




2015

# Examining the Interplay of Supervisor and Subordinate Leadership Style in the Performance Evaluation Process

Victoria A. Neuhauser  
*Georgia Southern University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Performance Management Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Neuhauser, Victoria A., "Examining the Interplay of Supervisor and Subordinate Leadership Style in the Performance Evaluation Process" (2015). *University Honors Program Theses*. 152.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/152>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

# **Examining the Interplay of Supervisor and Subordinate Leadership Style in the Performance Evaluation Process**

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the  
Department of Management

By  
Victoria Neuhauser

Under the mentorship of Dr. Feruzan Irani Williams

*The purpose of this study is to determine if differences in leadership behavior preferences in subordinates and supervisors can lead to quantitative differences in performance evaluation scores. Leadership behavior was considered on two dimensions: preference for person-oriented behaviors and preferences for task-oriented behaviors. Findings indicate that leaders with a preference for task-oriented behaviors tend to rate subordinates with the same preferences higher than subordinates with different preferences. No such relationship could be found for person-oriented leaders. Leaders with equal preference for task- and person-oriented behaviors produced, on average, equivalent scores for both types of subordinates. In a business context, the findings indicating that task-oriented leaders may inflate the scores of subordinates with similar styles can have implications for the performance appraisal system and organizational culture, especially perceptions of fairness and acceptance.*

Thesis Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Feruzan Irani Williams

Honors Director: \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Steven Engel

November 2015

Department of Management

University Honors Program

**Georgia Southern University**

## Acknowledgments

To Mommy, Daddy, Sissy, Grandma, and Grandpa~ for teaching me the balance between humility and pride. I love you all.

To my best friends- Rachel, Emily, Nathan, and Yollie~ for your love, support, and Sunday suppers.

To Dr. Irani Williams~ for your dedication to this project, your guidance, and your faith in my future.

To the University Honors Program- Dr. Engel, Dr. Desiderio, Erin, and Miss Linda~ for the opportunities, experiences, and chats.

To Eagle Dining Services- Kent, Denise, Avia, Jeff, Greg, Jason, Janice, AND EVERYBODY~ for my development, my second family, accepting my quirks, and for letting me sing and dance around the kitchen. Thank you for your faith in me, your honesty, and your love.

To all of the professors who have given me their time and expertise for this project~ Dr. Norton, Dr. Stalcup, Dr. Sikora, Miss Grimes, Dr. Campbell, and Dr. Denton. A special shout out goes to Dr. Charlier, who has been incredibly generous with his time.

**In loving memory of Patricia Ann Neuhauser (1937-2015)..... “We’re off to the races!”**

Beginning in the 1990's, leadership studies conducted in the United States have shown a movement toward focusing on charismatic and transformational leadership (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Mathadil, Heck, & Schuldberg, 2014; Shamir, Zakay, Breinin & Popper, 1998). This trend resulted largely from the theoretical framework, posed by Hall and Lord (1995) and later expanded by Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall (2001), which viewed leadership as a perceptual process.

Previously, however, leadership was viewed as a binary expression of behaviors: consideration or initiating structure (Fleischman, 1974), democratic or autocratic (Lippitt, 1969), and employee-centered or production-centered (Likert, 1961). While these researchers used different terms, Ehigie and Akpan (2003) consider the terms synonymous and posit that these terms have been used interchangeably by leadership scholars. In the present study, we use the terms task-oriented and person-oriented (House, 1996) to refer to leadership behaviors.

Recently, there has been a renewed interest in viewing leadership as a function of task- and person-oriented behaviors. For instance, Madlock's research (2008) studied communication competence as a function of task- and person-oriented behavior. This transition has also been accompanied by a change in the manner in which task- and person-oriented leadership is viewed. Rather than categorizing leadership as person-oriented *or* task-oriented, recent research views leadership as a relative, combinative process in which leaders demonstrate different combinations of task- *and* person-oriented behaviors as compared to other leaders (Casimir, 2001; Misumi, 1995; Ehigie & Akpan, 2003). In other words, leaders practice both behaviors but to differing extents.

Barker (2001) posits that leadership studies, to their detriment, often view the relationship between leadership and organization outcomes as a cause-effect process, especially when the

distinction between leaders and managers is not made. Madlock's (2008) research is an example of a leadership study conducted under the cause-effect assumption, where communication competence was studied as a function of task- and person-oriented behavior, and subsequently, the relationship of this competence to employee outcomes, such as communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, was tested. While Madlock's (2008) study is correlational and no attempt to establish causality is made, the study links a leader's traits and behaviors with organizational outcomes without considering the "complex, reciprocal relationships of people and institutions" (Barker, 2001, 483). Other studies follow this pattern, even to the extent of linking CEO transactional and charismatic leadership to firm profitability (Waldman, Ramirez, House & Puranam, 2001).

Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to explore leadership in a manner that considers the duality and reciprocity inherent in a supervisor-subordinate relationship. The current study will investigate whether the similarities and differences in the combinative leadership styles of superiors compared to the styles of their subordinates produce significant, quantitative differences in performance evaluation scores.

### **Leadership Styles**

Mullins (1996) defined leadership as a relationship in which one person is able to influence the behavior and actions of other people. The charismatic leadership trend of the 1990's attempted to explain the phenomenon by defining charisma in terms of two components-idealized influence and inspirational motivation (Bass & Avolio, 1994) - each consisting of its own inflexible list of behaviors. Research conducted by Awamleh and Gardner (1999) found that speech content, delivery, and organizational performance impacted perceptions of charisma, and that, in some cases, the content, delivery, and organizational performance outweighed the

effects of charisma itself in evaluating the performance of a fictional CEO. The results of this research indicate a need to disentangle the task- and person-oriented behaviors associated with idealized influence and inspirational motivation to better understand leadership effectiveness. In fact, other researchers have identified the need to “decompos[e] the general charismatic syndrome” (Shamir et al., 1998, 405). Likewise, Smith and Foti (1998) argued that patterns of leadership traits have greater effects on leadership perceptions than the effects of individual traits. Thus, it appears that patterns of task- and person-oriented behaviors outweighed the effects of charisma alone.

Further, Misumi (1995) and Casimir (2001) have disentangled charisma and explored the continuous, rather than binary nature of task- and person-oriented behavior by positing that leadership style is defined by one leader’s combination of leadership behaviors relative to another leader’s behavior. Casimir (2001) defined task-oriented behaviors as those that serve to provide pressure and instruction to subordinates and person-oriented behaviors as those that provide support to subordinates. Misumi (1995) created a typology in which leaders can express one of four leadership styles, dependent on high versus low expressions of task- and person-oriented behaviors.

Literature was reviewed to determine the behaviors that task- and person-oriented leaders enact. Several behavior patterns were identified for each type of leadership style regarding: the types of activities in which the leader participates, the leader’s priorities of performance (system versus unit performance), the scope of leader involvement, and the paralinguistic behaviors of the leader.

The types of activities in which the leader participates are derived from Yukl’s (2012) meta-analysis of leadership research which “develop[ed] a comprehensive behavior taxonomy”

(Yukl, 2012, 67). The activity categories and the behaviors associated with these categories for task- and person-oriented leadership, as defined by Yukl (2012), are contained in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1: Task-oriented activities and behaviors

Type of Activity	Specific Behaviors in Each Activity Type
Clarifying	Clearly explains task assignments and member responsibilities
	Sets specific goals and deadlines for important aspects of the work
	Explains priorities for different objectives
	Explains rules, policies, and standard procedures
Planning	Develops short-term plans for the work
	Determines how to schedule and coordinate activities efficiently
	Determines the action steps and resources needed to accomplish an activity
Monitoring	Checks on the progress and quality of the work
	Examines relevant sources of information to determine how well important tasks are performed
	Evaluates the performance of members in a systematic way
Problem Solving	Identifies work-related problems that can disrupt operations
	Makes a systematic, but rapid diagnosis
	Takes action to resolve the problem in a decisive and confident manner

Table 2: Person-oriented activities and behaviors

Type of Activity	Specific Behaviors in Each Activity Type
Supporting	Shows concern for the needs and feelings of members
	Provides support and encouragement when there is a difficult task
	Expresses confidence members can successfully complete difficult tasks
Recognizing	Praises effective performance by members
	Provides recognition for member achievements and contributions
	Recommends appropriate rewards for members with high performance
Developing	Provides helpful feedback and coaching for members
	Provides helpful career advice
	Encourages members to take advantage of opportunities for skill development
Empowering	Involves members in making important work-related decisions
	Considers the suggestions and concerns of members in decision-making
	Delegates responsibility and authority to members for important tasks
	Allows members to resolve work-related problems without prior approval

The leader's priorities for performance are based on Shamir et al.'s (1998) decomposition of charismatic leadership. Shamir and his colleagues (1998) found that charismatic leaders that demonstrated the charismatic behaviors of personal example and ideology were seen as more task-oriented because they were concerned with maintaining the performance of the system, or the organization as a whole, by relating the tasks to this system while emphasizing the system's ideology and demonstrating high commitment to the ideology and the tasks. In the same study (Shamir, et. al, 1998), leaders that emphasized collective identity of smaller units, or sub-units within the organization, were seen as more person-oriented because these leaders were perceived as engaging in more supportive behavior. Based on these findings, task-oriented leaders are more focused on maintaining the performance of the larger organization, while person-oriented leaders are more focused on maintaining the performance of the smaller sub-units within the organization.

Similarly, the scope of leader involvement for the task-oriented leadership style is also derived from Shamir et al.'s (1998) decomposition of charismatic leadership behavior into task- and person-oriented behaviors. Shamir and his colleagues (1998) found that when leaders engaged in the charismatic behavior of personal example, they tended to show higher role-involvement, higher motivation, and higher devotion to these tasks. In other words, charismatic leaders that demonstrated personal example carried out clarifying, planning, monitoring, and problem-solving behaviors identified by Yukl (2012) as task-oriented behaviors at high rates due to their high role-involvement, motivation, and devotion to the tasks. Additionally, Shamir and his associates (1998) found that when charismatic leaders engage in behaviors that emphasize collective identity of their respective sub-units, they engage in the supporting and empowering behaviors identified by Yukl (2012) as components of a person-oriented leadership style.



In addition to classifying task- and person-oriented leadership styles based on interpersonal and organizational behavior, Howell and Frost (1989) operationalized the leadership styles using paralinguistic behaviors. In order to portray a task-oriented behaviors, they trained actors to act in a business-like, neutral manner, to maintain intermittent eye contact, and to maintain neutral facial expressions (by the absence of smiling and positive head nods). In the same study, Howell and Frost (1989) trained actors to portray a person-oriented leadership style by using paralinguistic behaviors such as maintaining a warm voice tone, leaning toward the audience in a relaxed posture, and maintaining direct eye contact and friendly facial expressions (smiling and nods).

The patterns associated with task- and person-oriented leadership styles discussed above are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Patterns of Task- and Person-Oriented Leadership Styles

Pattern	Task-Oriented Leadership Style	Person-Oriented Leadership Style
Type of Activity	Clarifying	Supporting
	Planning	Recognizing
	Monitoring	Empowering
	Problem Solving	Developing
Performance Priority	System Performance	Unit Performance
Scope of Leader Involvement	High personal involvement	High empowering behaviors
Paralinguistic Behaviors	Business-like, neutral speech	warm voice tone
	Intermittent eye contact	direct eye contact
	neutral facial expressions (absence of smiling, head nods)	friendly facial expressions (smiling, head nods)
		leaning forward in a relaxed posture

Due to the relative nature of the combinative process of defining leadership style, the practice of viewing leadership as a perceptual process (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord et al., 2001)

becomes all the more relevant. Lord and his associates (2001) argue that combinations of traits form leadership prototypes that are then used to judge leadership effectiveness. In the context of Lord et al.'s research, it is therefore necessary to investigate the degree to which task- and person-oriented behaviors contribute to these prototypes. Lord et al. (2001) also contended that these prototypes then interact with the self-schemas of the follower when the follower judges leadership effectiveness. While Casimir (2001) considers self-schemas in terms of the combinative nature of leadership style, he does so only in reference to the effect of subordinate gender on perceptions of leadership style effectiveness. No direct attempt has been made to quantify whether task- and person-oriented behaviors compose self-schemas, nor to quantify the effects of self-schemas composed of opposing expectations of leadership behavior. This gap in the research becomes important after a recent sociological study (Hallett, 2007) produced qualitative evidence that perceptions of the performance of task-oriented and person-oriented leaders depended on the behavioral expectations held by various audiences.

### **Performance Evaluation and Leadership Style**

Kahn and Lange (2014) established the utility of performance evaluation scores as a measure of productivity by using a combination of pay records and performance measures to study employer learning, productivity, and earnings distribution. It is in this context that leadership as a perceptual process becomes relevant for modern business. Awamleh and Gardner (1999) found that subjects appeared to assume that the leader is responsible for outcomes in the organization. Because of the power component of performance evaluations identified by Ilgen and Favero (1985), it is important to understand whether a supervisor can hold a subordinate with a leadership role accountable for organizational outcomes based on his/her leadership style. Since businesses rely on performance evaluations as a tool for measuring their productivity, and

particularly the productivity of the leaders within the organization, there must be an attempt to quantify the interplay of self-schemas of the rater with their perception of the leadership behavior exhibited by the ratee, to realize a more accurate representation of the firm's productivity.

Sosik, Avolio, and Jung (2002) produced findings that provided preliminary support for Gardner and Avolio's (1998) contention that a leader's desired charismatic identity images composed the leader's self-schema, and that the complexity of the interaction between the leader's self-schema and the followers' expectations of leader behavior influences the leader's ability to gain approval in different audience situations. These findings indicate an interaction between the self-schemas of leaders and their followers. The study conducted by Sosik and colleagues (2002), however, explores the issue in terms of charismatic leadership, but not in terms of task- and person-orientation. In addition, these findings evaluate the degree to which the subordinates perceive their leader as charismatic, not the degree to which the subordinates view the leader as effective.

In terms of the performance evaluation process, Smeltzer (1981) found that person-oriented managers could not translate consideration into the written word, and that as task-oriented managers attempted to initiate structure they tended to write in a less organized manner. These findings raise the question of whether the behaviors were lost in the physical process or the cognitive process of writing. The qualitative findings produced by Hallett (2007), however, suggest that task- and person-oriented behavior composes the self-schema of both the leader and the subordinate. Further, the findings of Sosik and colleagues (2002) suggest that the process of reading descriptions of behavior may trigger leadership style to become part of the "working self-concept" used in decision-making discussed by Markus and Wurf (1987). Therefore, Smeltzer's (1981) findings regarding the writing process may not have an impact on the present

study because other more recent evidence suggests that evaluating behavior will lead to these behaviors becoming part of the ‘working self-concept’ involved in decision-making, and that these distinctions between behaviors will not be lost in the physical component of the performance evaluation process.

Based on the literature discussed above, we pose the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1:* Raters that primarily self-identify as task-oriented leaders will inflate the scores of other task-oriented leaders and deflate the scores of person-oriented leaders.

*Hypothesis 2:* Raters that primarily self-identify as person-oriented leaders will inflate the scores of other person-oriented leaders and deflate the scores of task-oriented leaders.

*Hypothesis 3:* Raters that self-identify as a more equal combination of the styles will not differentiate in their scoring of either type of leader.

## **Methods**

### **Participants**

In order to study the effect of the interaction between the leadership styles of leaders and their followers, 603 undergraduate business students enrolled in junior and senior level management coursework at a large university in southeast US were invited to participate in a survey about leadership style and performance evaluation. Voluntary and anonymous survey results were collected using Qualtrics software. The software settings prevented students from submitting the survey more than once from the same IP address, and students were reminded at the beginning of the survey not to submit results more than once. No demographic information was collected.

Of the 603 students invited, 122 responded, producing a response rate of 20.2%. The responses were reviewed and those that seemed to have simply marked the same answer throughout were deleted, leaving a total of 120 usable responses.

### **Measures**

*Ratee leadership style:* Two TED Talks were chosen in which the speakers exhibited high levels of either task- or person-oriented leadership behavior (See Appendix A for the video links). Differences in the videos were controlled as much as possible: the videos were of similar duration (approximately ten minutes) and on similar topics (work-life balance). In addition, speakers in the videos were of the same race and gender. The ability of each video to exhibit high levels of a specific leadership style was independently validated by two subject matter experts.

*Rater leadership style:* Participants were asked to complete Northouse's (2001) 20-item Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Appendix B) to determine their tendencies to exhibit task- and person-oriented leadership behaviors, with 10 items assessing task-oriented behaviors and 10 items assessing person-oriented behaviors. The alpha for the overall 20-item scale was .93, with equally acceptable values for each of the 10-item subscales (task-oriented = .91 and person-oriented = .86). The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Always. The response choices were slightly modified from the original scale, in which responses ranged from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Example questions include: "Develop a plan of action for the group" (task-oriented); and "Behave in a predictable manner toward group members" (person-oriented).

*Performance evaluation scale:* Participants were asked to rate the speaker in the TED Talk using a scale designed to rate the performance of a public speaker (Carlson & Smith-

Howell, 1995) (Appendix C). The scale consists of five items and evaluates the speaker's introduction, organization, development, conclusion, and delivery. The performance evaluations for these five items were recorded using a 5-item Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent. The intent of the Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) study was to investigate the reliability of various classroom public speaking scales, including the scale used in the current study, and the authors found that the alpha for this particular scale was .91.

### **Procedure**

Students first completed the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Northouse, 2001). They were then asked to watch one of the TED Talks, randomly selected by the software, and evaluate the performance of the speaker.

### **Results**

The three study hypotheses were tested via independent sample t-tests using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. The descriptive statistics and the results of the independent samples tests for Hypotheses 1 and 2 are summarized in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. Tables 6 and 7 present results for Hypothesis 3.

In order to test Hypothesis 1, a t-test was conducted that compared the mean performance evaluation scores of primarily task-oriented leaders rating a task-oriented speaker with the mean performance evaluation scores of primarily task-oriented leaders rating a person-oriented speaker, to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in the scores. As can be observed in Table 5, the assumption of equal variance in the groups is satisfied ( $F = 1.499, p = 0.237$ ). The mean difference between matching the leadership style of the leader and the speaker and not matching these styles was positive and marginally significant at the 10% level ( $t = 2.057, df=17, p = 0.055$ ), indicating that the mean performance evaluation scores of

task-oriented raters that rated a speaker of the same style were higher than the performance evaluation scores of a task-oriented rater that rated a person-oriented speaker. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is supported.

Similarly, in order to test Hypothesis 2, a t-test was conducted that compared the mean performance evaluation scores of primarily person-oriented leaders rating a person-oriented speaker with the mean performance evaluation scores of primarily person-oriented leaders rating a task-oriented speaker. As can be observed in Table 5, the assumption of equal variance in the groups is satisfied ( $F = 2.856$ ,  $p = 0.95$ ). The t-test did not produce significant results ( $t = -0.872$ ,  $df = 79$ ,  $p = 0.386$ ), indicating that there was no significant difference in the mean performance evaluation scores generated by person-oriented leaders based on the similarity of leadership style with the speaker. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Performance Evaluation Scores Generated by Task- and Person-oriented Raters Based on Matched and Unmatched Leadership Style with the Speaker

Leadership Style of the Rater	Matching between rater and speaker	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Task	Matched	8	22.38	2.264	.800	
	Unmatched	11	19.09	4.061	1.224	
Person	Matched	39	20.64	3.842	.615	
	Unmatched	42	21.33	3.296	.509	

Table 5: Independent Sample t-test to Determine the Difference in Performance Evaluation Scores of Task- and Person-Oriented Raters Based on Matched and Unmatched Leadership Style with the Speaker

Leadership Style of Rater		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Task	Equal variances assumed	1.499	.237	2.057	17	.055	3.284	1.597	-.085	6.653
	Equal variances not assumed			2.245	16.158	.039	3.284	1.463	.186	6.383
Person	Equal variances assumed	2.856	.095	-.872	79	.386	-.692	.794	-2.272	.887
	Equal variances not assumed			-.867	75.150	.389	-.692	.798	-2.282	.898

In order to test Hypothesis 3, a t-test was conducted to test whether there was a statistically significant difference in the mean performance evaluation scores of either speaker, when the participants/raters indicated equal preference for exhibiting either leadership behavior. As can be observed in Table 7, the assumption of equal variance between the groups is satisfied ( $F = 2.263$ ,  $p = 0.150$ ). The t-test showed no statistically significant difference ( $t = 0.524$ ,  $df = 18$ ,  $p = 0.607$ ) in the mean performance evaluation scores. Therefore, Hypothesis 3, which was



stated in the null form, is not rejected and indicates that speakers of differing leadership style were rated equally by participants that demonstrated no preference for exhibiting a specific leadership behavior.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Performance Evaluation Scores Generated by Raters that Equally Self-Identified as Task- and Person-Oriented Based on the Leadership Style of the Speaker

Leadership Style of Speaker	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Task	8	20.25	2.866	1.013
Person	12	21.08	3.825	1.104

Table 7: Independent Sample t-test to Determine the Difference of Performance Evaluation Scores of Raters that Equally Self-Identify as Task- and Person-Oriented Based on the Leadership Style of the Speaker

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	2.263	.150	.524	18	.607	.833	1.590	-2.507	4.174
Equal variances not assumed			.556	17.653	.585	.833	1.499	-2.320	3.986

## Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to identify whether similarities and differences in the leadership style of subordinates and supervisors could produce significant differences in the performance evaluation scores of the subordinates. Findings indicated that task-oriented leaders rated subordinates of the opposite style significantly lower than subordinates of the same style. This result suggests that leadership behaviors may become a component of a rater's 'working self concept' (Markus & Wurf, 1987) if s/he has preferences toward task-oriented leadership behavior and is making performance evaluation decisions, but future research is needed to further investigate this relationship. The relationship may be explained by the behavioral components associated with task-oriented leadership. In particular, the emphasis on efficiency in all four behaviors identified by Yukl (2012) becomes relevant in all performance evaluations. In addition, the monitoring behavior identified by Yukl (2012) indicates that evaluation of a subordinate's ability to contribute to organizational efficiency is a key emphasis in a task-oriented leader's ability to lead, in general. Therefore, it is logical to conclude that although a subordinate's contribution is part of the leader's self-concept the majority of the time, it becomes highlighted by the nature of the performance evaluation process.

Using the same reasoning as earlier, it might be possible to explain why person-oriented leaders did not significantly distinguish in their performance evaluations based on similarity of subordinate style. Perhaps subordinate performance is relevant only to the recognizing and developing components of person-oriented leadership as identified by Yukl (2012). It is necessary to recognize that a fair evaluation of both good and poor performance precedes both of these activities, but that identifying the good components of performance is arguably more relevant to executing recognizing and developing activities. Therefore, it is logical to assume

that a person-oriented leader may have a more holistic understanding of a subordinate's performance (i.e. the leader will consider more than just the subordinate's ability to contribute to process efficiency) and that this understanding will lead to performance evaluation scores that are relatively similar, irrespective of the subordinate's style. The component approach is also valuable in understanding why raters in the current study that demonstrated equal preference for both leadership behaviors rated the speakers equally. The balance in the leaders' styles may also have provided a holistic approach to evaluating the speaker.

The findings of the study have broad implications for the performance evaluation process in organizations. For instance, task-oriented leaders that inflate the performance scores of task-oriented subordinates as compared to those of person-oriented subordinates, may be accused of favoritism, and may in turn, be poorly evaluated themselves. However, this implication is largely dependent on the degree to which efficiency is stressed in the culture of the organization and should be studied further in future research. In addition, future research is needed on how raters that self-identify with an equal preference make evaluation decisions (e.g., whether they use a holistic approach, lack an understanding of appropriate performance, or link subordinate performance to organizational performance and goals).

A limitation of the current study is that it simulates one specific instance of performance by an imaginary subordinate. In reality, performance appraisal is based on a continuous process over a long period of time, and continuous interactions between the supervisor and the subordinate are considered (Ilgen & Favero, 1985). Therefore, future research should investigate the continuous interaction of leaders and subordinates of matched and mismatched leadership styles.

Another limitation is the relatively small sample size and sample composition of the survey. The sample size was 120 university students, who had no connection or relationship to the speaker of the video and who may not have substantial leadership experiences that would lend themselves to identifying leadership preferences. Future research should use a larger sample in an organizational context, with both experienced and inexperienced managers, in order to better investigate the impact of similarities of leadership styles on performance evaluations.

### **Conclusion**

The results of the current study indicate the presence of some interplay between supervisor and subordinate leadership styles in the context of the performance evaluation process. The relationships identified in this study aid in understanding the quantitative roles of leader and follower expectations and could help to improve perceptions of fairness and support the overall acceptance of the performance evaluation process.

## References

- Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 345-373.
- Barker, R. A. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations*, 54(4), 469-494.
- Casimir, G. (2001). Combinative aspects of leadership style: The ordering and temporal spacing of leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 245-278.
- Carlson, R. E & Smith-Howell, D. (1995). Classroom public speaking assessment: Reliability and validity of selected evaluation instruments. *Communication Education*, 44, 87-97.
- Ehigie, B. O., & Akpan, R. C. (2003). Roles of perceived leadership styles and rewards in the practice of total quality management. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(1), 24-40.
- Fleischman, E. A. (1974). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In Fleischman, E. A. & Hunt, J. G. (Eds), *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*, Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gardner, W. L. & Avolio, B. A. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective, *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32-58.
- Hall, R. J., & Lord, R. G. (1995). Multi-level information-processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 265-287.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- Hallett, T. (2007). Between deference and distinction: Interaction ritual through symbolic power in an educational institution. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(2), 148-171.
- Ilgén, D. R., & Favero, J. L. (1985). Limits in generalization from psychological research to performance appraisal processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 311-321.
- Kahn, L. B & Lange, F. (2014). Employer learning productivity and the earnings distribution: Evidence from performance measures. *Review of Economic Studies*, 81(4), 1575-1613.

- Likert, R. (1961). *New Patterns of Management*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lippitt, G. (1969). *Organizational Renewal*, New York, NY: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 311-338.
- Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45(1), 61-78.
- Mathadil, R., Heck, N. C., & Schuldberg, D. (2014). Burnout in psychiatric nursing: Examining the interplay of autonomy, leadership style, and depressive symptoms. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 28, 160-166.
- Misumi, J. (1995). The development in Japan of the performance-maintenance (PM) theory of leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 213-228.
- Mullins, L. J. (1996). *Management and Organizational Behavior*, London: Pitman Publishing.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 387-409.
- Smeltzer, L. R. (1981). The relationship between writing style and leadership style. *Journal of Business Communication*, 18(2), 23-32.
- Smith, J. A. & Foti, R. J. (1998). A pattern approach to leader emergence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9, 147-160.
- Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). Beneath the mask: Examining the relationship of self-presentation attributes and impression management to charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 217-242.
- Waldman, D. A., Ramírez, G. G., House, R. J., & Puranam, P. (2001). Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 134-143.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.

**Appendix A: TED Talk Video Links**

The speaker used to demonstrate a preference for task-oriented leadership behavior is Nigel Marsh. The link to the TED Talk is included below:

[https://www.ted.com/talks/nigel\\_marsh\\_how\\_to\\_make\\_work\\_life\\_balance\\_work](https://www.ted.com/talks/nigel_marsh_how_to_make_work_life_balance_work)

The speaker used to demonstrate a preference for person-oriented leadership behavior is Shawn Achor. The link to the TED Talk is included below:

[https://www.ted.com/talks/shawn\\_achor\\_the\\_happy\\_secret\\_to\\_better\\_work#t-288190](https://www.ted.com/talks/shawn_achor_the_happy_secret_to_better_work#t-288190)



## Appendix B: Leadership Behavior Questionnaire

Think about how often you engage in the following behaviors when working in a group. For each item, select the number that best represents how often you engage in each behavior.

1= Never

2=Seldom

3=Sometimes

4=Often

5=Always

1. Tell group members what they are supposed to do.
2. Act friendly with members of the group.
3. Set standards of performance for group members.
4. Help others feel comfortable in the group.
5. Make suggestions on how to solve problems.
6. Respond favorably to suggestions made by others.
7. Make my perspective clear to others.
8. Treat others fairly.
9. Develop a plan of action for the group.
10. Behave in a predictable manner toward group members.
11. Define role responsibilities for each group member.
12. Communicate actively with group members.
13. Clarify my own role within the group.
14. Show concern for the personal well-being of others.
15. Provide a plan for how the work is to be done.
16. Show flexibility when making decisions.
17. Provide criteria for what is expected of the group.
18. Disclose thoughts and feelings to the group members.
19. Encourage group members to do quality work.
20. Help group members get along.

### Appendix C: Speaker Performance Evaluation Form

Please assign the following values to evaluate the performance of the speaker:

1= Poor

2=Fair

3=Average

4=Good

5=Excellent

Speech Component	Rating
INTRODUCTION: (Capture attention; Relate to audience; Introduce topic)	
ORGANIZATION: (Speech easy to follow; Clear progression of ideas)	
DEVELOPMENT: (Clear explanation; Use of supporting material; Visual aids enhance presentation)	
CONCLUSION: (Provides closure; Summary; Vivid)	
DELIVERY: (Eye contact; Understandable; Use of gestures/facial expression; Conversational)	