

UC Riverside

UCR Honors Capstones 2016-2017

Title

Leadership Behaviors Across Contexts

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6rk493w8>

Author

Wilkinson, Dulce E

Publication Date

2017-12-11

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS ACROSS CONTEXTS

By

Dulce E. Wilkinson

A capstone project submitted for
Graduation with University Honors

May 11, 2017

University Honors
University of California, Riverside

APPROVED

Dr. David Funder
Department of Psychology

Dr. Richard Cardullo, Howard H Hays Jr. Chair and Faculty Director, University Honors
Interim Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education

Leadership Behaviors across Contexts

A leader is an individual who has a disproportionate amount of influence on a group activity (Van Vugt & Grabo, 2015). Leaders are ubiquitous; people have a natural tendency to form hierarchical social structures, and these hierarchies may enhance group performance, motivation, and success (Halevy, Chou, & Galinsky, 2011). Leader-follower hierarchies are present among most social animals, and evolutionarily serve to coordinate group activities and mediate intragroup conflicts (Van Vugt & Grabo, 2015). However, an understanding of the factors that distinguish leaders from non-leaders, and the qualities that differentiate effective leaders, are not well understood (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Despite a lack of consensus, leadership is thought to function via the process of social influence (i.e., the attainment of followers) and motivation of group behavior. The present study examines how the emergence of leadership behaviors differ across a variety of contexts.

A wide spectrum of leadership behaviors exist ranging from those considered intimidating or aggressive, to more task-oriented and social emotional. Although domineering leaders tend to make use of abrasive tactics, task-oriented and social emotional leaders display prosocial behaviors such as an open body posture, social competency, and confidence (Wiltermuth, Tiedens, & Neale, 2015).

Previous research suggests that context also dictates people's preference for leadership tactics. For example, prior findings show that the type of leader desired during wartime differs from the sort of leader people desire during peacetime (Van Vugt & Grabo, 2015). Therefore, differing patterns of leadership may be a result of the situational demands present in a given context. Psychological properties of situations may produce

different behavioral outcomes (Funder & Colvin, 1991). Indeed, adjusting behavior to fit the demands of the situation is considered not only adaptive, but also necessary for optimal human functioning (Sauerberger & Funder, in press). In a review by Vroom and Jago (2007), the researchers argued that the sort of leader people desire varies based on task. Both the leader's disposition, and the situation at hand, influence expressed leadership behavior. For instance, leaders who manage ineffective teams behave in a less considerate and supportive manner than those managing effective teams.

An individual's social environment, along with the nature of a goal implicit in a task, influences emerging patterns of leadership. In a study by Burke (1971), participants engaged in a "creative discussion" in which an elected or emergent leader moderated a group debate. Participants rated themselves and other group members on dimensions of task-oriented and social emotional leadership. Results showed that as task leaders' preoccupation with task performance increases, they become less concerned with maintaining group relations and behaving in a social emotional fashion (Burke, 1971). Although prior research has focused on the relationships between single situations and leadership behavior, the current study focuses on the natural emergence of leadership behaviors across a variety of contexts and further examines the possible relation to personality, situational construal, and subjective well-being.

Personality predicts behavioral outcomes as well as important social consequences (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006). In a review by Ozer and Benet Martinez (2006), researchers found that personality predicts individual as well as interpersonal outcomes. For instance, all the Big Five domains (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008) relate to social emotional

competence and the ability to engage effectively in a social interaction (Ozer & Benet-Martinez, 2006). Given that behavior is highly consistent across time and contexts (Funder & Colvin, 1991; Furr & Funder, 2006), and that personality has been shown to predict behavioral outcomes, it is reasonable to suspect that personality may drive individual differences in the manifestation of leadership behavior.

Past research suggests that situational construal may mediate the relation between personality and behavioral outcomes (Funder & Colvin, 1991; Morse, Sauerberger, Todd, & Funder 2015). Situational construal is how a person perceives his or her situation; this assessment depends both on the properties of the situation and the characteristics of the individual (Morse et al., 2015). Generally, positive social behaviors are associated with higher normativity and positivity of construal (Morse et al., 2015), demonstrating that construal may be an important predictor of behavioral outcomes.

The Three Leadership Styles

In this study, we assessed the emergence of social emotional, domineering, and task-oriented leadership. These three leadership styles, and the behaviors characteristic of each, were selected based on existing organizational and leadership research (Leary, Cottrell, & Phillips, 2001; Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003; Taberero, Chambel, Curral, & Arana, 2009). Here we provide evidence for the emergence and prevalence of these three styles of leadership found in previous studies.

Social emotional leadership. Social and emotional intelligence represent “people skills” that effective leaders often possess (Riggio et al., 2003). This emotional intelligence is a significant aspect of leadership, as it is important that leaders understand their own emotions, as well as the emotions of others, in order to act appropriately in a

variety of situations. Followers see social emotional leaders as more effective, but less able to produce group productivity (Riggio et al., 2003). For instance, social emotional skills are most useful and effective in discussion-based tasks rather than model-building tasks (Riggio et al., 2003). Therefore, social emotional leadership may be more prominent in tasks involving group discussion. While the current study did not aim to assess how effective certain leadership styles are, it did identify the situational variables associated with certain styles of leadership.

Domineering leadership. Dominance is the use of force or intimidation to induce fear and compliance (Cheng, Tracy, Kingstone, Foulsham, & Henrich, 2013). Dominant behavior facilitates an individual's ability to gain status and control during a social interaction (Rogers-Millar & Frank, 1979). Prior research suggests that dominant behavior is naturally embedded within leadership techniques (Leary, Cottrell, & Phillips, 2001). According to Leary and colleagues (2001), leadership captures a central feature of dominance, for dominant individuals are generally influential and tend to elicit submissiveness from others. In one study, participants who received high leadership feedback reported greater feelings of dominance and influence, when compared to those who received low leadership feedback (Leary et al., 2001). While dominance is often considered an integral aspect of leadership (Maner & Case, 2016), not all leadership is expressed via domineering tactics. Rather than being infallibly present, domineering leadership may manifest differentially depending on the demands of one's situation.

Task-oriented leadership. Task-oriented leaders are preoccupied with task performance rather than getting along with other group members (Taberner et al., 2009). When trained to use either task- or relationship-oriented leadership tactics, task-oriented

leaders stimulate higher group efficacy, whereas social emotional leaders achieve greater group cohesion (Taberbrero et al., 2009). In essence, leadership tactics produce different outcomes based on the goals of a task or context. Therefore, delineating the situations associated with the expression of certain leadership styles may aid in producing beneficial outcomes in real-world domains.

The Present Study

The purpose of this study was to support and extend findings of previous research by assessing the expression of three leadership styles (i.e., social emotional, domineering, and task-oriented) across three laboratory visits. Further, this study examined the potential relationships among the three leadership styles, personality, and situational construal. Situational construal is considered a crucial intermediary between personality and behavioral outcomes – for this reason, the type and amount of leadership behavior displayed may relate not only to individuals’ personality and the situation they find themselves in, but also to how they perceive the situation at hand. We proposed four research questions to address the aims of the current study. Research Question 1 asked if the three leadership styles - social emotional, domineering, and task-oriented - are displayed to a different degree within each laboratory situation. Research Question 2 asked in which visit was each leadership style most prevalent. Research Question 3 asked if the three leadership styles related to individuals’ perception of the situation (i.e., situational construal). Research Question 4 asked if these leadership styles related to personality.

Method

Participants

The study consisted of 256 (130 F, 126 M) undergraduate students from the University of California, Riverside. On average, participants were 19.83 years old ($SD = 1.25$). Participants were recruited using an online research participation system and asked to engage in three laboratory visits. Compensation included both research credit and a monetary payment that, with the completion of all visits and applicable bonuses, was up to \$115. The sample was 48.8% Asian, 23% Hispanic/Latino, 8.2% Caucasian, 4.3% Middle Eastern, 3.1% African American, and 12.5% other.

Measures

The Riverside Behavioral Q-Sort (RBQ; Funder, Furr, & Colvin, 2000) was used to assess behavior in each situation. The RBQ is a 68-item measure used to describe behavior in a situation (e.g., “seems detached from the situation”). Q-sort measures are forced-choice instruments that produce a quasi-normal distribution of ratings (1 = *not at all characteristic*, 9 = *extremely characteristic*). Raters are only able to place a limited number of items in the more extreme categories. Research assistants rated the extent to which each behavior in the RBQ was characteristic of the participant they rated in a given visit.

The Riverside Situational Q-sort (RSQ; Wagerman & Funder, 2009) was used to allow participants to describe their impression of the situation. The RSQ is an 89-item measure which evaluates psychological properties of a situation (e.g., “situation is potentially enjoyable”). Like the RBQ, the RSQ is also a forced choice Q-sort measure that produces a quasi-normal distribution. Participants rated the extent to which each RSQ item described the situation they were a part of on a 9-point scale (1 = *not at all characteristic*, 9 = *extremely characteristic*).

The Big Five Inventory was used to measure participants' personality (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The BFI is a 44-item scale that asks participants to rate the extent to which each item (e.g., "extraverted, enthusiastic") is characteristic of them on a 5-point scale (1 = *Disagree Strongly*, 5 = *Agree Strongly*).

The Subjective Happiness scale (SHS; Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999) was used to measure happiness. The SHS consists of 4 items (e.g., "in general, I consider myself" 1 = *not a very happy person*, 7 = *a very happy person*). Participants respond using a 7-point Likert scale for each item.

Procedure

Prior to the laboratory visits, participants gave informed consent, provided demographic information, and completed the BFI and the SHS. Subsequently, participants engaged in the three laboratory visits which took place about 1 week apart. Participants interacted in previously unacquainted groups of three; we ensured there were unique triads during each visit.

Visit 1 was an unstructured interaction in which participants were instructed to speak freely for 5 minutes. Visit 2 was a cooperative task in which participants were asked to work together to build a pre-specified model out of tinker-toys. If they succeeded in building the tinker-toy model within 5 minutes, a \$5.00 bonus was awarded. Visit 3 was a competitive task wherein participants played a sound repetition game, Simon. After several games, the participant who won the most rounds was awarded a \$5.00 bonus. Following each visit participants rated their impressions of the situation using the RSQ.

Each visit was video recorded, and research assistants rated participant behavior using the RBQ after watching the full 5-minute visit. Research assistants were arranged such that they did not rate the same participant's behavior more than once, nor did they rate the behavior of a participant whom they were acquainted with outside of the lab. A different group of four raters was assigned to assess participant behavior in each visit.

Results

The first step in the analyses was to operationalize the three leadership styles by forming three behavioral composites. Trained research assistants were asked to evaluate participant behavior in the video-recorded situations. Research assistants demonstrated good interrater reliability in their judgements of participant behavior (mean $\alpha = .80$). If the reliability of the four raters assigned to a certain video was below $\alpha = .70$, the coder whose ratings matched others' the least was asked to re-watch the video and recode for the participant's behavior.

Forming Behavioral Composites

Initially, we selected behaviors we regarded as prototypical of leadership from the RBQ. RBQ items were considered characteristic of leadership based on the face validity of each item. With these RBQ items, we conducted a series of exploratory factor analyses on behaviors at each of the three visits to see whether factors that emerged conveyed a meaningful leadership style. We then examined the resultant factors to determine if a consistent pattern was emerging across the three visits.

Three factors emerged consistently across the three visits. We named these factors: social emotional leadership, domineering leadership, and task-oriented leadership. After identifying these three distinct leadership styles, we constructed a final

list of RBQ items for each leadership style from the communalities present in the previous factor analyses (Table 1). The three leadership behavior factors are composed of RBQ items that represent the core features of each leadership style as assessed via reliability analyses. For example, social emotional leadership was best represented by items such as “exhibits social skills” and “seems interested in what someone had to say” (mean $\alpha = .89$). Domineering leadership was best represented by items such as “tries to control the situation” and “behaves in a competitive manner” (mean $\alpha = .74$). Task-oriented leadership was best represented by items such as “others seek advice from P” and “concentrates or works hard on a task” (mean $\alpha = .48$). We suspect that reliability analyses for task-oriented leadership were lower because the pursuit of task performance is subject to a higher degree of variability. Task performance (i.e., goal pursuit) strategies may be situation-specific.

Research Question 1 (RQ1): Which leadership style is most common within each visit?

To address Research Question 1, we examined the presence of the three leadership styles in each visit respectively. Three repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted to determine if there was an overall difference in how often each leadership style was expressed in each situation (Table 2).

Unstructured visit (RQ1). A repeated measures ANOVA indicated that the three leadership styles were expressed to a varying degree within the unstructured interaction $F(2, 386) = 707.35, p < .01$. We then conducted three paired sample t-tests to determine which leadership style was expressed most commonly in Visit 1. The first paired samples t-test indicated that social emotional leadership ($M = 6.58$) was expressed more than

domineering ($M = 4.46$), $t(193) = 33.33$, $p < .01$. The second paired samples t-test showed that social emotional leadership was also expressed more than task-oriented ($M = 6.44$), $t(193) = 2.12$, $p = .036$. The third paired samples t-test indicated that domineering leadership was expressed less than task-oriented, $t(193) = -31.43$, $p < .01$ (Table 2). These findings indicate that social emotional leadership was most commonly expressed in Visit 1, followed by task-oriented and domineering.

Cooperative Visit (RQ1). The second repeated measures ANOVA conducted for Visit 2 indicated that the three leadership styles varied in their expression within the cooperative situation $F(2, 416) = 611.74$, $p < .01$ (see Table 2). Three paired samples t-tests were again conducted and showed that task-oriented leadership ($M = 7.23$) was expressed significantly more than both social emotional ($M = 6.00$), $t(208) = -18.33$, $p < .01$ and domineering ($M = 4.71$), $t(208) = 15.40$, $p < .01$ (Table 2). Task-oriented leadership was expressed most commonly in Visit 2, followed by social emotional and domineering.

Competitive Visit (RQ1). The third repeated measures ANOVA conducted for Visit 3 demonstrated that the three leadership styles also varied in their expression within the competitive situation $F(2, 430) = 518.69$, $p < .01$ (Table 2). Three paired samples t-tests were conducted to determine which leadership style was most commonly expressed. As with Visit 2, results show that task-oriented leadership ($M = 6.90$) was expressed significantly more than social emotional ($M = 5.99$), $t(215) = -12.21$, $p < .01$ and domineering ($M = 4.50$), $t(215) = -37.84$, $p < .01$ in Visit 3. These findings demonstrate that task-oriented leadership was expressed most commonly in Visit 3, followed once again by social emotional and domineering leadership.

Research Question 2 (RQ2): In which visit is each leadership style most prevalent?

The next set of three repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted to address how commonly each leadership style was expressed in each visit. To do this, we looked at each leadership style across all three visits for a total of three repeated measures ANOVAs.

Social emotional leadership (RQ2). The first repeated measures ANOVA showed that social emotional leadership was indeed expressed differently across the three visits $F(2, 310) = 37.05, p < .01$ (Table 3). Three paired samples t-tests were then used to determine in which visit social emotional leadership was most commonly expressed. Results of the paired samples t-tests indicated that social emotional leadership was expressed more in Visit 1 ($M = 6.58$) than in Visit 2 ($M = 5.96$), $t(167) = 9.14, p < .01$ and Visit 3 ($M = 5.99$), $t(174) = 6.65, p < .01$. However, there was no difference in the expression of social emotional leadership between Visits 2 and 3, $t(192) = 0.12, p = .91$ (Table 3). Overall, social emotional leadership was most prevalent in Visit 1.

Domineering leadership (RQ2). The second repeated measures ANOVA showed that domineering leadership emerged differently across the three visits $F(2, 310) = 3.63, p = .028$ (see Table 3). A paired samples t-test showed that domineering behaviors were observed less in Visit 1 ($M = 4.49$) than in Visit 2 ($M = 4.69$), $t(167) = -2.72, p < .01$. A second paired samples t-test indicated that there was no significant difference in the expression of domineering leadership between Visit 1 and Visit 3 ($M = 4.53$), $t(174) = -1.11, p = .27$. A third paired sample t-test showed that domineering leadership was expressed more in Visit 2 than in Visit 3, $t(192) = 2.98, p < .01$. Domineering leadership was most prevalent in Visit 2.

Task-oriented leadership (RQ2). The third and final repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated that task-oriented leadership differed in its expression across the three situations $F(2, 310) = 105.05, p < .01$ (Table 3). A series of paired samples t-tests indicated that task-oriented leadership was less prevalent in Visit 1 ($M = 6.46$) than in Visit 2 ($M = 7.21$), $t(167) = -17.37, p < .01$. Task-oriented leadership was also expressed less in Visit 1 than in Visit 3 ($M = 6.93$), $t(174) = -9.33, p < .01$. The third paired samples t-test showed that task-oriented leadership was expressed more in Visit 2 than in Visit 3, $t(192) = 6.32, p < .01$. Across the three visits, task-oriented leadership was most prevalent in Visit 2.

Research Question 3 (RQ3): Is each leadership style related to situational construal?

To assess the potential relationship between the three leadership styles and situational construal, we correlated positivity of construal with each leadership style within each visit. These correlations revealed that positivity of construal was positively related with only social emotional leadership in Visit 1 ($r = .201, p < .01$) and Visit 3 ($r = .195, p < .01$) (see Table 11).

Gender differences in positivity of construal. Further analysis revealed that the relation between social emotional leadership and positivity of construal was driven by female participants in Visit 1 ($r = .238, p = .022$) and Visit 3 ($r = .359, p < .01$). There were no significant relation between social emotional leadership and positivity of construal among males (see Table 12).

Research Question 4 (RQ4): Is each leadership style related to personality?

A series of correlations were conducted to address Research Question 4. These correlations assessed the relation of personality to each leadership style and identified any

significant relations. Extraversion, openness, and agreeableness related significantly to the three leadership styles depending on the visit type.

Visit 1 (RQ4). The first correlation examined the relation between extraversion and social emotional leadership in Visit 1. There was a small positive relationship between extraversion and social emotional leadership in Visit 1, $r = .375, p < .01$; extraverted individuals were more likely to exercise social emotional leadership during the unstructured chat (see Table 13). The second correlation examined the relation between extraversion and domineering leadership in Visit 1. There was a positive relationship between extraversion and domineering leadership in Visit 1, $r = .315, p < .01$. Extraverted individuals were more likely to display domineering leadership in Visit 1.

Visit 2 (RQ4). In Visit 2, there was a small positive correlation between extraversion and social emotional leadership, $r = .328, p < .01$; extraverted individuals were more likely to display social emotional leadership in Visit 2. Social emotional leadership was also found to relate with openness, $r = .139, p = .083$ and agreeableness, $r = .165, p = .019$. Extraversion was also found to relate positively to the expression of domineering leadership in Visit 2, $r = .218, p < .01$ (see Table 13).

Visit 3 (RQ4). Extraversion and agreeableness both related to the emergence of leadership within Visit 3. Extraversion was positively correlated with the expression of social emotional, $r = .327, p < .01$, and domineering leadership, $r = .218, p < .01$. Lastly, task-oriented leadership was found to relate with agreeableness in Visit 3, $r = .153, p = .026$ (see Table 13).

Gender differences in the relation between leadership and personality. To determine if a pattern of relations was present in the leadership-personality correlates, we compared the relation between leadership and personality among males and females. Results indicated that no significant pattern of relations was present in the leadership-personality correlates between males and females (see Table 14).

Leadership and extraversion. Since extraversion was found to relate most significantly with leadership, we further examined the relation between leadership and each extraversion item on the BFI (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998; John et al., 1991; John et al., 2008). No significant pattern of relations emerged between leadership and the extraversion items (see Table 15). When separated by gender, the relation between leadership and extraversion items yielded no significant pattern of relations (see Table 16).

Subjective Happiness

Additionally, we correlated leadership with subjective happiness to reveal any potential relations. Social emotional leadership was found to relate with subjective happiness in Visit 1 ($r = .156, p = .036$), Visit 2 ($r = .213, p < .01$) and Visit 3 ($r = .231, p < .01$) (see Table 17). After closer examination of the relation between leadership and subjective happiness, we found that the correlation was driven by female participants in Visit 1 ($r = .266, p = .010$), Visit 2 ($r = .303, p < .01$), and Visit 3 ($r = .281, p < .01$), with non-significant relations between leadership and subjective happiness among male participants (see Table 18).

Discussion

The present study evaluated how the emergence of leadership behavior may vary depending on situational demands. A cross-situational examination of behavior is necessary to comprehend the natural expression of leadership and determine how leaders tend to behave (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Prior studies focused on elucidating the qualities of mainly social emotional and task-oriented leaders (Burke, 1971; Tabernero, Chambel, Curral, & Arana, 2009). However, the present study sought to understand the natural emergence of the behaviors that constitute social emotional, domineering, and task-oriented leadership. We formulated four research questions to address the consistency of leader behavior.

In regards to Research Question 1, the three leadership styles were displayed to a different degree within the three situations. When examining the mean-level change of leadership within each visit, task-oriented leadership was displayed to a higher degree in Visits 2 and 3. However, in Visit 1, participants tended to behave in a social emotional manner. One possible explanation for the difference between leadership we have uncovered is that Visits 2 and 3 are task-oriented in nature, requiring that participants perform specific actions to win additional compensation. By contrast, in the unstructured visit, participants acted freely, which prompted them to foster social bonds via social emotional behaviors. Thus, it may have been the lack of behavioral demands present in the unstructured situation that engendered the use of social emotional behaviors (Funder & Colvin, 1991; Sauerberger & Funder, in press).

Another explanation is that the expression of social emotional leadership is, to some extent, incompatible with that of task-oriented leadership (Burke, 1971). As participants become more preoccupied with task-performance, social emotional behaviors

may be viewed as less important. For this reason, task-oriented leadership emerged more often in Visits 2 and 3, and social emotional leadership in Visit 1. Lastly, while domineering leadership was displayed differently within each visit, domineering behaviors were not seen as commonly as were social emotional and task-oriented behaviors. This may be indicative of a decline in the use and perhaps efficacy of domineering tactics. Further research is necessary to reveal whether domineering leadership is truly as common or effective as is commonly believed (Maner & Case, 2016).

In assessing Research Question 2, each leadership style was found to be displayed to a different degree across each visit. Social emotional leadership was expressed most commonly in Visit 1, domineering in Visit 2, and task-oriented in Visit 3. Specifically, participants talked and shared more about themselves in Visit 1, presumably in order to form social relations. For this reason, social emotional leadership was most commonly used to preserve this semblance of group cohesion. Although Visit 2 was a cooperative task, domineering leadership was expressed most commonly. We suspect that participants may have become frustrated with task progress and attempted to take charge, leading to the expression of domineering leadership. Lastly, task-oriented leadership emerged most within the competitive task. Because the competitive task yielded additional cash bonuses, participants may have been focused on the task at hand (i.e., performing well at the sound repetition game) rather than on cooperating with or dominating others.

Research Question 3 examined the extent to which leadership related to positivity of situational construal. We found that only social emotional leadership in Visit 1 related

to positivity of construal. More specifically, higher engagement in social emotional leadership was related to a more positive construal of the situation. As stated, the unstructured situation prompted participants to establish friendly relations with one another. Since social emotional behaviors elicit positive reactions from others (Riggio et al., 2003), participants who behaved in a social emotional fashion may be said to have succeeded in getting along with others. This may have led to a more positive perception of the situation. Upon closer examination, we found that female participants drove this relationship. Contrary to the inherent goal of social cohesion, male participants in Visit 1 did not perceive the situation more positively if they engaged in social emotional leadership. To this extent, women may be more comfortable adopting the role of the social emotional leader than are males.

Research question 4 examined the relation between leadership and personality, revealing that social emotional, domineering, and task-oriented leadership were correlated with personality traits. For instance, social emotional and domineering leadership were both positively related to extraversion in Visits 1 and 2, whereas task-oriented leadership was related to agreeableness in Visit 3. As talkativeness and verbal fluency are both characteristic of social and domineering leadership, it is not surprising that extraversion was correlated with these leadership styles (Burke 1971; Maner & Case, 2016). Interestingly, task-oriented leadership was found to relate with an agreeable personality in Visit 3, the competitive task. While task-leaders lack some social influence due to their concentration on the task, task-leaders do not express hostility. Thus, agreeableness may have related to task-oriented leadership as it is unrelated to hostility. The lack of relation between openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism and leadership

behavior may be due to the inability of trait approaches to account for situational factors (Funder & Colvin, 1991; Riggio et al., 2003). Future research should focus on attaining measures of personality that go beyond trait measures, such as individual motivation, goals, and personal narratives (McAdams, 1995).

Conclusion and Future Directions

The present study replicated patterns of findings from the behavioral consistency literature. For instance, previous research demonstrated that people alter their behavior in important ways as situations change (Funder & Colvin, 1991; Sauerberger & Funder, in press). Although this study did not assess which leadership strategies people prefer, it does contribute to existing research regarding how leaders typically behave in different situations and the consistency of that behavior. Our findings confirm that these changes in behavior occur specifically in the context of leadership.

Overall, findings from the current study could have implications in the organizational realm and aid researchers in understanding the core features of leadership. By identifying some of the behavioral and contextual factors that distinguish leaders, this study may bring about a more naturalistic measure of leadership behavior. Additionally, this study identified leadership techniques that may be employed in certain situations, potentially enabling leadership positions to be filled with increased proficiency and designate how leaders should behave. Future research should focus on obtaining more detailed accounts of leadership behaviors from peer- and employee-report. Along with a more accurate measure of leadership, future studies could examine which leadership styles people prefer, and how that preference may vary depending upon their situation.

Table 1
Exploratory Factor Analysis of RBQ Items for Visit 1 (Unstructured Chat)

Factor 1: Social Emotional	Factor 2: Domineering	Factor 3: Task-Oriented
to control the situation	Seems interested in what someone had to say (R)	Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well
interested in what someone had to say	Seems to like other(s) present (R)	Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct (R)
has good social skills	Seems likable to other(s) present (R)	Expresses hostility (R)
expressive in face, voice, or gestures	Dominates the situation	Others seek advice from P
avoids others at a distance; avoids involvement of any sort of interpersonal relationship	Expresses criticism	
reserved and unexpressive (R)	Talks at rather than with others	
isolate the situation (R)	Exhibits condescending behavior	
struggles when faced with obstacles (R)	Behaves in a competitive manner	
speaks in a loud voice		

Note: Table displays the original RBQ items that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis for Visit 1.

Table 2
Exploratory Factor Analysis of RBQ Items for Visit 2 (Cooperative Task)

Factor 1: Social Emotional	Factor 2: Domineering	Factor 3: Task-Oriented
Seems interested in what someone had to say	Tries to control the situation	Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well
Seems to like other(s) present	Gives up when faced with obstacles (R)	Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct (R)
Exhibits social skills	Exhibits condescending behavior	Expresses hostility (R)
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	Dominates the situation	Others seek advice from P
Keeps others at a distance; avoids development of any sort of interpersonal relationship	Expresses criticism	Expresses criticism
Is reserved and unexpressive (R)	Speaks in a loud voice	Concentrates on or works hard at a task
Talks at rather than with others (R)		
Expresses hostility (R)		

Note: Table displays the original RBQ items that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis for Visit 2.

Table 3
Exploratory Factor Analysis of RBQ Items for Visit 3 (Competitive Task)

Factor 1: Social Emotional	Factor 2: Domineering	Factor 3: Task-Oriented
Seems interested in what someone had to say	Tries to control the situation	Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well
Seems to like other(s) present	Seems likable	Expresses criticism
Exhibits social skills	Behaves in a competitive manner	Expresses hostility (R)
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	Dominates the situation	Others seek advice from P
Keeps others at a distance; avoids development of any sort of interpersonal relationship	Speaks in a loud voice	Concentrates on or works hard at a task
Is reserved and unexpressive (R)		
Talks at rather than with others (R)		
Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct (R)		
Expresses hostility (R)		
Gives up when faced with obstacles (R)		
Exhibits condescending behavior (R)		
Behaves in a competitive manner (R)		

Note: Table displays the original RBQ items that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis for Visit 3.

Table 4
RBQ Item Factor Loadings for Visit 1: Unstructured Situation

RBQ Behaviors	Leadership Style		
	<i>Social Emotional</i>	<i>Domineering</i>	<i>Task-Oriented</i>
Tries to control the Situation	-.605	.542	.063
Seems interested in what someone had to say	-.435	-.583	-.051
Exhibits social skills	-.858	.026	.101
Seems to like other(s) present	-.323	-.634	-.211
Seems likable (to other(s) present)	-.220	-.627	.002
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	-.411	.020	.017
Keeps other(s) at a distance; avoids any sort of interpersonal development	.831	-.090	.268
Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well	-.025	-.145	.566
Is reserved and unexpressive	.877	-.253	.172
Dominates the situation	-.628	.623	.036
Expresses criticism	.099	.270	.173
Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct	.342	.172	-.532
Gives up when faced with obstacles	.504	-.076	.072
Concentrates on or works hard at a task	.281	-.176	.011
Talks at rather than with other(s)	.443	.543	.097
Exhibits condescending behavior	.199	.358	.136
Expresses hostility	.480	.267	-.599
Behaves in a competitive manner	.195	.266	.083
Speaks in a loud voice	-.376	.136	.031
Other(s) seek advice from P	.175	.050	.248

Note: Table displays the original factor loadings for each leadership style in Visit 1. Bolded values are significant at $p < .05$.

Table 5
RBQ Item Factor Loadings for Visit 2: Cooperative Situation

RBQ Behaviors	Leadership Style		
	<i>Social Emotional</i>	<i>Domineering</i>	<i>Task-Oriented</i>
Tries to control the Situation	.048	.883	.099
Seems interested in what someone had to say	-.540	-.266	.239
Exhibits social skills	-.811	.399	.065
Seems to like other(s) present	-.679	-.326	-.010
Seems likable (to other(s) present)	-.650	-.408	.068
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	-.579	.177	-.084
Keeps other(s) at a distance; avoids any sort of interpersonal development	.724	-.398	.241
Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well	-.130	.387	.437
Is reserved and unexpressive	.689	-.576	.161
Dominates the situation	.003	.876	.001
Expresses criticism	.217	.236	.314
Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct	.281	-.004	-.602
Gives up when faced with obstacles	.000	-.384	.105
Concentrates on or works hard at a task	.280	-.092	.500
Talks at rather than with other(s)	.593	.348	-.047
Exhibits condescending behavior	.365	.370	.210
Expresses hostility	.433	.096	-.437
Behaves in a competitive manner	.393	.269	-.245
Speaks in a loud voice	-.195	.533	-.036
Other(s) seek advice from P	.343	.227	.369

Note: Table displays the original factor loadings for each leadership style in Visit 2. Bolded values are significant at $p < .05$.

Table 6
RBQ Item Factor Loadings for Visit 3: Competitive Situation

RBQ Behaviors	Leadership Style		
	<i>Social Emotional</i>	<i>Domineering</i>	<i>Task-Oriented</i>
Tries to control the Situation	-.154	.809	.251
Seems interested in what someone had to say	-.508	-.216	.072
Exhibits social skills	-.879	.203	.066
Seems to like other(s) present	-.676	-.347	-.028
Seems likable (to other(s) present)	-.560	-.488	.137
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	-.681	.127	-.162
Keeps other(s) at a distance; avoids any sort of interpersonal development	.867	-.151	.191
Speaks fluently and expresses ideas well	-.234	.154	.508
Is reserved and unexpressive	.837	-.286	.240
Dominates the situation	-.235	.731	.195
Expresses criticism	.112	.279	-.328
Tries to undermine, sabotage, or obstruct	.424	.008	-.344
Gives up when faced with obstacles	.337	-.145	-.290
Concentrates on or works hard at a task	.392	-.200	.570
Talks at rather than with other(s)	.514	.360	-.029
Exhibits condescending behavior	.527	.352	-.130
Expresses hostility	.511	.160	-.441
Behaves in a competitive manner	.433	.281	.332
Speaks in a loud voice	-.231	.412	.034
Other(s) seek advice from P	.251	-.144	.430

Note: Table displays the original factor loadings for each leadership style in Visit 3. Bolded values are significant at $p < .05$.

Table 7
RBQ Items used in Leadership Style Composites

Factor 1: Social Emotional	Factor 2: Domineering	Factor 3: Task-Oriented
Tries to control the situation	Tries to control the situation	Expresses hostility (R)
Seems interested in what someone had to say	Seems likable (R)	Others seek advice from P
Seems to like other(s) present	Behaves in a competitive manner	Concentrates on or works hard at a task
Exhibits social skills	Exhibits condescending behavior	
Is expressive in face, voice, or gestures	Speaks in a loud voice	
Keeps others at a distance; avoids development of any sort of interpersonal relationship (R)		
Is reserved and unexpressive (R)		
Talks at rather than with others (R)		

Note: Table displays the final list of RBQ items that make up each factor developed from the communalities present in the exploratory factor analyses.

Table 8
Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Analyses for Leadership Style Composites

Visit	Mean	SD	Alpha
V1 Unstructured Chat			
<i>Social Emotional</i>	6.58	0.058	.794
<i>Domineering</i>	4.46	0.056	.624
<i>Task-Oriented</i>	6.44	0.028	.434
V2 Cooperative Task			
<i>Social Emotional</i>	6.00	0.061	.820
<i>Domineering</i>	4.71	0.062	.753
<i>Task-Oriented</i>	7.23	0.030	.532
V3 Competitive Task			
<i>Social Emotional</i>	5.99	0.068	.858
<i>Domineering</i>	5.00	0.051	.657
<i>Task-Oriented</i>	6.90	0.035	.565
Mean			
<i>Social Emotional</i>	6.19	0.062	.885
<i>Domineering</i>	4.72	0.056	.739
<i>Task-Oriented</i>	6.86	0.031	.480

Note: Visit 1 N = 194; Visit 2 N = 209; Visit 3 N = 216. N varies by visit due to attrition and unrecoverable video recordings.

Table 9

Research Question 1: Mean Expression of each Leadership Style within each Visit

Visit	F	Social Emotional	Domineering	Task-Oriented
Unstructured	707.35**	6.58 ₁	4.46 ₁	6.44 ₁
Cooperative	611.74**	6.00 ₁	4.71 ₁	7.23 ₁
Competitive	518.69**	5.99 ₁	4.50 ₁	6.90 ₁

Note: Unstructured $N = 190$; Cooperative $N = 206$; Competitive $N = 216$. Leadership means that share a subscript are significantly different from each other at $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$. N varies by visit due to attrition and unrecoverable video recordings.

Table 10
Research Question 2: Overall Mean-Level Change for each Leadership Style across each Visit

Leadership Style	<i>F</i>	Unstructured	Cooperative	Competitive
Social Emotional	37.05**	6.58 _{1,2}	5.96 ₁	5.99 ₂
Domineering	3.63*	4.49 ₁	4.69 ₁	4.53
Task-Oriented	105.05**	6.46 ₁	7.21 ₁	6.93 ₁

Note: $N = 156$. N represents participants with viable video recordings for all 3 visits. Visit means that share a subscript are significantly different from each other at $p < 0.05$. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table 11
Leadership Style correlated with Positivity of Construal

Leadership Style	Positivity of Construal		
	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3
Social Emotional	.201*	.092	.195*
Domineering	.040	-.041	.050
Task-Oriented	-.049	-.087	.098

Note: Visit 1 $N = 190$; Visit 2 $N = 206$; Visit 3 $N = 216$. * $p < 0.05$. N varies by visit due to attrition and unrecoverable video recordings.

Table 12
Leadership Style correlated with Positivity of Construal: Gender Differences

Leadership Style	Positivity of Construal		
	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3
<i>Male</i>			
Social Emotional	.164	.052	.026
Domineering	.131	-.124	.021
Task Oriented	.044	-.043	.046
<i>Female</i>			
Social Emotional	.238*	.159	.359*
Domineering	-.048	-.010	.079
Task Oriented	-.119	-.131	.158

Note: Visit 1 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 98; N_{\text{Female}} = 92$); Visit 2 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 100; N_{\text{Female}} = 106$); Visit 3 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 111; N_{\text{Female}} = 105$). * $p < 0.05$.

Table 13

Leadership Styles correlated with Big 5 Personality Traits

Leadership Style	Extraversion	Openness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Agreeableness
<i>Visit 1</i>					
Social	.375*	.127	-.084	-.051	.048
Emotional					
Domineering	.315*	.066	.021	.065	-.090
Task-Oriented	.026	.051	.009	.060	-.016
<i>Visit 2</i>					
Social	.328*	.139*	.050	.086	.165*
Emotional					
Domineering	.218*	.046	.124	-.120	-.027
Task-Oriented	-.019	.042	.046	.009	.018
<i>Visit 3</i>					
Social	.327*	.117	.036	-.126	.122
Emotional					
Domineering	.218*	.126	.017	-.009	.032
Task-Oriented	.008	.078	.042	-.130	.153*

Note: Visit 1 *N* = 190; Visit 2 *N* = 206; Visit 3 *N* = 216. **p* < 0.05.

Table 14
Leadership Styles correlated with Big 5 Personality Traits: Gender Differences

Leadership Style	Extraversion	Openness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Agreeableness
<i>Males</i>					
<i>Visit 1</i>					
Social Emotional	.307*	.142	-.002	-.002	-.008
Domineering	.170	.034	.080	.162	-.063
Task Oriented	-.008	.140	.192	.048	.045
<i>Visit 2</i>					
Social Emotional	.384*	.216*	.082	-.054	.125
Domineering	.215*	-.083	.132	-.070	-.085
Task Oriented	-.118	.135	.188	-.028	.200*
<i>Visit 3</i>					
Social Emotional	.181	-.009	.016	-.044	.076
Domineering	.219*	.076	-.022	-.002	.013
Task Oriented	-.084	-.025	.038	-.185	.133
<i>Females</i>					
<i>Visit 1</i>					
Social Emotional	.426*	.122	-.159	-.113	.098
Domineering	.462*	.088	-.023	-.001	-.115
Task Oriented	-.053	-.027	-.168	.046	-.084
<i>Visit 2</i>					
Social Emotional	.280*	.078	.000	-.182	.197*
Domineering	.244*	.175	.159	-.110	.060
Task Oriented	.065	-.043	-.056	.065	-.165
<i>Visit 3</i>					
Social Emotional	.418*	.239*	.007	-.294	.170
Domineering	.234*	.178	.005	.015	-.084
Task Oriented	.041	.187	.021	-.124	.176

Note: Visit 1 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 98$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 92$), Visit 2 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 100$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 106$), Visit 3 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 111$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 105$). * $p < 0.05$.

Table 15
Leadership Styles correlated with Extraversion Items

Leadership Style	Is reserved (R)	Is full of energy	Generates a lot of enthusiasm	Tends to be quiet (R)	Has an assertive personality	Is sometimes shy, inhibited (R)	Is outgoing sociable
<i>Visit 1</i>							
Social Emotional	.263*	.327*	.348*	.337*	.128	.258*	.392*
Domineering	.190*	.217*	.173*	.321*	.213*	.298*	.298*
Task-Oriented	-.094	.040	.047	-.029	.006	-.060	-.080
<i>Visit 2</i>							
Social Emotional	.251*	.304*	.320*	.303*	.200*	.218*	.271
Domineering	.172*	.167*	.199*	.284*	.176*	.134	.070
Task-Oriented	-.034	-.037	.003	-.024	.049	-.062	-.008
<i>Visit 3</i>							
Social Emotional	.254*	.222*	.259*	.282*	.205*	.219*	.342*
Domineering	.073	.244*	.222*	.180*	.147*	.181*	.165*
Task-Oriented	-.053	.050	.050	.001	-.063	-.079	.079

Note: Visit 1 $N = 190$; Visit 2 $N = 206$; Visit 3 $N = 216$. * $p < .05$.

Table 16
Leadership Styles correlated with Extraversion Items: Gender Differences

Leadership Style	Is reserved (R)	Is full of energy	Generates a lot of enthusiasm	Tends to be quiet (R)	Has an assertive personality	Is sometimes shy, inhibited (R)	Is outgoing sociable
<i>Male</i>							
<i>Visit 1</i>							
Social Emotional	.196	.325*	.340*	.294*	.019	.236*	.279*
Domineering	.044	.116	.117	.181	.094	.169	.241*
Task Oriented	-.122	.121	.193	-.046	.044	-.129	-.122
<i>Visit 2</i>							
Social Emotional	.320*	.286*	.375*	.398*	.121	.321*	.247*
Domineering	.138	.016	.064	.232*	.317*	.213*	.162
Task Oriented	-.158	-.116	-.065	-.038	-.081	-.211*	.024
<i>Visit 3</i>							
Social Emotional	.169	.058	.215*	.148	.102	.104	.104
Domineering	.117	.259*	.227*	.155	.140	.141	.153
Task Oriented	-.222*	.036	.018	-.067	.095	-.102	-.009
<i>Female</i>							
<i>Visit 1</i>							
Social Emotional	.320*	.326*	.356*	.373*	.220*	.281*	.473*
Domineering	.352*	.323*	.245*	.465*	.349*	.428*	.368*
Task Oriented	-.080	-.041	-.111	-.020	-.043	.010	-.061
<i>Visit 2</i>							
Social Emotional	.192	.317*	.264*	.221*	.243*	.159	.284*
Domineering	.016	.346*	.310*	.181	.308*	.121	.131
Task Oriented	.072	.034	.063	-.009	.168	.053	-.030
<i>Visit 3</i>							
Social Emotional	.316*	.333*	.282*	.386	.259*	.332*	.500*
Domineering	.036	.245*	.234*	.216*	.176	.222*	.190
Task Oriented	.098	.047	.066	.055	-.057	-.053	.122

Note: Visit 1 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 98$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 92$). Visit 2 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 100$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 106$). Visit 3 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 111$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 105$). * $p < 0.05$.

Table 17
Leadership Styles correlated with Subjective Happiness

Leadership Style	Subjective Happiness
Social Emotional	.156*
Domineering	.213*
Task Oriented	.046
	.012

Note: Visit 1 $N = 190$; Visit 2 $N = 206$; Visit 3 $N = 216$. * $p < 0.05$.

Table 18

Leadership Styles correlated with Subjective Happiness: Gender Differences

Leadership Style	Subjective Happiness		
	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3
<i>Male</i>			
Social Emotional	.029	.089	.150
Domineering	.024	.098	-.116
Task Oriented	-.060	.064	.012
<i>Female</i>			
Social Emotional	.266*	.303*	.281*
Domineering	.180	.028	.126
Task Oriented	-.072	.025	.058

Note: Visit 1 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 98$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 92$); Visit 2 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 100$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 106$); Visit 3 ($N_{\text{Male}} = 111$; $N_{\text{Female}} = 105$). * $p < 0.05$.

References

- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). *Los Cinco Grandes* across cultures and ethnic groups: Multi-trait multi-method analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 729-750. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190127
- Burke, P. J. (1971). Task and social-emotional leadership role performance. *Sociometry, 22-40*. doi: 10.2307/2786349
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 103. doi: 10.1037/a00 30398
- Funder, D. C., & Colvin, C. R. (1991). Explorations in behavioral consistency: properties of persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 60*, 773-794. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.60.5.773
- Funder, D. C., Furr, R. M., & Colvin, C.R. (2000). The Riverside Behavioral Q-Sort: A tool for the description of social behavior. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 451-489. doi: 10.1111/1 467-6494.00103
- Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). A functional model of hierarchy: Why, how, and when vertical differentiation enhances group performance. *Organizational Psychology Review, 1*, 32-52. doi: 10.1177/2041386610380991
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory - Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 3, 114-158.
- Leary, M. R., Cottrell, C. A., & Phillips, M. (2001). Deconfounding the effects of dominance and social acceptance on self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 898. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.5.898
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 137-155. doi: 10.1023/A:1006824100041
- Maner, J. K., & Case, C. R. (2016). Dominance and prestige: dual strategies for navigating social hierarchies. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. doi: 10.1016/bs.aesp.2016.02.001
- McAdams, D. P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of Personality*, 63, 365-396. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1995.tb00500.x
- Morse, P. J., Sauerberger, K. S., Todd, E., & Funder, D. (2015). Relationships among personality, situational construal and social outcomes. *European Journal of Personality*, 29, 97-106. doi: 10.1002/per.1987
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401-421. doi: 0.1146/annurev.psych.57.102.904.190127
- Riggio, R. E., Riggio, H. R., Salinas, C., & Cole, E. J. (2003). The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, 83. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.7.2.83
- Rogers-Millar, L., & Frank III, E. M. (1979). Domineeringness and dominance: A

- transactional view. *Human Communication Research*, 5, 238-246. doi:
10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00637.x
- Sauerberger, K. S., & Funder, D. C. (in press). Behavioral change and consistency
across contexts. *Journal of Research in Personality*. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2016.04
.007
- Tabernerero, C., Chambel, M. J., Cural, L., & Arana, J. M. (2009). The role of task-
oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership on normative contract and group
performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37,
1391-1404. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2009.37.10.1391
- Van Vugt, M., & Grabo, A. E. (2015). The many faces of leadership an evolutionary-
psychology approach. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24, 484-489.
doi: 10.1177/0963721415601971
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American
Psychologist*, 62, 17. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17
- Wagerman, S. A., & Funder, D. C. (2009). Situations. In P.J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.),
Cambridge Handbook of Personality (pp. 27-42). Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511596544.005
- Wiltermuth, S., Tiedens, L. Z., & Neale, M. (2015). The benefits of dominance
complementarity in negotiations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management
Research*, 8, 194-209. doi: 10.1111/ncmr.12052