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**PART ONE – PROJECT SUMMARY**

**First Named Chief Investigator (CI) Details**
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| **Name:** | Dr. Jennifer Overbeck |
| **Department:** | Melbourne Business School / Department of Business Administration |
| **Telephone:** | 03 9349 8284 |
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* Are any of the CIs Early Career Researchers (within first 5 years of award of PhD)?
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1. **Project Title**

Short descriptive title, no more than 10 words in length

|  |
| --- |
| Exploring effects of managers’ everyday behaviours on subordinates’ perceptions of them |

1. **Project Summary**

Outline for the lay reader the aims, expected outcomes, and significance of the project.

|  |
| --- |
| **Aim/Outcome.**  This project seeks to explore how judgments of leaders develop over time based on particular sequences of positive, neutral, and negative behaviours shown by the leader, and to examine whether leader gender moderates the effect of these sequences. Though women are often judged negatively as leaders, this is not always the case; our goal is to identify sequences of behaviours that may predict when overall judgments of leaders (particularly, female leaders) are positive or negative.  **Significance.** Past research has shown that female leaders are often judged more negatively than male leaders. These judgments are especially negative when women show anger, criticise subordinates, deliver discipline, or use intimidation strategies. Some of our prior work, however, has shown judgments of female leaders to be no less positive than those of men, even when they exhibit similar negative behaviours. I anticipate that impressions of leaders develop over time and change based on the *sequence* of everyday behaviours they display, and that identifying effects of particular sequences can help us to predict overall judgments of leaders. |

*(Maximum 150 words)*

1. **Budget**

All costs should be quoted excluding GST.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Detailed Budget** *(List all items individually)* |  | **$ Amount Requested** |
| **Personnel**  142 hours x $41.63/hr, inclusive, for casual RA |  |  |
|  | **Sub-Total:** | **$5911.46** |
|  |  |  |
| **Other** |  |  |
| Participant fees - Survey 1 – MTurk - 1000 x 40¢ |  | $400.00 |
| Participant fees – Coding surveys – MTurk - 750 x $1.35 |  | $1012.50 |
| Participant fees – Survey 2 – ClearVoice - 500 x $15.00 |  | $7500.00 |
| MTurk administrative fees (20% X MTurk fees) |  | $147.30 |
|  | **Sub-Total:** | **$9059.80** |
|  |  |  |
| *Proposed Grant Amount* | ***SUBTOTAL*** | **$14971.26** |
| *Contribution from our own research funds* |  | -$2994.25 |
|  |  |  |
| *Proposed MBS Internal Grants Funding Net* | ***TOTAL*** | **$11977.01** |

1. **Budget Justification**

Please provide detail as to how the budget has been costed and provide a detailed justification as to why each item is essential for the project to proceed. If multiple trips are required during the project, please justify why.

**Personnel:**

I will require a substantial amount of research assistant support in completing two tasks: 1) programming a complex survey using Qualtrics. The survey is quite long and uses a complicated skip logic and interrelation of questions, and I need a highly experienced RA (currently available at MBS) to handle the programming. This task will take approximately 20 hours to complete. 2) Responses to our first survey will generate 3000 leader behaviours that must be coded and reduced to a set of general positive, negative, and neutral behaviours. The RA will screen and group the initial 3000 items so they can be rated by M-Turk coders, and will review coders’ responses to do further grouping and refinement throughout the second phase of the project. This will require up to 200 hours of work, of which I request grant funding to cover 122 hours.

**Participant fees:**

Participants in Survey 1 and the coding surveys will be recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). In Survey 1; participation will take only about 3 minutes so I am paying US30¢. In the coding surveys, participants will be asked to sort 20 statements into categories and then name those categories. This is more intensive work and will take up to 10 minutes, so I am paying a higher rate. Survey 2 is the main study (the prior stages are pretesting and validation steps); for this study, I will recruit a higher-quality sample through a company called ClearVoice that recruits and screens panel respondents. Costs to access these participants are higher; I will pay approximately $15 for what I anticipate to be a 30-minute study.

1. **Other Information**

**a) Publication Outcome**

Please detail your plan for publishing the research in a DIISR-category publication;

**\*How will you present your research?**

I plan to generate a paper and give conference talks.

**\* Which publication/s will you aim to publish your research in?**

I aim to publish the outcomes in Journal of Applied Psychology (a FT journal).

**\* Why have you chosen this particular publication?**

This journal is most closely related to this area of research and the present studies extend earlier work published in this journal. I have published a JAP paper involving implicit leadership theories, and this work is strongly consistent with that literature.

**b) Future Funding**

Please detail your plan for using the project to form the basis of future ARC applications; Which scheme and round will you apply to? How will this project enhance your chance of a successful application outcome? If you do not intend to use the project as a basis for a future ARC application please provide the Committee with an explanation as to why this is not an appropriate course of action for your project.

|  |
| --- |
| ***\* Please detail your plan for using the project to form the basis of future ARC applications: Which Scheme and Round will you apply to?***  I do not have plans to pursue additional grant funding at this time.  \* ***How will this project enhance your chance of a successful application outcome?*** |

**PART TWO – PROJECT DETAILS**

***Exploring effects of managers’ everyday behaviours on subordinates’ perceptions of them***

This project seeks to explore how judgments of leaders develop over time based on particular *sequences* of positive, neutral, and negative behaviours shown by the leader, and to examine whether leader gender moderates the effect of these sequences. Though women are often judged negatively as leaders, this is not always the case; our goal is to identify sequences of behaviours that may predict when overall judgments of leaders (particularly, female leaders) are positive or negative.

**Background and aims of project**

*Background of the project*

Since women began to enter the workforce and occupy leadership positions, researchers have become increasingly interested in studying perceptions of female leaders relative to male leaders. This interest also developed in light of a seminal paper by Schein (1973), who demonstrated a clear “think manager – think male” link. Following up on Schein’s work, in their Role Congruity Theory, Eagly and Karau (2002) argued that attributes of a prototypic leader, such as assertiveness, competitiveness and even pushiness are incommensurate with stereotypes of a woman, which include traits such as warmth, nurturance, and compassion. As such, they argued, women are less likely to be selected for leadership positions, and if they do, they are judged less competent than male leaders. Conversely, the literature on the backlash (e.g., Rudman, 1999) effect suggests when women behave in counter-stereotypic manner (i.e., applying to masculine positions, such as leadership positions), they are judged to be less warm than their counterparts. Insofar it appears that female leaders may experience a double bind such that they are simultaneously judged to be less competent and less warm.

To help women, some researchers have explored potential positive behaviors female leaders could exhibit to counter the negative evaluations. One strategy that was found to be especially effective is exhibiting both masculine and feminine behaviors at the same time. For example, research showed that it bodes well for a female leader to emphasize her motherhood status or to engage in volunteer activities (Heilman & Okimoto, 2007). In terms of leadership style, democratic or participative leadership also helps a female leader achieve positive evaluations (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992).

On the other hand, other, more extensive research has explored the specific leadership behaviors that increase the negative perceptions of women even further. For example, a meta-analysis showed that women are especially devalued if their leadership is carried out in stereotypically masculine style, such as autocratic or non-participative (Eagly et al., 1992). Other work has focused on stable patterns of behaviors of female leaders. For example, women are evaluated more negatively if they exhibit anger (Brescoll &Uhlmann, 2008), use intimidation strategies (Bolino & Turnley, 2003), deliver discipline (Atwater, Carey, &Waldman, 2001), or criticize subordinates (Sinclair & Kinda, 2000). What all of those behaviors have in common is that they are characteristic of a man. To the extent then that a female leader acts in a masculine manner, her evaluation is lowered.

Although at first glance leader evaluations may seem inconsequential, prior work has demonstrated that these evaluations may spill over to affect behaviors towards these leaders a well. For example, in a study of hospitals, Heim (1990) demonstrated that female nurses were more reluctant to follow the directions of female doctors compared with male doctors, and in a laboratory study Rudman and Fairchild (2004) showed that female leaders are more likely to be undermined and sabotaged compared with male leaders. As such, studying leader evaluations is important due to their behavioral implications.

*Aim*

Our goal is to contribute to this literature by focusing specifically on everyday behaviors of leaders and examining their impact on the subordinates’ evaluations of the leaders. Key to our research would be studying how various sequences composed of *various* behaviors (as opposed to studying a specific behavior occurring in a single instance) affects the fluctuations of leader evaluations. Within this investigation, it would be worthwhile to explore questions such as: does a positive behavior of a leader cancel a negative one, how do various negative behaviors rank against each other in lowering leader evaluations, and are there differences in perceptions of a leader as a function of both leader gender and a certain behavior sequence of that leader? More specifically, do particular sequences of behaviors affect judgments of female leaders differently than judgments of male leaders?

**Significance and innovation**

This research is innovative and significant in two respects. First, though past research has studied the effects of different behaviours of female (vs. male) leaders on the subordinates’ evaluations of them, to my knowledge no one has studied the effects of *sequences* of various behaviours on leader perceptions. This is unfortunate because the usual approach does not parallel real life where a leader is typically judged not on a single instance but on a variety of behaviours exhibited throughout the leader’s day and even tenure in his or her position. As such this approach would move us toward greater understanding of how different behaviours exhibited sequentially balance out or amplify each other in terms of eliciting positive or negative leader evaluations. Second, whereas most past work has focused specifically on behaviours that would lower a female leader’s evaluations, there is only sparse research examining positive behaviors that would help a female leader with improving their evaluations. To this end, this research will examine negative, positive and neutral behaviors, in combination, to identify with greater sensitivity how subordinates judgments develop as they interact with their leaders.

**Description of approach**

By the first two months into the grant period, I will design and launch a survey in which Mechanical Turk participants identify 3 behaviours their leaders exhibit: one positive, one neutral, and one negative. I chose to allow participants identify these behaviours rather than deriving them from the literature because I wanted to be as exhaustive as possible of specifically *everyday* behaviours rather than more general behavioural proclivities (e.g., leadership style) typically studied in academic research. Once the data are collected I will ask a research assistant to do a preliminary Q-sort, wherein they organize these behaviours into types (e.g., impression management behaviours, undermining behaviours). This will help with the initial organization of the data.

By the 3rd and 4th month, the same research assistant will help with splitting these identified behaviours into multiple surveys and allowing different Mechanical Turk participants to sort them in distinct category types. This will allow me to confirm the categories that were identified by the research assistant.

By the 5th and 6th months, I will carefully go through the behaviour categories and behaviours within each one of them and select several most representative or common behaviours from each category so that I end up with a list of about 40 behaviours. I will then create a survey in which participants are presented with leader behaviours, one at a time, following which they will be asked to make their evaluation of the leader exhibiting this behaviour. The behaviour will be randomly selected (with replacement) from the list of 40 behaviours. Participants will make their leader ratings for 100 rounds of behaviours presented to them. Importantly, participants will start each subsequent round of this activity with their rating of the leader from the previous round. For example, if participants evaluated a leader who cursed as “-2” on a scale from “-3” to “3” (really bad evaluation to really good evaluation), on the next round where a leader praises a subordinate, they would start their rating from “-2.” In this way, I can track how subordinates’ impression formation changes over successive exposures to leader behaviours.

During the 7th and 8th month of the grant period, analysis will be conducted. This is a critical part of the research plan: I intend to recruit a co-author or consultant expert in Markov Chain analysis (note, I am also working with a co-author at another university who is expert in gender issues in the workplace and impressions of female leaders). This analysis will afford the mapping of behavioural sequences, and the ability to predict outcomes as a result of those sequences and of gender. Without this approach, it is much more challenging to handle the complicated data yielded by this design. Depending on the outcome of the analysis I may conduct another study in a field setting, where rather than presenting online participants with different leader behaviours, I will conduct a field study with organizational employees to ensure external validity of our findings.

During the 9th-12th months of the grant period I will work on writing up our manuscript, targeting to submit it to a top-tier management journal. Before I submit, I may present this research at a conference or research talk to solicit feedback.

**Nature of expected outcome**

The project is equally intended to (i) contribute to basic knowledge about impression formation and (ii) gain a more nuanced understanding of how evaluations are formed of female leaders relative to male leaders—in particular, how different sequences of behaviours may lead to different attributions and evaluations of female leaders that result in more negative views. Both goals are achieved through statistical confirmation of our research hypotheses, leading to a publishable manuscript. Further, I hope to continue a larger project in 2018; this project would yield a second paper, and I will supervise a psychology honours student who will complete much of that project.
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**PART THREE – INVESTIGATOR DETAILS**

For each investigator please attach a PDF with the following information:

**3.1 Research Opportunity to Performance Evaluation (ROPE)**

***Details on your career and opportunities for research from 1 January 2005 onwards***

**Provide and explain the following:** (Maximum 750 words)

1. The number of years it has been since you graduated with your highest educational qualification.
2. The research opportunities that you have had in the context of your employment situation (e.g. Early Career Researcher), the research component of your employment conditions, and any unemployment or part-time employment you may have had.
3. Whether you are a research-only, teaching and research, teaching-only, teaching and administration, research and administration, or administration-only academic, giving any additional information (e.g. part-time status) needed to understand your situation. Give an indication of what percentage of time you have spent over the last 10 years in those roles.
4. Any ***career interruptions*** you have had for childbirth, carer’s responsibility, misadventure, or debilitating illness.
5. The research mentoring and research facilities available to you.
6. Any other aspects of your career or opportunities for research that are relevant to assessment and that have not been detailed elsewhere in this Proposal (e.g. any circumstances that may have slowed down your research and publications or affected the time you have had to conduct and publish from research).

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **I received my PhD in 2001 (16 years ago).** 2. **Since then, I have worked as a postdoctoral scholar, an assistant professor, and a visiting associate professor—all roles that prioritized research (in the latter two cases, along with teaching and/or service) in university environments.** 3. **My research obligations have ranged from 50% to 5/9 throughout the past 13 years. Currently, my teaching load is 120 pts/yr and I am research active.** 4. **I was on the tenure clock at USC (while an assistant professor) for 7 years; in addition, my tenure clock was suspended at USC for 2 years (2006-2007) during treatment for and recovery from cancer.** 5. **I have been working to push out publications that were held up through disruption of two major moves (one domestic US, CA🡪Utah; and one international, US🡪Oz).** |

**3.2 Publications**

Please attach a list of recent significant publications (from 2005 onwards) split into the five categories:

1. scholarly books
2. scholarly book chapters
3. refereed journal articles
4. refereed conference papers – *only when the full paper was published in the conference proceedings*
5. other (major exhibitions, compositions, performances)

*Where relevant please note if the publication was an outcome of previous funding with an \* and scheme reference name or reference no. (E.g. Faculty ECR; DP12452163…)*

***(i) Scholarly Book (edited):***

Overbeck, J. R. (Volume Ed.); Mannix, E.A., & Neale, M. A. (Series Eds.) (2011). *Research on managing groups and teams, Vol. 14: Negotiation and Groups.* Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

***(ii) Scholarly Book Chapters:***

Smith, P. K., & Overbeck, J. R. (2014). The leaders’ rosy halo: Why do we give powerholders the benefit of the doubt? In J.W. van Prooien & P. A. M. van Lange, *Power, Politics, and Paranoia*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Overbeck, J. R., & Kim, Y. K. (2013). Power, status, and influence in negotiation. In M. Olekalns & W. Adair, Eds., *Handbook of Negotiation*.

Cho, Y., Overbeck, J. R., & Carnevale, P. J. (2011). Status conflicts in negotiation. *Research on Managing Groups & Teams, Vol. 14*.

Overbeck, J. R. (2010). Concepts, domains, and historical perspectives on power. In A. Guinote & T. K. Vescio (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Power*. New York: Guilford Press.

Overbeck, J. R., Correll, J. C., & Park, B. (2005). The internal sorting process of group status: The problem of too many stars. In M. Hunt-Thomas, E. Mannix, & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Research on Managing Groups & Teams, Vol. 7* (pp. 169-199). St. Louis, MO: Elsevier Press*.*

***(iii) Journal Articles (Peer-Reviewed):***

Overbeck, J. R.\*, Tost, L. P.\*, & Wazlawek, A. With great power comes great…trust? Increased credulity toward the powerful decreases monitoring. Submitted to *Journal of Applied Pyschology*.(\*shared first authorship)

Overbeck, J. R., & Droutman, V. (2013). One for all: Social power increases self-anchoring of traits, attitudes, and emotions. *Psychological Science*.

Melwani, S., Mueller, J. S., & Overbeck, J. R. (2012). Looking down: The effect of contempt and compassion on emergent leadership categorizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*

Ivanic, A., Overbeck, J. R., & Nunes, J. (2011). Status, race, and money. *Psychological Science, 22*, 1557-66*.*

Fragale, A., Overbeck, J. R., & Neale, M. A. (2011). Resources versus respect: Social judgments based on targets’ power and status positions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Overbeck, J. R., Neale, M. A., & Govan, C. (2010). I feel, therefore you act: Intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of emotion on negotiation as a function of social power. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.*

Porath, C., Overbeck, J. R., & Pearson, C. (2008). Picking up the gauntlet: How individuals respond to status challenges. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 1945-1980*.*

Curhan, J., & Overbeck, J. R. (2008). Making a “positive impression” in a negotiation: Gender differences in response to the manipulation of impression motivation. *Negotiation & Conflict Management Research, 1,* 179-193.

Overbeck, J. R., & Park, B. (2006). Powerful perceivers, powerless objects: Flexibility of powerholders’ social attention. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*,227-243.

Overbeck, J. R., Tiedens, L. Z., & Brion, S. (2006). The powerful want to, the powerless have to: Perceived constraint moderates causal attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology (Special Issue: Social Power and Group Processes) 36*, 479-496.

***(iv) Refereed Conference Papers/Proceedings:***

Fast, N. J., & Overbeck, J. R. (2011). The curse of power: Elevated resource control hinders self-determination. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*.

* 1. **Competitive Funding**

Please provide details of research funding (ARC and other agencies in Australia and overseas) for the years 2012 to 2016 inclusive. That is, list all projects/proposals/fellowships awarded or requests submitted involving that Participant for funding.

* Use the table format below to create a list of relevant projects/proposals.
* List this current proposal first. List other proposals and/or projects (including Fellowships) in descending date order.
* Support statuses are ‘R’ for requested, ‘C’ for current support and ‘P’ for past support.
* The proposal/project ID applies only to proposals, current and past projects (including fellowships), funded by the ARC or NHMRC.
* Details should be provided for all sources of funding, not just ARC funding.
* Funding amounts are to be in thousands and in Australian dollars.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description**  (all named investigators on any Proposal or grant/ project/ fellowship in which a participant is involved, project title, source of support, scheme and round) | **Same Research Area** (Yes/No) | **Support Status** (Requested/ Current/ Past) | **Proposal/ Project ID**  (if applicable) | **2012**  ($’000) | **2013**  ($’000) | **2014**  ($’000) | **2015**  ($’000) | **2016**  ($’000) |
| Kim, Traum, Overbeck, & Narayanan; Using virtual characters for cross-cultural competence training; US Office of Naval Research | No | P |  |  | US $187,697.00\* |  |  |  |

\*Funding suspended by US Congress, which did not pass appropriations bill for related research