked to think of a supervisor who displayed very low or very high levels of interpersonal justice. Some participants completed study 2 before completing study 1 and thus might have been particularly sensitized.

Analyses were conducted to investigate the possible extent of these issues in affecting the results. In initial analyses, study order was entered as a covariate, and it was found that the investigations of hypotheses including study order resulted in the same overall findings in terms of which hypotheses were supported. Additionally, in order to investigate the potential effect of the instruction (some study 1 participants received
instructions regarding utilizing their most or least polite supervisor), correlations between
study 1 focal variables were run separately for the participants who did not receive this
instruction but were instead instructed to use their most recent supervisor; the main
effects hypotheses were also found to be supported for this smaller subset of the sample.
Similar analyses were also conducted for the study 1 subgroup that completed the study 1
survey first as opposed to the study 2 scenarios; and once again the main effects
hypotheses were supported within this subgroup.

Nevertheless, it is also possible that within the studies some of the variables were
not measuring what they purported to measure or that some of the dependent variables
were not completely distinct from the independent variables. For example, in study 2, the
low justice scenario supervisors were behaving in an unpleasant manner, and some of the
items in the coercive power scale ask about the supervisor’s ability to “make things
unpleasant”. Future studies could study more orthogonal aspects of coercive power, such
as specifics regarding the supervisor’s ability to fire the subordinate or cut the
subordinate’s pay. Additionally, the use of a single item to measure commitment in
study 1 may have reduced the validity of the results relating to the construct of
commitment.

**Study Implications**

**Implications for Future Research.**

As described above, the current set of studies suggests future studies which could
expand on the utilization of operationalizations from politeness theory as applied to
interpersonal justice research. Utilizing live actors, video and audio clips, and written
instructions, one could further distinguish the effects of wording and non-verbal behavior
on the perception of interpersonal justice, power, and on behavioral reactions. In addition to behavioral compliance, reactance, and commitment, one could also measure work quality and quantity. It is possible that even if one is attempting to comply outwardly, the cognitive resources required to overcome “saying no inwardly” when one is reactant may lower performance levels even against one’s will and outside of one’s conscious awareness. Thus, in future studies it will be important to measure actual performance rather than relying solely on self-report.

Although the strong main effects in the current study suggest that the relationships found were not limited to individuals with a particular set of personality traits, it is likely that there are important personality differences that do affect the reactions to interpersonal justice. Future studies could seek out groups with more diverse levels of Social Dominance Orientation, perhaps through recruiting participants from diverse political groups and geographical settings. Other related personality variables could be measured such as authoritarianism, negative vs. positive affectivity, neuroticism, job centrality, and need for achievement. The effects of differing power perceptions on the psychological well being of subordinates could also be investigated. There has been increasing interest in occupational health, and it would be useful to investigate, for example, how someone with strong job centrality, high need for achievement, and negative affectivity would react to low interpersonal justice behavior. This person might feel the need to be committed to tasks but experience cognitive dissonance when trying to do so under conditions of low interpersonal justice and high perceived coercive power. Other outcome variables such as turnover and affective, continuance, and normative commitment could also be examined in terms of their relationship to differing types of
power. Longitudinal studies could also be conducted, investigating whether the effects of interpersonal justice on power perceptions increase or decrease over time. For example, does the effect of an abusive boss increase over time, or does a subordinate sometimes learn that a supervisor’s bark is worse than his bite? What happens to the perception of power after a decisive public event, such as the firing of a fellow work group member, or conversely when a supervisor backs down in a conflict with a subordinate? Also, what is the ability of a supervisor to change how he is perceived over time? If a previously disrespectful supervisor is trained on interpersonal justice and suddenly starts acting more respectful, do his power bases quickly change? Or could it backfire, so that he is now perceived as weak, perhaps losing coercive power without a sufficient gain in referent power? And how do gender, age, and rank of the supervisor affect all this?

Indeed, other factors regarding the supervisor should also be investigated regarding interpersonal justice, power, and worker reactions. The current research addressed cause and effect relationships in power perception and the possible effects of subordinate personality. One could instead focus on the characteristics of the supervisor that might lead him to believe that low interpersonal justice and high coercive power behavior are positive. It is possible that Social Dominance Orientation might be more successful as a predictor of supervisory behavior than of subordinate behavior. Moreover, perhaps sharing similar levels of Social Dominance Orientation could lead to a better fit between supervisor and subordinate, thus resulting in increased referent power. In future, job position, age, gender, and other demographic variables of the supervisor could also be manipulated in the experimental portion of the study to determine how those variables interact with request wording in determining the perception of power.
Studies have been done regarding the effects on third parties of episodes of low interpersonal justice directed at another employee (for example, Jones & Skarlikci, 2005; Skarlikci & Rupp, 2010). The effects of such episodes specifically on power perception could also be investigated. It would also be useful to know the effect of other employees’ communication regarding a supervisor’s power and interpersonal justice. Moreover, it would be useful to investigate the different effects on power perception in more or less structured environments, for example comparing unionized employees in a government office where the supervisor has very constricted powers that are well spelled out, vs. a small entrepreneurial company subject to few employment laws, where at-will employment is in effect and salaries and assignments are subject to immanent change. Additionally, life circumstances of the subordinate could be investigated as a moderator. Is a person with stable finances likely to react differently to low justice and high coercive power, as compared to someone who is being sponsored for their greencard? Lastly, family history could be investigated as playing a role. Does a person who grew up with low or high interpersonally just parents react differently to their supervisor’s justice behavior?

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study imply that by treating people with low interpersonal justice, supervisors may cause themselves to be seen as having a greater degree of coercive power. However, although these supervisors may agree with Machiavelli that “it is better to be feared than to be loved”, such behavior will actually result in subordinates “saying no inwardly”. Similarly, although some supervisors may believe that behaving with low interpersonal justice will cause subordinates to see the supervisor as a legitimate
authority figure who can “make people feel they have tasks to accomplish”, the reverse is actually the case, with disrespectful behavior actually associated with lower levels of legitimate power. Acting with high levels of interpersonal justice can help a supervisor to make their personnel feel important and valued. Moreover, the interpersonally just behavior results in the perception of referent power, which will have positive effects on task commitment. And, the difference between eliciting in someone reactance—the feeling that he or she does not want to give one inch—or commitment, giving extra effort beyond what is required, can begin with simply the words used to make the request.

As previously stated, the results of this study imply that training and self-education on justice behavior could be carried out with a basis in the specifics of politeness theory and that interpersonal justice behavior may potentially play a large role in the power dynamics in an organization. In fact, if one wants to change power-related aspects of an organizational climate, changing the justice behavior of the management may be a good, and rather straightforward, first step.

In conclusion, this study suggests that there is a strong relationship between interpersonal justice and the perception of several important types of power. The literature investigating the causes and effects of interpersonal justice have not generally acknowledged the large role that power is likely to play in work attitudes and behavior that are being ascribed to interpersonal justice. Likewise, most literature on power has not heretofore discussed the large effects that interpersonal justice behavior is likely to have on power perception and how reactions generally ascribed to power itself may in fact partly be reactions to the differing levels of interpersonal justice that so often accompany differing levels of power. Additionally, although literature on both interpersonal justice
and power tend to make general unspoken assumptions about what an episode of low or high interpersonal justice or coercive power might look like, politeness literature provides enlightening specifics that can be used to measure, predict and manipulate both the objective and perceived politeness of an interaction, and these specifics may be useful in manipulating and measuring interpersonal justice as well.

Therefore, it is suggested that future literature on interpersonal justice should utilize information from politeness theory when designing manipulations of interpersonal justice. Moreover, theory, research and practice involving interpersonal justice could potentially benefit from integrating conclusions from the existing power literature and from investigating where and how power may play a decisive role in both positive and negative reactions to interpersonal justice. Moreover, if one is attempting to improve anything from employee task commitment, compliance, and reactance; to employee perception of supervisor legitimacy; success may be unlikely unless one considers both the power dynamics in an organization and the very words used to communicate those power dynamics.
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Footnotes

¹Bies actually uses the term interactional justice; because of their similarity, throughout this document the terms interactional and interpersonal will be used interchangeably.
Appendix A: Recruitment Information

Text used to recruit participants from the research Pool via online Sona Systems:

Title: All About Your Supervisor.

We will give you confidential surveys about your supervisor's behavior, your job in general, your views about work, your personality, and your reactions to hypothetical work situations. You must have a paying job at least 5 hours a week, and be at least 18 years of age, to participate.
Email sent from management at small organization 1/13/2011

Email subject: Survey about your Supervisor

Our organization has agreed to allow a student working on her Ph.D. in the Psychology department at SUNY, University at Albany to distribute a voluntary, confidential survey about perceptions of supervisor behavior. We think you might find it interesting. If you are interested in participating or taking a look at the survey, it can be found online at http:\AllAboutYourSupervisor1.Questionpro.com

Your responses will be strictly confidential and the survey does not ask for your name. Individual responses will only be available to the researchers at SUNY; other people will only have access to the results in summary form, which will be combined with information on many participants from outside this organization. More information about the survey is included in the attached email. Thanks in advance for your consideration!

Sincerely,
As part of my requirements for obtaining a Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at the University at Albany, I need to conduct research for my dissertation and would be very grateful if you could spend short time filling out a survey for a study entitled “All About Your Supervisor”. The survey contains questions about your supervisor, your attitudes towards your work, and some other information about yourself. This should take about 20-30 minutes to complete. Your organization has granted approval for you to complete this survey as long as it doesn’t interfere with completing your work, but they will not have access to your individual responses and you will not be asked for your name. You can complete the study online at 
http://AllAboutYourSupervisor1.Questionpro.com/ or, if you prefer you can complete the survey on paper by obtaining a paper copy from the researcher, Ellen Weissblum, ellen.weissblum@gmail.com, 518 258-0555.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your responses will be strictly confidential. Your responses will be identified by a participant number which is not tied to your name. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board and University may inspect these records. We do not anticipate any risk in your participation other than you may become uncomfortable answering some of the questions. You may choose to stop participating at any time and you do not have to answer every question. Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained from this research. I ask that you answer as accurately and
frankly as possible, because your responses will better help us understand human psychology in the workplace.

If you have any questions about the study, please ask me, Ellen Weissblum, doctoral student (A.B.D.), Ellen.Weissblum@gmail.com, 518 258-0555, or Dr. Sylvia Roch, Associate Professor of Psychology at the University at Albany, roch@albany.edu, 518 442-5962. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University at Albany Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at 518-442-9050, 800-365-9139, or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

Thank you for your consideration!

-Ellen Weissblum
Doctoral Candidate, SUNY, University at Albany
In Person-Recruiting Script-Small Organization-December 2011:

The primary researcher and/or research assistants will approach employees at the organization and say

“Hi. I'm XX [name of researcher or assistant], a friend of __. Do you have a minute?”

If the employee says they do NOT have a minute, the researcher will say

"That's okay, is it okay if I just leave this information with you?"
and if the employee says it's okay, the researcher will leave the flyer and survey and envelope with the employee, and move on.

However, if the employee says they DO have a minute, the researcher will say:

"I am a student at SUNY Albany doing a research survey on supervisor behavior and employee reactions in the workplace, for a doctoral dissertation in Psychology. __ said it would be ok to provide information to employees here about the survey in case any of you guys would be interested in filling it out. The survey is confidential and totally voluntary. I have the survey and some more information here, is it ok if I leave you the information?"

If the employee says it's ok, the researcher will leave the flyer and survey with the employee.

(The flyer and packet left with the participant is the same as used with the email recruitment script).
Posting on LinkedHR Global Website 1/27/2011

LinkedIn Groups

- Group: Linked:HR Global
- Subject: [Linked:HR Global] Research on Supervision, Article on Personality & International Assignments

Dear colleagues,

I had to "hide" for a couple of weeks as I was confronted with a veritable mountain of work early in the semester at the university. Yikes! I spent almost my entire break studying for the Senior Professional in Human Resources exam (a certification exam for HR professionals in the U.S.) and of course got behind in everything else. Now I'm back, ready to participate in some great discussions! Please come to Linked:HR today and share your questions, ideas, and concerns about international HR.

A couple of announcements today:

1. Linked:HR Global supports academic research (sponsored by an academic institution and following appropriate ethical processes / requirements at that institution). Today I received a request from one of our members - a doctoral student from the University of SUNY Albany. Let's help our fellow member in her study! See below:

"All About Your Supervisor! As a doctoral student completing my dissertation at SUNY Albany, I would be very grateful if you could fill out a 20-30 minute confidential survey about a supervisor you have had and your attitudes towards your job. You can complete the study online at [http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.QuestionPro.com](http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.QuestionPro.com)."

2. I thought you might enjoy some articles on engagement, personality, and (since we're talking about international adjustments) Personality and International Assignments. If so, please visit the page [http://www.criswildermuth.com/articles-publications/](http://www.criswildermuth.com/articles-publications/), where I post various articles you might find of interest. The very first link is for the article "Personality Matters Internationally" which describes the possible impact of personality on international assignments for U.S. expatriates.

Have a wonderful week!

Sincerely,

Dr. Cris Wildermuth
Chief Evangelist, Linked:HR and Linked:HR Global
Follow me on Twitter: [http://twitter.com/criswildermuth](http://twitter.com/criswildermuth)
Share the link to Linked:HR Global! [http://www.tinyurl.com/globallinkedhr](http://www.tinyurl.com/globallinkedhr)

Posted By Cris Wildermuth, Ed.D.

158
Dear colleagues,

As I hope you know, Linked:HR supports academic research. Our hope is that our support will advance the knowledge in our field and encourage more HR researchers. Today I ask for your help with a study conducted by one of our members, doctoral candidate Ellen Weissblum from SUNY Albany. Here's what Ellen wrote me:

* * * *

"As part of my requirements for obtaining a Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at the University at Albany, I need to conduct research for my dissertation and would be very grateful if you could spend a short time filling out a survey for a study entitled “All About Your Supervisor”.

The survey contains questions about your supervisor, your attitudes towards your work, and some other information about yourself. This should take about 20-30 minutes to complete. You can complete the study online at http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.Questionpro.com/.

Thank you for your consideration!

If you have any questions about the study, please ask me, Ellen Weissblum, doctoral student (A.B.D.), Ellen.Weissblum@gmail.com, 518 258-0555, or Dr. Sylvia Roch, Associate Professor of Psychology at the University at Albany, roch@albany.edu, (518) 442-5962."

* * * *

Thank you colleagues! Please write Ellen directly about the dissemination of her study results.

Kind Regards,

Cris Wildermuth, Ed.D., SPHR
Chief Evangelist, Linked:HR
Follow me on Twitter: http://twitter.com/criswildermuth
Other Postings-Academic Version

LinkedIn: Positive Organizational Scholarship Community – December 2010
LinkedIn: HR Higher Education & Research – December 2010
LinkedIn: Cvent Web Surveys- December 2010
LinkedIn: Smart Tech People- December 2010
LinkedIn: Social Influence December 2010
LinkedIn: State University of New York, December 2010
LinkedIn: University at Albany Alumni, January 2011
Craigslist-Volunteer Section

All About Your Supervisor! As a doctoral student completing my dissertation at SUNY Albany, I would be very grateful if you could fill out a 20-30 minute confidential survey

It's about a supervisor you have had and your attitudes towards your job. You can complete the study online at http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.questionpro.com
Ads/Postings- Non academic version:

Metroland Local Newspaper/ Website:
Ran on the website from Friday, November 5, 2010, until midnight, Wednesday, November 17, 2010.
Appeared in Metroland newspaper in the issues dated Thursday, November 11, 2010 to Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

Facebook-Chamber of Southern Saratoga County
Facebook-Albany Chamber of Commerce
Facebook-Saratoga Chamber of Commerce
Facebook-Rensselaer Chamber of Commerce
Facebook -Capital Alliance of Young Professional

LinkedIn: Tech Valley Nonprofit Business Council
LinkedIn: Albany-Colonie Chamber of Commerce group
LinkedIn: Capital District & Upstate New York young professionals group
LinkedIn: Tech Valley Nonprofit Business Council group
LinkedIn: Women's Business Council group
LinkedIn: Capital Alliance of Young Professionals group
LinkedIn: Albany Job & Career Network

Tell Us About Yours!
Many of us have or have had
one.

Independent, anonymous survey that will take
approximately 20-30 minutes. Your participation is greatly
appreciated!

'http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.QuestionPro.com'
Tell us about yours! 20-30 minute confidential survey about a supervisor you have had.  
'http://AllAboutYourSupervisor.QuestionPro.com'
Appendix B  Demographic and Work History Variables

**Work History Questions (Survey Study-study 1)**

What type of industry do you work in?
- a) Service (for example, restaurants)
- b) Retail (for example, stores)
- c) Other non-government business/industry (for example, marketing, publishing etc.)
- d) Government/Military
- e) Other

How many hours in a typical week did you work at this job?
- (a) 8 or less
- (b) 9-14
- (c) 15-24
- (d) 25-35
- (e) More than 35

Length of Time Known Manager

How long have you worked with this manager?
- (Student version)
  - (a) 0-3 months
  - (b) 4-6 months
  - (c) 7-9 months
  - (d) 10-12 months
  - (e) More than 12 months

- (Working sample version)
  - (a) Less than one year
  - (b) At least one year but less than 2 years
  - (c) At least 2 years but less than 5 years
  - (d) At least 5 years but less than 10 years
  - (e) 10 years or more
How long have you worked at this job?
(Student version)
(a) 0-3 months
(b) 4-6 months
(c) 7-9 months
(d) 10-12 months
(e) More than 12 months
(Non student version)
(a) Less than one year
(b) At least one year but less than 2 years
(c) At least 2 years but less than 5 years
(d) At least 5 years but less than 10 years
(e) 10 years or more

How many hours in a typical week did you work at this job?
(a) 8 or less  (b) 9-14  (c) 15-24  (d) 25-35  (e) More than 35

Demographic Questions Concerning Manager

What gender is your manager?
(a) Male or
(b) Female

Approximately how old is your manager?
(a) 25 or under
(b) 26-35
(c) 36-45
(d) 45-54
(e) 55 or older

Demographic Questions

How would you best describe your gender? (a) Male or (b) Female

How would you best describe your ethnicity? (a) Asian American, (b) African American, (c) Caucasian, (d) Latino, (e) Other

How old are you?
Student version:
(a) 20 or under
(b) 21-24,
(c) 25-28,
(d) 29-32,
(e) 33 or older
(working sample version)
(a) 25 or under
(b) 26-35
(c) 36-45
(d) 45-54
(e) 55 or older

What is your year in school?
(a) freshman, (b) sophomore, (c) junior, (d) senior, (e) other
(student sample only)
Appendix C: Focal Variable Questionnaire items

**Interpersonal Justice (Colquitt, 2001)**

The following items refer to your manager: *(survey version)*
The following items refer to the supervisor in the situation described: *(scenario version)*

1. My manager treats me in a polite manner.
2. My manager treats me with dignity.
3. My manager treats me with respect.
4. My manager refrains from improper remarks or comments.

Positive and Negative Politeness (Goldsmith & MacGeorge, 2000)
Please rate from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal)

Positive politeness:

In this situation, how much you would feel *(scenario version)*
In working for the supervisor you are thinking of, how much did or do you feel *(survey version)*

1. liked and accepted
2. criticized
3. identified with
4. disapproved of
5. empathized with
6. made to look bad
7. made to feel bad about yourself
8. thought highly of

Negative Politeness:

In this situation, how much you would feel *(scenario version)*
In working for the supervisor you are thinking of, how much did or do you feel *(survey version)*

1. imposed upon
2. told what to do
3. left with a choice about what to do
4. free to do what you want
5. respected in the right to make your own decision
6. like you could choose whether or not to carry out the request

Power Bases- Referent, Coercive, and Legitimate Power (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990)
Below is a list of statements which may be used in describing behaviors that supervisors in work organizations can direct toward their subordinates. First carefully read each descriptive statement, thinking in terms of your supervisor. Then decide to what extent
you agree that your supervisor could do this to you. Mark the letter which most closely represents how you feel. Use the following scale for your answers:

(Note: for scenario version, the introduction said “the supervisor in the situation described” instead of “your supervisor”. For the survey version, the introduction said “the supervisor you are thinking of”).

(A) = strongly disagree
(B) = disagree
(C) = neither agree nor disagree
(D) = agree
(E) = strongly agree

My supervisor could …
1. Increase my pay level (Reward)
2. Make me feel valued (Referent)
3. Give me undesirable job assignments (Coercive)
4. Make me feel like he/she approves of me (Referent)
5. Make me feel that I have commitments to meet (Legitimate)
6. Make me feel personally accepted (Referent)
7. Make me feel important (Referent)
8 Give me good technical suggestions (Expert)
9 Make my work difficult for me (Coercive)
10. Share with me his/her considerable experience and/or training (Expert)
11. Make things unpleasant here (Coercive)
12. Make being at work distasteful (Coercive)
13. Influence my getting a pay raise (Reward)
14. Make me feel like I should satisfy my job requirements (Legitimate)
15. Provide me with sound job-related advice (Expert)
16. Provide me with special benefits (Reward)
17. Influence my getting a promotion (Reward)
18. Give me the feeling that I have responsibilities to fulfill (Legitimate)
19. Provide me with the needed technical knowledge (Expert)
20. Make me recognize that I have tasks to accomplish (Legitimate)
Social Dominance Orientation Scale 2 (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 2004)

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement by choosing in the appropriate number from ‘1’ (A) Strongly Disagree/Disapprove to ‘5’ (E), Strongly Agree/Approve. Once again, remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were.
4. Some people are just more deserving than others.
5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
6. Some people are just inferior to others.
7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.
8. Increased economic equality.
9. Increased social equality.
11. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.
12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.
13. We should try to treat one another as equal as much as possible. (All humans should be treated equally.)
14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.

Reactance (Blickle, 2003)

1. The way this person acts if he or she wants another person to do something makes you say “No” inwardly.
2. The way this person acts if he or she wants another person to do something elicits in you the feeling that you don’t want to give in one inch.
3. The way this person acts makes you disagree, regardless of whether he or she is right or wrong.
**Task Commitment (Yukl, Chavez, & Seifert 2005)**
(For supervisor survey, study 1, only)

1. How many influence attempts by your supervisor result in complete commitment? (strong enthusiasm and special effort beyond what is normally expected).
   (a) None or few of them
   (b) Some (less than half)
   (c) About half of them
   (d) More than half of them
   (e) Most or all of them

**Compliance- Behavioral Compliance items from Rahim’s Compliance with Supervisor’s Wishes Scale**
(A Strongly Disagree to E Strongly Agree)

**Copyrighted-only one item can appear**

1. I follow my supervisor's orders.

**Commitment For scenario study (study 2 only) - Adapted from Hollenback & Williams 1989 Goal Commitment scale**
1. I am strongly committed to pursuing this task
2. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond what I'd normally do to perform this task
3. Quite frankly, I don't care about this task
4. There is not much to be gained by trying to perform this task
5. It wouldn't take much to make me abandon this task
6. It's unrealistic expect me to perform this task
7. It's hard to take this task seriously.
Appendix D: Careless Response Questions

Rate from (A) strongly Disagree to E Strongly agree

1. I make all my own clothes and shoes (study 1 and 2)
2. I like it when my supervisor treats me in a rude manner. (study 1 and 2)
3. My supervisor has traveled to the moon several times (study 1)
4. have traveled to the moon several times (study 2)
Appendix E: Study 1 Justice Manipulation Information

Randomization manipulation question- online survey only:

In order to randomly assign online participants to one of the three survey versions for study 1, they were asked to select the first number from a list of numbers shown; the order the numbers were shown in was randomized so that some participants were shown the number 1 first, some were shown the number 2 first, and some were shown the number 3 first. Based on the number chosen, they were sent to the appropriate survey.

The question is shown below:

“Please select the first number shown below *

( ) 2
( ) 1
( ) 3

[ Continue]

Instructions for Survey 1- Justice Manipulation:

Version A and B: Top instructions info:

When filling out this portion of the survey, please think of the specific supervisor you currently have or had in the past, at a paying job, which best fits the following description:

(High interpersonal justice version)

This supervisor treats me with dignity
This supervisor treats me with respect
This supervisor refrains from improper remarks and comments
This supervisor treats me politely

(Low interpersonal justice version)

This supervisor treats me with very little dignity
This supervisor treats me with very little respect
This supervisor makes improper remarks and comments
This supervisor is rude to me
This should be a supervisor you remember well. It is okay if the supervisor you are thinking of does not fit this description perfectly. If you cannot think of a supervisor you have had who fits this description at all, you can just use your current supervisor.

**Version C: (Current supervisor version)**

For the questions below, we want you to think about a specific supervisor you have or have had, at a paying job. If you currently have one job, use your current supervisor. If you have more than one paying job now, think of the supervisor at the job where you work the most hours. If you are NOT currently working, think of your most recent supervisor.

Manipulation check- Supervisor Study (study 1)

What type of supervisor were you thinking of to complete this survey?
(A) The most polite supervisor I have had
(B) The most rude supervisor I have had
(C) I was just using my current supervisor
Appendix F: Study 2 Task Requests and Scenarios

Instructions for Scenario Study (study 2):

Now we would like you to imagine yourself in some situations. Please react to the situations based on the described situation, NOT based on your current supervisor or co-workers. At times you may be asked to give a response based on incomplete information. There are no right or wrong answers; just answer based on your judgment and feelings based on the description.

Task Request 1: You are a server in a restaurant. Cleaning the bathrooms is not normally part of your responsibility but there is a bad smell coming from there.

Low interpersonal justice version:
One day your boss comes over and says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner “Go clean out that bathroom!”

High interpersonal justice version:
One day your boss comes over and says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner “I know you don’t normally do this, but you’ll clean out that bathroom, won’t you?”

Task Request 2. You are a server in a restaurant. Friday and Saturday shifts are not part of your normal schedule and are not your preference but you do not have other plans yet this weekend.

High interpersonal justice version: Your boss comes over and says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner, “I know you don’t normally work Friday and Saturday nights, and I’m so sorry to inconvenience you, but could you please switch shifts with Pat this week?”

Low interpersonal justice version: Your boss comes over and says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner, “This week you have to switch with Pat and take the Friday and Saturday night shifts!”

Task Request 3. You are a server in a restaurant. There is currently a staff shortage.

High justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner, “I know you are usually a server, but could you please go up front and be the host-person tonight instead?”

Low justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner, “Go up front and be the host-person tonight instead of serving!”

Task Request 4. You are a server in a restaurant.

High justice version. One day your supervisor says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner, “Would you please try out this sample new uniform tonight and give me feedback on how it compares to the old one?”

Low justice version: One day your supervisor says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner, “Try out this sample new uniform tonight and give me feedback on how it compares to the old one!”
Task Request 5: You are a salesclerk in a store.
High justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner, “Sorry to bother you, but would you please go and re-fold the shirts on that rack over there?”
Low justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very rude and disrespectful manner, “Go and re-fold the shirts on that rack over there!”

Task Request 6: You are a salesclerk in a store.
High justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very polite and respectful manner, “Would you please help us do inventory tonight?”
Low justice version: One day your boss says to you, in a very impolite and disrespectful manner, “Help with the inventory tonight”