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Abstract

Recent advances in social hierarchy research highlight that power and status are two prevalent but distinct bases of hierarchy. However, these distinctions have yet to be thoroughly explored in contexts where power and status coexist and can covary. This is, in part, due to the lack of an appropriate measure capable of capturing power and status as distinct constructs. In order to advance research on social hierarchy and bridge the empirical findings from social psychology research to organizational research, this paper outlines the development of a 12-item bipartite measure of perceived power and perceived status. Using seven samples, we develop a psychometrically sound measure and provide evidence of construct validity. Our results not only support the importance of distinguishing between these two prevalent bases of social hierarchy, but also highlight the potential dangers of capturing one base of hierarchy without accounting for the other.
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Introduction

Social hierarchy, defined as a rank ordering of individuals or groups along a socially valued dimension (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), is ubiquitous in organizations (Blau & Scott, 1962). Hierarchies can provide a functional structure that establishes social order, facilitates interpersonal coordination, and motivates employees to work toward achieving collective goals (Anderson & Brown, 2010; March & Simon, 1958). Therefore, it is not surprising that the topic of hierarchy has garnered significant scholarly interest at multiple levels of theorizing and examination, ranging from individuals (e.g., Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mundell, 1993; Fast, Sivanathan, Mayer, & Galinsky, 2012; Janssen & Gao, 2015; Pitesa & Thau, 2013; Williams, 2014), to groups and teams (e.g., Aime, Humphrey, DeRue, & Paul, 2014; Leslie, 2017; Ridgeway, 1982, 2001; Tost, Gino, & Larrick, 2013), to organizations and institutions (e.g., Piazza & Castellucci, 2014; Podolny, 1993; Ravlin & Thomas, 2005; Sauder, Lynn, & Podolny, 2012).

More recently, researchers have elucidated distinctions between two prevalent bases of social hierarchy: power and status. Power refers to an actor’s asymmetric control over socially valued resources, and status refers to the respect and admiration an actor has in the eyes of others (Blader & Chen, 2014; Fiske, 2010; Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Power and status share important similarities. For example, both are potential sources of influence over others (Magee & Galinsky, 2008) and often coexist in real-world settings (Dubois, Rucker, & Galinsky, 2015; Hays & Bendersky, 2015). However, power and status also differ in important ways. For example, elevated power affords individuals greater access to resources, making them less dependent on others than are those with less power (Anderson & Brion, 2014; Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). As a result, the powerful tend to pursue their own goals and are less attentive to social constraints and less concerned about others (Galinsky, Magee, Gruenfeld, Whitson, & Liljenquist, 2008; Guinote, 2007; van Kleef et al., 2008; Whitson et al., 2013). In contrast, because status is reliant on social conferral processes (Fiske & Berdahl, 2007; Fragale, Overbeck, & Neale, 2011; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), those with higher status are more attuned to their social environment than are those with lower status. Indeed, research has shown that those with elevated status are more attentive to, aware of, and concerned about others (Blader & Chen, 2012; Blader, Shirako, & Chen, 2016; Willer, 2009).

Although the idea that power and status represent distinct bases of social hierarchy has gained acceptance in recent years, measures of power and status have not kept pace with these changes. This has led to several conceptual and empirical issues in the existing literature. First, existing measures do not accurately reflect the theoretical refinements made in recent years. In particular, some measures that were derived from earlier conceptual definitions of social hierarchy conflate power and status with one another or with related but distinct constructs (e.g., influence, prominence). Second, existing measures of power or status are often used in isolation (i.e., without consideration of the other base). As a result, measuring one base without accounting for the other increases the risk of making spurious inferences. For instance, if
researchers only measure power, the unique variability in outcomes attributed to power may, in fact, be more appropriately attributed to status (or can be explained by both). Third, few existing measures have undergone a scale development and validation process, creating uncertainty about what these scales may actually capture. Finally, attempts to measure “objective” power or status (e.g., formal rank) are far too distal to accurately draw conclusions about the psychological consequences of experiencing power or status.

As such, the purpose of this paper is to develop a measure of social hierarchy that can capture the psychological experiences of power and status in settings where bases of hierarchy coexist and can covary, while maintaining their distinctiveness. In doing so, we aim to make three contributions to the literature. First, building upon the theoretical advances that have been made in social hierarchy scholarship, we argue that power and status are not only conceptually distinct, but also empirically demonstrate that individuals perceive power and status in distinct and meaningful ways (both about themselves and others in their social environment). Second, we follow established scale development guidelines to develop and validate our measures of perceived power and perceived status, providing evidence of sound psychometric properties and construct validity. As part of this process, we examine the relationships that perceived power and perceived status have with (a) existing operationalizations of social hierarchy and related constructs (e.g., influence), and (b) psychological correlates associated with power and/or status established in social-psychology research. Third, we extend the nomological networks of perceived power and perceived status by examining their relationships with work outcomes commonly investigated in field settings. Taken together, these contributions extend the generalizability and validity of contemporary perspectives on social hierarchy and serve as a vital bridge between social psychology and organizational research.

Power and Status as Prevalent and Distinct Bases of Social Hierarchy

Despite the recent scholarly interest in the psychological experiences of power and status, arguments for the existence of different bases of hierarchy go as far back as work by Max Weber (1947) who distinguished between class (i.e., economic power) and status (i.e., social honor). Until recently, however, research has often overlooked the distinction between power and status, or conflated them with related constructs (e.g., prominence) and shared consequences (e.g., influence). For example, Raven and French (1958) defined social power as the “potential influence of some individual or group over an individual” (p. 400; italics added for emphasis); they used this definition to create their seminal framework that delineated five sources of social power (French & Raven, 1959). Similarly, Anderson, John, Keltner, and Kring (2001) defined status as “respect, influence, and prominence.” The notable overlap in conceptual definitions makes it difficult to empirically discern the unique effects that power and status can have, particularly when existing studies have used operationalizations based on these definitions.

More recently, in their seminal review of the social hierarchy literature, Magee and Galinsky (2008) advanced conceptual definitions of power and status – which we adopt here –
that highlighted the important distinctions between these two prevalent bases of social hierarchy. Power, by definition, involves control over resources. Consequently, feeling powerful activates an approach orientation that focuses people on their own goals (Guinote, 2007; Keltner et al., 2003) and increases their psychological distance from others (Magee & Smith, 2013). Together, the approach orientation and social distance associated with feeling powerful has been argued to facilitate behaviors that align with one’s underlying attitudes and traits (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003; Hecht & LaFrance, 1998; Pitesa & Thau, 2013). Because people tend to be self-interested actors (Hobbes, 1950; Miller, 1999; Smith, 1776), those who feel powerful (vs. powerless) often demonstrate greater concern for themselves and reduced concern for others (Dubois et al., 2015; Galinsky, Magee, Inesi, & Gruenfeld, 2006; Rucker, Dubois, & Galinsky, 2011; van Kleef et al., 2008). Consistent with theorizing that power focuses people on their own goals, the psychological experience of power can, at times, lead to prosocial behaviors for individuals with prosocial goals or values (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001; DeCelles, DeRue, Margolis, & Ceramic, 2012; Gardner & Seeley, 2001; Kopelman, 2009), when cooperative goals are imposed (Tjosvold, 1985), or when others are perceived to have instrumental value to the powerholder (Copeland, 1994; Gruenfeld, Inesi, Magee, & Galinsky, 2008).

In contrast to power, status is voluntarily and collectively conferred upon an individual by others through an ongoing social exchange (Gould, 2002). Those who are perceived to have higher status receive respect and deference from others in exchange for, for example, sharing their knowledge and abilities (Hardy & Van Vugt, 2006; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). The conferred nature of status and a psychological need to maintain the benefits associated with high status (Pettit, Yong, & Spataro, 2010) – including more opportunities to contribute, positive feedback from others, feelings of inclusion, and a greater sense of wellbeing (Anderson, Kraus, Galinsky, & Keltner, 2012; Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980) – lead to a variety of prosocial cognitions and behaviors as people seek to justify and maintain their elevated status in the eyes of others. Specifically, the psychological experience of having higher status has been found to increase perspective taking (a common index of interpersonal sensitivity) and generosity toward others (Blader et al., 2016; Flynn, 2003; Willer, Feinberg, Simpson, & Flynn, 2013). Moreover, feeling high in status has been shown to heighten one’s sensitivity to equity and fairness (Hays & Blader, 2017), leading to greater enactment of justice toward others (Blader & Chen, 2012). Thus, despite the similarities that power and status share, hierarchy scholars have generally converged on definitions that highlight their distinctiveness (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

**Critical Issues in the Extant Literature**

Despite these conceptual advances, current operationalizations of power and status suffer from a variety of issues that make it difficult to distinguish their effects empirically, particularly in settings where both coexist and can covary. First, as previously mentioned, some measures conflate power and status with one another or with related constructs. For example, existing scales include items that reflect earlier conceptual definitions of power and status, such as
influence (e.g., French & Raven, 1959; Ridgeway & Walker, 1995). This is problematic because
the inclusion of items with overlapping key terms makes it difficult to separate power and status
as distinct constructs, as participants will have similar responses to these items. Anderson, John
et al. (2012), for example, defined sense of power in terms of influence, and items in their
measure include “I can get others to do what I want” and “My ideas and opinions are often
ignored” (reverse scored). These items overlap with Flynn’s (2003) measure of social status,
which includes items such as “How much influence does this person exert over decisions at
work?” Other measures conflate status with prominence (i.e., attention or visibility), which can
also be associated with one’s position in a power hierarchy. An example can be found in
Djurdjevic et al. (2017) measure of workplace status, which includes the item “I possess a high
level of prominence in my organization.” Importantly, scholars have identified numerous sources
of influence (e.g., similarity; Cialdini, 2001) and prominence (e.g., tokenism; Kanter, 1977) that
are unrelated or even antithetical to having power or status. For these reasons, Magee and
Galinsky (2008) argued that these constructs are best viewed as outcomes of power and status,
rather than being inherent to either.

Second, several measures of power and status have been developed and used in isolation,
without consideration of the other base of social hierarchy. Although these studies often
acknowledge the existence of both prevalent bases of social hierarchy, their research designs
only account for power or status. In doing so, researchers may attribute unique variability
explained in an outcome to a particular base of hierarchy, whereas in reality either base may
account for this variability. This has contributed, in part, to the mixed empirical findings
(Anderson & Brown, 2010) that have led some to question whether measures of hierarchy
actually predict outcomes meaningfully (Sturm & Antonakis, 2015). Without an adequate
measure that can accurately distinguish power and status as prevalent bases of social hierarchy,
researchers may unwittingly draw misleading conclusions regarding the relationships that power
or status have with outcomes, thereby exacerbating the mixed findings within the literature.

Third, research often employs measures without sufficient evidence of reliability and
construct validity (Schwab, 1980). For example, Flynn, Chatman, and Spataro (2001) developed
an ad hoc measure of social status (e.g., “s/he is able to persuade other people and change their
opinions”). Similarly, Hays and Bendersky (2015) used ad hoc measures of power (e.g., “To
what extent does he or she control resources that are valuable in the group?”) and status (e.g.,
“How much respect does he or she have in the group?”). Although these scales exhibit good face
validity, measures that have not been properly vetted can create uncertainty about whether they
accurately measure what they purport to. Moreover, the proliferation of ad hoc measures
designed for individual studies makes it difficult to achieve consensus in a literature, particularly
when conceptual definitions or items exhibit overlap.

Fourth, some measures of social hierarchy, in particular structural and proxy measures
such as rank in an organization’s formal hierarchy, are far too distal to accurately capture the
psychological experience of power and status (in addition to possibly conflating them; e.g.,
Kennedy & Anderson, 2017). Indeed, scholars have noted that, although objective in nature, proxy measures may not necessarily align with one’s psychological experience of power or status (Tost, 2015). In some cases, studies have even shown that objective measures, such as rank, can even interact with perceptions of power or status to predict outcomes (e.g., van Dijke, De Cremer, Langendijk, & Anderson, 2018). At the very least, the use of structural or objective indicators creates “slack” in inferences about the psychological experience of power and status, much like an experiment that lacks manipulation checks.

**Development and Validation of the Perceived Power and Perceived Status Scales**

To develop measures that can accurately distinguish power and status, we follow established scale development guidelines for developing psychometrically sound and construct valid measures (Clark & Watson, 1995; Hinkin, 1995, 1998; Schwab, 1980). We note that our measures are developed in tandem to ensure that the theoretical distinctions between power and status are reflected in their measurement. Below, we outline the steps taken in three distinct phases. In Phase 1, we generate and refine a pool of potential items to develop measures of perceived power and perceived status. Phase 2 provides support for the bipartite factor structure of social hierarchy, establishing evidence of good psychometric properties and examining their relationships with prior operationalizations that exist in the literature. Finally, Phase 3 examines how our new measures are related to (a) psychological correlates established from social psychology research, and (b) work-related outcomes commonly investigated in field research. Importantly, when investigating these relationships, we examine perceived power and perceived status concurrently in order to partial out the unique variability explained by each base.

**Phase 1: Item Development and Refinement**

**Item Development**

The first step of any scale development effort is to ensure that the content of each item reflects the construct that it measures (Clark & Watson, 1995; Ghiselli, Cambell, & Zedeck, 1981). We used a deductive approach to generate an initial pool of items, based on the definitions of power and status advanced by Magee and Galinsky's (2008) review of the social hierarchy literature. Utilizing these conceptual definitions, each author independently generated a list of items, anticipating that only about half of the total items would survive the content validation process (Hinkin, 1998). We dropped items that were similarly worded or redundant, and improved the wording of the remaining items. This process led to an initial pool of 24 items (12 for perceived power and 12 for perceived status).
Assessment of Content Validity

We followed Hinkin and Tracey's (1999) analysis of variance approach to examine the extent to which each item is representative of the theoretical definitions for power and status. The key advantage of this technique is that it eliminates the reliance on subjective judgments for item retention. This is accomplished through a statistical test that assesses the validity of each item, providing a straightforward method to remove any items that were not distinctive enough to the respondents.

**Participants and procedure.** We recruited 132 undergraduate business students at a large midwestern university to perform an item-sort task (Sample 1). Participants rated the initial pool of 24 items for consistency with the theoretical definitions of power and status using a five-point scale (1 = not at all, 5 = completely), allowing for a within-person assessment of the content adequacy for each item. To mitigate potential order effects (Krosnick & Alwin, 1987; Krosnick & Presser, 2010), participants received the conceptual definitions and items in a random order. Additionally, we monitored the amount of time that subjects spent on each page and included an attention check item to ensure that participants were reading the materials thoroughly. In total, 97 participants passed the attention check and their responses were retained for further analyses.

**Analyses.** We assessed content validity using analysis of variance comparisons of each item’s mean rating for the conceptual definitions of power and status (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999). Specifically, an item exhibits sufficient distinctiveness when the mean rating of fit with the focal construct is higher than with the non-focal construct, and the difference in mean ratings is statistically significant. Items that did not exhibit significant differences were dropped from further analyses, as this suggested that respondents did not judge the items as distinctive. In total, 16 items survived the content analysis process and were retained for additional refinement.

\[\text{Insert Table 1 about here}\]

---

1 Although the first two items of the perceived power scale (see Table 1) may be interpreted as indicators of objective power, we assert that these items are open to interpretation by respondents and therefore capture perceived power. Specifically, the phrases “a large number of subordinates” (item 1) and “many other people” (item 2) are subjective in nature. We examined this question empirically using data collected for a separate research effort (N = 183), which included a survey item that asked participants to estimate the size of their organization (1 = less than 25, 2 = 26–50, 3 = 51–100, 4 = more than 100). If items 1 and 2 were interpreted in an objective sense, only respondents who supervised a large number of employees in larger organizations would provide high values for these items. However, when regressing items 1 and 2 on (a) managerial position, (b) organization size, and (c) their interaction, we found that the interaction between managerial position and organization size was not a significant predictor of either item. Thus, we believe that both items are suitable for assessing perceptions of power, rather than a proxy of objective power.
Scale Refinement

Assessing content validity provides preliminary evidence that each item is a reasonable representation of the construct that it is designed to measure. However, this alone is not sufficient evidence that an item should be retained in the final measure. It is recommended that researchers conduct exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to evaluate the underlying factor structure of the items (Hinkin, 1998). Based on existing guidelines, a minimum of 150 – 200 responses are necessary for attaining an accurate solution in exploratory factor analysis (EFA), with a minimum item-to-response ratio of 1:10 (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Guadagnoli & Velicer, 1988). Moreover, to avoid any idiosyncratic differences stemming from contextual differences that may limit the external validity of our measures (Clark & Watson, 1995; Hinkin, 1998), the sample should include respondents from a wide range of contexts in which the measures will be used (see Table 1).

Participants and procedures. To obtain a large sample across a wide range of contexts, we recruited 220 full-time employees located in the United States via Mechanical Turk (Sample 2). Past research suggests that online crowdsourcing platforms, such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, are a valid and low-cost means for collecting survey data (Mason & Suri, 2012). Additionally, studies have demonstrated that the psychometric properties of data collected from such platforms are comparable to other methods, such as student subject pools (see Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Goodman, Cryder, & Cheema, 2013; Minton, Gurel-Atay, Kahle, & Ring, 2013). Respondents received $1.00 for completing a short online questionnaire that contained the 16 items retained from our content validity assessment and demographic questions. Participants averaged 32.5 years of age and 50.0% were female.

Exploratory factor analysis. Because power and status represent distinct but interrelated bases of social hierarchy, we used an oblique rotation criterion in our exploratory factor analyses that allows the extracted factors to be correlated (Sass & Schmitt, 2010). Our results supported a two-factor solution for the 16 items that survived the content validation process, which explained 71.69% of the total variance in the items (Factor 1: Eigenvalue = 8.17, Factor 2: Eigenvalue = 3.31, compared with an Eigenvalue for the third factor of 0.65). Examining the break in the scree plot of the extracted Eigenvalues also supported a two-factor solution (Gorsuch, 2003). The factor loadings for perceived power items ranged from 0.70 to 0.93 and the loadings for perceived status items ranged from 0.55 to 0.87, which are above the recommended minimum 0.40 criterion level (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986).

Item retention. Although there are no definitive rules for the total number of items that a “good” measure should include, shorter measures are preferable for survey research to minimize response biases caused by boredom and fatigue (Kraut, Wolfson, & Rothenberg, 1975; Schmitt & Stults, 1985). In addition, measures with a large number of items are not necessarily a good representation of a construct’s domain, as it is possible to achieve adequate estimates of internal consistency (i.e., $\alpha > 0.70$) with many items, even if the item intercorrelations are relatively low.
(Cortina, 1993; Loevinger, 1954). Thus, existing recommendations suggest that the eventual goal of scale development efforts for survey research should be to retain four to six items (per scale) to adequately tap the construct domain while ensuring sufficient homogeneity between items (Clark & Watson, 1995; Hinkin, 1998). Based on the results from EFA, we dropped the two items that had the lowest factor loadings for each construct (one dropped item for perceived status also exhibited a significant cross-loading with perceived power). This resulted in a final set of six items ($\alpha = 0.95$) for perceived power and six items ($\alpha = 0.91$) for perceived status.

**Confirmatory factor analyses.** We confirmed the factor structure of the final set of items using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Importantly, CFAs provide goodness of fit indices to assess the quality of the overall model and affords a stricter interpretation of unidimensionality, thereby overcoming criticisms of relying on EFA alone (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Fabrigar et al., 1999). Moreover, we contrasted a two-factor model of social hierarchy (i.e., with power and status items loading on separate factors) with a one factor model (i.e., all items loading on a single social hierarchy factor) for the original 16 items retained from content analyses and the reduced set of 12 items (see Sample 2 results in Table 2).

---

The results supported the two-factor solution derived from EFA. Specifically, when using the original 16 items retained from content analysis, our results indicated that a two-factor model ($\chi^2_{(103)} = 366.95$, CFI = 0.90, SRMR = 0.09) fit the data better than a one-factor model ($\chi^2_{(104)} = 1112.37$, CFI = 0.63, SRMR = 0.19). Similarly, results using the reduced set of 12 items indicated that a two-factor model ($\chi^2_{(53)} = 170.52$, CFI = 0.94, SRMR = 0.06) was a better fit of the data than a one-factor model ($\chi^2_{(54)} = 799.82$, CFI = 0.62, SRMR = 0.22). Finally, we conducted a chi-squared difference test on the two-factor models, finding that the 12 items retained from EFA yielded a better model fit ($\Delta \chi^2_{(50)} = 196.43$, $p < .01$) than the full set of 16 items that demonstrated sufficient content validity.

**Phase 1 Discussion**

In Phase 1, we followed the procedures outlined in the scale development literature to establish a psychometrically sound 12-item measure of social hierarchy based on the conceptual definitions of power and status advanced by Magee and Galinsky (2008). First, we assessed the quality of our items using Hinkin and Tracey's (1999) analysis of variance approach and removed items that did not exhibit sufficient content validity. Next, we evaluated the underlying factor structure of the items using exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. These procedures resulted in a reliable instrument that constitutes our bipartite measure of social hierarchy (6 items for perceived power and 6 items for perceived status).
Phase 2: Reliability and Convergent Validity

In Phase 2, we collected a separate sample to assess the reliability and convergent validity of the perceived power and perceived status scales. As we previously noted, a critical issue in the literature is that many existing measures do not accurately reflect the recent theoretical definitions that conceptualize power and status as distinct but interrelated bases of social hierarchy. These measures also do not properly distinguish power and status from similar but distinct constructs (e.g., influence, prominence). Therefore, we examine the relationships that the perceived power and perceived status scales have with existing and related measures of social hierarchy in this phase.

Participants and Procedures

We recruited 232 full-time employees (Sample 3) in the United States via TurkPrime (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2017) for this phase. Participants responded to the 12-item bipartite measure of social hierarchy developed in Phase 1, as well as measures of (a) hierarchical rank, (b) power and status (used in prior research), and (c) distinct but related constructs (e.g., social influence). To reduce the effects of careless responding, we included three attention check items in this survey. Participants who failed any of the attention check items were dropped from our analyses. This resulted in a final sample of 206 participants for Sample 3 at Time 1. Participants averaged 40.2 years of age and 44.0% were female.

Measures

Unless otherwise indicated, items were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Perceived power and perceived status. We assessed perceived power using six items (α = 0.93) and perceived status using six items (α = 0.92) that were retained from Phase 1.

Hierarchical rank. We measured the hierarchical rank an employee has at work using two separate operationalizations. First, we asked participants whether they occupied a formal managerial position at work (0 = no, 1 = yes). Second, we adapted a measure of hierarchical rank from previous research (see Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000; Anderson, Kraus et al., 2012; Kraus, Cote, & Keltner, 2010). Specifically, we presented participants with an image of a ladder that has ten rungs, labeled from “1st and Top Rung” (representing people at the very top of the organization, such as the CEO and top management team) to “10th and Bottom Rung” (representing people at the entry-level of the organization, such as assistants and maintenance staff). Next, participants were instructed to “Indicate approximately where on your organization’s hierarchy you fall.” Participants selected the rung that best represented their

---

2 One week after the close of this questionnaire, we invited the same participants to complete a second questionnaire that included outcome variables for subsequent analyses to establish criterion-related validity (used in Phase 3).
position in their organization’s hierarchy. Values for this measure were reverse-coded, such that 1 indicated the lowest hierarchical rank and 10 indicated the highest hierarchical rank.

**Bases of influence.** We measured the five bases of influence by adapting the scales developed in Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989). The five bases were measured using four items each ($\alpha_{\text{reward}} = 0.93$; $\alpha_{\text{coercive}} = 0.94$; $\alpha_{\text{legitimate}} = 0.96$; $\alpha_{\text{expert}} = 0.90$; $\alpha_{\text{referent}} = 0.86$). All items began with the stem “In my organization, I can …”, and sample items included “… influence others in getting a pay raise” (reward); “… give others undesirable job assignments” (coercive); “… make others feel like they have responsibilities to fulfill” (legitimate); “… provide others with needed technical knowledge” (expert); and “… make others feel valued” (referent).

**Social status.** We measured social status using the three items ($\alpha = 0.71$) from Flynn (2003), which included “How much influence do you exert over decisions at work?” (1 = *cannot affect decisions*, 7 = *has a great deal of influence*); “How valuable are your contributions at work?” (1 = *not valuable at all*, 7 = *extremely valuable*); and “How well respected are you at work?” (1 = *not respected at all*, 7 = *respected a great deal*).

**Sense of power.** We measured sense of power using the eight items ($\alpha = 0.86$) from Anderson, John et al. (2012). Sample items include “I can get others to listen to what I say at work” and “My wishes do not carry much weight at work” (reverse-scored).

**Workplace status.** We measured workplace status using the five items ($\alpha = 0.93$) from Djurdjevic et al. (2017). Sample items include “I have a great deal of prestige in my organization” and “I possess a high level of prominence in my organization.”

**Social desirability.** We included a 13-item ($\alpha = 0.86$) measure of social desirability taken from Reynolds (1982) to examine any effects that social desirability may have on our results. A sample item includes “It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.”

Insert Table 3 about here

-------------------

**Results**

Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and correlations for variables measured in Time 1 of Sample 3 are shown in Table 3.

---

3 Although the original measures were created to assess French and Raven’s (1959) bases of social power, as noted earlier, French and Raven defined social power in terms of influence. This prompted Blader and Chen (2014) to conclude that French and Raven’s influential framework is more accurately construed as bases of potential influence.
Reliabilities. To evaluate the internal consistency of the perceived power and perceived status scales, we examined coefficient alpha estimates and item intercorrelations. The internal consistency estimates for perceived power (α_{time 1} = 0.93; α_{time 2} = 0.92) and perceived status (α_{time 1} = 0.92; α_{time 1} = 0.92) were well above the minimum recommended cutoff of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). The average item intercorrelations were 0.68 (Time 1) and 0.69 (Time 2) for perceived power and 0.65 (Time 1) and 0.67 (Time 2) for perceived status. Finally, the test–retest stability coefficients were 0.80 for perceived power and 0.81 for perceived status (see Table 4).

Confirmatory factor analyses. We conducted CFA to ensure that we could replicate the factor structure obtained in Phase 1 (see Table 2). At Time 1, a two-factor model of social hierarchy (χ^2(53) = 174.45, CFI = 0.93, SRMR = 0.04) was a better fit of the data than a one-factor model (χ^2(54) = 919.63, CFI = 0.53, SRMR = 0.24). Likewise, the CFA results from Time 2 also supported a two-factor model (χ^2(53) = 167.78, CFI = 0.93, SRMR = 0.06) over a one-factor model (χ^2(54) = 758.85, CFI = 0.57, SRMR = 0.20). All factor loadings were statistically significant.

Convergent validity. We found a positive relationship between perceived power and measures of hierarchical rank: managerial position (r = 0.69, p < .05) and our ladder measure of rank (r = 0.31, p < .05). In addition, we found a positive relationship between perceived power and all potential bases of influence: reward (r = 0.75, p < .05), coercive (r = 0.59, p < .05), legitimate (r = 0.57, p < .05), expert (r = 0.29, p < .05), and referent (r = 0.26, p < .05). We note that the relationships were (a) strongest for bases of influence that are more theoretically aligned with the conceptual definition of power than with that of status (i.e., reward and coercive); (b) moderate for influence that could be derived from power or status (i.e., legitimate); and (c) weakest for bases of influence that are more closely aligned with status than with power (i.e., expert and referent). Perceived power was also positively correlated with Anderson, John et al.’s (2012) sense of power scale (r = 0.38, p < .05) and with prior measures of status, including Flynn’s (2003) social status measure (r = 0.45, p < .05) and Djurdjevic et al.’s (2017) workplace status scale (r = 0.61, p < .05). We note that the strength of the relationships between perceived power and prior operationalizations of status supports our assertion that measures used in past research may have inadvertently captured overlap between bases of social hierarchy and constructs that power and status share (i.e., influence, prominence).

With respect to perceived status, we found a positive relationship between status and measures of hierarchical rank: managerial position (r = 0.32, p < .05) and our ladder measure of rank (r = 0.25, p < .05). In addition, we found a positive relationship between perceived status and all potential bases of influence: reward (r = 0.30, p < .05), coercive (r = 0.15, p < .05), legitimate (r = 0.53, p < .05), expert (r = 0.65, p < .05), and referent (r = 0.72, p < .05). We again note that the relationships with perceived status were (a) strongest for bases of influence that are more aligned with the conceptual definition of status than with that of power (i.e., expert and referent); (b) moderate for influence that could be derived from status or power (i.e., legitimate);
and (c) weakest for bases of influence that are more closely aligned with power than with status (i.e., reward and coercive). Perceived status was also positively related to existing measures of status, including (a) Flynn’s (2003) social status measure ($r = 0.68$, $p < .05$), and (b) Djurdjevic et al.’s (2017) workplace status scale ($r = 0.52$, $p < .05$). Finally, perceived status was strongly correlated with Anderson, John et al.’s (2012) sense of power scale ($r = 0.55$, $p < .05$), likely due to its emphasis on influence.

**Social desirability.** Our results showed that social desirability was not significantly related to perceived power ($r = 0.05$, $p = .49$). However, social desirability was positively related to perceived status ($r = 0.24$, $p < .05$), which was consistent for the relationships between social desirability and social status ($r = 0.24$, $p < .05$), sense of power ($r = 0.22$, $p < .05$), and workplace status ($r = 0.22$, $p < .05$). We examine the potential effects of social desirability on criterion variables in the next phase.

**Phase 2 Discussion**

In Phase 2, we provide initial evidence that the measures we develop for perceived power and perceived status are psychometrically sound, as evident from internal consistency and test-retest coefficients. We also replicated the two-factor structure reported in Phase 1, providing additional support that our measures can reliably separate power and status as interrelated bases of social hierarchy. Finally, the significant relationships between the perceived power and the perceived status scales with prior operationalizations of social hierarchy suggest that our measures have good convergent validity. The relationships are also not strong enough to suggest that the measures are redundant.

**Phase 3: Criterion-related Validity**

In Phase 3 we establish evidence of construct validity by demonstrating significant relationships between the measures we developed and criteria of interest to researchers (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955; Hinkin, 1998). We examine the relationships that the perceived power and perceived status scales have with psychological correlates, based on existing research from social psychology, and work outcomes that have been commonly studied in organizational research. Specifically, we consider five categories of variables to establish the criterion-related validity of the perceived power and perceived status scales: (a) interpersonal sensitivity; (b) interpersonal work behaviors; (c) organization-directed work behaviors; (d) job attitudes; and (e) task performance.

**Interpersonal Sensitivity**

A significant amount of research on the psychological experience of power and status has found that the two have divergent effects on interpersonal sensitivity, which refers to one’s
ability to sense, perceive accurately, and respond to one’s personal, interpersonal, and social environment (Bernieri, 2001). In this study, we operationalized interpersonal sensitivity using three constructs that have been examined in prior hierarchy research: perspective taking, which refers to one’s ability to take others’ viewpoints (Davis, Conklin, Smith, & Luce, 1996); empathic concern, which refers to an individual’s tendency to experience warmth, compassion, and concern toward others (Davis, 1983); and justice sensitivity, which refers to the extent to that an individual is attuned to enacting justice toward others (Lotz, Baumert, Schlosser, Gresser, & Fetchenhauer, 2011).

As noted previously, the sense of independence associated with feeling powerful (compared to feeling powerless) tends to focus individuals on their own goals (Guinote, 2007; Keltner et al., 2003) and increase their social distance from others (Magee & Smith, 2013). Consistent with the notion that humans are generally self-interested actors (Hobbes, 1950; Ratner & Miller, 2001; Schwartz, 1986; Smith, 1776), most research on the psychology of power indicates that feelings of high power have a variety of self-oriented consequences. For example, feeling powerful, versus powerless, increases the likelihood that an individual will engage in self-interested behaviors (Rucker et al., 2011), such as unethical acts (Lammers, Stapel, & Galinsky, 2010; Lammers, Stoker, Jordan, Pollmann, & Stapel, 2011; Pitesa & Thau, 2013), particularly when these behaviors benefit that individual (Dubois et al., 2015). Moreover, feeling powerful has been found to reduce one’s tendency to take others’ perspectives or to be concerned about others’ welfare (Blader et al., 2016; Galinsky et al., 2006; van Kleef et al., 2008). The self-oriented effects of psychological power can also cause one to view others in instrumental terms and disparage their contributions (Georgesen & Harris, 2000; Gruenfeld et al., 2008; Kipnis, 1972), as well as increase their cynicism about others’ intentions towards oneself, even for acts of kindness (Inesi, Gruenfeld, & Galinsky, 2012).

While the majority of research on the psychology of power suggests that feeling powerful often leads to self-interested behaviors – consistent with evidence that a sense of power leads to goal pursuit – a sense of power can also trigger prosocial behaviors among individuals who hold prosocial goals and values (DeCelles et al., 2012; Gardner & Seeley, 2001; Kopelman, 2009). Although a handful of studies have found that feeling powerful can increase one’s interpersonal sensitivity, we note that these effects may occur because (a) doing so benefits the powerholder (Copeland, 1994; Overbeck & Park, 2006; Tjosvold, 1985) or (b) feeling powerful creates the sense that one also has high status (e.g., Schmid Mast, Jonas, & Hall, 2009; Smith & Hofmann, 2016) (for possible exceptions, see Greenberg, 1978; Handgraaf, Van Dijk, Vermunt, Wilke, & De Dreu, 2008; Tost, Wade-Benzoni, & Johnson, 2015). Thus, we expect that our measure of perceived power will be negatively related to indicators of interpersonal sensitivity.

Hypothesis 1a. Perceived power will be negatively related to perspective taking.

Hypothesis 1b. Perceived power will be negatively related to empathic concern.
Hypothesis 1c. Perceived power will be negatively related to sensitivity about justice enactment.

Research indicates that, in contrast to feeling powerful, feeling high in status increases one’s attention to the social environment because status is conferred by others. Status tends to orient individuals outwardly to their relationships with others (Blader & Chen, 2014; Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006), heightening their awareness of how others view them and the quality of their relationships with others (Blader & Chen, 2014). Due to the myriad benefits associated with high status (Anderson, Kraus et al., 2012; Berger et al., 1980), the notion that status becomes increasingly central to one’s self-identity as one’s status increases (Marr & Thau, 2014), and that status hierarchies are perceived as mutable (Hays & Bendersky, 2015), high-status individuals are especially concerned about maintaining their status. This focus on status maintenance suggests that higher status individuals (vs. lower status individuals) will be more vigilant in monitoring their social environment and attuned to how others perceive them (Anderson, Hildreth, & Howland, 2015; Blader & Chen, 2011; Gould, 2002). In support of these arguments, research has shown that feeling high in status (compared to feeling low in status) increases one’s generosity (Willer, 2009), perspective taking (Blader et al., 2016), interpersonal trust (Lount & Pettit, 2012), sensitivity to equity in one’s relationships (Hays & Blader, 2017), and enactment of justice toward others (Blader & Chen, 2012). Therefore, we expect that our measure of perceived status will be positively related to indicators of interpersonal sensitivity.

Hypothesis 2a. Perceived status will be positively related to perspective taking.

Hypothesis 2b. Perceived status will be positively related to empathic concern

Hypothesis 2c. Perceived status will be positively related to sensitivity about justice enactment.

Interpersonal Work Behaviors

To extend the study of power and status into field settings, where both coexist and can covary, we consider the distinct effects that perceived power and perceived status can have on two contrasting forms of interpersonal work behaviors: organizational citizenship (OCB-I) and counterproductive behaviors (CWB-I). Specifically, OCB-I refers to discretionary behaviors intended to benefit others (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997), which reflect interpersonally sensitive behaviors in a work setting. Conversely, CWB-I refers to discretionary behaviors intended to harm others (Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), which represent interpersonally insensitive behaviors toward others at work. Importantly, both represent work behaviors that are theoretically related to interpersonal sensitivity. Building upon the arguments about the relationships between power and interpersonal sensitivity, we further argue that perceptions of power will be negatively related to behaviors that benefit others (OCB-I) and positively related to disparaging treatment of others (CWB-I). Beyond the effects that psychological power can have on interpersonal sensitivity, feeling powerful has also been found
to heighten one’s action orientation (Galinsky et al., 2003). As such, those with an elevated sense of psychological power are more likely to act in ways that align with their internal states, and are less attentive to social norms and others’ feelings (Galinsky et al., 2008; van Kleef et al., 2008), which might otherwise inhibit people from engaging in interpersonally insensitive behaviors, including CWB-I.

_Hypothesis 3a._ Perceived power will be negatively related to OCB-I.

_Hypothesis 3b._ Perceived power will be positively related to CWB-I.

In contrast to our predictions for perceived power, we expect that elevated perceptions of status will heighten one’s interpersonal sensitivity, as outlined in the previous section. This suggests that individuals with higher perceived status will engage in discretionary behaviors that benefit others (OCB-I) and fewer behaviors that disparage others (CWB-I). Despite a lack of research on the relationship between status and action-orientation, the positive feedback that high-status people tend to receive (Berger et al., 1980) and perceive (Pettit & Sivanathan, 2012), coupled with their ability to influence others, is likely to elevate their sense of efficacy and increase the likelihood that they will take action (Berger et al., 1980; Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

_Hypothesis 4a._ Perceived status will be positively related to OCB-I.

_Hypothesis 4b._ Perceived status will be negatively related to CWB-I.

**Organization-directed work behaviors**

Just as citizenship and counterproductive behaviors can be directed toward other individuals at work, they can also be directed toward the organization (i.e., OCB-O; Williams & Anderson, 1991; CWB-O; Fox et al., 2001). In addition, a related area of research has also delineated the importance of an additional form of work behavior that can benefit the organization: employee voice. Voice behaviors refer to volitional expressions of constructive opinions, concerns, or ideas intended to benefit the functioning of the organization, but challenge the existing status quo (Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012; Morrison, 2011). Thus, we argue that perceived power and perceived status are related to organization-directed work behaviors, including OCB-O, CWB-O, and voice behaviors.

As discussed previously, individuals with higher power have greater access to organizational resources that can enhance their ability to pursue their own goals (Guinote, 2007; Keltner et al., 2003), including work-related goals (Joshi & Fast, 2013). In work contexts, however, an individual’s ability to maintain access to these resources is tied to the performance and longevity of the organization. As such, they have an incentive to contribute to the organization’s success and survival. Moreover, people at higher ranks of an organizational hierarchy tend to identify more strongly with the organization and with their roles (Joshi & Fast, 2013; Kennedy & Anderson, 2017). As employees identify more strongly with the organization,
they incorporate the organization and its values into their self-concept, and, thus, their own goals and success become increasingly tied to the organization’s goals and success (Lawler & Yoon, 1996; Lawler, 2001; Lawler, Thye, & Yoon, 2000). This suggests that powerful people, who are likely to experience a higher sense of power than those with less power, will be particularly invested in the organization’s success because it will correspond to their personal success. Moreover, as people who feel powerful are more likely to act in pursuit of their goals (Galinsky et al., 2003; Guinote, 2007), they are also more likely to engage in behaviors that benefit the organization, because the organization is the source of their power at work and an important part of their identity. For these reasons, we argue that, compared to those who feel less powerful, people with a higher sense of power are more likely to behave in ways that will benefit the organization and less likely to behave in ways that will undermine the organization.

_Hypothesis 5a._ Perceived power will be positively related to OCB-O.

_Hypothesis 5b._ Perceived power will be negatively related to CWB-O.

_Hypothesis 5c._ Perceived power will be positively related to voice behaviors.

In contrast to power, status is based on being respected and admired by others (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). The conferral of status is typically determined by others’ perceptions that one is willing and able to contribute in ways that benefit a collective, such as one’s organization (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Ridgeway, Boyle, Kuipers, & Robinson, 1998). As people increase in status, they are particularly concerned about maintaining their status, both because status provides them with benefits (Anderson, Kraus et al., 2012; Berger et al., 1980) and because status becomes increasingly central to their self-identity as they ascend the status hierarchy (Marr & Thau, 2014). Maintaining elevated status requires one to continually demonstrate one’s value to the organization. Moreover, increases in status (Tyler & Blader, 2003) and rank (which typically affords status; Kennedy & Anderson, 2017) tend to heighten one’s identification with the organization – meaning that the organization is an important part of one’s self-concept – higher-status individuals are likely to see the organization’s success as personal success (Lawler & Yoon, 1996; Lawler et al., 2000; Lawler, 2001). Therefore, they are motivated to behave in ways that benefit the organization. Finally, as noted earlier, a higher sense of status is also likely to lead to elevated feelings of self-efficacy, which would increase people’s tendency to act in service of their goals (Bandura, 1977; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). This suggests that people who perceive themselves as higher in status will be more likely than those lower in status to engage in prosocial behaviors that benefit the organization and less likely to engage in behaviors that are harmful to the organization.

_Hypothesis 6a._ Perceived status will be positively related to OCB-O.

_Hypothesis 6b._ Perceived status will be negatively related to CWB-O.

_Hypothesis 6c._ Perceived status will be positively related to voice behaviors.
Although individuals can, in various ways, benefit their organizations through their actions, not all such actions are purely beneficial or detrimental. Indeed, the opportunity to engage in behaviors that are unethical, yet may benefit the organization, presents a difficult choice for employees (Umphress, Bingham, & Mitchell, 2010). On the one hand, they can choose to “do the right thing,” but potentially harm the organization, which is likely the source of their feelings of power and status in the workplace and an important part of their self-identity. On the other hand, employees can decide to engage in acts that are unethical and yet benefit the organization (Brief, Buttram, & Dukerich, 2001; Vardi & Weitz, 2005).

We predict that individuals with an elevated sense of power are more likely to engage in unethical behaviors that benefit the organization. In support of this argument, prior studies have shown that feeling powerful can make individuals more likely to rationalize and engage in unethical behaviors (Dubois et al., 2015; Lammers et al., 2010, 2011). In the work context, these tendencies may be even stronger because such behaviors can promote the organization’s success and, thus, reinforce one’s power in that organization.

**Hypothesis 7a.** Perceived power will be positively related to unethical behaviors that benefit the organization.

Although individuals with elevated status may also have an intrinsic desire to demonstrate their value through behaviors that benefit the organization, unethical behaviors pose a risk to their status (Graffin, Bundy, Porac, Wade, & Quinn, 2013). Specifically, unethical acts are inconsistent with others’ expectations for high-status individuals (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Willer, 2009). Thus, getting caught behaving unethically, even when the organization stands to benefit, may lead to an aversive status loss (Pettit et al., 2010). This suggests that, despite the possible benefits to the organization, those with an elevated sense of status may remain unwilling to engage in unethical actions as they seek to protect their own status.

**Hypothesis 7b.** Perceived status will be negatively related to unethical behaviors that benefit the organization.

**Job Attitudes**

*Job attitudes*, broadly defined as “evaluations of one’s job that express one’s feelings towards, beliefs about, and attachment to one’s job” (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012, p. 344), are the subject of significant interest to organizational researchers. Two of the most commonly studied constructs in this domain are job satisfaction and affective commitment. Job satisfaction refers to the positive feelings that individuals associate with their job (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012), and affective commitment refers to one’s emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012; Meyer & Allen, 1991). However, studies that have examined the relationships between hierarchy-related constructs and job attitudes are limited. The few studies that have considered these relationships have relied upon French and Raven's (1959) typology of
social power and have found a general positive relationship between power, job satisfaction, and commitment (e.g., Carson, Carson, & Roe, 1993; Mossholder, Bennett, Kemery, & Wesolowski, 1998).

In light of the theoretical advances in the social hierarchy literature (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), French and Raven’s bases of power are more accurately viewed as bases of potential influence (Blader & Chen, 2014). In a work context, those with greater influence are more able to fulfill their own psychological needs, such as autonomy, self-worth, and competence (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Sommer & Bourgeois, 2010). Subsequently, fulfillment of one’s psychological needs tends to improve work attitudes (Brown, 1996; Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). Because influence is a downstream consequence of power and status (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), we predict that perceived power and perceived status will be positively related to both job satisfaction and affective commitment.

**Hypothesis 8a.** Perceived power will be positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8b.** Perceived power will be positively related to affective commitment.

**Hypothesis 9a.** Perceived status will be positively related to job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 9b.** Perceived status will be positively related to affective commitment.

**Task Performance**

Finally, task performance is one of the most important outcomes examined in organizational research. This is because individuals are hired into organizations to perform activities that contribute towards the organization’s goals (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Consistent with our logic for the effects of perceived power on OCB-O and CWB-O, we expect that higher levels of perceived power will be positively related to task performance. Specifically, the organization is the source of individuals’ power, and those who feel more powerful (versus less powerful) at work tend to identify more strongly with the organization and their roles within the organization (Joshi & Fast, 2013; Kennedy & Anderson, 2017). This suggests that individuals who feel more powerful are particularly vested in the organization’s success and, thus, will be more motivated to perform well for the organization than those who feel less powerful. Additionally, people who feel powerful experience a heightened sense of self-efficacy, tend to act in service of their goals, and attend less to goal-inhibiting information compared to those with less power (Fast, Gruenfeld, Sivanathan, & Galinsky, 2009; Galinsky et al., 2003; Guinote, 2007; Whitson et al., 2013; Wojciszke & Struzynska-Kujalowicz, 2007). This indicates that the psychological experience of power should also increase one’s motivation to perform (Clark, 1971), a critical predictor of task performance (Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). As such, we predict that feeling powerful will be positively related to task performance.
**Hypothesis 10a.** Perceived power will be positively related to task performance.

Similarly, we expect that perceived status will be positively related to task performance. Specifically, those who perceive themselves as higher in status will seek to maintain the benefits associated with their position (Anderson, Kraus et al., 2012; Berger et al., 1980). This is because status becomes increasingly central to an individual’s self-identity as they move up within a status hierarchy (Marr & Thau, 2014) and, as a result, those with elevated status will be particularly concerned with maintaining their own status (Anderson et al., 2015; Blader & Chen, 2011). Because status is conferred based on perceptions of an individual’s value to the organization, maintaining high status involves continually demonstrating that one deserves high status, and one way of doing this is via superior performance (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Moreover, due to the positive feedback they receive and their ability to influence others, higher-status individuals are more likely than lower-status individuals to feel a heightened sense of efficacy (Berger et al., 1980), which will lead to better performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Therefore, we predict that perceived status will be positively related to task performance.

**Hypothesis 10b.** Perceived status will be positively related to task performance.

**Participants and Procedures**

We used data from five samples to examine the relationships that perceived power and perceived status have with established psychological correlates and work-related outcomes, including data from Sample 3 (collected at Time 2) and four additional samples (Samples 4-7). Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and bivariate correlations for each sample are shown in Tables 4-8. In addition, each table provides the partial correlation (above the diagonals) between outcomes examined and each base of social hierarchy, while partialling out the effects of the other base.

**Sample 3.** As discussed in the prior phase, participants in Sample 3 were invited to complete a second questionnaire approximately one week after the initial survey for this phase. Of the participants who completed the first survey, 185 completed the follow up survey. Two attention check items were included in Time 2, and participants who failed any of the attention check items were dropped from our analyses. This resulted in data from 173 (84.0%) participants retained for analyses from Sample 3 in this phase.

**Sample 4.** We recruited full-time employees in various organizations across the United States using referrals from undergraduate students enrolled in business courses at a large midwestern university. Students were not informed of the purpose of the study and were given extra credit for providing contact information for potential participants. The researchers contacted each referral directly, provided details about the nature of the study, and requested their consent to participate. Upon completing the study, participants had an opportunity to enter in a random drawing for one of four $25 gift cards to an online retailer. Participants responded to
two questionnaires separated by approximately one week. The first survey measured perceived power, perceived status, psychological correlates (perspective taking and justice sensitivity), and demographic information. The second survey measured perceived power and perceived status to provide another assessment of test-retest reliability, and organization-directed work behaviors (citizenship, counterproductive, and unethical behaviors). Out of 211 participants, 185 (87.7%) completed both questionnaires and were retained for analyses. The average age of participants was 41.2 years and 42.2% were female.

**Sample 5.** We recruited full-time employees and their coworkers using referrals from students enrolled in a part-time executive MBA program at a large midwestern university. Each full-time employee received a nominal amount of extra credit for providing contact information for up to four coworkers in his or her current organization. As part of an in-class assignment, the executive MBA students completed two surveys. Perceived power, perceived status, and demographic information were measured in the first survey, and interpersonal work behaviors (employee voice, helping, and counterproductive behaviors) in the second survey, which was administered approximately two weeks after the first. Researchers directly contacted the coworkers of each focal employee, provided details about the nature of the study, and asked for their consent to participate. Upon completing the study, participants had an opportunity to enter in a random drawing for one of four $25 gift cards to an online retailer. Each coworker responded to a short online questionnaire about his or her perceptions of the focal employee’s perceived power, perceived status, and interpersonal work behaviors. A total of 288 coworkers completed the survey for 105 focal employees in this sample, with an average of 2.74 coworker responses for each focal employee. The average age of focal employees that were rated by their coworkers was 35.8 years and 31.2% were female.

**Sample 6.** We identified 231 employees within a service department at a large midwestern university and sent invitations to participate in our research study. In exchange for their participation, respondents were paid $15. Each employee responded to items that measured perceived power, perceived status, affective commitment, job satisfaction, interpersonal work behaviors (OCB-I and CWB-I), and organization-directed work behaviors (OCB-O and CWB-O). In total, we received 93 completed responses (40.3% response rate). The average age of respondents was 41.9 years and 68.8% were female.

**Sample 7.** Using referrals from students enrolled in business courses at a large western university, we identified pairs of coworkers who were working full-time in the same organization. Upon completing the study, participants had an opportunity to enter in a random drawing for one of four $50 gift cards to an online retailer. Participants responded to perceptions of their own perceived power and perceived status, followed by perceptions of their coworkers’ power, status, voice behaviors (promotive and prohibitive), OCB-I (task-focused and person-focused), CWB-I (active and passive forms), and task performance. We then matched each focal participant’s perceptions of their own power and status with their coworker’s reports about the
focal participant. In total, 243 matched pairs of full-time employees completed the online questionnaire. Participants’ average age was 32.1 years and 55.6% were female.

**Measures**

*Perceived power and perceived status.* We assessed perceived power and perceived status using the 12 items developed and retained from Phase 1. Across all samples in this phase, the internal consistency estimates were above the recommended 0.70 cutoff (Nunnally, 1978). The reliabilities for power and status for each respective sample can be found on the diagonals in Tables 4-8.

*Perspective taking.* We measured perspective taking using the seven items developed by Davis (1983) in Sample 3 ($\alpha = 0.85$) and Sample 4 ($\alpha = 0.81$). The items, measured on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 7 = \text{strongly agree}$), included “I try to look at everybody’s side of a disagreement before I make a decision.”

*Empathic concern.* We measured empathic concern in Sample 3 using the seven items ($\alpha = 0.88$) developed by Davis (1983). The items, measured on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 7 = \text{strongly agree}$), included “I am quite touched by things that I see happen.”

*Justice sensitivity.* We measured sensitivity for enacting justice toward others using the 10-item justice perpetrator scale from Schmitt, Baumert, Gollwitzer, and Maes (2010). For Sample 3 ($\alpha = 0.93$), the items were measured on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{not at all like me}, 7 = \text{just like me}$). For Sample 4 ($\alpha = 0.92$), the items were measured on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{not at all like me}, 5 = \text{just like me}$). Sample items included “I cannot stand the feeling of exploiting someone” and “I feel guilty when I treat someone worse than others.”

*OCB-I.* We used four items from Van Dyne and LePine (1998) to measure OCB-I in Sample 5 ($\alpha = 0.85$) and Sample 6 ($\alpha = 0.87$) on a five point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 5 = \text{strongly agree}$). Sample items included “This coworker assists others with their work.” In Sample 7, we examined whether the pattern of relationships held when we made a more nuanced distinction between task-focused and person-focused citizenship behaviors. We measured task-focused OCB-I using six items ($\alpha = 0.93$) and person-focused OCB-I using eight items ($\alpha = 0.95$), from Settoon and Mossholder (2002) on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 7 = \text{all of the time}$). Sample items included “This coworker helps others with difficult assignments, even when assistance is not directly requested” (task-focused) and “This coworker makes an extra effort to understand the problems faced by others” (person-focused).

*OCB-O.* We used four items from Lee and Allen (2002) to measure OCB-O in Sample 4 ($\alpha = 0.82$) and Sample 6 ($\alpha = 0.80$). Participants responded on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 5 = \text{strongly agree}$). A sample item for OCB-O was “I show pride when representing the organization when other employees criticize it.”
**CWB-I.** We used four items from Bennett and Robinson (2000) in Sample 5 ($\alpha_{\text{self}} = 0.82$; $\alpha_{\text{coworker}} = 0.85$), and Sample 6 ($\alpha = 0.80$) using a five-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 5 = \text{all of the time}$). Sample items included “To what extent have you acted rudely toward someone at work?” (self-report) and “To what extent does this coworker act rudely towards others at work?” (coworker-report). In Sample 7, we examined whether the pattern of relationships held when we made a more nuanced distinction between active and passive forms of CWB-I. We measured active CWB-I using seven items ($\alpha = 0.95$) and passive CWB-I using four items ($\alpha = 0.94$) from Ferris, Yan, Lim, Chen, and Fatimah (2016) measured on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 7 = \text{all of the time}$). Sample items included “This coworker acts rudely towards others” (active CWB-I) and “This coworker withdraws from others at work” (passive CWB-I).

**CWB-O.** We used four items from Bennett and Robinson (2000) to assess CWB-O in Sample 4 ($\alpha = 0.75$) and Sample 6 ($\alpha = 0.85$) on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 5 = \text{all of the time}$). A sample item for CWB-O was “To what extent have you taken property from work without permission?”

**Voice behaviors.** In Sample 5, we assessed voice behaviors using four items ($\alpha_{\text{self}} = 0.87$; $\alpha_{\text{coworker}} = 0.85$) from Van Dyne and LePine (1998) on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 5 = \text{strongly agree}$). Sample items included “I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the workplace” (self-report) and “This coworker develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect the workplace” (coworker-report). In Sample 7, we examined whether the pattern of relationships held when we made a more nuanced distinction between promotive and prohibitive voice behaviors. We measured promotive voice behaviors using five items ($\alpha = 0.96$) and prohibitive voice using five items ($\alpha = 0.86$) from Liang et al. (2012) on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 7 = \text{all of the time}$). Sample items included “This coworker proactively voices out constructive suggestions that help our work unit reach its goals” (promotive voice) and “This coworker proactively reports coordination problems in the workplace to management” (prohibitive voice).

**Unethical behaviors.** We used four items ($\alpha = 0.84$) from Umphress et al. (2010) to assess the extent to which participants would be willing to engage in unethical behaviors that benefit the organization in Sample 4. The items were measured on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{never}, 5 = \text{all of the time}$). All items included the stem “If it would help my organization,” and sample items included “I would misrepresent the truth to make my organization look good” and “I would withhold negative information about my company or its products from customers and clients.”

**Affective commitment.** We used four items from Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) to measure affective commitment in Sample 3 ($\alpha = 0.87$) on a seven-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 7 = \text{strongly agree}$), and in Sample 6 ($\alpha = 0.83$) on a five-point scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}, 5 = \text{strongly agree}$). Sample items included “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own” and “I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.”
Job satisfaction. We measured job satisfaction using six items (α = 0.93) from Brayfield and Rothe (1951) in Sample 3 on a seven-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Sample items included “Overall, I am satisfied with my present job” and “I definitely dislike my work” (reverse-scored).

Task performance. We measured task performance using three items (α = 0.93) from Griffin, Neal, and Parker (2007) in Sample 7 on a seven-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = always). A sample item was “To what extent does this coworker carry out the core parts of their job well?”

Insert Tables 4-5 about here

Psychometric Properties

Across all samples in this phase, the average reliability estimate was 0.93 for perceived power and 0.91 for perceived status (including self- and coworker-reports; see diagonals in Tables 4-8). The test–retest reliability coefficients in Sample 4 were 0.86 for perceived power and 0.69 for perceived status (see Table 5). Confirmatory factor analyses across all samples in this phase confirmed that a two-factor structure fit the data better than a one-factor structure.

Results

As previously discussed, several critical issues emerged from our review of existing measures. One such issue was that prior studies have examined power and status in isolation, thereby lacking the capability to uncover distinct outcomes of power and status. This issue is compounded by the fact that items used to capture power and status were often conflated with one another or with similar but distinct constructs (e.g., influence, prominence). To test our hypotheses, therefore, we examined the partial correlations between each base of social hierarchy (while controlling for the other) and the outcomes examined in this phase. We believe that this is a more conservative test of our predictions by considering only the unique variance that is attributable to either power or status when they are considered simultaneously. Partial correlations for each sample are reported above the diagonal on Tables 4-8. Below, we discuss our results pertaining to each category of outcomes examined in Phase 3.

Interpersonal sensitivity and perceived power. We found weak support for Hypothesis 1a, which predicted a negative relationship between perceived power and perspective taking. We found a non-significant relationship in Sample 3 at Time 1 (pr = −0.08, p = .32) and Time 2 (pr = −0.02, p = .75). However, results from Sample 4 showed a marginal negative relationship at Time 1 (pr = −0.13, p = .08) and Time 2 (pr = −0.12, p = .09). In support of Hypothesis 1b, results from Sample 3 demonstrated a negative relationship between perceived power and empathic concern at both Time 1 (pr = −0.23, p < .05) and Time 2 (pr = −0.25, p < .05). Finally,
we found weak support for Hypothesis 1c, as indicated by a marginal negative relationship between perceived power and justice sensitivity in Sample 3 at Time 1 ($pr = -0.14, p = .07$) and a non-significant relationship at Time 2 ($pr = -0.12, p = .11$). Results from Sample 4 showed a non-significant relationship at Time 1 ($pr = -0.10, p = .17$) and Time 2 ($pr = -0.04, p = .58$).

**Interpersonal sensitivity and perceived status.** In support of Hypothesis 2a, we found a positive relationship between perceived status and perspective taking in Sample 3 (Time 1, $pr = 0.30, p < .05$; Time 2, $pr = 0.26, p < .05$) and Sample 4 (Time 1, $pr = 0.25, p < .05$; Time 2, $pr = 0.30, p < .05$). In support of Hypothesis 2b, in Sample 3, we found a positive relationship between perceived status and empathic concern at Time 1 ($pr = 0.19, p < .05$) and Time 2 ($pr = 0.26, p < .05$). Finally, in support of Hypothesis 2c, we found a positive relationship between perceived status and justice sensitivity in Sample 3 (Time 1, $pr = 0.19, p < .05$; Time 2, $pr = 0.26, p < .05$) and Sample 4 (Time 1, $pr = 0.28, p < .05$; Time 2, $pr = 0.15, p < .05$).

**Interpersonal work behaviors and perceived power.** Our results provided weak support for Hypothesis 3a, in which we predicted a negative relationship between perceived power and OCB-I. Results from Sample 5 revealed a non-significant relationship between OCB-I and both self-reports ($pr = 0.08, p = .41$) and coworker-reports ($pr = -0.03, p = .74$) of perceived power. Similarly, we found a non-significant relationship between perceived power and OCB-I ($pr = 0.07, p = .50$) in Sample 6. When distinguishing between task-focused and person-focused OCB-I (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002) in Sample 7, we found non-significant relationships between task-focused OCB-I and both self-reports ($pr = -0.09, p = .18$) and coworker reports ($pr = 0.07, p = .31$) of perceived power. However, our results did indicate a negative relationship between person-focused OCB-I and (a) self-reports of perceived power ($pr = -0.17, p < .05$), but (b) a non-significant relationship with coworker-reports of perceived power ($pr = -0.07, p = .27$).

In support of Hypothesis 3b, results from Sample 5 revealed a positive relationship for self-reports of perceived power and both self-reports ($pr = 0.30, p < .05$) and coworker-reports ($pr = 0.21, p < .05$) of CWB-I. Similarly, coworker-reports of perceived power were also positively related to both self-reports ($pr = 0.24, p < .05$) and coworker-reports ($pr = 0.21, p < .05$) of CWB-I. In Sample 6, we also found a positive relationship between perceived power and CWB-I ($pr = 0.53, p < .05$). When distinguishing between active and passive forms of CWB-I (Ferris et al., 2016) in Sample 7, we found a positive relationship between self-reports of perceived power and both active ($pr = 0.17, p < .05$) and passive ($pr = 0.19, p < .05$) forms of CWB-I. Similarly, coworker-reports of perceived power also exhibited a positive relationship with active CWB-I ($pr = 0.19, p < .05$) and a marginal positive relationship with passive CWB-I ($pr = 0.11, p = .08$).

**Interpersonal work behaviors and perceived status.** In support of Hypothesis 4a, results from Sample 5 revealed that OCB-I had a positive relationship with self-reports ($pr = 0.20, p < .05$) and a marginal positive relationship with coworker-reports ($pr = 0.19, p = .06$) of perceived status. Similarly, we found a positive relationship between perceived status and OCB-I ($pr =
0.48, *p < .05*) in Sample 6. When distinguishing between task-focused and person-focused OCB-I (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002), we found a positive relationship between task-focused OCB-I and both self-reports (*pr = 0.13, *p < .05*) and coworker-reports (*pr = 0.65, *p < .05*) of perceived status. Similarly, person-focused OCB-I was positively related to both self-reports (*pr = 0.31, *p < .05*) and coworker-reports (*pr = 0.63, *p < .05*) of perceived status.

We found partial support for Hypothesis 4b, which predicted that perceived status would be negatively related to CWB-I. Results from Sample 5 revealed that self-reports of perceived status were not significantly related to either self-reports (*pr = 0.04, *p = .66*) or coworker-reports (*pr = 0.07, *p = .46*) of CWB-I. Similarly, we found that coworker-reports of perceived status were not related to self-reports of CWB-I (*pr = 0.04, *p = .67*), but were negatively related to coworker-reports of CWB-I (*pr = −0.37, *p < .05*). In Sample 6, we found a negative relationship between perceived status and CWB-I (*pr = −0.33, *p < .05*). When distinguishing between active and passive forms of CWB-I (Ferris et al., 2016) in Sample 7, our results demonstrated that self-reports of perceived status had a marginal negative relationship with active CWB-I (*pr = −0.11, *p = .09*) and a negative relationship with passive CWB-I (*pr = −0.13, *p < .05*). Coworker-reports of perceived status were negatively related to both active (*pr = −0.51, *p < .05*) and passive (*pr = −0.50, *p < .05*) forms of CWB-I.

**Organization-directed work behaviors and perceived power.** In support of Hypothesis 5a, results from Sample 4 demonstrated a positive relationship between OCB-O and perceived power reported at both Time 1 (*pr = 0.25, *p < .05*) and Time 2 (*pr = 0.23, *p < .05*). Similarly, we found a marginal positive relationship between perceived power and OCB-O (*pr = 0.17, *p = .10*) in Sample 6. However, we did not find support for Hypothesis 5b. Results from Sample 4 revealed a non-significant relationship between CWB-O and perceived power reported at both Time 1 (*pr = 0.05, *p = .51*) and Time 2 (*pr = 0.01, *p = .93*). We also did not find a significant relationship between perceived power and CWB-O (*pr = −0.06, *p < .05*) in Sample 6. Finally, we found partial support for Hypothesis 5c. Specifically in Sample 5, we found that self-reports of perceived power were positively related to both self-reports (*pr = 0.26, *p < .05*) and coworker-reports (*pr = 0.42, *p < .05*) of voice behaviors. Similarly, coworker-reports of perceived power also had a positive relationship with both self-reports (*pr = 0.23, *p < .05*) and other-reports (*pr = 0.45, *p < .05*) of voice behaviors. In Sample 7, we differentiated between prohibitive and promotive voice behaviors (Liang et al., 2012) and found that coworker-reports of promotive voice were not significantly related to self-reports of perceived power (*pr = −0.03, *p = .60*), but were positively related to coworker-reports of perceived power (*pr = 0.29, *p < .05*). We found the same pattern of relationships for coworker-reports of prohibitive voice: self-reports (*pr = 0.10, *p = .13*) and coworker-reports (*pr = 0.31, *p < .05*) of perceived power.

**Organization-directed work behaviors and perceived status.** In support of Hypothesis 6a, results from Sample 4 demonstrated a positive relationship between OCB-O and perceived status reported at both Time 1 (*pr = 0.34, *p < .05*) and Time 2 (*pr = 0.40, *p < .05*). Results from Sample 6 also showed a positive relationship between perceived status and OCB-O (*pr = 0.37, *p
We also found support for Hypothesis 6b. Results from Sample 4 demonstrated a negative relationship between CWB-O and perceived status reported at both Time 1 ($pr = -0.27, p < .05$) and Time 2 ($pr = -0.27, p < .05$). Similarly, we found a negative relationship between perceived status and CWB-O ($pr = -0.30, p < .05$) in Sample 6. Finally, we found partial support for Hypothesis 6c. Specifically, in Sample 5, we found that self-reports of perceived status were not significantly related to self-reports ($pr = 0.04, p = .67$) or coworker-reports ($pr = 0.11, p = .12$) of employee voice. Coworker-reports of perceived status were also not related to self-reports of employee voice ($pr = -0.01, p = .89$); however, we did find a positive relationship with coworker-reports of voice ($pr = 0.32, p < .05$).

Unethical behaviors. In support of Hypothesis 7a, results from Sample 4 demonstrated a positive relationship between unethical behaviors intended to benefit the organization and perceived power reported at both Time 1 ($pr = 0.19, p < .05$) and Time 2 ($pr = 0.19, p < .05$). Moreover, we found tentative support for Hypothesis 7b; results from Sample 4 revealed that unethical behaviors intended to benefit the organization had a marginal negative relationship with perceived status at both Time 1 ($pr = -0.13, p = .09$) and Time 2 ($pr = -0.14, p = .07$).

Job attitudes. Although we predicted that perceived power would be positively related to job satisfaction (Hypothesis 8a) and affective commitment (Hypothesis 8b), our results did not support these predictions. In our results from Sample 3, we did not find a significant relationship between perceived power and job satisfaction (Time 1, $pr = -0.04, p = .62$; Time 2, $pr = 0.02, p = .77$) or Sample 6 ($pr = -0.02, p = .87$). Similarly, we found a non-significant relationship between perceived power and affective commitment in Sample 3 (Time 1, $pr = -0.02, p = .77$; Time 2, $pr = 0.01, p = .87$) and Sample 6 ($pr = -0.01, p = .89$). In contrast, we found support for Hypothesis 9a and 9b. Our results demonstrated a positive relationship between perceived status and job satisfaction in Sample 3 (Time 1, $pr = 0.51, p < .05$; Time 2, $pr = 0.57, p < .05$) and in Sample 6 ($pr = 0.33, p < .05$). Similarly, perceived status was positively related to affective commitment in Sample 3 (Time 1, $pr = 0.44, p < .05$; Time 2 $pr = 0.44, p < .05$) and Sample 6 ($pr = 0.48, p < .05$).

Task performance. We did not find support for Hypothesis 10a. Results from Sample 7 revealed no significant relationships between task performance and self-reports ($pr = -0.09, p = .18$) or coworker-reports ($pr = -0.02, p = .73$) of perceived power. However, we did find support for Hypothesis 10b, as demonstrated by the positive relationship between task performance and both self-reports ($pr = 0.20, p < .05$) and coworker-reports ($pr = 0.65, p < .05$) of perceived status.
Supplemental Analyses

In addition to examining the unique variability attributable to perceived power and perceived status in Phase 3 as part of the scale development process, we conducted supplemental analyses to examine (a) the agreement between self and coworker perceptions of power and status; (b) the interactive effects between power and status on outcomes; and (c) the effects, if any, of social desirability on our findings.

**Agreement between self and coworker perceptions of power and status.** We found significant relationships between self-reports and coworker-reports of (a) perceived power in Sample 5 ($r = 0.89$, $p < .05$) and Sample 7 ($r = 0.36$, $p < .05$), and (b) perceived status in Sample 5 ($r = 0.63$, $p < .05$) and Sample 7 ($r = 0.19$, $p < .05$). In Sample 5, we also found sufficient agreement between coworker-reports of a focal employee’s perceived power ($r_{wg} = 0.85$, ICC(1) = 0.61, ICC(2) = 0.82) and perceived status ($r_{wg} = 0.96$, ICC(1) = 0.30, ICC(2) = 0.56), indicating similarity in coworkers’ perceptions of a focal employee’s power and status.

**Interactive effects of power and status.** In light of a few studies that have found interactions between power and status (e.g., Anicich, Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2016), we checked for interactive effects of perceived power and perceived status on outcomes we measured across the samples used in Phase 3. Although we do not develop formal predictions for these research questions, results from our additional analyses may serve as preliminary evidence that can be built upon in future research. Our analysis revealed some evidence of interactive effects between perceived power and perceived status on the outcomes we examined (see Appendix A). Specifically, we found that those with higher perceived power and lower perceived status reported the least amount of empathic concern (Fig. 1), while those with higher perceived power and higher perceived status engaged in the highest levels of OCB-O (Fig. 2). Moreover, those with higher perceived power and lower perceived status engaged in the highest levels of CWB-O (Fig. 3). Finally, those with higher perceived power and lower perceived status had the lowest levels of task-focused OCB-I, yet those with higher perceived power and higher perceived status had the highest levels (Fig. 4). These findings are generally aligned with studies that have shown the toxic combination of having power without status and the benefits of having both.

---

4 In Sample 6, we also captured coworker-reports of a focal employee’s perceived power and perceived status. However, we were able to match only 56 observations between self-reports and coworker-reports for which the bivariate correlation for perceived power was $r = 0.77$ ($p < .05$) and for perceived status was $r = 0.37$ ($p < .05$). In addition, of the 93 employees included in Sample 6, only 52 had more than one coworker rating. The interrater agreement for perceived power ($r_{wg} = 0.85$, ICC(1) = 0.64, ICC(2) = 0.79) and perceived status ($r_{wg} = 0.85$, ICC(1) = 0.26, ICC(2) = 0.42) were both sufficient to support averaging coworker-reports.
power and status (e.g., Anicich et al., 2016). We note, however, that these effects were not consistently found across all of the samples used in this phase.

**Social desirability as an alternative explanation.** As noted in Phase 2, we found that social desirability was not significantly related to perceived power but was positively related to perceived status. To test the robustness of our findings, we supplemented our analyses with OLS regressions for outcomes included in Sample 3 (perspective taking, empathic concern, justice sensitivity, affective commitment, and job satisfaction). Each regression model included perceived power, perceived status, and social desirability as predictors. Although social desirability was either marginally significant or significantly related to our outcome variables, the significance of the effects for perceived power and perceived status remained consistent with the partial correlations reported in Table 4. Thus, consistent with prior operationalizations of status, we find that, while social desirability is positively associated with perceptions of status, it does not diminish the unique variance explained in outcomes that were included in this Sample 3.

**Phase 3 Discussion**

In Phase 3, we examined the criterion-related validity of the perceived power and perceived status scales using five separate samples. We investigated a number of relationships that power and status have with various outcomes, including interpersonal sensitivity, interpersonal work behaviors, organization-directed work behaviors, job attitudes, and task performance. In addition, we replicated the psychometric properties of the perceived power and perceived status scales from Phase 2, as evidenced by the internal consistency and test-retest reliabilities. Furthermore, we assessed the agreement between self and coworker perceptions of power and status. Most importantly, we provided evidence that power and status should be considered simultaneously when examining outcomes in settings where they coexist and can covary. This is evident in some of the differences we found between the bivariate and partial correlations in this phase. We discuss the implications of our findings in the section below.

**General Discussion**

Despite the growing consensus that power and status represent two prevalent but distinct bases of social hierarchy with distinct psychological signatures (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), existing operationalizations have not kept pace with these conceptual refinements. The purpose of our study was to create a reliable and valid measure to capture perceived power and perceived status as distinct constructs, while maintaining their interrelatedness. Using seven samples, we developed and validated measures of perceived power and perceived status. As a result, we believe that our scales have a number of strengths that will help advance research on social hierarchy in field settings, which we discuss below.
Relationship between Perceptions of Power and Status

Consistent with prior research (e.g., Anicich et al., 2016; Dubois et al., 2015; Hays & Bendersky, 2015), we demonstrated that measures of power and status are positively related. However, we also found that the relationships between the perceived power and perceived status scales were modest across our samples. We believe that this is a reflection of the rigor in our content analysis in Phase 1, in which we retained only the items that aligned with the conceptual definition of power or status, thereby avoiding contamination between the two measures (Hinkin, 1995). Most importantly, the modest correlations we found provide support for arguments that power and status should be viewed (and measured) as distinct constructs (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

Effects that Converge with Current Hierarchy Research

Our results are generally consistent with contemporary hierarchy scholarship that suggests divergent effects of power and status on indices of interpersonal sensitivity (i.e., perspective taking, empathic concern, and justice sensitivity; Blader & Chen, 2012; Blader et al., 2016). Specifically, with regard to the relationships with measures of interpersonal sensitivity, we found evidence that perceived power had non-significant or marginal negative relationships, whereas perceived status exhibited significant positive relationships. The weaker relationships between perceived power and indices of interpersonal sensitivity echo some inconsistency in past research on power (e.g., Blader & Chen, 2012; Blader et al., 2016; Greenberg, 1978; Schmid Mast et al., 2009), perhaps because power tends to shape thoughts and behavior in ways that align with one’s goals, regardless of whether those goals are self-oriented or prosocial in nature.

Extending the Nomological Network of Power and Status

In addition to empirically distinguishing power and status in field settings, we extended the nomological network of power and status by investigating their relationships with outcomes commonly investigated in organizational research. Specifically, we examined the relationships that perceived power and perceived status have with four broad categories of work-related outcomes: interpersonal work behaviors, organization-directed behaviors, job attitudes, and task performance. Our findings demonstrate that perceived power and perceived status generally exhibit diverging relationships with interpersonal work behaviors OCB-I and CWB-I, which are manifestations of interpersonally sensitive and insensitive behaviors, respectively.

Perceived power and perceived status had similar relationships with OCB-O and voice behaviors, both of which are organization-directed work behaviors that reinforce one’s psychological power and status. Although perceived status was negatively related to CWB-O, we found that perceived power was unrelated to CWB-O. This suggests that feeling powerful may create a tension between acting to pursue one’s own goals, even when such behaviors are detrimental to the organization, and acting in ways that advance the goals of the organization because it is the source of one’s power at work. Indeed, our results suggest that feeling powerful
can lead one to act in an unethical manner for the good of the organization. In contrast, perceived status was negatively related to unethical behaviors that benefit the organization. Although we did not find support for our hypothesized relationships between perceived power and job attitudes (affective commitment and job satisfaction) or task performance, we did find significant relationships between perceived status and these work outcomes. This suggests that the psychological experience of status may be a more important predictor of how employees feel and behave at work, whereas the relationships between one’s psychological power and these outcomes are likely more complex and shaped by other factors.

**Linking Past and Present Research on Hierarchy**

Our findings also shed light on the existing debate in the hierarchy literature about the nature of status vis-à-vis power. Specifically, proponents of French and Raven's (1959) bases of social power often argue that status is merely a form of power because the conceptual definition of status is similar to that of referent power. This suggests that status is conceptually subordinate to power. As Blader and Chen (2014) articulated, however, French and Raven (1959) defined social power in terms of influence. In light of the theoretical refinements that have recast influence as a shared outcome of both power and status, we encourage hierarchy scholars to reconsider how they describe and understand French and Raven's (1959) bases of social power and move toward viewing them as potential bases of influence.

In support of this notion, we found that both perceived power and perceived status are positively related to French and Raven's (1959) bases of social power. We demonstrated that perceived power is most strongly related to reward and coercive power, both of which involve having control over resources that one can use to reward and punish others. In contrast, perceived status is most strongly related to referent and expert power, which is consistent with the contemporary definition of status (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). As discussed previously, referent power is nearly synonymous with status; expertise is the predominant antecedent of status (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Berger et al., 1972) and, theoretically, the reason that status hierarchies emerge in the first place (Gould, 2002; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Finally, perceived power and perceived status are both modestly correlated with legitimate power, which is conceptually similar to formal rank in an organizational hierarchy. This underscores the dangers of using rank as a proxy for drawing inferences about the distinct effects of power or status. Taken together, our results serve as a useful link between past and present perspectives on social hierarchy by empirically demonstrating the stronger relationships that each respective base has with French and Raven's (1959) original typology.

**Limitations**

As with all studies, our research has limitations that should be noted. First, we developed our measures for general use in an organizational context. We fully recognize that there may be other field settings where perceptions of power and status play an important role. For example,
within organizations, researchers may want to use the perceived power and perceived status scales to measure perceptions of hierarchical differences in teams. The items we develop here can be adapted to include, for example, a stem such as “In my work team, …” or a qualifier such as “… within my work team.” Beyond organizations, non-work relationships (e.g., intimate relationships) often involve power and status dynamics that affect partner behaviors, such as aggressiveness (Overall, Hammond, McNulty, & Finkel, 2016). Another example can be seen in research on parent-child relationships, which involve both actual (e.g., access to money) and perceived (e.g., parents feeling powerless over their children) differences in power (Bugental & Lewis, 1999). While we are confident in the psychometric properties of the perceived power and perceived status scales, it would be useful to examine whether adapted versions of these measures are suitable for use in other domains and levels of analysis (e.g., teams).

Second, although our hypotheses in Phase 3 were motivated by evidence from prior studies that used experimental research designs to establish the causal relationships between power or status and their psychological outcomes, causality cannot be definitively inferred from this study. Importantly, the fluid nature of social hierarchies in settings where power and status coexist suggests that there may be reciprocal relationships between power, status, and their correlates. We believe that the introduction of a reliable and valid measure of social hierarchy, grounded in accepted theoretical definitions, is a necessary first step towards more rigorous research designs that can extend social hierarchy research, some of which we will discuss in the following section.

Finally, we note that the goal of this study was to establish criterion-related validity of the perceived power and perceived status scales with commonly investigated outcomes in organizational research. It is important for future research to integrate perceptions of power and status into other theoretical frameworks that may predict relationships with different variables, as well as explain the mediating mechanisms and boundary conditions for these relationships. Below, we discuss some of what we view to be fruitful avenues for future research to pursue.

**Future Research Directions**

**Correlates of perceived power and perceived status.** Extant social hierarchy research has considered the effects of power and status on a range of consequences, from interpersonal sensitivity (Blader et al., 2016; Galinsky et al., 2006) to justice enactment (Blader & Chen, 2012). This research has informed both the selection of variables in our research and the nature of our predictions. Additionally, research has examined the various needs that power and status can fulfill for individuals. For example, power meets needs for control (Fast et al., 2009; Inesi, Botti, Dubois, Rucker, & Galinsky, 2011) and autonomy (Lammers, Stoker, Rink, & Galinsky, 2016), whereas status meets needs for relatedness (Anderson, Kraus et al., 2012) and for status itself (Anderson et al., 2015). We selected variables that we expected would have distinct relationships with power vis-à-vis status and that are theoretically related to other constructs of interest to researchers. However, future studies should consider the relationships that perceived
power and perceived status have with a wider range of psychological needs and behaviors. For example, scholars may be interested in uncovering the relationships between power and status and satisfaction of core psychological needs drawn from prominent needs frameworks, such as McClelland's (1965) theory of human motivation and Ryan and Deci's (2000) self-determination theory. This is especially true for perceived status, as research—particularly organizational research—has paid disproportionately less attention to this base of social hierarchy than it has to power.

Alignment between perceptions of power and status. Our results suggest that, to some degree, self and other perceptions of power and status are aligned. However, the degree of alignment varied across our samples. This may have been a result of our sampling strategies or other unobserved factors, such as relational characteristics between self and other (e.g., relationship quality, dyadic tenure) and individual differences (e.g., personality, demographics).

Indeed, other areas of psychological research provide some clues about the extent to which perceptions of power and status are convergent or divergent. For example, research on supervisor-subordinate work relationships has found that the agreement in relationship quality can be importantly affected by interpersonal affect and dyadic tenure between the two parties (Sin, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2009). We would expect relational characteristics between actors and observers to influence perceptions of power and status in similar ways. Likewise, individual characteristics of the actor or observer are also likely to affect the extent that self and other perceptions align. For example, existing research suggests that narcissistic individuals have inflated self-views (Paulhus & Williams, 2002) and report higher levels of leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness than what their peers report (Grijalva, Harms, Newman, Gaddis, & Fraley, 2015). We would expect that inflated views of oneself will also affect the convergence of self-reported and other-reported views for a wide range of constructs, including perceived power and perceived status. Thus, we believe that both relational characteristics (e.g., relationship quality, tenure, interpersonal affect) and individual differences (e.g., narcissism) may shape the extent that self and other perceptions of social hierarchy are aligned.

Finally, we note that there is a general consistency in an observers’ beliefs about a focal employee. Specifically, compared to self-reports, an observer’s perceptions of an actor’s power and status exhibited stronger correlations with observer reports of behavioral outcomes. We acknowledge that this may, in part, be due to methodological issues such as common methods variance. Alternatively, if observers generally form internally consistent views of others within their local environment, these impressions may shape how these observers treat others, which may elicit specific behavioral responses (i.e., self-fulfilling prophecy; Merton, 1948). The fact that observers’ perceptions of an employee’s position in a social hierarchy and their behaviors cluster together suggests that our measures may also serve as a promising tool for future research to use when investigating interpersonal perceptions.
Conclusion

We believe that the introduction of a reliable and valid measure for perceived power and perceived status will serve as an important bridge between contemporary perspectives of social hierarchy and organizational research. Moreover, organizational researchers are in an enviable position to enhance our understanding of how power and status operate in tandem. We hope that the development and introduction of the perceived power and perceived status scales will encourage others to examine the role that each prevalent base of social hierarchy might have in their own research domains.
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Table 1
*Results of Exploratory Factory Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Workplace Power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I supervise a large number of subordinates.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I formally manage many other people.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I can provide rewards to others at my own discretion.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a great deal of power at work.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have authority to discipline others when needed.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My designated role allows me to control a lot of resources.</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My job allows me to control access to other people with a great deal of power.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am able to delegate work to others.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Workplace Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Others often seek my opinion because they respect me.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have a good reputation among those I work with.</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am highly respected by others at work.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People look up to me because I am good at my job.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am admired by others at work because I am seen as competent in my work.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coworkers come to me because they trust my judgment.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People come to me for advice because I am good at my job.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In general, my position tends to be highly respected.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: N = 220; R item not retained in final scale.*
Table 2
Results of Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Phase 1 and Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2 (N = 220), 16-item model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor</td>
<td>366.95</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor</td>
<td>1112.37</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2 (N = 220), 12-item model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor</td>
<td>170.52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor</td>
<td>799.82</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3, Time 1 (N = 206)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor</td>
<td>174.45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor</td>
<td>919.63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3, Time 2 (N = 173)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-factor</td>
<td>167.78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-factor</td>
<td>758.85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.
Table 3

Sample 3 (Time 1) - Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Power</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Managerial position</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rank</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reward power</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coercive power</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legitimate power</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expert power</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Referent power</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social status</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sense of power</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Work status</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Social desirability</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 206; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.

†p < .10; *p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Power&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>- .23</td>
<td>- .14&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.51&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.80&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.42&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Status</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.44&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.57&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perspective taking</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Empathic concern</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-.18&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.58&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Justice sensitivity</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.48&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affective commitment</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.20&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.48&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.37&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.16&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.53&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.61&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.72&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* N = 173; <sup>1</sup>measured at Time 1 (from Table 3); all other variables measured at Time 2; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.  
<sup>†</sup>p < .10; <sup>*</sup>p < .05
### Table 5

Sample 4 - Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Power(^1)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13(^\dagger)</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>.25(^*)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19(^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status(^1)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.29(^*)</td>
<td>-.25(^*)</td>
<td>.28(^*)</td>
<td>.34(^*)</td>
<td>-.27(^*)</td>
<td>-.13(^\dagger)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.86(^*)</td>
<td>.37(^*)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.12(^\dagger)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.23(^*)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19(^*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Status</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.37(^*)</td>
<td>.69(^*)</td>
<td>.36(^*)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.30(^*)</td>
<td>.15(^*)</td>
<td>.40(^*)</td>
<td>-.27(^*)</td>
<td>-.14(^\dagger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perspective taking(^1)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.23(^*)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.28(^*)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Justice sensitivity(^1)</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.26(^*)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14(^*)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OCB-O</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.33(^*)</td>
<td>.41(^*)</td>
<td>.36(^*)</td>
<td>.47(^*)</td>
<td>.15(^*)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CWB-O</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.27(^*)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.29(^*)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.29(^*)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unethical behaviors</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.16(^*)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15(^*)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24(^\dagger)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** N = 185; \(^1\) measured at Time 1; all other variables measured at Time 2; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.

\(\dagger p < .10; ^* p < .05\)
### Table 6

**Sample 5 - Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Power</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.43†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Powera</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.39†</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Statusa</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee voice²</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee voicea</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OCB-I²</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CWB-I²</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CWB-Ia</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** N = 105; ¹measured at Time 1; ²measured at Time 2; aother-reported; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.

*¹p < .10; *p < .05
### Table 7
Sample 6 - *Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td>.20†</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-I</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB-O</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.22†</td>
<td>-0.17†</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: N = 93; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.†p < .10; *p < .05*
### Table 8

#### Sample 7 - Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Power</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-0.11†</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
<td>-0.50*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee voice - promotive&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employee voice - prohibitive&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task-focused OCB-I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Person-focused OCB-I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Active CWB-I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.11†</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Passive CWB-I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.50*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.39*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Task performance&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: N = 243; <sup>a</sup>other-reported; partial correlations for relationships with power or status (while controlling for the other) in the upper diagonal; bolded values represent changes in statistical significance compared with bivariate correlations.

<sup>†</sup>p < .10; <sup>*</sup>p < .05