

ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: BEYOND SIMPLE SIMILARITY: THE RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER-FOLLOWER PERSONALITY FIT WITH FOLLOWER SATISFACTION WITH THE LEADER AND FOLLOWER COMMITMENT TO THE ORGANIZATION

Jessica Lynne Saltz, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Katherine J. Klein
Department of Psychology

This dissertation examines the relationship of leader-follower personality similarity (supplementary fit) and dissimilarity (complementary fit) with two employee outcomes: follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. With the exception of one study (Glomb & Welsh, in press), prior research on leader-follower personality fit focused primarily on personality similarity (e.g., Bauer & Green, 1996; Deluga, 1998), yielding few clear, consistent results. These studies ignored the possibility that it might be personality *differences* that lead to positive employee outcomes. To my knowledge, only one study exists that proposed positive outcomes for leader-follower personality dissimilarity (i.e. Glomb & Welsh, in press). In this dissertation I extend past research by suggesting that personality dissimilarity may have a significant relationship with follower outcomes. Further, I suggest that the direction of the difference between a leader and a follower (which person has which characteristic) may also affect the outcome.

Drawing upon similarity attraction theory (Byrne, 1971) and implicit leadership theory (e.g., Lord, 1985), I test competing hypotheses about the relationship of leader-

follower personality fit with follower outcomes using three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability) from the five-factor model of personality (Goldberg, 1992). With a sample of 778 leader-follower dyads, this longitudinal study also extends past research by using a relatively new statistical technique, polynomial regression analyses (Edwards, 1993). This technique overcomes some of the difficulties associated with more traditional ways of assessing fit, such as difference scores. In addition, I use hierarchical linear modeling to address nonindependence in my sample.

However, results revealed that leader-follower personality fit was *not* significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader nor to follower commitment to the organization. That is, neither leader-follower personality similarity nor dissimilarity for any of the three dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability) was significantly related to follower satisfaction with a leader nor with follower commitment to the organization. Significant main effects, however, were found for follower personality. When I tested the personality dimensions one at a time, I found that follower extraversion and emotional stability were significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader and that follower extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability were significantly related to follower commitment to the organization. Further, when I included the dimensions of agreeableness and openness in post hoc analyses, I found a significant relationship between follower agreeableness and both of the follower outcomes. However, when I included all five personality dimensions in a simultaneous regression I found significant relationships only for follower emotional stability with follower satisfaction with the leader and for follower conscientiousness and

agreeableness with follower commitment to the organization. Implications and future research directions are discussed.

BEYOND SIMPLE SIMILARITY: THE RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER-FOLLOWER
PERSONALITY FIT WITH FOLLOWER SATISFACTION WITH THE LEADER
AND FOLLOWER COMMITMENT TO THE ORGANIZATION

by

Jessica Lynne Saltz

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2004

Advisory Committee:

Professor Katherine J. Klein, Chair
Professor Michele J. Gelfand
Professor Paul J. Hanges
Professor Debra L. Shapiro
Professor Paul Tesluk

© Copyright by
Jessica Lynne Saltz
2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Graduate school for me has been a very challenging and exciting opportunity. I am proud of my drive, my persistence, and my ability to take on seemingly impossible tasks. Yet, I could only do it because I have an amazing support network and I want to make sure to acknowledge the people that have helped me reach this point in my professional life.

While I know everyone has good friends, no one else has, or will ever have, people in their life like my friends. They are my family, they are my support, my cheerleaders, my confidantes. They make me smile, they listen to me cry and they give me a reason to dry my tears. They are everything to me, and through the many trials and tribulations of graduate school they have been behind me, rooting for me all along. While people may joke that I have so many “best friends” I thank G-d for them every day. So, (in alphabetical order of course) I VERY thankfully acknowledge a special few of my many amazing friends: Terra Adler, Hallee Altman, Lisa Aronauer, Jodi Bezack, Jenn Bitzer, Jen Colaguori, Michelle Diamond, Erica Felson, Suzanne Feuerstein, Jonathan Grebow, Josh Jacobs, Amy Kletnick, Allison Kochman, Jessica Kutikov, Tami Lambert, Lisa Leslie, Dave Mayer, Lisa Mendelsohn, Ami Norman, Marissa Ribak, Nancy Robbins, Jaymie Schaffer, Abbey Small, Sandy Sondell, Lauren Ward, Julie Weber, Marc Weber, Brian Weisbrot, and all of their fantastic significant others and children as well. You all mean the world to me.

I must also credit my success in graduate school to the wonderful guidance I received in my undergraduate institution, Emory University. Three professors in particular, Dr. Marshall Duke, Dr. Barbara Strock, and Dr. Eric Vanman believed in me,

challenged me, and supported me every step of the way. I could not have asked for better mentors. And a very special thank you to a very special individual at Emory University – Mary Lisa....I could not even imagine where to begin thanking you.

It goes without saying that I owe a deep thank you to the people who have guided me throughout graduate school, my professors. Thank you to Paul Tesluk and Debra Shapiro for taking the time and putting in the effort to be on my dissertation committee. Thank you to Ben Schneider who I was in awe of before meeting. After meeting him, I was impressed with his insightfulness, determination, guidance, and sense of humor. Thank you to Rob Ployhart for showing me what drive, intelligence, and go-getting looks like. Thank you to Paul Hanges for making time out of your crazy schedule to carefully and repeatedly teach me. Thank you to Michele Gelfand for being one of the most exciting, intelligent, ambitious, and warmest individuals that I will ever work with. And most of all a very big thank you to my advisor Katherine Klein (KK). Thank you for laughing with me, comforting me, challenging me, teaching me, and just for being you. Maryland's loss is most definitely Wharton's gain!

Further, I must thank the close-knit group of graduate students that I have had the pleasure of working with for the last five years. Your intelligence, friendship, and laughter have made it a great experience. I especially want to thank those I have worked closely with – Mark Ehrhart, Hilary Gettman, Andrew Knight, Beng-Chong Lim, Julie Lyon, Dave Mayer, and Jonathan Ziegert. Also, thank you to Courtney Ferrell and Robin Yeganeh for always being a source of comfort, advice, and friendship. I owe a very special thanks to Michelle Paul Heelan for helping me get to Maryland in the first place

and being the best I/O “big sister” I could have hoped for. Thank you also to Betty Padgett for being an incredible source of warmth and support for all of these years.

I also must thank Phil Mirvis. Phil, your belief in me, your willingness to mentor me, guide me, and take a chance on me, have inspired me to go and attempt to light the world on fire. If I can make half the impact you have on the field I will be wildly successful. And I would also like to thank my terrific boss, Traci Berliner, for giving me an opportunity to do what I want with someone I greatly admire and who is a role model for me. You, along with Edith, Tanya, Diarra, Adolph, Mara, and Karen are making my first job a fantastic experience.

Most importantly, thank you to my terrific family. My mother Arlene who would do and has done everything in the world for me. You are the most amazing person I have ever met and I love you more than I can ever express. Thank you to my dad, Howard, and my step mom, Linda for loving me, supporting me, and believing in me – I love you so very much!!! Thank you to my favorite brother Jason - I greatly admire your intelligence, heart and values. Thank you to my aunts and uncles, Vicki and David and Lillian and Harold, and my cousins Jan, Daryl, Danny, Kitty, Lee, Jessica, Josh, Alex, Jake, and Emma. And a special thank you to my other “parents”, Sandy and Jack Ward for making me a part of your family and always being in my corner. I love you all very much.

And of course, I could not end my dissertation without thanking some of the people that make me the happiest – the New York Yankees and especially Derek Jeter. They are the epitome of a winning spirit, drive, ambition and class.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	vii
Follower Reactions to Leaders.....	4
Fit.....	6
Supplementary Fit.....	8
Complementary Fit.....	9
Personality Fit.....	11
The Five-Factor Model of Personality.....	12
Supplementary Personality Fit.....	13
Complementary Personality Fit.....	19
Method.....	25
Sample.....	25
Procedure.....	26
Measures.....	27
Personality.....	27
Follower Satisfaction With The Leader.....	28
Follower Commitment To The Organization.....	28
Analyses.....	29
Control Variables.....	29
Group-Mean Centering.....	29
Polynomial Regression.....	29
Hierarchical Linear Modeling.....	33
Results.....	34
Null Model.....	34
Extraversion.....	35
Conscientiousness.....	36
Emotional Stability.....	38
Post-Hoc Analyses.....	39
Agreeableness.....	40
Openness To Experience.....	41
Follower Personality.....	42
Discussion.....	43
Leader-Follower Personality Fit.....	43
Personality Main Effects.....	50
Limitations.....	52
Conclusion.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Reliabilities, Means, And Standard Deviations.....	55
Table 2 –Intercorrelations Among Variables.....	56
Table 3 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 1a And 4a – Extraversion Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	57
Table 4 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 1b And 4b – Extraversion Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	58
Table 5 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 2a And 5a – Conscientiousness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	59
Table 6 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations for Hypothesis 2b And 5b – Conscientiousness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	60
Table 7 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations for Hypothesis 3a And 6a – Emotional Stability Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	61
Table 8 –Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 3b And 6b – Emotional Stability Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	62
Table 9 -Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses -Agreeableness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	63
Table 10 -Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses -Agreeableness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	64
Table 11 -Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses -Openness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	65
Table 12 -Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses -Openness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	66
Table 13 -Test Of Follower Personality Dimensions Post Hoc Analyses – Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2.....	67
Table 14 -Test Of Follower Personality Dimensions Post Hoc Analyses – Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2.....	68

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. MEASURES.....	69
---------------------------	----

In a succession planning meeting at a Fortune 500 company, executives discussed a high potential employee that was dissatisfied with her supervisor and seemingly less committed to the organization. This employee was on the CEO's succession plan and therefore, the executives were eager to address this problem. One solution was to move the employee to another position under a different boss. Two similar opportunities were available for the employee that differed primarily in who would be the employee's leader. In one position the leader was very similar in terms of personality as the employee, while in the other situation the leader differed from the employee in personality traits. As the executives considered where to place the employee they pondered if the employee would be more satisfied with the leader and more likely to be committed to the organization if he/she worked for a leader who had a similar personality or a leader with a dissimilar personality.

Such situations raise the question: why would some followers be more satisfied with a leader and more committed to an organization while other followers would be less satisfied with the *same* leader and less likely to be committed to the organization? The few prior studies focusing on this topic do not yield clear or consistent findings. Yet the answer to this question may have important implications for selection, project assignment, and mentoring placement. Integrating theory and research on personality (e.g. Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001; Antonioni & Park, 2001) person-environment fit (e.g. Holland, 1966, Kristof, 1996), similarity attraction theory (Byrne, 1971), and implicit leadership theory (e.g., Lord, 1985), I propose that leader-follower personality fit is significantly related to a follower's satisfaction with a leader and commitment to the organization.

As the fit literature reveals (e.g. Kristof, 1996), fit is a complex topic. Thus, for example, a follower might be satisfied with a leader because they both have similar personalities (e.g. both are conscientious) or because they have dissimilar, complementary personalities (e.g. one is extraverted and the other is introverted). In this dissertation, I refer to personality similarity as *supplementary* fit, defined as a situation in which a person “supplements, embellishes, or possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals” in an environment (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p.269). I refer to personality dissimilarity as *complementary* fit, or a situation in which a person’s characteristics complement those of another individual and provide important, needed traits that the individual himself/herself is lacking. (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987).

Research has only begun to examine how leader-follower personality fit is related to follower outcomes. The few studies that exist are focused primarily on supplementary personality fit (e.g., Bauer & Green, 1996; Deluga, 1998; Strauss, Barrick, & Connerley, 2001). The foundation for this research is mainly the similarity attraction theory (e.g. Byrne, 1969) which proposes that people are attracted to and like being around similar others. Further, as individuals tend to view themselves in an overly positive manner, (Taylor & Brown, 1988) followers, believing that they themselves could be leaders, may be most satisfied and most likely to want to continue working with, leaders who are similar to them. However, the results of studies examining leader-follower personality supplementary fit are neither clear nor consistent. For example, Deluga (1998) found that leader-follower conscientiousness supplementary fit was significantly related to leader ratings of follower behavior while Strauss et al. (2001) found no significant relationship between leader-follower conscientiousness supplementary fit and leader ratings of

follower performance. In another example, Bauer and Green (1996) found that leader-follower supplementary fit in positive affectivity, a personality dimension very similar to extraversion, was significantly related to follower performance. Strauss and colleagues (2001), however, found no significant relationship between leader-follower extraversion supplementary fit and ratings of follower performance.

The lack of consistent findings suggests that it may be more than leader-follower personality supplementary fit that is associated with follower outcomes: personality *complementary fit* may play a role as well. Further, beyond simple complementary fit, it may be that *directional complementary fit* (which person in the dyad – the leader or the follower has which trait) impacts follower outcomes. Implicit leadership theories (ILT's) describe individual's ideas and thoughts about what characteristics a leader should possess (Keller, 1999). It may be that employees hold expectations for leaders, and that part of an individual's implicit leadership theory is the idea that a leader is higher than he or she on personality traits that have a positive connotation (i.e. extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability). That is, because individuals tend to view themselves positively (Taylor & Brown, 1988), they may think that if someone other than themselves is selected to be a leader, that individual must be very high on these positive traits. In addition, in the United States, leadership is viewed as a position of status. Relational norms suggest that a leader will be higher than a follower on positive traits. The opposite scenario (the follower higher on positive traits than the leader) would be contrary to relational norms and may lead to negative follower outcomes.

I am aware of only one study (Glomb & Welsh, in press) that proposed and tested that leader-follower personality complementary fit was associated with positive follower

outcomes. Glomb and Welsh (in press) found partial support for their hypotheses. They found that leader-follower personality complementary fit was related to follower satisfaction with the leader, but was not significantly related to the two other employee outcomes – work withdrawal and organizational citizenship behavior. Glomb and Welsh's (in press) study also revealed that it was not only personality complementary fit that was associated with follower outcomes but the direction of the difference as well. That is, whether it was the leader or follower who was higher on a particular personality dimension played an important role.

This dissertation extends and adds to previous leader-follower personality fit research in 4 primary ways: (1) by hypothesizing and testing competing hypotheses (thus if one hypothesis is supported the contrasting hypothesis must be false) about the relationship between supplementary fit and the outcomes as compared to directional, complementary personality fit, (2) by using a well-established measure of personality, the five-factor model (Goldberg, 1992), (3) by analyzing the data with a relatively new procedure for assessing fit, polynomial regression analyses (Edwards, 1993) and using a large sample size as required by this technique, and (4) by using two important employee outcomes, follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization, that are arguably more proximal to personality fit than other outcomes used in prior studies. Below, I begin by discussing follower satisfaction with a leader and commitment to the organization, and then I describe prior theory and research on fit. I propose the specific competing hypotheses that I will test before describing the method.

Follower Reactions to Leaders

Leaders need to concern themselves with their follower's attitudes, such as satisfaction and organizational commitment. Dissatisfied followers may withdraw from work, or stay but sabotage the work effort (Baird & Hamner, 1979). Keller (1999) suggested that if a leader differs from followers' leadership expectations (their implicit leadership theories), dissatisfaction might occur.

One dimension of worker or follower satisfaction is satisfaction with the leader. As Glomb and Welsh (in press, p. 9) suggested in their study of the effects of leader-follower personality complementary fit on follower satisfaction with the leader, "supervisor satisfaction (with the leader) seems particularly relevant as an attitudinal variable that is proximal to the dyadic relationship." Clark and Clark (1990) noted that "...between 60 and 75% of American workers report that the worst or most stressful part of their jobs is their immediate supervisor."

Further, a follower's supervisor is likely to impact whether or not the employee is committed to the organization. Organizational commitment refers to an employee's feeling of connection to his/her company (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974). Employees often interact more frequently with their leader than with anyone else in the organization. A follower's superior is typically the person who assigns the follower projects and offers him/her opportunities within the company. In addition, it is the leader who supplies the follower with feedback and praise, thus affecting his/her feelings about his/her worth to the organization (i.e. Vecchio & Bullis, 2001). That is, in the follower's eyes, the leader comes to represent the organization. Thus, the leader plays a crucial role in the follower's commitment to the organization.

What affects how satisfied a follower is with his/ her leader or whether the follower is committed to the organization? Prior research revealed that a leader's behaviors, leadership style, and actions influenced how his/her followers reacted to him/her (House, 1977; Bass, 1985; Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001). However, followers often differ in their reactions and attitudes to the same leader. That is, two followers may hold widely different views of and attitudes toward the same leader (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Dansereau & Yammarino, 2000).

Why is one follower satisfied with a leader and committed to the organization the leader represents while another follower is dissatisfied with the same individual and less committed to the organization? I suggest that leader-follower personality fit may be one answer this question. In this dissertation, I examine the relationship between both leader-follower personality supplementary and directional, complementary fit with follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization.

Fit

A key influence of follower satisfaction with a leader or follower commitment to an organization may be the personality fit between the leader and the follower. Personality fit may be significantly associated with how individuals, such as a leader and a follower, act and react to each other (Olver & Mooradin, 2003). At the most general level, fit refers to person-environment (P-E) congruence, or "the degree of fit or match between the two sets of variables in producing significant positive (or negative) outcomes" (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 268-269). Person-environment fit research is based on the interactionist theory of behavior that proposes variance in behavior and attitudes is determined by the interaction between personal and situational characteristics

(Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). That is, neither the person nor the situation alone accounts for the greatest variance; the interaction of the two is critical.

Under the umbrella of P-E fit there are various types of fit, including person-vocation (P-V) fit, person-organization (P-O) fit, person-job (P-J) fit, and the focus of this dissertation, leader-follower fit. Allinson, Armstrong and Hayes (2001) noted that research on leader-follower fit was relatively rare, which was surprising considering that “the most important factor in the organizational environment is the other people” (Antonioni & Park, 2001, p.354). And one of the most important people a follower interacts with at work is his or her leader. As Vecchio and Bullis (2001, p.885) noted, “it is the supervisor who is best able to administer sanctions that affect work and career outcomes, and it is the supervisor who is likely to command status by virtue or organizational position.” Thus, more research is needed on the fit between a follower and this influential person, the leader. Accordingly, although operationalization of the “environment” dimension in P-E fit is generally a facet of the organization, job, or group, “an alternative approach is to regard a person’s supervisor as the key representation of organizational influence” (Allinson et al., 2001, p. 201).

In this dissertation, I propose that leader-follower fit is one reason why some followers are satisfied with their leader, while other followers are dissatisfied with the same leader. In addition, I suggest that leader-follower fit is related to whether an employee is committed to the company or not. In examining the effects of leader-follower fit, what is meant by “compatibility” or “fit” is not obvious.

Supplementary Fit

One conceptualization of fit is supplementary fit which occurs when people “perceive themselves as ‘fitting in’ because they are *like* or *similar to* other people possessing these characteristics” (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987, p. 270). A follower who is satisfied with a leader because both he/she and the leader are emotionally stable is an example of supplementary fit.

In studies examining leader-follower fit, researchers most frequently conceptualized fit as supplementary fit (e.g., Bauer & Green, 1996; Deluga, 1998; Strauss et al., 2001). The foundation for supplementary fit research is similarity attraction theory (e.g., Byrne, 1969, 1971), which proposes that people are attracted to individuals with whom they share similar characteristics. Interacting with a leader who is of the same race, age, or who has a similar personality is positively reinforcing for a follower because it confirms that his/her own characteristics, personal beliefs and perceptions are correct or desirable (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Thus for example, if a follower and leader are both introverted, the follower feels that it is acceptable to be quiet and withdrawn.

Although most leader-follower personality fit studies conceptualized fit as supplementary fit, the results from these studies were not clear. This suggests that fit should be examined as more than just similarity or supplementary fit. Therefore in this dissertation I test hypotheses that examine the relationship of supplementary fit to the outcomes, as well as the relationship between leader-follower dissimilarity or complementary fit and follower satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization.

Complementary Fit

Although supplementary fit seems to be the most common conceptualization of fit in the leader-follower personality research, fit can refer to more than similarity. Fit can also refer to individuals having complementary, dissimilar characteristics, referred to as complementary fit. Muchinsky and Monahan (1987, p.271) proposed that complementary fit occurred when “the characteristics of an individual serve to “make whole” or complement the characteristics of an environment. The environment is seen as either being deficient in or requiring a certain type of person in order to be efficient. The weakness or need of the environment is offset by the strength of the individual and vice versa. That is, in a leader-follower dyad, each person brings characteristics to the relationship that are important and that the other individual does not possess. Therefore, the leader and follower’s characteristics are complementary to each other, resulting in positive outcomes. For example, a follower may be more satisfied with a leader if the follower is introverted and the leader is extraverted, than if both the leader and follower are introverted.

Kristof (1996) discussed a conceptualization of person-organization (P-O) fit referred to as the needs-supplies perspective. This perspective suggests that “P-O fit occurs when an organization satisfies individuals’ needs, desires, or preferences (Kristof, 1996, p.4).” At the dyad level, leader-follower complementary fit occurs when a leader and a follower have characteristics which are dissimilar and satisfy the needs and desires of the other individual.

While research on complementary fit is not as prevalent as research on supplementary fit, there are theories supporting the notion of complementary fit. Winch,

Kstanes, and Kstanes (1954) proposed a theory of complementary needs in mate selection. This paradigm suggested that when an individual sought a mate, he or she searched for the person who would maximally gratify his or her needs. That is, people searched for partners whose traits were complementary rather than similar. For example, an attention seeking person would be attracted to an attention giving mate. Cattell and Nesselroade (1967, p.351) also proposed a theory of complementarity in marriage selection: “choice in marriage is directed by a desire to possess characteristics (by sharing them in the possessed partner) which are felt by the individual to be necessary to his self-concept or to his or her social and general life adjustment in marriage.” They provided the example of a person who was unable to responsibly manage his/her affairs who sought a wiser, more capable individual.

A more work-related theory, implicit leadership theory, may explain why leader-follower complementary fit is likely related to positive outcomes. An employee’s implicit leadership theories define his or her “personal assumptions about the traits and abilities that characterize an ideal business leader” (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004, p.293). Because leadership is associated with status an employee is likely to think of an ideal leader as someone who possesses positive traits that are above and beyond the characteristics the follower himself/herself has. Therefore, the follower expects the leader to have qualities that he/she is lacking – complementary qualities.

This suggests that the *direction* of the complementary fit is important. Implicit leadership theories indicate that within the leader-follower dyad, it will be the leader who possesses greater quantities of positive characteristics, rather than the follower. In this dissertation I test whether the follower’s satisfaction with a leader and commitment to the

organization is related to which individual in the dyad has which personality characteristic. For example, will a follower be differentially satisfied with a leader if the follower is introverted and the leader extraverted than if the follower is extraverted and the leader introverted? I hypothesize that a follower's satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization is related to more than the two people having complementary characteristics – it also depends on who has which characteristic.

Personality Fit

In the past few years, interest in the role of personality in the workplace has grown (Strauss et al., 2001). Research has suggested that personality traits are heritable (Jang, McCrae, Angleitner, Rieman, & Livesley, 1998), unaffected by external influences (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998), and stable throughout a person's lifetime (McCrae & Costa, 1990).

Personality traits are important because they influence how a person reacts and responds to his/her environment (Olver & Mooradin, 2003), which includes the people he or she interacts with, such as the leader. Personality fit between people who work together can influence the interactions between the individuals, thus affecting their overall relationship. Because personality fit affects interactions among people who work together, and because followers and leaders often have intense and frequent interactions, more research is needed on leader-follower personality fit. The little research that exists has revealed that leader-follower personality fit is associated with outcomes such as follower performance and follower satisfaction, yet findings are not consistent. In this dissertation, I examine the relationships of both leader-follower personality supplementary and complementary fit with two important outcomes, follower satisfaction

with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. It is important to note that the personality fit studied in this dissertation is *actual* personality fit, and not *perceived* fit. That is, I assessed actual similarities and dissimilarities in personality fit between a leader and a follower rather than followers' perceptions of the similarity of their personality to their leader's personality or leaders' perceptions of the similarity of their personality to their followers' personality.

The Five-Factor Model of Personality

In this dissertation, I use the five-factor model (FFM) of personality to assess the personality dimensions of leaders and followers. Bauer and Green (1996) noted the need for research on the relationship of personality similarity with work outcomes, in which personality was assessed with the FFM or the "Big 5." While there are criticisms of the five-factor model, primarily over whether the taxonomy is too broad, researchers overall support this five-factor taxonomy (Olver & Mooradin, 2003). Personality researchers have typically concluded that the five-factor model provides a comprehensive, structural organization for personality traits (Deluga, 1998).

The five factors or dimensions of the "Big Five" are extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Goldberg, 1992). In this dissertation, I focus on three of these dimensions – extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness. Extraversion refers to sociability, dominance, or positive emotionality. Emotional stability can be defined as a lack of hostility, depression, or anxiety. Conscientiousness refers to traits such as dependability, careful planning, organization, and achievement striving (Barrick et al., 2001).

I selected these dimensions because they are associated with characteristics of leaders (Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994), and thus are characteristics that followers expect leaders to possess. Offerman and colleagues (1994) identified eight factors that characterize people's implicit theories of leadership. Three of these factors (dedication, charisma, sensitivity) are related to these dimensions of the five factor model (Keller, 1999). Leader dedication, which describes a leader who plans, is organized, and works hard to complete tasks, is similar to conscientiousness (Keller, 1999). Leader charisma, which describes a dynamic, outgoing leader is related to extraversion (Keller, 1999). Further, Keller (1999) found that neurotic individuals described their ideal leader as one characterized by leader sensitivity, or a compassionate, sympathetic and understanding leader. In addition, these three personality traits are the three traits primarily examined in previous leader-follower personality fit research. Bauer and Green (1996) examined leader-follower positive affectivity similarity, which as previously mentioned, is similar to extraversion. Deluga (1998) examined leader-follower conscientiousness similarity. Glomb and Welsh (in press) examined dominance, which seems to be somewhat related with extraversion. And Strauss and colleagues (2001) examined leader-follower similarity for all three of these dimensions. Thus this research can help to further clarify the findings of these past studies.

Supplementary Personality Fit

As described above, supplementary personality fit exists when a follower is satisfied with a leader or committed to the organization because both the leader and follower share similar personality traits. The similarity attraction theory (Byrne, 1969, 1971) is the basis for much supplementary fit research and proposes that people are

attracted to individuals with whom they share characteristics. Therefore, a conscientious individual should be attracted to another conscientious individual, and an introverted person should find another introverted individual attractive.

Bauer and Green (1996) suggested that personality supplementary fit was important not just because a person is attracted to someone with a similar personality, but because individuals with similar personalities are able to build trust more easily than are individuals with dissimilar personalities. In addition, individuals with similar personalities may work easier with each other because they understand the other person's viewpoints in regards to completing work or handling a work task. Antonioni and Park (2001) proposed that personality similarity among people who work together made it easier for an individual to predict what others will do, and it made it easier to interpret and understand external events and circumstances in the same manner. That is, two people with the same personality are likely to see the world in a similar manner, or "see eye to eye" (Senger, 1971). Although the research on this topic is limited, there are a few studies that examined the effects of supplementary personality fit between a leader and a follower. While none of these studies examined how leader-follower supplementary personality fit for these three personality dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability) was related to follower satisfaction with the leader or commitment to the organization, they provided a basis for future research to build from.

In an empirical study Bauer and Green (1996) examined leader-follower positive affectivity similarity. Positive affectivity refers to a display of enthusiasm, activity, and alertness and is very similar to one of the five-factor model dimensions, extraversion. Bauer and Green (1996) proposed that leader-follower positive affectivity similarity

would be positively related to follower performance, and to leader delegation of responsibilities to the follower. They found that positive affectivity similarity was significantly related to member performance at two time periods, but was not significantly related to leader delegation at either time period. Although this hypothesis was only partially supported, the results revealed that similarity of positive affectivity influenced follower's behavior.

Strauss and colleagues (2001) also examined the impact of leader-follower extraversion similarity. They hypothesized that similarity in extraversion between a leader and follower would be positively related to follower performance ratings made by the supervisor. However, support was not found for this hypothesis.

Bauer and Green (1996) and Strauss and colleagues (2001) found little overwhelming, consistent support for the effects of leader-follower extraversion similarity. However, I examine the relationship between leader-follower extraversion similarity and follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization for two reasons: 1) to provide additional information about this relationship, and 2) because I believe my dissertation improves upon Bauer and Green's (1996) and Strauss et al.'s (2001) study in several ways. First, I assess extraversion using the five-factor model, which was done in the Strauss et al. (2001) study but not in the Bauer and Green (1996) research. As previously mentioned, the five-factor model is widely accepted as a personality taxonomy (Goldberg, 1992). Second, I test whether similarity of extraversion is related to two different and arguably, more proximal subordinate outcomes, follower's satisfaction with a leader and follower commitment to the organization. Finally, I use polynomial regression analyses, while Bauer and Green

(1996) relied on a different statistical procedure, difference scores, for analyzing the data. Although Strauss et al. (2001) also used polynomial regression analyses, their sample size is considerably smaller than mine. Polynomial regression analysis requires a large sample size and it may be that Strauss and colleagues (2001) sample size was too small to reveal relationships that may exist.

Building from Bauer and Green's (1996), and Strauss et al.'s (2001) study I propose that followers will be satisfied with a leader and committed to an organization if they work for someone who shares their level of extraversion. Thus, outgoing, sociable, talkative, extraverted followers will be committed to the organization and satisfied with similarly extraverted leaders, while quieter, reserved, introverted followers will be committed to the organization and satisfied and eager to work with other introverts. I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1a: Followers who are similar to their leader in extraversion are significantly more satisfied with their leader than are followers who differ in extraversion from their leader.

Hypothesis 1b: Followers who are similar to their leader in extraversion are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who differ in extraversion from their leader.

With regard to leader-follower conscientiousness, to my knowledge, only two empirical studies examined the relationship of leader-follower conscientiousness similarity to follower outcomes, resulting in inconsistent findings. Using a sample of 127 subordinate-supervisor dyads, Deluga (1998, p.190), suggested that "similarity on a personality trait strongly predicting performance (conscientiousness) may generate

subordinate-supervisor interpersonal attraction, compatibility...” Deluga (1998) hypothesized that conscientiousness similarity between a leader and a follower would be positively related to leader ratings of the follower’s in-role behavior. This hypothesis was supported, revealing that leader-follower conscientiousness similarity was significantly associated with individual follower outcomes. However, Strauss and colleagues (2001), hypothesized that leader-follower conscientiousness similarity would be related to supervisor ratings of follower performance, but found no significant results.

In this dissertation, I will examine the relationship of leader-follower conscientiousness similarity with follower satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization. I propose that a conscientious follower will be committed to the organization and satisfied working for a conscientious leader who is similarly detailed oriented and organized, while a nonconscientious follower who dislikes plans and organization will be committed to the organization and more satisfied working for a leader who is also not focused on details and does not mind that the follower is not conscientious. Although Strauss and colleagues (2001) found no support for this hypothesis, my study differs from theirs in that I examine the relationship between leader-follower conscientiousness similarity with different follower outcomes. Further, because their sample size is small for polynomial regression while mine is larger, I may be able to reveal findings that they could not detect. Thus, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2a: Followers who are similar to their leader in conscientiousness are significantly more satisfied with their leader than are followers who differ in conscientiousness from their leader.

Hypothesis 2b: Followers who are similar to their leader in conscientiousness are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who differ in conscientiousness from their leader.

I also examine the relationship of leader-follower emotional stability similarity with follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. In the only study I am aware of that examined leader-follower emotional stability similarity, Strauss and colleagues (2001) hypothesized that emotional stability similarity would be positively related to supervisor performance ratings. Although Strauss and colleagues (2001) found no support for the effects of leader-follower personality similarity, they found that personality similarity on emotional stability between two coworkers was associated with higher peer ratings of performance. Thus, while the hypotheses for leader-follower personality similarity were not supported this study provides some evidence that emotional stability similarity is consequential.

I propose that emotionally stable followers will be more committed to the organization and satisfied working for emotionally stable leaders who are also level headed and have control of their emotions, while neurotic individuals will be more committed to the organization and prefer working for leaders who are similarly neurotic and can relate to the followers. Supporting this idea, Locke and Horowitz (1990) found that dysphoric or depressed individuals were more satisfied interacting with other depressed individuals than with nondepressed individuals, and nondysphoric people preferred interacting with other nondepressed people. Although Strauss and colleagues (2001) found no support for the relationship of leader-follower emotional stability similarity with follower outcomes I suggest that my use of different follower outcomes

and larger sample size may allow me to find results for this relationship. Thus, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 3a: Followers who are similar to their leaders in emotional stability are significantly more satisfied with their leaders than are followers who differ in emotional stability from their leader.

Hypothesis 3b: Followers who are similar to their leaders in emotional stability are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who differ in emotional stability from their leader.

Complementary Personality Fit

While the majority of research on personality compatibility focuses on similarity of personality, compatibility or fit is not necessarily synonymous with similarity. As I previously described, Winch and colleagues' (1954) theory of complementary needs in mate selection and Cattell and Nesselrode's (1967) theory of complementarity in marriage selection suggested that individuals sought out marriage partners who were different from them in desirable ways.

This idea of complementarity of characteristics may also be important in the workplace. Leonard and Strauss (1997) proposed a "whole brain" approach to selecting organizational members. They suggested that it was beneficial to have individuals who had dissimilar cognitive styles work together. They suggested that diversity of cognitive style would result in creative decision making while homogeneity of cognitive style inhibited such creativity. There is some support from the team composition literature that complementary personalities among individuals working together can be beneficial. For example, Barry and Stewart (1997) reported a curvilinear, upside down u shaped

relationship between the number of extraverted group members and group effectiveness. That is, having some extraverted group members increased group effectiveness, but too many extraverted members was harmful.

However, while Winch and colleague's (1954) theory of complementary needs in mate selection and Cattell and Nesselroade's (1967) theory of complementarity in marriage selection proposed that it was beneficial to have mates or marriage partners with differing characteristics, these theories did not suggest that a certain partner needed to have certain characteristics. Other researchers, however, hypothesized and found support for the idea that who has what characteristics matters (e.g., Perry, Kulik, & Zhou, 1999), suggesting that outcomes may be affected by more than individuals having complementary characteristics. Which individual in the dyad has which characteristics seemed to be important as well.

Implicit leadership theories suggest that *which* individual (the leader or the follower) has which characteristics does matter. These theories imply that followers expect their leaders, individuals in a position of status, to possess certain traits such as particular personality characteristics. As status positions in the United States are often viewed as positions that are earned or awarded on the basis of certain experiences, skills, or personal characteristics, followers may have implicit theories that leaders possess more of or greater amounts of positive personality characteristics.

Bacharach, Bamberger, and Mundell (1993) proposed that certain demographic variables (i.e. education, gender, age) were linked with status implications in a given social situation. For example, in the U.S., education is a symbol of high status in society. Bacharach and colleagues (1993) suggested that these demographic variables could be

seen as surrogates for status, and that status inconsistencies arose when a person's status in two or more situations was inconsistent with each other. Bacharach and colleagues (1993, p. 22) proposed that "an example of this could be the university lecturer who earns less than the department technician servicing his computers." In that example, the lecturer is high in status for profession but low in status for salary compared to the technician.

Status inconsistency between a leader and a follower may affect important outcomes. That is, if a follower is higher in status for a particular characteristic than his/her leader, this difference is contrary to expected norms in our society. In our society, we expect those in higher positions to be better educated, older, and wiser. Therefore, in a situation in which status differences between individuals are contrary to the norm, outcomes are likely to be different than if the status differences conformed to the norm (Shore, Cleveland, & Goldberg, 2003). In addition, because people's implicit theories about leaders are that they possess more positive qualities than nonleaders, if a follower is higher than a leader on these characteristics, the follower may feel that the leader does not deserve his/her position of status and will be dissatisfied with the leader and less likely to be committed to the organization that the leader represents.

Researchers have begun examining the effects of demographic differences between individuals that follow the norm, versus those that are counter to the norm. Their results suggested that who has which characteristics matters. For example, Perry and colleagues (1999) proposed and found support for the hypothesis that subordinates who were older than their supervisors (contrary to societal norms) would experience less positive outcomes than subordinates who were younger than their supervisors (following

societal norms). Tsui and O'Reilly (1989), in a field study with 272 superior-subordinate dyads, found that subordinates who were younger, less educated, and had lower job tenure than their supervisors (following societal norms) had better job outcomes than subordinates who were older, more educated, and had higher tenure than their supervisors.

Although these studies examined status inconsistencies for demographic characteristics, status inconsistencies in personality may explain why a follower would be more satisfied with a leader if the leader was highly conscientious while the follower was less conscientious, than if the follower was highly conscientious but the leader was not. A follower's implicit leadership theories may include the idea that leader's are more planned, organized and generally conscientious than the follower himself. If a leader's characteristics match these follower expectations, the follower should be satisfied with the leader and committed to the organization the leader represents, whereas if the leader's characteristics are counter to the follower's expectations, the follower may be dissatisfied and less likely to be committed to the organization.

While demographic characteristics such as age and education seem to have established positions of status within the United States, the status of personality dimensions is less clearly defined. Nonetheless, certain dimensions are seen as more socially desirable than others. Funder and Colvin (1988) for example, reported that dimensions of emotional stability and conscientiousness were viewed as being high in desirability. Further, Hogan, Curphy and Hogan (1994) proposed that the dimensions of the big five personality model, which included extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness, represented the "bright side" of personality, or the positive aspects of

personality. Finally, Keller (1999) found extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness to be associated with people's theories of what traits a leader has. Thus, followers may expect people in authority positions (leaders) to be more organized and planful (conscientious), outgoing and sociable (extraverted), and level headed and smooth tempered (emotionally stable) than they themselves are.

The only study I am aware of that examined leader-follower complementary personality fit was by Glomb and Welsh (in press). They hypothesized that differences in control personality traits (ranging from dominance to submission) were significantly related to subordinate outcomes that included satisfaction with the leader, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and work withdrawal. Further, they hypothesized that the direction of the difference (which individual in the dyad had which personality trait) matters. They suggested that because leaders lead their followers, they were expected to be higher in control personality than followers. They proposed that "from a relational norm perspective, supervisors would be expected to have higher control scores than their subordinates. Dyads where supervisors are higher in control than their subordinates should have more positive, individual-level outcomes than if the supervisors were lower in control than their subordinates (Glomb & Welsh, in press, p.8)." Glomb and Welsh (in press) found that, indeed, follower satisfaction with a leader was higher when a leader was higher in control than the follower. This relationship held when the leader was high in control and the subordinate was moderate to low in control. However, when the leader was high in control but the follower's control was at a minimum level, subordinate satisfaction was not high, providing partial support for Glomb and Welsh's (in press) hypothesis. Glomb and Welsh (in press) found no significant relationship between

leader-follower complementary personality fit and the other two outcomes – OCB's or work withdrawal.

Although Glomb and Welsh (in press) found only partial support for their hypotheses, they found that personality differences among a leader and a follower, with the leader being higher on a personality trait thought to be associated with leadership were important. In my study I improve upon Glomb and Welsh's (in press) research in several ways. I assess personality using the dimensions from the five-factor model. Further, I include a different outcome measure, follower commitment to the organization. And most importantly, my sample size is significantly larger than Glomb and Welsh's (in press) sample, which may allow me to find relationships which were undetectable in their study due to their small sample size.

Thus, on the basis of implicit leadership theory, notions of status and relational norms, and Glomb and Welsh's (in press) study, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 4a: Followers who are lower than their leader in extraversion are significantly more satisfied with their leader than are followers who are higher in extraversion than their leader.

Hypothesis 4b: Followers who are lower than their leader in extraversion are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who are higher in extraversion than their leader.

Hypothesis 5a: Followers who are lower than their leader in conscientiousness are significantly more satisfied with their leader than are followers who are higher in conscientiousness than their leader.

Hypothesis 5b: Followers who are lower than their leader in conscientiousness are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who are higher in conscientiousness than their leader.

Hypothesis 6a: Followers who are lower than their leader in emotional stability are significantly more satisfied with their leader than are followers who are higher in emotional stability than their leader.

Hypothesis 6b: Followers who are lower than their leader in emotional stability are significantly more committed to the organization than are followers who are higher in emotional stability than their leader.

Method

Sample

My sample, 778 leader-follower dyads, is drawn from a national service organizational program. Participants in this program work for ten months within teams assigned to diverse service projects (e.g., tutoring, disaster relief). In return, participants receive an educational grant and a modest stipend.

The organization is located at five different campuses across the United States. Each campus has between 12 and 28 teams (102 teams total across the U.S.), with each team composed of approximately nine to 13 team members (followers) as well as a team leader. Each dyad in this study is composed of a leader and a different follower.

Team leaders are chosen by the organization specifically for a leadership position. Team leaders are in charge of leading and supervising his/her followers in all work activities. Team leaders work exclusively with their followers throughout the entire ten

months of the program, directing them through various work projects. Sixty percent of the team leaders participated in the organizational program previously as a team member.

In this sample, followers were 32.2% male and 67.8% female. Their ages ranged from 17 to 25 ($M = 20.81$ years, $SD = 1.93$). The racial/ethnic background of the followers is as follows: 2.8 % Asian, 5.2% Black/African American, 4.6% Hispanic/Latino, 82.6% White/Caucasian, .5% Indian/Native American, and 4.4% “other”. For leaders, 37.4% were male and 62.6% were female. Their ages ranged from 19 to 37 years old ($M = 23.66$ years, $SD = 2.21$). Their racial/ethnic background is: 4.4% Asian, 5.6% Black/African American, 85.6% White/Caucasian, and 4.4% “other”. Demographic information was missing from four team leaders.

Procedure

I collected longitudinal survey data from the team leaders and team members of this service organization at three time periods: (1) within the first two weeks following team formation, (2) at the halfway point – five months into the program, and (3) at the end of the ten months. For the purposes of this dissertation, I use data from Time 1 and Time 2 to test my hypotheses. I did so because team membership was changed for many teams between Time 2 and Time 3. Thus the number of followers in teams with their original leaders at Time 3 is substantially smaller than it is at Time 2.

At Time 1, either my advisor or I went to each of the campuses and administered the surveys in person. We explained the nature and purpose of the project to the participants. At this time period, background information, including personality, was assessed. At Time 2, I administered the surveys at two nearby campuses. For the three farther campuses, I mailed the surveys to the campuses. A member of the administrative

staff at each of these three locations held a campus wide meeting for members to complete the survey. Completed surveys were then mailed directly to me. At Time 2, I collected a variety of information about the teams, as well as measuring the followers' satisfaction with their leader and commitment to the organization. All surveys were coded so that Time 1 and Time 2 surveys could be matched.

For the first time period, 1022 followers from 102 teams returned completed surveys out of a possible 1078 followers, for a response rate of 95%. Ninety-four leaders from 102 teams also returned completed surveys out of possible 102 leaders, for a response rate of 92%. For the second time period, 867 followers from 100 teams returned completed surveys out of a possible 1002 followers, for a response rate of 87%. At the second time 92 team leaders (one from each team) out of 102 team leaders returned completed surveys for a response rate of 90%.

For a dyad to be included in this dissertation, each member of the pair (the leader and the follower) had to complete the personality information at Time 1. In addition, at Time 2, the follower had to rate his/her satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization. Therefore, for this dissertation, analyses were run on 778 dyads.

Measures

Personality. Three personality dimensions (extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability) of the leaders and followers were assessed at Time 1 of the survey administration. To assess these dimensions, as well as openness to experience and agreeableness, I used an adapted version of Goldberg's (1992) measure of the Big Five Factor Structure. For each of the dimensions, there were ten items for which participants (leaders and followers) were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed

with each of the statements. Sample items of the conscientiousness scale are “I am always prepared” and “I pay attention to details.” Sample items of the emotional stability scale are “I seldom feel blue” and “I am relaxed most of the time.” Sample items of the extraversion scale are “I am the life of the party” and “I don’t mind being the center of attention”. Goldberg (1992) reports a reliability of .79 for conscientiousness, .86 for emotional stability and .87 for extraversion. In this study, the reliability is .83 for conscientiousness, .86 for emotional stability, and .88 for extraversion. These items can be seen in Appendix A.

Follower Satisfaction with the Leader. At Time 2, each follower rated his/her satisfaction with the team leader. Adapted from Bass and Avolio’s MLQ measure (1990), followers rated their satisfaction with their leader using a 5 item measure. Followers were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each of the items, using a 5-point “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” response scale. Items include “I respect my team leader” and “My team leader works with me in a satisfactory way”. Bass and Avolio (1990) report the reliabilities for follower satisfaction with the leader across 4 samples as ranging from .90 to .94. In this dissertation, the reliability for this scale is .94. These items can be seen in Appendix A.

Follower Commitment to the Organization. At Time 2, each follower rated his/her commitment to the organization. Adapted from Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) followers rated their commitment to the organization using a four-item measure. Followers were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each of the items, using a 5-point “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” response scale. Sample items include “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization” and “The

organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me”. Mowday et al. (1979) reported reliabilities across nine samples ranging from .82 to .93. In this dissertation the reliability for this scale is .85.

Analyses

Control variables. In conducting my analyses, I originally controlled for a number of variables, including follower age, education, race, and gender, as well as leader age, education race, and gender, in addition to team size. However, when I ran the analyses with the control variables in the equations, I found no significant effects for these variables. Thus, because none of the control variables were significant I did not control for these variables in the analyses in this dissertation.

Group-mean centering. Because my interest in this dissertation is in within-variance and not between-variance I group mean centered the follower personality items by subtracting the mean of the group from the individual score. Therefore, the results will not be altered if some teams are higher than other teams in follower extraversion, for example. By group mean centering the personality dimensions I eliminate between-variance differences in follower personality. Thus, I group mean centered follower extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability.

Polynomial Regression. The choice of a congruence or fit index is critical, given that the measurement chosen will affect the results (Rounds, Dawis, & Lofquist, 1987). The type of fit assessed in this dissertation is actual fit– that is, a comparison between two separate entities (i.e., leader and follower) to determine their congruence. This is in contrast to perceived fit, which refers to an individual’s perception of how he or she fits with another individual (Turban & Jones, 1988). For example, a follower may perceive

that he/she is similar in extraversion to a leader, when actual measurement of the follower and leader's extraversion levels reveals otherwise. In this dissertation, only actual fit is measured.

There are two popular techniques for assessing actual fit. The first method involves one entity (i.e., the leader) moderating the effects of a second entity (i.e., the follower) on an outcome variable (Kristof, 1996). The second method, which is more common, involves reducing measures of each of the entities into a single score representing their congruence. Difference scores are an example of this method.

Used to indicate congruence or fit, difference scores typically consist of the algebraic $(X-Y)$, absolute $|X-Y|$, or squared difference $(X-Y)^2$ between measures of two entities (Edwards & Parry, 1993). However, despite their widespread use in congruence research, there are a number of substantive and methodological problems associated with the use of difference scores (Kristof, 1996). Edwards (1993, 1994) described some of these problems.

One problem associated with difference scores is that they discard information in two ways (Kristof, 1996). First, they discard information about the level or magnitude of the scores, so that a dyad with scores of "five" and "six" will receive the same congruence score as a dyad with scores at "166 and 167", regardless of the difference in magnitude between these two dyads. Further, these indices discard information about direction. For example, a dyad with scores "ten" and "15" will have the same difference score as a dyad with scores of "20" and "15" even though the score of "ten" is less than "15" and the score of "20" is greater than "15". Thus, the information about direction, as well as magnitude, is lost.

In addition, difference scores imply restrictive constraints on data without first testing these assumptions. For example, one constraint associated with these indices is that the coefficients on X and Y be of equal but opposite magnitude. That is, an equation using a difference scores as a predictor is: $Z = b_0 + b_1 (X - Y) + e$, where X and Y are component measures and Z is the outcome. If b_1 is distributed through the equation, the equation becomes: $Z = b_0 + b_1 X - b_1 Y + e$, with $b_1 X$ and $b_1 Y$ equal in magnitude but opposite in sign (Edwards, 2002). Constraints such as these are rarely substantiated by the actual data (Kristof, 1996).

In light of these issues, an alternative method for assessing congruence is proposed. This technique, referred to as polynomial regression, was initially described by Cronbach (1958). However, it is only recently that the technique has been further developed and has begun to be used by congruence researchers (Edwards 1993, 1994; Edwards & Parry, 1993).

Polynomial regression equations consist of a separate measurement of the two entities (i.e. leader and follower) supplemented by a higher order term which depicts the hypothesized relationship (Edwards, 1993). This equation for leader X and follower Y yields five separate terms: X, Y, X^2 , Y^2 , and $X * Y$ (Kristof, 1996). Thus, the hypothesized congruence will be tested by the following equation: $Z = b_0 + b_1(X) + b_2(Y) + b_3(X^2) + b_4(X * Y) + b_5(Y^2) + e$. Such a technique allows for the three-dimensional relationship that exists between paired entities and an outcome measure to be revealed.

The three dimensional surfaces associated with polynomial regression “invites researchers to develop and test hypotheses regarding the effects of congruence that take

into account the full range of both component measures” (Edwards, 2002, p. 360). That is, this technique allows researchers to test questions such as “Do outcomes differ if a leader is higher on conscientiousness than the follower compared to if the follower is higher on conscientiousness than the leader?” These types of questions cannot be answered with difference scores.

However, despite the advantages of this technique, polynomial regression equations also have limitations. For example, this procedure requires a very large sample size because of the degrees of freedom required (Edward, 1993). However, because of my large sample size this was not a problem in this dissertation. In addition, the coefficients of the regression equation are difficult to interpret, which has been one of the main reasons this technique is not more frequently used. A recent methodology, however, referred to as response surface methodology (Edwards, 1994) makes it possible to see the hypothesized relationship associated with the equations in three-dimensional space. This methodology aids in the interpretation of three-dimensional surfaces depicting the relationship between two predictors and an outcome variable (Edwards, 2002). In this dissertation I employed the use of response surface methodology, which allowed me to graph the hypothesized relationships.

As I was able to address and resolve the limitations associated with polynomial regression analysis, I used polynomial regression equations for assessing congruence between a leader and a follower in this dissertation. Given that the direction of the personality differences was important in this study it did not make sense to use difference scores.

To test each of the competing hypotheses I proposed, I tested a progression of higher order equations (null, linear, quadratic) to determine which model explained the most variance in the dependent variable. The equation for the null model was $Z = b_0 + e$, and the linear model equation was $Z = b_0 + b_1(X) + e$. The quadratic equation was $Z = b_0 + b_1(X) + b_2(Y) + b_3(X^2) + b_4(X * Y) + b_5(Y^2) + e$. In these equations, Z = the dependent variable (follower satisfaction with the leaders or follower commitment to the organization), X = follower personality (extraversion, conscientiousness, or emotional stability), and Y = leader personality (extraversion, conscientiousness, or emotional stability). If the linear model was found to be significant over the null model, then the next step was to test the higher order equation – the quadratic equation to see if there existed a more complex relationship. The quadratic model was the model that tested the effects of the interaction of the leader and follower's personalities. If the quadratic equation was significant this suggested that the linear model was not sufficiently complex to explain and capture the effects. If the quadratic model was found to be significant, the relationship was displayed in a three-dimensional graph with surface response methodology. It is worth noting that the degrees of freedom associated with the X^2 test used in this dissertation refers to the number of additional parameters added into the model (Singer, 1998).

Hierarchical Linear Modeling. In this dissertation, the leader-follower dyads are nested within teams. Thus, to account for the hierarchical structure of the data, and because my interest is in within-team effects (as opposed to between-team effects) I conducted the polynomial regressions within hierarchical linear modeling (HLM). This method allowed me to deal with the lack of independence that arose from having each

supervisor be in more than one leader-follower dyad. That is, because each team was composed of nine to 13 followers and one leader, the leader of that team was the leader in each of the nine to 13 leader-follower dyads.

I analyzed my data with SAS and the proc mixed command for hierarchical linear modeling (Singer, 1998). Kreft and De Leeuw (1998) noted that within HLM the concept of explained variance or R^2 becomes complicated. For example, when the change in R^2 (ΔR^2) is calculated by subtracting the variance of the new model (i.e. the linear model) from the variance of the null model, as was the case in this dissertation, it is not unusual for there to be negative multiple correlation coefficients. Thus, Kreft and De Leeuw (1998) suggested that researchers not place too much emphasis on calculations of explained variance (total, within or between) in HLM.

Results

Table 1 presents the reliabilities, means and standard deviations for the variables used in this dissertation. Table 2 presents the intercorrelations among these variables. It is important to note that the follower personality variables displayed in Tables 1 and 2 are not group mean centered. Further, I disaggregated leader personality by assigning the leader's personality scores to each follower of his/her team. This allowed for an assessment of the individual level correlations among the variables. However, the correlational results may be misleading as they do not reflect the fact that individuals are nested within teams – hence, effectively nested within leaders.

Null Model

Before I tested the linear, and quadratic models I first tested the null model for follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. I

calculated the ICC (1) for each model to assess the extent to which the dependent variables varied between-teams versus within-teams. ICC(1) assesses the amount of between-group variability. ICC(1) values of .05 to .20 are typical values for field research (Bliese, 2000). In this dissertation, the ICC(1) for the null model predicting follower satisfaction with the leader was .45. This means that 45% of the variance in follower satisfaction with the leader was between-teams and 55% was within-teams. The ICC(1) for the null model predicting follower commitment to the organization is .24. This means that 24% of the variance in predicting follower commitment to the organization was between-teams and 76% was within-teams.

Extraversion

Hypotheses 1a and 1b, based on similarity attraction theory, predicted that leader-follower similarity in extraversion would be positively related with follower satisfaction with the leader, and positively related to follower commitment with the organization. However, Hypotheses 4a, based on implicit leadership theory, predicted that followers who were lower than their leader in extraversion, would be more satisfied with the leader than followers who were higher than their leader in extraversion. Similarly, Hypotheses 4b predicted that followers who were lower than their leader in extraversion would be more committed to the organization than followers who were higher than their leader in extraversion.

I first tested the relationship between leader-follower extraversion fit and follower satisfaction with the leader (Hypotheses 1a and 4a). Table 3 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. While the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2 (2) = 118.2, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2 (3) = 4.4, p > .05$,

$\Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the results revealed that the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could be interpreted. Therefore, both Hypotheses 1a and 4a were not supported: leader-follower extraversion fit was not significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model indicated that there was a significant main effect for follower extraversion ($b = .09$, $t(686) = 1.94$, $p \leq .05$). Thus, follower extraversion was positively related to satisfaction with the leader. In short, the more extraverted the follower, the greater his/her satisfaction with the leader.

Hypothesis 1b and 4b examined the relationship between leader-follower extraversion fit and follower commitment to the organization. Table 4 displays the progression of testing higher order equations for these hypotheses. Although the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 92.2$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .02$) the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -6.2$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Therefore, both Hypotheses 1b and 4b were not supported: leader-follower extraversion fit was not significantly related to follower commitment to the organization.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model indicated that there was a significant main effect for follower extraversion ($b = .10$, $t(686) = 2.77$, $p = .01$), indicating that follower extraversion is positively related to commitment to the organization. Therefore, the more extraverted the follower, the greater his/her commitment to the organization.

Conscientiousness

Hypotheses 2a and 2b predicted that leader-follower similarity in conscientiousness would be positively related with follower satisfaction with the leader, and positively related to follower commitment to the organization, respectively. On the other hand, Hypotheses 5a and 5b predicted that followers who were lower than their leaders in conscientiousness, would be more satisfied with their leaders and more committed to the organization than followers who were higher than their leader in conscientiousness, respectively.

I first tested the relationship between leader-follower conscientiousness fit and follower satisfaction with the leader (Hypotheses 2a and 2b). Table 5 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Results revealed that while the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 116.6, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -2.5, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Therefore, neither Hypothesis 2a nor 5a was supported: leader-follower conscientiousness fit was not significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader. Further, the linear model did not depict any significant main effects between follower conscientiousness and satisfaction with the leader.

Hypothesis 2b and 5b examined the relationship between leader-follower conscientiousness fit and follower commitment to the organization. Table 6 displays the progression of testing higher order equations for these hypotheses. While the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 98.6, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -.02, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .01$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and

neither Hypothesis 2b nor 5b were supported: leader-follower conscientiousness fit was not significantly associated with follower commitment to the organization.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model did indicate that there was a significant main effect for follower conscientiousness ($b = .16$, $t(685) = 3.55$, $p < .01$), indicating that follower conscientiousness was positively related to commitment to the organization. That is, the more conscientious a follower, the greater his/her commitment to the organization.

Emotional Stability

The final set of competing hypotheses examined the relationship of leader-follower emotional stability fit with follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. Hypotheses 3a and 3b predicted that leader-follower similarity in emotional stability would be positively related with follower satisfaction with the leader, and positively related to follower commitment to the organization. On the other hand, Hypotheses 6a and 6b, predicted that followers who were lower than their leaders in emotional stability would be more satisfied with their leaders and more committed to the organization than followers who were higher in emotional stability than their leader.

First, I tested the relationship between leader-follower emotional stability fit and follower satisfaction with the leader (Hypotheses 3a and 6a). Table 7 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Although results revealed that while the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 120.1$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -6.8$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not

be interpreted. Therefore, Hypotheses 3a and 6a were not supported: leader-follower emotional stability fit was not significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model did indicate a significant main effect for follower emotional stability ($b = .10$, $t(685) = 2.20$, $p < .05$), indicating that follower emotional stability was positively related to follower satisfaction with the leader. Thus, the more emotionally stable a follower, the greater his/her satisfaction with the leader.

Hypotheses 3b and 6b examined the association between leader-follower emotional stability fit and follower commitment to the organization. Table 8 displays the progression of testing higher order equations for these hypotheses. While the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 90.1$, $p < .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -8.5$, $p > .05$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, neither Hypothesis 3b nor 6b was supported. Leader-follower emotional stability fit was not significantly associated with follower commitment to the organization.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model indicated that there was a significant main effect for follower emotional stability ($b = .09$, $t(685) = 2.36$, $p < .05$). Follower emotional stability was positively related to commitment to the organization. Therefore, the more emotionally stable a follower, the greater his/her commitment to the organization.

Post-Hoc Analyses

Because of the lack of significant leader-follower personality fit findings, I tested the relationship between leader-follower personality fit on satisfaction with the leader and

follower commitment to the organization with the other two personality dimensions of the five-factor model, agreeableness and openness to experience. I originally did not include these dimensions in my analyses because they are not as strongly associated with leadership as the other dimensions, and because past leader-follower personality fit studies have tended to focus primarily on extraversion, conscientiousness and emotional stability. However given the lack of findings I examined the association of leader-follower personality fit for these two dimensions with the two dependent variables.

Agreeableness. Agreeableness refers to an individual's tendency to be cooperative, trustworthy, and to follow directions (Barrick et al., 2001). I tested whether or not leader-follower agreeableness fit was positively related with follower satisfaction with the leader. Table 9 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Although results revealed that the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 121.3, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -1.9, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Therefore, leader-follower agreeableness fit was not significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model did indicate that there was a significant main effect for follower agreeableness ($b = .15, t(685) = 2.29, p < .05$), indicating that follower agreeableness was positively related to follower satisfaction with the leader. That is, the more agreeable a follower was, the more he/she was satisfied with his/her leader.

Next, I tested the relationship between leader-follower agreeableness fit and the other dependent variable, follower commitment to the organization. Table 10 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Although results revealed that the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 131.1, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -1.1, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Therefore, leader-follower agreeableness fit was not significantly related to follower commitment to the organization.

Although the quadratic model was not significant, the linear model did indicate that there was a significant main effect for follower agreeableness ($b = .38, t(685) = 6.84, p < .0001$), indicating that if a follower was high on agreeableness he/she was more likely to be committed to the organization.

Openness to Experience. The personality dimension, openness to experience which is also referred to as intellectance, describes qualities such as creativity and unconventionality (Barrick et al., 2001). I tested whether or not leader-follower openness fit was associated with follower satisfaction with the leader. Table 11 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Although results revealed that while the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 117.2, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -2.6, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model could not be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Leader-follower openness fit was not significantly associated with follower satisfaction with the leader. Further, the linear model did not depict any significant main effects between follower openness and satisfaction with the leader.

Next, I tested the relationship between leader-follower openness fit and the other dependent variable, follower commitment to the organization. Table 12 displays the progression of testing higher order equations. Although results revealed that the linear model was significant, ($\chi^2(2) = 85.5, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .01$), the quadratic model was not ($\chi^2(3) = -1.6, p > .05, \Delta R^2 = .00$). Thus, the linear model cannot be rejected and therefore the quadratic model, and the corresponding response surface graph, could not be interpreted. Leader-follower openness fit was not significantly related to follower commitment to the organization. Further, the linear model did not depict any significant relationships between follower openness and follower commitment to the organization.

Follower Personality. Results revealed several main effects for follower personality. Specifically, follower extraversion, emotional stability and agreeableness were significantly related to satisfaction with the leader. Follower extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability and agreeableness were significantly related to follower commitment to the organization.

I tested the overall relationship of follower personality to follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. To do so, I regressed each of the outcome variables on all five follower personality dimensions. For satisfaction with the leader, results revealed that follower personality as a whole explains 1.3% of within-team variation. As shown in Table 13, only emotional stability was significantly related with follower satisfaction with the leader ($b = .10, t(720) = 2.12, p < .05$). For follower commitment to the organization, results revealed that follower personality as a whole explains 8.2% of the within-team variance. As displayed in Table 14 follower conscientiousness ($b = .12, t(721) = 2.75, p = .01$) and follower agreeableness ($b = .35,$

$t(721) = 6.02, p < .0001$) were significantly positively related with follower commitment to the organization.

Discussion

In this dissertation I attempted to elucidate why the findings of leader-follower personality fit research are inconclusive. I suggested that (a) testing competing hypotheses about the relationship of supplementary fit with follower outcomes as compared to the relationship between directional, complementary personality fit and follower outcomes (b) using a well-established measure of personality, the five-factor model (Goldberg, 1992), (c) analyzing the data with polynomial regression analyses and using a large sample size as required by this technique, and (d) using two important and arguably proximal outcomes variables, such as follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization, would help to make clearer previous inconclusive findings about the relationship between leader-follower personality fit and follower outcomes. I found, however, no significant relationship between leader-follower personality fit and my dependent variables, follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. Given the lack of support for my hypotheses, I suggest possible explanations for these findings, and consider how future research could improve upon the present dissertation.

Leader-Follower Personality Fit

In this dissertation, I tested whether having similar personalities (supplementary fit), or dissimilar personalities (with the leader being higher on positive personality traits) (directional, complementary fit) would lead to more positive follower outcomes. Specifically, I examined whether supplementary or directional, complementary fit for the

personality characteristics of extraversion, conscientiousness, or emotional stability was associated with greater follower satisfaction with the leader and greater follower commitment to the organization. My results, however, suggested that neither type of fit was significantly related to the outcome variables.

I expected my dissertation to clarify what type of fit (supplementary or complementary) was related to more positive results, in terms of follower outcomes. Because I tested competing hypotheses only one type of hypothesis (supplementary or complementary fit) could be supported. However, neither type of hypothesis was supported. Instead, the study revealed no difference between the relationships of supplementary and complementary fit with follower outcomes. Indeed, leader-follower personality fit did not seem to have any significant relationship with the two follower outcomes, follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. Thus, I consider why I did not find a relationship between leader-follower personality fit and follower satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization and what these nonsignificant findings suggest for future research.

One possible explanation for the lack of significant findings may be that I was not assessing the traits that mattered (personality or otherwise) to the follower in his/her evaluation of a leader. That is, perhaps the personality dimensions that were assessed (extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability) are not the dimensions that matter to followers in their satisfaction with a leader or in their commitment to an organization. This may be particularly the case with respect to the lack of findings regarding complementary personality fit. Recall that a follower's implicit leadership theories "...represent cognitive structures or schemas specifying traits and behaviors that

followers expect from leaders” (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004, p. 293). Further, recall that the definition of complementary fit is that each person possesses characteristics that the other lacks *and needs* (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Thus, the follower’s perception of what traits he/she expects from a leader is crucial.

In this dissertation, I chose to assess leader-follower personality fit on the dimensions of extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability because these traits are associated with leadership (Offerman et al., 1994). That is, in the United States, these are traits that leaders are typically thought to possess. I therefore hypothesized that followers would be more satisfied with and more likely to be committed to an organization if they either were similar on these traits with their leader, or if their leader possessed more of these leaderlike characteristics. Yet, my results did not support these hypotheses.

Although these traits are associated with leadership, it is possible that these traits were not part of the follower’s implicit leadership theory and/or were not qualities that the follower’s deemed as critical and necessary for being a good leader. For example, a follower may not place a great deal of importance on introversion/extraversion. Thus, even if the follower identifies extraversion as a characteristic associated with leadership, if this trait is not important to the follower, the leader’s level of extraversion in relation to the follower’s level of extraversion is unlikely to affect the follower’s satisfaction with the leader or commitment to the organization. Therefore, regardless if the follower and leader are both outgoing and sociable (supplementary extraversion fit) or if the follower is quiet and reserved and the leader is gregarious (directional, complementary extraversion fit), personality fit would not be related to the follower’s satisfaction with

the leader or commitment to the organization. Thus, the lack of findings may be because the dimensions assessed were not the traits seen as crucial to being a leader in the follower's mind. For example, perhaps followers think traits such as adaptability and honesty are more critical leadership characteristics instead of conscientiousness or emotional stability.

Researchers interested in leader-follower fit, therefore, should first assess what traits followers deem critical in a leader and then measure the relationship of leader-follower fit on those dimensions with follower outcomes. It is only by identifying such traits that researchers can then seek to understand whether being similar to the leader on critical traits, or having leaders whom possess more of these necessary traits is associated with better follower outcomes. This type of research may lead to better understanding of leader-follower fit.

Another explanation may be that I did not find the results I expected because I assessed *actual* personality fit rather than *perceived* personality fit. My decision to assess actual rather than perceived personality fit was based on data availability. However, past research (e.g., Ferris & Judge, 1991) found perceived similarity to more consistently predict work outcomes than actual similarity. Strauss and colleagues (2001), testing the effects of actual and perceived similarity for the same personality dimensions used in this dissertation, found no results for actual similarity but significant results for perceived personality similarity. Thus, future researchers may want to assess perceived similarity as it may be that "people react on the bases of perceptions of personality, not reality per se" (Ferris & Judge, 1991, p.464).

In addition, my lack of significant findings for leader-follower personality fit may be associated with my choice of personality measure. I assessed personality with Goldberg's (1992) measure of the five-factor model of personality. This measure assesses the five factors of personality as a whole, rather than the facet level of personality. That is, while extraversion is a factor, dominance and sociability are facets of extraversion. In this dissertation, however, given the personality measure I used, I was unable to assess this facet-level of personality. It may be that the factors I assessed were too broad to capture a significant relationship, and that leader-follower facet-level personality fit may be important. Future researchers may want to look at leader-follower personality fit at the facet-level.

Along these lines, it may be that instead of personality fit, the answer to the question of why followers may be satisfied/dissatisfied with the same leader or committed/not committed to the organization the leader represents, has to do with the different expectations a follower holds and whether or not the leader meets those expectations. These may be expectations of things such as the leader's work style or the relationship between a follower and a leader. For example, one follower may expect a leader to take an interest in his/her personal life, while another follower expects that the leader will focus only on his/her work and not interfere or question the employee about his/her personal life. If this is an important leader expectation for a follower, followers may be differentially satisfied with the same leader, depending on how the leader fulfills their expectations. Or, one follower may expect a leader to clearly outline his/her work objectives and projects and check in regularly with the employee, while another follower expects a great deal of autonomy from a leader. If these followers work for a leader who

micromanages, one follower is likely to be satisfied with the leader and committed to the organization, while the other follower may be less satisfied and less committed to the organization. Thus, researchers may want to consider the relationship between follower expectations and how leaders meet these expectations with important follower outcomes such as follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) research (e.g., Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975) does consider how the leader and follower's relationship affects important organizational outcomes. This research is based on the idea that leaders and followers form different relationships over time, with closer relationships associated with greater outcomes for the individuals involved. LMX researchers are beginning to examine the antecedents of these different relationships, and are considering leader and follower characteristics such as personality traits. Bauer and Green (1996), for example, found that positive affectivity similarity contributed to LMX. Thus, future researchers may want to examine the role of leader-follower personality fit and LMX.

However, given the lack of findings in this study, it is worth considering that leader-follower personality fit is simply not significantly associated with follower outcomes. While the results in this dissertation were contrary to my hypotheses, they are not entirely surprising given the findings of past leader-follower personality studies. Strauss and colleagues (2001), testing the relationship between leader-follower supplementary personality fit and follower performance evaluations, using the same personality dimensions as I tested in this dissertation (extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability) and the same statistical technique (polynomial regression analyses),

did not find any significant associations. Bauer and Green (1996), testing the relationship between leader-follower positive affectivity supplementary fit and follower outcomes, found that leader-follower positive affectivity supplementary fit was positively related to follower performance, but not to leader delegation to a follower.

Glomb and Welsh (in press), in the only other study I am aware of that examined leader-follower complementary personality fit, found some support for their hypothesis that differences between the leader and follower in control traits, with the leader being higher, would be related to higher follower satisfaction with the leader. They did not however, find a significant relationship between leader-follower fit and the other two outcomes, follower organizational citizenship behavior and work withdrawal. In fact, of the studies testing the relationship between leader-follower personality fit and follower outcomes, only Deluga (1998) completely supported for his hypothesis that leader-follower conscientiousness similarity would be positively related with follower in-role behavior.

Thus, although my dissertation added to each of these studies in ways that I hoped would further elucidate these inconclusive findings, my results do not differ greatly from the findings of previous leader-follower personality fit studies. Given the large sample size and statistical technique employed in this dissertation, if leader follower personality fit truly affected these outcomes it is likely that I would have detected a relationship in my analyses. Therefore, given my lack of findings and the results of previous studies, it may be that leader-follower personality fit simply is not significantly associated with follower outcomes such as follower satisfaction with the leader or follower commitment

to the organization. Leader-follower personality fit appears not to be a fruitful avenue for further research.

Personality Main Effects

The focus of my dissertation was on leader-follower personality fit. I expected to find relationships between the interaction of leader and follower personalities and the two follower outcomes assessed, follower satisfaction with the leader and commitment to the organization. Instead the only, albeit few, significant findings of this dissertation were main effects of the follower's personality. Specifically, when I tested all five follower personality predictors in a simultaneous regression I found that followers who were emotionally stable were more satisfied with their leader and that followers who were conscientious and agreeable were more likely to be committed to the organization.

While not hypothesized, these follower main effects of personality are not surprising. Emotionally stable individuals are calm and can think clearly and are able to appreciate their leader's efforts rather than being caught up in a their own anxieties and concerns. Conscientiousness is well-known as the dimension of the five-factor model that is consistently related to job performance across different sample groups and criterion types (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Although the criterion in this dissertation is organizational commitment, it is not surprising that conscientiousness is significantly related to an important follower outcome. Further, as agreeable individuals are trustful, compliant and cooperative (Barrick et al., 2001) it is not surprising that agreeable followers are likely to be committed to the organization that they work for.

These results may have practical implications. Antonioni & Park (2001) note that organizations often assess employees' personalities when making selection and

assignment decisions. The findings of this study suggest that organizations may want to consider an employee's level of emotional stability, conscientiousness and agreeableness in such decisions. Further, these findings suggest that even if a follower who is emotionally stable, conscientious or agreeable is placed under a leader who is neurotic, for example, he/she is still likely to be committed to the organization or satisfied with the leader. Thus, including personality measures in the selection and assignment process might be a good way to maintain and enhance employee commitment to the organization.

The few significant main effects found in this dissertation suggest that whether or not a follower is committed to an organization is affected by his/her own personality, but not by the leader's personality. The leader's personality was also found to not be significantly related to follower satisfaction with the leader. Thus, leader personality is inconsequential with regards to follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization.

One might think that this is surprising considering that in a meta-analysis of personality and leadership conducted by Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002), the results revealed that extraversion, conscientiousness, openness, and emotional stability are "useful traits in relation to leadership" (p. 774). However, although Judge and colleagues (2002) report correlations such as .31 for extraversion and leadership or -.24 for neuroticism and leadership, these are corrected correlations and hence are larger than the results found in my dissertation. The uncorrected correlations in this study (i.e. .22 for extraversion and -.17 for neuroticism) are smaller. Further the leadership criterion used in this meta-analysis is a combination of leadership emergence (whether someone is seen as being leaderlike in a situation where there is no clear leader) and leader

effectiveness (how effective a leader is in helping his/her followers achieve goals).

Given that there are clearly designated leaders in my sample, leader emergence is not similar to the follower outcome variables assessed in this dissertation. Leadership effectiveness is somewhat similar to satisfaction with the leader, but is not as related to follower commitment to the organization. Thus, my lack of significant findings between leader personality and follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization are not completely surprising.

Overall, I found many nonsignificant results for relationships I expected to be significant. I will now discuss the limitations of this study.

Limitations

This dissertation is not without limitations. The main limitation stems from the use of an organizational sample where members of the organization live and work together and thus, they differ from the typical student (e.g. Bauer & Green, 1996) or organizational sample (e.g., Strauss et al., 2001) more commonly used in leader-follower fit studies. Thus, there may be some qualities of this sample that are unique and limit the generalizability of these results.

For example, the notion of commitment in a ten month long program may take on a different meaning than in a typical work setting. That is, given that participants in this organization knew that their interactions would end at a defined time period, they may have been able to look past personality “misfits” and instead focus on the work. Therefore, given the relatively short time period that organization members would be working together, leader-follower personality may simply not have mattered in the follower’s commitment to the organization or satisfaction with the leader.

In addition, because this sample was comprised of individuals willing to give up 10 months of their lives to focus on national service for very minimal monetary compensation, there may be restriction of range in the measures given the very strong situation. Future researchers should use other, more typical organizational samples.

Another limitation may be that I assessed the role of leader-follower personality fit in influencing only two outcomes, and both outcomes were measured from the follower's point of view. It may be that leader-follower personality fit does not play a role in a follower's assessment of his/her satisfaction with a leader or commitment to the organization, but a leader may take personality fit into consideration when making assessments of the follower. For example, in Deluga's (1998) study, significant results were found for the relationship between leader-follower conscientiousness similarity and leader-rated follower in-role behavior. Future research may want to examine the relationship between leader-follower personality fit and other outcomes, including outcomes assessed from the leader's viewpoint.

Additionally, there is some consideration in the personality research about applicant faking on personality tests, and how this affects the validity of the measure (i.e. Douglas, McDaniel, & Snell, 1996). Thus, I note my use of an objective measure of personality in this dissertation as a possible limitation of the study.

Conclusion

The implications of this dissertation are that leader-follower personality fit may not be a fruitful avenue for further research. That is, the results of this study suggest that leader-follower personality fit is not significantly related to follower outcomes. I found no relationship between leader-follower fit (supplementary and complementary fit) for

extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability with follower satisfaction with the leader and follower commitment to the organization. I did, however, find that two follower personality dimensions have a main effect on follower commitment to the organization. Future researchers should consider pursuing other predictors that would distinguish why some followers under a leader are committed to the organization and satisfied with the leader while other followers under the same leader are less committed to the organization and less satisfied with the leader. The results of this dissertation suggest that leader-follower personality fit, whether supplementary or complementary fit, is not the answer.

Table 1
Reliabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations

	Alpha	Mean	SD
Follower Extraversion	.88	3.41	.68
Follower Conscientiousness	.83	3.52	.58
Follower Emotional Stability	.86	3.36	.66
Leader Extraversion	.88	3.47	.60
Leader Conscientiousness	.83	3.64	.51
Leader Emotional Stability	.86	3.21	.58
Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2	.94	3.69	1.04
Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2	.85	4.23	.75

Table 2: Intercorrelations Among Variables (N ranges from 778 to 1021)
 Correlations At .06 And Above Are Significant At .05 Level, While Correlations At .10
 And Above Are Significant At .01 Level

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Follower Extraversion								
2. Follower Conscientiousness	-.07							
3. Follower Emotional Stability	.25	.22						
4. Leader Extraversion	-.06	.01	.01					
5. Leader Conscientiousness	-.004	.001	.01	.13				
6. Leader Emotional Stability	.01	-.02	.03	.13	.11			
7. Follower Satisfaction with the Leader Time2	.06	.06	.11	.02	-.05	.08		
8. Follower Commitment to the Organization Time2	.11	.11	.10	.04	-.08	.02	.30	

Table 3: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 1a And 4a – Extraversion Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	3.54	7.70	<.0001	5.81	2.66	.01
Follower Extraversion	.09	1.94	.05	.23	.92	.36
Leader Extraversion	.04	.32	.75	-1.29	-1.01	.32
Follower Extraversion Squared				-.09	-1.73	.08
Follower Extraversion * Leader Extraversion				-.05	-.67	.50
Leader Extraversion Squared				.19	1.04	.30
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 4: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 1b And 4b – Extraversion Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.04	15.10	<.0001	6.51	5.17	<.0001
Follower Extraversion	.10	2.77	.01	.001	0.00	.99
Leader Extraversion	.05	.64	.52	-1.42	-1.94	.06
Follower Extraversion Squared				.02	.50	.62
Follower Extraversion * Leader Extraversion				.03	.50	.62
Leader Extraversion Squared				.21	2.01	.05
Change in R ²	.02			.00		

Table 5: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 2a And 5a –
Conscientiousness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.10	7.53	<.0001	2.85	1.10	.28
Follower Conscientiousness	.06	1.06	.30	.69	1.79	.07
Leader Conscientiousness	-.11	-.77	.44	.60	.42	.68
Follower Conscientiousness Squared				-.11	-1.52	.13
Follower Conscientiousness * Leader Conscientiousness				-.18	-1.69	.09
Leader Conscientiousness Squared				.20	-.49	.62
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 6: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 2b And 5b –
Conscientiousness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.58	14.18	<.0001	4.32	2.75	.01
Follower Conscientiousness	.16	3.55	.0004	1.07	3.33	.001
Leader Conscientiousness	-.10	-1.17	.24	.05	.05	.96
Follower Conscientiousness Squared					-1.11	.27
Follower Conscientiousness * Leader Conscientiousness					-2.89	.004
Leader Conscientiousness Squared					-.16	.87
Change in R ²	.00			.01		

Table 7: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 3a And 6a – Emotional Stability Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	3.29	7.51	<.0001	5.58	3.55	.00
Follower Emotional Stability	.10	2.20	.03	.14	.52	.60
Leader Emotional Stability	.12	.91	.36	-1.39	-1.38	.17
Follower Emotional Stability Squared				.00	.05	.96
Follower Emotional Stability * Leader Emotional Stability				-.01	-.16	.87
Leader Emotional Stability Squared				.24	1.51	.13
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 8: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Hypothesis 3b And 6b – Emotional Stability Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.08	15.63	<.0001	3.35	3.43	.0001
Follower Emotional Stability	.09	2.36	.02	-.04	-.18	.86
Leader Emotional Stability	.04	.50	.62	.53	.85	.40
Follower Emotional Stability Squared				-.05	-1.26	.21
Follower Emotional Stability * Leader Emotional Stability				.04	.52	.60
Leader Emotional Stability Squared				-.08	-.79	.43
Change in R ²	.00			.00		

Table 9: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses – Agreeableness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	3.31	4.38	<.0001	3.99	.70	.49
Follower Agreeableness	.15	2.29	.02	1.23	1.78	.08
Leader Agreeableness	.09	.49	.63	-.25	-.09	.93
Follower Agreeableness Squared				.07	.64	.52
Follower Agreeableness * Leader Agreeableness				-.25	-1.55	.12
Leader Agreeableness Squared				.04	.12	.90
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 10: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses – Agreeableness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.48	10.09	<.0001	.26	.08	.94
Follower Agreeableness	.38	6.84	<.0001	1.33	2.35	.02
Leader Agreeableness	-.07	-.63	.53	2.01	1.24	.21
Follower Agreeableness Squared				-.07	-.75	.45
Follower Agreeableness * Leader Agreeableness				-.23	-1.72	.09
Leader Agreeableness Squared				-.25	-1.29	.20
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 11: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses – Openness Fit Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.42	6.94	<.001	3.85	1.10	.27
Follower Openness	.03	.45	.65	.58	1.06	.29
Leader Openness	-.20	-1.16	.25	.10	.05	.96
Follower Openness Squared				.16	1.41	.16
Follower Openness * Leader Openness				-.14	-.99	.32
Leader Openness Squared				-.04	-.16	.87
Change in R ²	.03			.00		

Table 12: Test Of Progressive Higher Order Equations For Post Hoc Analyses – Openness Fit Predicting Follower Commitment to the Organization Time 2

	B Linear	t Linear	P Linear	B Quadratic	t Quadratic	P Quadratic
Intercept	4.19	10.91	<.0001	4.19	1.96	.05
Follower Openness	.02	.28	.78	.29	.65	.52
Leader Openness	.06	.06	.95	.03	.02	.98
Follower Openness Squared				-.21	-2.32	.02
Follower Openness * Leader Openness				-.08	-.65	.51
Leader Openness Squared				-.003	-.02	.98
Change in R ²	.01			.00		

Table 13: Test Of Follower Personality Dimensions Post Hoc Analyses – Predicting Follower Satisfaction With The Leader Time 2

	B	t	<i>P</i>
Intercept	3.67	47.35	<.0001
Follower Extroversion	.05	1.12	.26
Follower Conscientiousness	.04	.81	.42
Follower Emotional Stability	.10	2.12	.03
Follower Openness	-.00	-.07	.94
Follower Agreeableness	.10	1.40	.16

Table 14: Test Of Follower Personality Dimensions Post Hoc Analyses – Predicting Follower Commitment To The Organization Time 2

	B	t	<i>P</i>
Intercept	4.23	95.77	<.0001
Follower Extroversion	.07	1.78	.08
Follower Conscientiousness	.12	2.75	.01
Follower Emotional Stability	.03	.89	.38
Follower Openness	-.07	-1.38	.17
Follower Agreeableness	.35	6.02	<.0001

APPENDIX A

Extraversion

This subscale was adapted from Goldberg's (1992) Big-Five Factor Markers measure

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I am the life of the party
2. I feel comfortable around people
3. I don't like to talk a lot (reversed)
4. I keep in the background (reversed)
5. I start conversations
6. I have little to say (reversed)
7. I talk to a lot of different people at parties
8. I don't like to draw attention to myself (reversed)
9. I don't mind being the center of attention
10. I am quiet around strangers

Conscientiousness

This subscale was adapted from Goldberg's (1992) Big-Five Factor Markers measure

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I am always prepared
2. I leave my belongings around (reversed)
3. I pay attention to details
4. I make a mess of things (reversed)
5. I get chores done right away
6. I often forget to put things back in their proper place (reversed)
7. I like order
8. I shirk my duties (reversed)
9. I follow a schedule
10. I am precise in my work

Emotional Stability

This subscale was adapted from Goldberg's (1992) Big-Five Factor Markers measure

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I get stressed out easily (reversed)
2. I am relaxed most of the time
3. I worry about things (reversed)
4. I seldom feel blue
5. I am easily disturbed (reversed)
6. I get upset easily (reversed)
7. I change my mood a lot (reversed)

8. I have frequent mood swings (reversed)
9. I get irritated easily (reversed)
10. I often feel blue (reversed)

Agreeableness

This subscale was adapted from Goldberg's (1992) Big-Five Factor Markers measure

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I feel little concern for others (reversed)
2. I am interested in people
3. I insult people (reversed)
4. I sympathize with others' feelings
5. I am not interested in other people's problems (reversed)
6. I have a soft heart
7. I am not really interested in others (reversed)
8. I take time out for others
9. I feel others' emotions
10. I make people feel at ease

Openness to Experience

This subscale was adapted from Goldberg's (1992) Big-Five Factor Markers measure

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I have a rich vocabulary
2. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas (reversed)
3. I have a vivid imagination
4. I am not interested in abstract ideas (reversed)
5. I have excellent ideas
6. I do not have a good imagination (reversed)
7. I am quick to understand things
8. I use difficult words
9. I spend time reflecting on things
10. I am full of ideas

Satisfaction with the Leader

This scale was adapted from Bass and Avolio's MLQ measure (1990).

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I respect my team leader
2. My team leader has a very effective way of handling conflict within the team
3. My team leader uses methods of leadership that are satisfying
4. My team leader works with me in a satisfactory way
5. I trust my team leader

Follower Commitment to the Organization

This scale was adapted from Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979).

Participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization
3. Deciding to join this organization was a definite mistake on my part (reversed)
4. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me

References

- Allinson, C.W., Armstrong, S.J., & Hayes, J. (2001). The effects of cognitive style on leader-member exchange: A study of manager-subordinate dyads. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 201-220.
- Antonioni, D., & Park, H. (2001). The effects of personality similarity on peer ratings of contextual work behaviors. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 331-360.
- Asendorpf, J.B., & Wilpers, S. (1998). Personality effects on social relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1531-1544.
- Bacharach, S.B., Bamberger, P., & Mundell, B. (1993). Status inconsistency in organizations: From social hierarchy to stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 21-36.
- Baird, L.S., & Hamner, W.C. (1979). Individual versus systems rewards: Who's dissatisfied, why, and what is their likely response? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 783-792.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K., & Judge, T.A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9-30.
- Barry, B., & Stewart, G.L. (1997). Composition, process, and performance in self-managed groups: The role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 62-78.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free

Press.

- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development. Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Bauer, T.N., & Green, S.G. (1996). Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1538-1567.
- Bliese, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability. In K. Klein and S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations* (pp. 349-381). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Byrne, D. (1969). Attitude and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol 4, pp. 35-90). New York: Academic Press.
- Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cattell, R.B., & Nesselroade, J.R. (1967). Likeness and completeness theories examined by sixteen personality factor measures on stably and unstably married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 351-361.
- Clark, K.E., & Clark, M.B. (1990). Personality measures and leadership. In K.E. Clark, M.B. Clark, & R.R. Albright (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp. 49 – 55). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1958). Proposals leading to analytic treatment of social perception scores. In R. Tagiuri & L. Petrullo (Eds.), *Person perception and interpersonal behavior* (pp. 353-379). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W.J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to

- leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dansereau, F. & Yammarino, F. J. (2000). Within and between analysis: The variant paradigm as an underlying approach to theory building and testing. In K.J. Klein & S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations* (pp.425-466). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Deluga, R.J. (1998). Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group & Organization Management*, 23, 189-216.
- Douglas, E.F., McDaniel, M.A., & Snell, A.F. (1996, August). *The validity of non-cognitive measures decays when applicants fake*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, Cincinnati, OH.
- Edwards, J.R. (1993). Problems with the use of profile similarity indices in the study of congruence in organizational research. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 641-665.
- Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in org. behavior research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 58, 51-100.
- Edwards, JR. (2002). Alternatives to difference scores: Polynomial regression analysis and response surface methodology. In F. Drasgow & N. Schmitt (Eds.), *Measuring and Analyzing Behavior in Organizations: Advances in Measurement and Data Analysis* (pp. 350-400). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Edwards, J.R., & Parry, M.E. (1993). On the use of polynomial regression equations as

- an alternative to difference scores in organizational research. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1577-1613.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 293-310.
- Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T.A. (1991). Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. *Journal of Management*, 17, 447-488.
- Funder, D.C., & Colvin, C.R. (1988). Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship, agreement, and the accuracy of personality judgement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 149-158.
- Glomb, T.M., & Welsh, E.T. (in press). Can opposites attract? Personality heterogeneity in supervisor-subordinate dyads as a predictor of subordinate outcomes.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the big-five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26-42.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G.J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504.
- Holland, J.L. (1966). A psychological classification scheme for vocations and major fields. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13, 278-288.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jang, K.L., McCrae, R.R., Angleitner, A., Rieman, R., & Livesley, W.J. (1998).

- Heritability of facet-level traits in a cross-cultural twin sample: support for a hierarchical model of personality. *Journal of Personality traits and Social Psychology*, 74, 1556-1565.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.
- Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 589-607.
- Kreft, & De Leeuw, J. (1998). *Introducing Multilevel Modeling*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, Ca.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.
- Leonard, D., & Strauss, S. (1997). Putting your company's whole brain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 75, 110-121.
- Locke, K.D., & Horowitz, L.M. (1990). Satisfaction in interpersonal interactions as a function of similarity in level of dysphoria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 823-831.
- Lord, R.G. (1985). An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership perceptions and behavioral measurement in organizations. In B.W. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 7 (pp. 87-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. Jr. (1990). *Personality in adulthood*. New York: Guilford

Press.

- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277.
- Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 43-58.
- Olver, J.M., & Mooradian, T.A. (2003). Personality traits and personal values: A conceptual and empirical integration. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 109-125.
- Perry, E.L., Kulik, C.T., & Zhou, J. (1999). A closer look at the effects of subordinate-supervisor age differences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 341-357.
- Porter, L.M., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rounds, J.B., Dawis, R.V., & Lofquist, L.H. (1987). Measurement of person-environment fit and prediction of satisfaction in the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 297-318.
- Senger, J. (1971). Manager's perceptions of subordinates' competence as a function of personal value orientations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 14, 415-423.
- Shore, L.M., Cleveland, J.N., & Goldberg, C.B. (2003). Work attitudes and decisions as

- a function of manager age and employee age. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 529-537.
- Singer, J.D. (1998). Using sas proc mixed to fit multilevel models, hierarchical models, and individual growth models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 24, 323-355.
- Strauss, J.P., Barrick, M.R., & Connerley, M.L. (2001). An investigation of personality similarity effects (relational and perceived) on peer and supervisor ratings and the role of familiarity and liking. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 637-657.
- Taylor, S.E., & Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 193-210.
- Tsui, A.S., & O'Reilly, C.A. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 402-423.
- Turban, D.B., & Jones, A.P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: Types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 228-234.
- Vecchio, R.P., & Bullis, R.C. (2001). Moderators of the influence of supervisor-subordinate similarity on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 884-896.
- Williams, K. Y., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1998). Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20 (pp. 77-140). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Winch, Kstanes, & Kstanes. (1954). The theory of complementary needs in mate-selection: An analytic and descriptive study. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 241-249.
- Zaccaro, S.J., & Klimoski, R.J. (2001). The nature of organizational leadership. In S.J. Zaccaro & R.J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The Nature of Organizational Leadership* (pp. 3-41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.