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Abstract

Norm violations typically result in negative consequences and perceptions towards the transgressor; however, recent research has indicated that violating norms may result in positive outcomes if the transgressor was perceived as high status (Bellezza, Gino, & Keinan, 2014). Negotiators in a job hiring process might have their own set of social norms that they are expected to follow, such as the attire they should wear to a negotiation. A violation of one of these norms may have an impact on the perceptions of the job applicant, and thus, alter the negotiation process for a starting job offer. It was hypothesized that the qualifications of a job applicant would increase perceptions of power and competence and that the applicant would receive more favorable first offers than less qualified applicants. It was also hypothesized that there would be an interaction between non-conformity and resume qualifications on perceived power, perceived competence, and the value of a first offer. The data was collected from 240 participants from Amazon’s MTurk platform. Results indicated that having a profile that shows an applicant is highly qualified for a position received more favorable first offers and were perceived as more competent than unqualified applicants. Furthermore, there were interaction effects nonconformity and resume quality such that applicants who are unqualified and strongly deviate from expected norms received significantly worse first offers and are perceived as being incompetent relative to other conditions. The implications of these findings are discussed.
Introduction

In almost all facets of daily life, people are expected to behave and interact in ways that are congruent with previous personal experiences and with the prevailing social norms for the situation at hand (Crutchfield, 1955). People fall in line with social expectations in order to gain social acceptance and to avoid potential disapproval for being different (Levine & Marques, 2016). Recently, research has suggested that nonconformity, that is violating social norms, may be associated with positive perceptions in the right context (Bellezza, Gino, & Keinan, 2014). This research paper sought to build on Bellezza et al. (2014) and examined how surface level nonconformity could impact perceptions of a job applicant in a hiring process. Nonconforming applicants may be able to increase their power and competence levels in the eyes of the hiring manager, which could lead to being presented with a more favorable first offer.

Social Norms

Social norms are explicit or implicit rules that guide or constrain the behavior of group members without the need of enforcement by formal laws (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Social norms can also be defined as unofficial laws that are designed to guide behavior; however, there is no formal, set mechanism for creating penalties for breaking the rules. The norms dictate how an individual or group ought to behave in a certain situation (Asch, 1956; Crutchfield, 1955; Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004). Explicit social norms refer to norms that are generally outlined in a written document and are made available for everyone to see (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). A sign suggesting employees go outside when taking
a personal phone call in order to avoid disrupting other employees might be an example of an explicit social norm, as long as there is no formal organizational rule against talking on cell phones at work. Implicit social norms, on the other hand, are not formally codified through writing and emerge from day-to-day interactions between group members (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). People often follow implicit social norms without being fully aware that they are (Milgrim, 1963). For example, in the United States, most people automatically walk on the right side of the sidewalk or move to the right side when encountering someone walking at them. People generally conform to this simple, implicit social norm without even thinking about it and often encounter an awkward situation when this rule is broken.

Conforming to social norms, whether implicit or explicit, can be viewed as an adaptive behavior. Some people might conform to social norms because they are seeking group acceptance and social inclusion (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Other people might conform because it is easier to conform to norms than it is to deviate from the group and face possible sanctions (Asch, 1956; Crutchfield, 1955). Zimbardo (1973) and Milgram (1963) demonstrated the extreme lengths people will go to in order to conform to the social norms of the group, even at the cost of others. People are more likely to conform to social norms when their personal goals or values match up with behaviors espoused in the social norms (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004). The threat of being excluded from the group or the perception of consequences of violating a norm may also drive conformity (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004).
Violating Norms

However, not everyone conforms to the social norms all the time. People can purposely or unintentionally violate social norms, which often has consequences. Referring back to the sidewalk example, a person who does not move to the right side of the sidewalk when encountering an oncoming walker might bump into the other person or have an awkward “dance” to get past because the oncoming walker expected the person to follow the social norm of moving over. Someone leaving phone volume on during a movie, showing up late for a business meeting, or taking up two seats on a train are all examples of violations of basic social norms. It is important to note that violations occur in many different ways and may be associated with different perceptions of violation (van Kleef, Wanders, Stamkou, & Homan, 2015). Showing up late to a business meeting might be deemed a severe violation by a manager but not by other employees and overall, might be deemed more severe compared to taking up two seats on a train. Because violations of social norms can take on vast array of meanings and perceptions, this study looked at violations in a more general definition that was used by van Kleef et al. (2015). They defined norm violations as behaviors that infringe on one or more rules of proper conduct (van Kleef et al., 2015). A more colloquial definition for nonconformity is any behavior that does not follow what is expected (Nail, MacDonald, & Levy, 2000).

Norm violations can be classified based on the motive (Griskevicius, Goldstein, Mortensen, Cialdini, & Kenrick, 2006). Individuals who violate norms to maintain or improve their self-concept and social identity and who are trying to
resist the influence of norms are classified as seeking independence (Allen & Wilder, 1979; Nail et al., 2000). Independence nonconformity can be conceptualized as a behavior or belief that results when individuals give little weight to the norms of a group (Nail, 1986). Individuals who violate norms by rebelling against them are exhibiting anti-conformity (Nail et al., 2000). Anti-conformity behaviors provoke group conflict or attempt to distance the transgressor from unattractive others (Cooper & Jones, 1969; Hollander, 1975; Nail et al., 2000).

**Consequences of Violating Norms**

Violating a social norm can have an impact on both the transgressor and the other group members, and these interactions may contribute to the likelihood of future violations (van Kleef et al., 2015). Violators of social norms often feel emotional consequences of their actions, such as guilt or shame (Costarelli, 2005). As a result of the shame and/or guilt, violators may be more likely to conform in the future and decrease their tendencies to violate norms in order to avoid facing the negative feelings again (Carlsmith & Gross, 1969). A violation of social norms may also trigger a threat to the belonging of the group for the transgressor because they are acting in a way that is counter to the beliefs of the group (Prewitt-Freilino, Bosson, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2012). They may believe the group will ostracize them for the violation. People are typically uncomfortable when their group belonging is threatened, and they will take measures to reduce that threat, such as conforming to social norms and reducing violating behaviors (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).
While transgressors typically experience guilt and shame when violating norms, other group members may experience anger and blame towards the transgressor, even if the violation does not directly, personally impact them (Costarelli, 2005; Helweg-Larsen & LoMonaco, 2008). This finding may be due to the desire to maintain a positive group identity (van Kleef et al., 2015). A violation of norms may not impact a person directly, but it could impact the prestige or status of the group a person belongs to, which in turn triggers negative responses towards the violator (Reese, Steffens, & Jonas, 2013). The closer the transgression is to a person, the stronger the negative response towards the violator (Brauer & Chekroun, 2005). Group members may also attempt to place sanctions on the transgressor and try to exclude them from the group (Miller & Anderson, 1979).

While reactions to violations of social norms are often negative, there can be positive outcomes for the transgressor (van Kleef et al., 2015). Studies have revealed that norm violators may be perceived as having more power and a higher social status because they are not concerned with conforming to standards and do not fear the consequences that might come from violating the norms (Bellezza et al., 2014; van Kleef, Homan, Finkenauer, Gundemir, & Stamkou, 2011). Individuals wearing gym clothes in an upscale boutique were rated as having a higher social status than those wearing more appropriate, upscale clothing (Bellezza et al., 2014). Transgressors may also be given more power from group members as a result of a violation if the violation somehow benefits the group or certain group members (van Kleef, Homan, Finkenauer, Blaker, & Heerdink,
2012). For example, participants in a study reacted favorably and granted more power to a confederate who stole coffee from the experimenter and offered the coffee to the participant than when the participant either did not steal coffee or stole coffee but did not share it (van Kleef et al., 2012).

**Reasons for Norm Violations**

People typically violate norms because of social influences (van Kleef et al., 2015). The social context can be a very important determinant of whether a social norm will be followed or violated. For example, blue-collar workers were more likely to violate the safety norms of the organization if the overall safety climate of the workplace was ambivalent to safety procedures (Cavazza & Serpe, 2009). Another study demonstrated that drivers might be more likely to break traffic rules if they see or believe that other drivers are breaking those rules (Forward, 2009). These findings suggest that the strength of a social norm might be dictated by how well others follow the norm. If other members of the group are not perceived as placing a high importance on the social norm or are often violating the social norm, an individual may adopt a similar stance and be more likely to violate the same norm.

Individual differences may also contribute to the decision to violate a social norm (van Kleef et al., 2015). Forward (2009) found that drivers might violate traffic rules because they do not believe that the rules are appropriate. Perceptions of self-power may also impact the decision to follow a social norm, such that high power individuals may be more likely to violate social norms (van Kleef et al., 2008). High powered individuals may be more likely to interrupt
others, invade personal space, and claim credit for the work of others, among other behaviors (DePaulo & Friedman, 1998; Kipnis, 1972). Power may impact the perceived consequences of violating a norm or impact the perception of the norm itself based on the approach and inhibition theory of power (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003).

**Approach and Inhibition Theory**

The approach and inhibition theory suggests that contextual and dispositional factors interact to activate approach or inhibition behaviors (Keltner et al., 2003). The approach system is believed to regulate behaviors related to achievement, aggression and social attachment (Keltner et al., 2003). Approach processes can be activated by rewards and/or opportunities that encourage proactive pursuit of goals related to gaining those rewards (Keltner et al., 2003). The inhibition system, on the other hand, acts as threat reduction system, which is activated by threats, uncertainty, and perceived punishment (Keltner et al., 2003). Individuals who have their inhibition system activated may feel anxiety and adopt avoidance or vigilant behaviors to prevent and reduce possible punishment (Keltner et al., 2003). In terms of conforming to social norms, individuals who have their inhibitory system activated are more likely to conform to social norms because they want to avoid the possibility of threat or punishment that might come from violating the group norms, while individuals with approach behaviors activated might be more likely to violate norms if they believe it will help them reach their goals and rewards.
Approach/Inhibition theory and power. Approach and inhibition theory may explain why individuals with high and low power statuses behave differently. Power can generally be defined as the ability to be uninfluenced or as the ability to influence other parties (Galinsky, Magee, Gruenfeld, Whitson, & Liljenquist, 2008). High powered individuals may not fear violating a social norm because they believe that they have access to numerous resources that can help them deal with any consequences involved in violating the norm, so they are more likely to use approach behaviors (Stamkou & van Kleef, 2014). They are also more likely to ignore situational pressures and act in congruence with their dispositional inclinations (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001; Galinsky et al., 2008). Low powered individuals, however, use more inhibitive behaviors than high power individuals because they believe they are more susceptible to social constraints and punishments (Stamkou & van Kleef, 2014). Low power individuals do not possess the same level of access to material, social, and cultural resources and are then more susceptible to social threats and punishment (Keltner et al., 2003).

The relationship between power and norm violation may also be bidirectional (Stamkou & van Kleef, 2014). High powered individuals may be more likely to violate social norms and people who violate social norms may be seen as having more power (Stamkou & van Kleef, 2014). Certain behaviors may serve as a signal that indicates how much power an individual has. People who use more action or approach orientations may be perceived as having power because the orientation signals that they have the freedom to act according to their own volition (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003; Magee, 2009). Studies have
shown that volition may be a mediator between power and norm violations (van Kleef et al., 2011). When people who violate norms are perceived as having the freedom and autonomy to act as they see fit, they are perceived as having higher levels of power than when the autonomy is lacking (Stamkou & van Kleef, 2014).

**Signaling theory.** The benefits, and negatives, associated with nonconforming may be attributed to signaling theory (Bellezza et al., 2014). People often form judgments and make inferences about the status and competence of others based on easily observable signals (Magee, 2009; Ridgeway & Cornell, 2006). The clothes that people wear, the way people talk, and the items people choose to buy can all send signals about their status and competencies to others (Ridgeway & Cornell, 2006). People often use these cues to make sense of information asymmetry concerning others (Spence, 2002). The costlier and more observable a signal is, the more likely it is to be effective at swaying inferences about a person (Feltovich, Harbaugh, & To, 2002; Spence 1973). Nonconforming behaviors and violations of social norms are likely to be seen as costly and easily observable, which could strengthen the inferences made about the violation (Bellezza et al., 2014). Individuals who violate a norm send a visible cue that they are willing to violate a norm, which could signal inferences of power and competence (Bellezza et al., 2014). Violating a social norm can also be interpreted as a potentially costly signal because the transgressors risk alienating themselves from the social group and possibly face backlash.

Typically, high-status individuals get away with a larger degree of nonconformity compared to low-status individuals because they accumulate more
idiosyncrasy credits (Hollander, 1958; Phillips & Zuckerman, 2001). Essentially, high-status individuals are believed to accumulate more total positive impressions compared to low-status individuals based on the signals sent by easily observable behaviors. A deviation from a norm can subtract from the idiosyncrasy balance an individual has built up, which means that high-status individuals are able to get away with more frequent and/or stronger deviations from norms because they have a larger, more positive balance to draw from. High-status individuals can afford to take more hits to their idiosyncratic balance before experiencing social disapproval (Galinsky et al., 2008).

While they may or may not consciously know the status of their idiosyncratic balances, high powered individuals may be more likely to violate social norms by voluntarily downgrading their lifestyle. Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Facebook, is well known for his unusual attire, such as jeans and a hoodie, at important interviews and conferences. Although they could not determine causality, Bellezza et al. (2014) found a significant correlation between the attire of academics at a conference and the quality of their publications, such that less conforming attire was associated with more research productivity. High-status individuals may want to differentiate themselves from low-status individuals and signal their status, but they may want to do so in a way that avoids obvious or excessive displays of self-promotion (Berger & Ward, 2010; Han et al., 2010). Instead of following social norms, such as wearing an expensive suit and tie, high status individuals may be more likely to violate their social norms and dress down to showcase their ability to get away it.
Norms in Organizations

Organizations have many diverse social norms for their employees and for potential job applicants to follow. Image norms are a group of norms that most organizations consciously or unconsciously follow for selecting and promoting individuals (Hurley-Hanson & Giannantonio, 2006). Image norms contain the expected attractiveness an individual must possess in order to be a part of the organization. Attractiveness can be broken down into height, weight, clothing, and facial beauty among other constructs (Hurley-Hanson & Giannantonio, 2006). Applicants or employees that do not meet the image norms of a recruiter and/or organization may be less likely to get a position over an equally qualified, but more conforming applicant because of the stigmas and stereotyping attached with the image norms (Hurley-Hanson & Giannantonio, 2006). These norms may or may not have any direct impact on the employee’s ability to perform the job effectively.

For example, a recruiter may hold the norm that a real estate agent must maintain a professional, business-like image in order to perform the required tasks correctly, even though this is unlikely the case (Hurley-Hanson & Giannantonio, 2006). In this scenario, the recruiter may be more likely to hire a potential real estate agent that attends the selection interview in a suit and tie compared to an equally qualified applicant that violates the expected image norm by attending the interview in less formal attire. Forsythe (1990) found that women were more likely to be hired when they wore masculine clothing compared to when they wore more feminine clothing. These findings highlight the importance of image
norms in organizational settings. Recruiters and organizations may look at something as simple as clothing choices when evaluating the potential of applicants and for promoting within the company.

Conforming to the expected image norms of a position has been found to be potentially related to more positive attributions about personal and extended characteristics (Workman & Johnson, 1989). Taxicab drivers who dressed appropriately for their jobs received more positive inferences about personal characteristics and ability compared to taxicab drivers who dressed inappropriately (Workman & Johnson, 1989). Furthermore, the positive inferences extended to objects associated with the individual. Participants rated the city that the taxicab drivers worked in more favorably if the drivers were wearing clothing that conformed to the image norms of a taxicab driver (Workman & Johnson, 1989). Organizations and recruiters may have certain expectations for image norms because each individual in the organization could potentially impact how the organization is perceived.

**Negotiator Power**

Negotiators and power in the workplace may play an important role in how negotiations proceed. Negotiations involve the bargaining of resources and can be influenced by social perceptions, such as norms (Galinsky et al., 2008; Thompson & Hastie, 1990). The perceived or real power differences between individuals in a negotiation can have a big impact on the personal and integrative outcomes in the final agreement (Wolfe & McGinn, 2005). High power parties are typically characterized as having access to an abundant amount of resources or
other alternatives in a negotiation, which helps increase the probability they can achieve their goals and influence the negotiation (Kim, Pinkley, & Fragale, 2005). High power individuals are more likely to have their interests addressed during negotiations compared to low power parties (Wolfe & McGinn, 2005). Typically, high power individuals are able to gain a greater share of the pie because they can use their greater access to resources to their advantage (Kim et al., 2005).

Power disparity between negotiators may influence negotiation outcomes by impacting the first stages of a negotiation. Low power parties are less likely to make a first offer compared to high power parties (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruenfeld, 2007). This finding may be attributed to the activation of the inhibition system instead of the approach system. Low power parties might feel uncertainty in their ability to control the outcomes of the negotiation and may feel threatened by high power parties. As a result, they focus on inhibitory behaviors, such as waiting for a first offer to be presented. High power parties, on the other hand, may have their approach system activated which increases the tendency actively pursue personal goals, such as presenting a first offer. The first offer can then have an important impact on how the rest of negotiation plays out.

Presenting the initial offer in a negotiation can set an anchor point that changes the frame of reference for both parties (Neale & Bazerman, 1991). A first offer has the potential to serve as a new reference point from which all counteroffers will be made. A first offer might cause the second party to shift its initial negotiating range to center or skew towards the first offer, thus pulling the final offer towards the favor of the initiating party. Anchoring is believed to be
behind the positive benefits associated with presenting first offers. The first offer serves as an anchor that people are typically unable to correctly adjust away from, and an extreme first offer is even harder to adjust from (Neale & Bazerman, 1991).

One of the more extreme examples of the anchoring effect asked participants to estimate how old Mahatma Ghandi was when he died. They were asked if he died before or after the age of 9, or 140 in the second condition, and then to estimate his age upon death. Given the time period and Ghandi’s achievements, neither age should be considered remotely plausible, and yet the age served to anchor the results estimated by the participants (Strack & Mussweiler, 1997). Even completely implausible information can serve to bias decision making if presented first through the anchoring heuristic.

**Norm Violations and Negotiations**

Power plays such an important role in negotiations that it is useful to examine how it may be influenced. This study suggests negotiators might be able to increase their perceived power levels by violating social norms regarding the negotiation of a job offer. Norm violators may be perceived as having more power, a higher social status, and elevated competency levels when the violation is perceived as being intentional (Bellezza et al., 2014; van Kleef et al., 2011). A negotiator who transgresses a social norm may be able to increase his or her perceived power level, which may eventually lead to more beneficial personal outcomes in the negotiation (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruenfeld, 2007).

**Rationale**
This study sought to connect social norm violations and negotiator power in a job hiring process. Every interaction between individuals can potentially be dictated and evaluated in terms of following and violating social norms, including negotiations (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Often, violations of social norms are perceived negatively by others around the transgressor (Costarelli, 2005; Helweg-Larsen & LoMonaco, 2008). Recently, however, studies indicated that norm violators may be perceived as having a higher status, more power, and greater competency than those who do not violate norms (Bellezza et al., 2014). This effect seems to rely on whether or not the non-conformity is volitional (Bellezza et al., 2014). If the violation is perceived as unintentional, then people might be more likely to react negatively instead of positively (Bellezza et al., 2014). This study was an important first step to looking at how norm violations and nonconformity can be beneficial, or possibly harmful, for negotiating a job offer. Negotiators can possibly benefit from having greater perceived power, status, and competency. If negotiators can achieve increases in these three constructs by violating a social norm, it could have a positive impact on their negotiation outcomes. Power has been associated with who is more likely to take charge of a negotiation and present a first offer (Magee, Galinsky, & Gruendfeld, 2007). First offers are particularly interesting because they have been positively associated with better financial outcomes in negotiations (Neale & Bazerman, 1991). Bellezza et al. (2014) suggest that observer responses might change based on the degree of nonconformity. This study attempted to shed light onto this hypothesis by examining a more extreme transgression of norms, in addition to a smaller,
more acceptable norm transgression. The main goal of this study was to examine the changes in perceptions of a negotiator based on an intentional norm violation.

**Statement of Hypothesis**

Studies have demonstrated that violating norms can result in positive perceptual changes about the transgressor from others, which has been called the red sneaker effect (Bellezza et al., 2014). People view the transgressor as being more competent, having a higher social status, and having more power than someone who conforms to the norms, but this finding only holds if the transgression is viewed as volitional (Bellezza et al., 2014). The transgressions reported in Bellezza et al. (2014) fit under the independence dimension of norm violations (Nail et al., 2000). Transgressions aimed at independence might not be as big of a hit to high-status individuals’ “balance” of idiosyncrasy credits compared to making an anti-conformity transgression (Hollander, 1958; Phillips & Zuckerman, 2001). As a result, independence transgressions could be costly and observable enough to signal inferences of power and competence instead of outright disagreement with the accepted group norms (Bellezza et al., 2014). However, a stronger violation of norms, such as anti-conformity, could potentially drain the goodwill associated with an idiosyncrasy credit balance and lead to the negative consequences typically seen in norm violations (Reese, Steffens, & Jonas, 2013; Nail et al., 2000). Bellezza et al. (2014) found that the qualifications of the individual could impact how non-conformity is perceived, such that nonconformity is more beneficial when it comes from a more qualified individual. The authors postulated that non-conformance from a highly qualified individual
could signal more power and competence than non-conformance from a less qualified individual because the norms associated with prestige are typically more formal (Bellezza et al., 2014). Power has previously been reported as being an important link to negotiation related processes, such as the first offer (Magee et al., 2007). The first offer typically anchors a negotiation, and perceptions of power can impact who typically receives the more favorable first offer, with high power individuals generally earning more value in first offers than low power individuals (Magee et al., 2007). The current study sought to test the following hypotheses on the “red sneaker effect” in job hiring negotiation perceptions.

_Hypothesis I:_ Job applicants who are highly qualified will be seen as more competent (_Ia_), more powerful (_Ib_), and would receive more favorable first offers (_Ic_) than job applicants who are unqualified.

The difference in perceptions of power resulting from different forms of conformity could have an impact on how a negotiation proceeds. High power parties are often perceived as having access to an abundant amount of resources or other alternatives, which help increase the probability that they can achieve their goals (Kim, Pinkley, & Fragale, 2005). High power individuals are more likely to have their interests addressed during a negotiation as lower parties might believe they have to concede more because they rely more on the negotiation being successful (Wolfe & McGinn, 2005). High power parties can seek out other alternatives if the negotiation drops below a certain value, but low power
parties might not have the same alternatives and have to keep going with the current negotiation even if it is becoming more unfavorable (Wolfe & McGinn, 2005). Typically, high power individuals are able to gain a greater share of the pie because they can use their greater access to resources to their advantage (Kim, Pinkley, & Fragale, 2005).

*Hypothesis II*: Job applicants who transgress by independence nonconformity and are highly qualified will be perceived as more competent (*IIa*), more powerful (*IIb*), and receive more favorable first offers (*IIc*) than job applicants who conform and are highly qualified and any applicant who is unqualified, regardless of conformity.

*Hypothesis IIId*: The interaction between conformity and qualifications on first offers will be mediated by perceptions of power.

*Hypothesis III*: Job applicants who transgress by anti-conformity and are unqualified will be perceived as less competent (*IIIa*), less powerful (*IIIb*), and receive less favorable first offers (*IIIC*) than job applicants who conform and are unqualified, who are independence nonconforming and unqualified, and any applicant who is qualified, regardless of conformity.

*Hypothesis IIIId*: The interaction between conformity and qualifications on first offers will be mediated by perceptions of power.
It is unclear how perceptions of anti-conformity will interact with high status individuals. On the one hand, anti-conformity should be an easily observable signal that individuals will base judgments on (Magee, 2009; Ridgeway & Cornell, 2006). When someone has a high status, and is highly qualified, he or she may still be able to draw from a bank of built up idiosyncrasy credits and be reacted to favorably from the transgression, similar to or greater than that of independence nonconformity (Hollander, 1958; Phillips & Zuckerman, 2001). A larger deviation, i.e. anti-conformity, could signal even more power and competence than a smaller one, i.e. independence; however, it is also possible that the deviation could be too extreme and elicit the negative responses seen in norm violation research (Reese, Steffens, & Jonas, 2013). This study explored that relationship.

**Research Questions:** Will job applicants who transgress by anti-conformity and are highly qualified be viewed as more powerful (RQ1), more competent (RQ2), and be offered more favorable first offers (RQ3) than job applicants who transgress with independence and high qualifications or who conform with high qualifications?

**Method**

**Research Participants**

This study recruited 240 participants through Amazon’s MTurk research recruiting system. MTurk has been shown to contain at least as good of a, if not
better, representation of the U.S. population than typical convenience sampling methods (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2011). Twelve participants with incomplete data and six participants who completed the study in under five minutes were removed. Two participants who met the time cut-off but had no variance in their responses were also removed based on reverse scored items and manipulation checks (e.g. a participant answers a rating of five for every question, including negatively worded questions). The final participant count was 220. The final participant pool was approximately 58% male (see Table 1 for demographic variables). The participants were about 41% white, 24% African American, 26% Hispanic, and 7% Asian. The average age of participants was 36 years with approximately 11 years of work experience. Participants were told the study would take approximately 30 minutes; however, the average time to completion was about 12 minutes, and participants were paid 75 cents for their participation.

Design

The study used a 3 (independence, anti-conformity, conforming) x 2 (high qualification, unqualified) between-subjects design. Half of the participants were assigned to the high qualifications condition and the other half were assigned to the unqualified condition. Being unqualified was operationally defined as a lack of leadership experience, a poor GPA, and very menial work experience. High qualification was operationally defined as an applicant that has leadership experience, a high GPA, and greater quality of work relevant to the open position. There were three conformity manipulations. In the independence condition, a job applicant violated a clothing norm by independence, which was operationally
defined as wearing business casual attire. In the anti-conformity condition, a job applicant violates a clothing norm by anti-conforming, which was operationally defined as wearing gym shorts and a t-shirt. In the conforming condition, a job applicant wore traditional, conforming clothing. This condition served as the control condition and conforming clothing was operationally defined as wearing a suit and tie.

**Procedure**

Participants took an online Qualtrics survey through Amazon’s MTurk system. After accepting the MTurk HIT, participants were presented with an informed consent section that detailed the nature of the study and their involvement. Participants were then presented with an overview of the task. The negotiation task was a slight adaptation from Harinck and De Dreu (2008). The participants assumed the role of a job recruiter negotiating with a potential job candidate and needed to agree on five issues (Annual Salary, Relocation Stipend, First Year Vacation Days, Insurance Effective Date, and Professional Development Stipend). The participants were given a payout schedule (see Appendix B for instructions and measure) that indicated what their goals should have been on each issue. Participants were given time to read the description of the issues and the task and then told they had 20 minutes to complete the negotiation. The participants were told that the other negotiator had a different payout schedule, but some issues may have similar priorities, which indicated integrative potential.
After learning about the task and their role in the negotiation, participants viewed a brief social media profile (simulated LinkedIn format) about the potential job candidate. The profile contained the counterpart’s photo and the manipulations of conformity. In the conforming condition, the negotiator wore a traditional suit and tie in the profile picture. In the independence non-conformity condition, the candidate wore slightly less formal, but still professional attire. In the anti-conformity condition, the candidate wore clothing that marked them as distinct from traditional norms; t-shirt and shorts. The counterpart was the same in all photos, and the clothing was the only variable that differed.

In addition to the picture, the profile contained a short, written passage pertaining to the qualifications of the candidate (Appendices D-I). In the conformity condition, participants were shown a picture of their counterpart in a suit and tie. In the independence condition, participants saw an applicant wearing a slight deviation from a suit and tie. In the anti-conformity condition, participants saw a job applicant in a t-shirt and gym shorts.

In order to manipulate the qualifications of the job candidate, the profile also included information that represented a qualified candidate in one condition and an unqualified candidate in another condition. The qualified candidate had a profile that included more leadership roles, used more professional language, and emphasized working with customers compared to the unqualified candidate (Appendices D-I). The qualified candidate also held more prominent roles in his past employment positions than the unqualified candidate.
Participants were then told that they had 5-10 minutes to read over the task and prepare a first offer to present to the job applicant once the negotiation period started. Before submitting a first offer, participants were presented with questionnaires to assess the perceived competence of the counterpart and manipulation checks. Participants were then asked to submit a first offer for the negotiation. After submitting a first offer, the participants were brought to a page that stated that the negotiation would not happen and the purpose of the study was to gather information only on the first offer.

**Outcomes of Interest**

**Perceived competence.** Perceived competence refers to the participants’ perception of credibility and effectiveness of the job applicant. The construct was assessed using a five item Likert scale (1 = strongly agree, 7 = strongly disagree), and the values on each question were averaged into a composite score. The questions were adapted from items used in Bellezza et al. (2014; see Appendix J). Sample items included, “Mark is a strong candidate for this position,” and “Mark has the skills necessary to be successful in this position.”

**Perceived power.** The perceived power balance between the participant and the job applicant was assessed with a context-specific version of Anderson, John, and Keltner’s (2012) eight item sense of power scale. The items were changed slightly to represent negotiation related power instead of more generalized power. For example, the question “I think I have a great deal of power” was changed to “I have more power in the negotiation than my
counterpart” (1 = Strongly Disagree, 8 = Strongly Agree). The revised scale from Anderson et al. (2012) is attached to Appendix K.

**First offer.** The value of the first offer is a composite score derived from summing the values assigned to the option the participant picked on each of the five issues. For example, if the participant made a first offer with an annual salary of $51,000 (worth 1200 point), relocation stipend of $4,500 (2100 points), 5 vacation days (600 points), 2-month effective insurance date (150 points), and a $2,000 professional development stipend (300 points), the final point total for the participant would be 4,250 points. The goal of the participant was to achieve the most points possible in the negotiation. High point values are indicative of better performance in the negotiation for the participant. In terms of analysis, a more favorable first offer for the job applicant is represented by a low value on this measure. A high value on this measure indicates a less favorable first for the job applicant.

**Manipulation checks.** A check on the conformity manipulate was asked before the participant presented a first offer (see Appendix L). Four questions were adapted from a conformity scale designed by Mehrabian and Stefl (1995) and were issued to assess the manipulation of conformity.

**Results**

After the data was cleaned for outliers and non-usable participants, descriptive analyses were run on demographic and experimental variables (Table 1). Correlations between the variables of interest were also conducted (Table 2). The quality of the first offer given to applicants was related to both conformity
and competence. Applicants rated as more competent were typically given more favorable starting offers (lower point values on first offers presented by the participant represent better first offers for applicants), $r(218) = -.462, p < .01$. Applicants who conformed more also received more favorable starting offers, $r(218) = -.219, p < .01$. This second correlation is a little misleading because it does not paint a full picture of the interaction. Anti-conformists were predicted to receive worse starting offers, while independence non-conformists were predicted to receive favorable starting offers. The more powerful statistical analyses run in the next section will flesh out the nuances of this correlation. None of the independent variables appeared to be correlated with any of the control or demographic variables. A series of one-way ANOVAs were conducted for hypotheses, and post hoc tests were run on specific conditions to examine hypotheses II and III.

Hypothesis I, which predicted that job applicants who are highly qualified would be seen as more competent (Ia), more powerful (Ib), and receive more favorable starting offers (Ic) than job applicants who were unqualified was tested by running three one-way ANOVAs. Hypothesis Ia was supported, which indicated that highly qualified job applicants ($M = 5.11, SD = .63$) are perceived as being more competent than unqualified applicants ($M = 3.74, SD = .84$), $F(1, 219) = 189.65, p < .05$. Hypothesis Ib, however, was not supported by the results, as the average perceived power of the applicant did not differ between highly qualified ($M = 4.87, SD = .63$) and unqualified applicants ($M = 4.99, SD = .61$), $F(1,219) = 1.474, p = .226$. Hypothesis Ic was supported, which suggested that
job applicants that had a highly qualified resume ($M = 5431.98$, $SD = 771.65$) received more value (participants earned less points) in starting offers from the participants than the applicants that were unqualified ($M = 6167.88$, $SD = 563.33$), $F(1,219) = 65.52$, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis II predicted an interaction between conformity and resume quality such that job applicants who transgressed by independence nonconformity and were highly qualified (ICQ) would be perceived as more competent ($IIa$), more powerful ($IIb$), and receive more favorable first offers ($IIc$) than job applicants who conformed and were highly qualified (CQ) and job applicants who were unqualified, regardless of conformity. While the overall ANOVA was significant, the individual, specific predictions for $IIa$, $IIb$, and $IIc$ were not significant, $F(5,219) = 18.278$, $p < .05$. Tukey’s HSD was used to test the specific post hoc comparisons in $IIa$, $IIb$, and $IIc$ for significance (Tables 3-5). The means and standard deviations for all six conditions in terms of competence, power, and first offers are reported in Table 6. In hypothesis $IIa$, job applicants who transgressed by independence nonconformity and were highly qualified significantly differed from all unqualified applicants but were not significantly different from the two other conditions that were also highly qualified. In hypothesis $IIb$, there was no significant difference between any of the six conditions in terms of perceived power (Table 4). In hypothesis $IIc$, applicants who transgressed by independence nonconformity and were highly qualified were significantly different from all groups except those who conformed and were highly qualified (Table 5). Because there was not a significant interaction
between conformity and qualifications on first offers, hypothesis IIId, which predicted power would mediate the interaction, was also not significant.

Hypothesis III predicted that there would be an interaction effect between conformity and resume quality such that job applicants who transgressed by anti-conformity and were unqualified (ACU) would be perceived as less competent (IIIa), less powerful (IIIb), and receive less favorable first offers (IIIc) than job applicants who conformed and were unqualified (CU), who were independent nonconforming and unqualified (ICU), and who were qualified, regardless of conformity. Tukey’s HSD was again used to test the specific post hoc comparisons in IIIa, IIIb, and IIIc for significance. In hypothesis IIIa, applicants who transgressed by anti-conformity and were unqualified significantly differed from all other conditions in terms of competence (Table 7). They were significantly less competent than the other conditions. In part IIIb, however, there was no significant difference between any of the six conditions in terms of perceived power (Table 8). In hypothesis IIIc, applicants who transgressed by anti-conformity and were unqualified were significantly different from all groups (Table 9). Similar to hypothesis IIId, power did not mediate any of the interactions in hypothesis IIId.

Finally, there were three research questions posed about the interaction between anti-conformity and being highly qualified (Tables 10-12). The findings from Tukey’s HSD indicate that anti-conformists who were qualified (ACQ) do not differ from the other five conditions in terms of perceived power but do differ in regards to competence and first offers. ACQs were perceived as being
significantly more competent than the three unqualified conditions but were not significantly different from the other two qualified conditions. Interestingly, ACQs were significantly different from ACUs and ICQs in terms of first offers but did not significantly differ from the remaining three conditions. They received significantly higher first offers than applicants who transgressed through independence and were highly qualified; however, they also received significantly lower first offers than applicants who were also anti-conforming but were unqualified.

**Discussion**

Resumes are used by management as the first barrier for consideration for a position (Cole et al., 2009). Resumes provide managers with a quick, easy way to compare applicants to each other and to the needs of the position. Managers can quickly review a resume and remove the unqualified applicants from future consideration. The present research supports the idea that resumes are a first hurdle, as an applicant with a high-quality resume that matches the needs of the position was typically perceived as being more competent, having more power, and was given a better starting job offer than applicants who had a low-quality resume that was not a good fit for the position. This trend indicates that people can distinguish between a high-quality resume and a low-quality resume, at least when given a job description to compare the information against. Job applicants can potentially improve their chances by tailoring their resumes to highlight how well their past experiences and skills match what the job description says.
While the resume appeared important in perceiving competency and receiving a job offer, it did not seem to impact perceptions of power. In fact, none of the manipulations in the study seemed to impact perceptions of power, which was contrary to what previous research suggested (Bellezza et al., 2014). Some of the interactions were still significant despite the lack of power acting as a mediator (Bellezza et al., 2014). The design of the experiment may have contributed to these findings. Participants were asked to assume a role as the hiring manager in this scenario and the applicant was a new graduate. As such, the participants may have been influenced by the position they were placed and assumed that they had a great degree of power relative to the applicant because they would have the final say in whether the applicant was hired. A scenario where the participant and counterpart are given similar roles may show different trends. The resume may also not be as important to predicting power when there is no actual negotiation or contact between the two parties. It may require some sort of interaction to bring the impact of the resume into relevance for the hiring manager. A simple change in the clothing of an applicant’s picture may not provide a meaningful or strong signal to observers, so it did not produce the same effects as in previous research (Bellezza et al., 2014).

Another important finding from this study is that impression management appears to matter when searching for a job. People seem to have expectations and biases relating to how an applicant should present themselves, even in a LinkedIn style picture. This finding is not necessarily surprising considering previous research has indicated that physical attractiveness has been related to both better
and worse outcomes in the job recruiting process depending on the industry (Johnson, Podratz, Dipboye, & Gibbons, 2010). Other non-job related variables such as having a facial piercing can trigger cognitive stereotypes that impact job related outcomes and perceptions (McElroy, Summers, & Moore, 2014). What is surprising is that something as simple as the clothes applicants wear in a picture may impact how an employer evaluates their ability to perform a job relative to an applicant with equal credentials. Humans inherently rely on subjective biases and cues to efficiently make sense of the world. One such bias seems to be that job applicants are expected to present themselves in at least some professional manner. Regardless of the resume quality, applicants who had a LinkedIn profile picture in gym shorts and t-shirt were perceived quite poorly compared to those wearing more formal attire. A failure to dress up for a publicly viewable picture may signal negative qualities about the applicant to potential employers. If the applicant is not willing to put in the effort to present themselves in a professional manner, will they put in adequate effort to perform the job well? This suggests that anyone applying to a job may want to make sure any viewable resources or social media, such as LinkedIn, are set up in a more professional manner.

There is another potential caveat to the previously mentioned finding. While it seems that dressing professionally is much better for an applicant than dressing in casual, informal wear, it should be noted that a highly qualified applicant might be able to get away with having a more casual profile picture. The applicant in gym shorts and a t-shirt did not receive significantly worse first offer than an applicant in formal attire when both were highly qualified. While the
interaction was not significant, the result was likely due to the type of manipulation that was used. Participants did not actually negotiate with the participants, so the picture may not have had the same effect as it would have had if the job applicant showed up to the actual negotiation in gym shorts and a t-shirt. A casual profile picture may not send strong negative signals about the applicant to the hiring manager.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

One possible limitation for this study is that the researcher forced participants to believe they would be negotiating a job offer with applicants. In practice, hiring managers likely would not have wasted their time considering the low-quality resume applicants since the resume was designed to be a poor fit for the open position. By forcing participants to suggest a job offer, it may have artificially lowered the perceptions of power, competence, and starting offers because participants had to give starting offers. If participants were given a choice between negotiating a job offer and denying applicants up front, the findings may have been different. Participants may have punished low-quality applicants more than normal because they had no choice. When given a choice, participants may be more likely to give better offers and judgments than what the findings indicate due to cognitive dissonance. Because the participant chose to negotiate a job offer with the participant, they may rate them more favorably as a way of justifying the decision.

Another limitation to the study is that participants did not actually negotiate with anyone. Participants may not have truly believed that they were
going to negotiate with another individual over MTurk, which may have impacted how they responded to questions. Because there was not an actual negotiation, there is no way to be certain that pre-negotiation perceptions would have impacted the actual negotiation or matched post-negotiation perceptions.

A direction for future research would be to conduct an actual job offer negotiation with a confederate and a participant. While this study indicates job applicants can improve how employers perceive them by changing how they present themselves, it may or may not play out the same way in practice. Having to interact with an individual may either strengthen the effects or reduce them because there will be other signals present that the participant/employer looks for to evaluate applicants. Any of these signals, for example tone of voice, physical attraction, or body language, may interact with how the choice of attire impacts manager perceptions. It is important to see if the findings of the study actually do play out in the real world.

Another potential future direction comes from the style of the profile pictures. To control for extraneous variables, the profile pictures were taken in the exact same bland setting with the exact same posture and facial expressions. It is possible that the style of the picture itself can interact with perceptions of conformity. The picture was a three-quarters body shot instead of the more traditional headshot so that the full range of attire, torso and legs could be displayed. Experimenting with a wider range of picture settings, such as locations, posture, lighting, etc., could provide a better overall view of the effect.
In the study, participants were only given one applicant to evaluate because they were expected to also spend 20 to 30 minutes negotiating with the applicant. As such, we can make no claims about within-participant decisions regarding conformity. In the future, a study could be designed so that participants were told they would have to conduct two negotiation sessions with applicants of equal resume quality. The only difference between the applicants would be in the degree of conformity. An experiment using this design would allow the researcher to see how a single employer might treat two individuals differently. Alternatively, a study using this methodology could simply ask participants which applicant they would consider for the job. Of course, this method would also hurt the researcher’s ability to control for extraneous variables, such as the applicants’ name, physical appearance, etc., that have been linked to negotiation and job search outcomes because the researcher would need to present different actors with slightly different language in their resumes.

This study also did not look at how conformity might interact with demographic variables like gender and ethnicity, which have been linked to negotiation and job hiring outcomes in the past (e.g. Forsythe, 1990). Forsythe (1990) found that women were more likely to receive favorable hiring recommendations when they were wearing masculine clothing compared to more feminine clothing in a job interview. In terms of conformity, there are at least two explanations for this finding. The first explanation is that women who conform to the more traditional, masculine expectations in the business world are treated more favorably, or alternatively, maybe women who dress more masculine are
seen as deviating from social expectations regarding women in the workforce and thus, are perceived more favorably. A future study could help clear up the exact reasoning and processes behind this finding and other relevant demographic biases.

In summary, this study looked to shed light on recent findings on conformity and applied those findings to a potential job negotiation. While not all hypotheses were supported, there was evidence the conformity matters, to an extent, when applying for a job. The study was conducted in a very limited and controlled environment, which may beg future, more robust exploration into conformity and the hiring process. Recommendations for future research have been discussed in the previous sections.
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Appendix A

Demographics

Q11. How old are you?

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Other

Please identify your race (Select all that apply)
- Caucasian
- Black/African American
- Native American/Alaskan native
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Other

What is the highest education you have completed?
- Did not complete high school or GED
- High school graduates or GED
- Some College or Associate Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Above Bachelors Degree
Do you have a degree in business?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Q17

Please estimate your working experience (in years).

☐ Q18

Do you have any experience negotiating in a work related setting?

☐ I have no experience negotiating in a work setting.
☐ My current and/or past occupation required occasional negotiating.
☐ My current and/or past occupation required extensive negotiating.
Appendix B

Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this virtual negotiation. As technology increases, organizations are in a position to reach a larger range of candidates for open positions. Job recruiters can now interview and negotiate with potential candidates in other states and countries through the telephone and internet. This study seeks to examine how a virtual negotiation on the internet influences the choices and outcomes made in potentially hiring a candidate for a job. In a few minutes you will be connected to another MTurk participant to simulate a job recruiter negotiating with a potential candidate. When you are ready to read your role in this negotiation, please click next.

This is a two-party negotiation between a job candidate and job recruiter. You will play the job recruiter and your counterpart will play the job candidate. You are recruiting on behalf of a telecommunication company who is looking to fill a supervisor position in a new store. The organization has selected several applicants that they are interested in and would like you to review and negotiate a potential offer with one of these applicants. On this page, you will find an ad for the position to be filled. Please pay close attention to the qualities and responsibilities requested by the company when evaluating and negotiating with the job candidate.

<Appendix J>

Now that you are familiar with the position that CellCom is attempting to fill, you will be given the LinkedIn profile of a potential candidate. Your job is to use this profile to evaluate the candidate and then negotiate a potential starting job offer with them. Please click next and take a few minutes to look at the qualifications of the applicant you will be negotiating with. If you would like to have the CellCom position ad open for reference, please right click here and open the link in a new tab. When you are ready to see the candidate profile, click next.

<Randomly selected page from one of the six conditions>

Here is a payoff schedule for the negotiation you are about to conduct. This table lists 5 topics that you will be negotiating over. You will be trying to get the best Annual Salary, Relocation Stipend, First Year Vacation Days, Insurance Effective Date, and Professional Development Stipend. Each column starts with a heading for one of the 5 topics and then lists options for that topic. Just to the right of each option is a point value. These point values are to show you what the best
options are. The higher the point value, the better the deal for your organization. For example, look under the Annual Salary column. The option of “$54,000” has a point value of 0 and “$49,000” has a point value of 2400. This indicates that “$49,000” is a better option than “$54,000.” Your goal is to get the best deal possible, which is indicated by the amount of points you earn in the negotiation. This table will be provided later on in case you would like to reference it.

<Appendix C presented>

Please take a few minutes to go over the options and plan out what options you would like to include in your first offer to the other negotiator. When you are ready to submit an offer, go to the next page and submit your options.

Once you click next, the first offer will be submitted to the other participant and a chat box will be opened for you talk about preferences and negotiate. You will have five minutes to negotiate before your counterpart must submit a counter-offer. The offer will pop up on the page when it is ready. You will have 20 total minutes to come up with a final offer with your counterpart. There will be a button to accept an offer on the next page. Please submit whenever you are ready to begin.

<Appendix C and I presented>

Thank you for submitting your offer. While we connect you to your counterpart, please fill out these questions about the upcoming negotiation. The program takes some time to line up participants (about 5 minutes), so answering these questions now will save you time from filling them out after the negotiation ends. Once the negotiation is ready, you will automatically be taken to the chat and your progress on these questions will be saved so that you can complete them after the negotiation is over.

<Appendices F, G, and H>

Thank you for answering our questions. The survey is complete now. This study was examining how the clothing a negotiator wears impacts the perceptions of others. We needed you to believe you were participating in an actual negotiation in order to get more accurate perceptions.
# Appendix C

Recruiter Payoff Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>First Year Vacation Days</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Insurance Effective Date</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Day Hired</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1 month after hire date</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2 months after hire date</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3 months after hire date</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation Stipend</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Professional Development Stipend</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Anti-Conformity*Unqualified

Mark O’Conner
Attending DePaul University
markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Cashier at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)
  • Convince customers to buy our merchandise and sign up for sale card memberships
  • Responsible for operating the cash register, cleaning floors, and opening/closing the store
  • Unpack boxes of shipments and putting merchandise in their correct locations

Resident Advisor at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)
  • Resident assistants try to plan events for residents on the floor to get to know each other, usually socials involving food
  • Had to write up residents for violating policies
  • Went to meetings to discuss weekly and monthly events and do activities
  • Talk to residents, counsel them when sad, advise them on taking classes, and provide utilities for their rooms

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)
  • Assist employees in filing paperwork, stapling packets, delivering materials across the office, updating social media, and attending meetings
  • Responsible for setting up weekly meetings and running errands
Education

DePaul University
Bachelor of Arts (BA), Communication and Media Studies, 2012-2016
GPA: 2.5

Organizations

Alpha Beta Gamma
Member
October 2014 to June 2016
- Participated in volunteer efforts: working at the homeless shelter, educational outreach, and fundraising
- Joined brothers in multiple socials throughout the year to develop interpersonal and networking skills while reinforcing the Alpha Beta Gamma reputation across campus

Volunteer Experience

Camp Counselor at Lake Geneva Youth Camp
June 2013 – Present
- As camp counselors, we hang out with less fortunate kids during the summer doing various activities: campfires, coloring books, playing games, role playing, and arts and crafts
- Occasionally tutor children and inform them about what is needed to attend college
Appendix E
Conformity*Unqualified

Mark O’Conner
Attending DePaul University
markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Cashier at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)
- Convince customers to buy our merchandise and sign up for sale card memberships
- Responsible for operating the cash register, cleaning floors, and opening/closing the store
- Unpack boxes of shipments and putting merchandise in their correct locations

Resident Advisor at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)
- Resident assistants try to plan events for residents on the floor to get to know each other, usually socials involving food
- Had to write up residents for violating policies
- Went to meetings to discuss weekly and monthly events and do activities
- Talk to residents, counsel them when sad, advise them on taking classes, and provide utilities for their rooms

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)
- Assist employees in filing paperwork, stapling packets, delivering materials across the office, updating social media, and attending meetings
- Responsible for setting up weekly meetings and running errands
Education

DePaul University
Bachelor of Arts (BA), Communication and Media Studies, 2012-2016
GPA: 2.5

Organizations

Alpha Beta Gamma
Member
October 2014 to June 2016

• Participated in volunteer efforts: working at the homeless shelter, educational outreach, and fundraising
• Joined brothers in multiple socials throughout the year to develop interpersonal and networking skills while reinforcing the Alpha Beta Gamma reputation across campus

Volunteer Experience

Camp Counselor at Lake Geneva Youth Camp
June 2013 – Present

• As camp counselors, we hang out with less fortunate kids during the summer doing various activities: campfires, coloring books, playing games, role playing, and arts and crafts
• Occasionally tutor children and inform them about what is needed to attend college
Appendix F
Independence*Unqualified

Mark O’Conner
Attending DePaul University
markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Cashier at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)

- Convince customers to buy our merchandise and sign up for sale card memberships
- Responsible for operating the cash register, cleaning floors, and opening/closing the store
- Unpack boxes of shipments and putting merchandise in their correct locations

Resident Advisor at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)

- Resident assistants try to plan events for residents on the floor to get to know each other, usually socials involving food
- Had to write up residents for violating policies
- Went to meetings to discuss weekly and monthly events and do activities
- Talk to residents, counsel them when sad, advise them on taking classes, and provide utilities for their rooms

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)

- Assist employees in filing paperwork, stapling packets, delivering materials across the office, updating social media, and attending meetings
- Responsible for setting up weekly meetings and running errands
Education

DePaul University
Bachelor of Arts (BA), Communication and Media Studies, 2012-2016
GPA: 2.5

Organizations

Alpha Beta Gamma
Member
October 2014 to June 2016
• Participated in volunteer efforts: working at the homeless shelter, educational outreach, and fundraising
• Joined brothers in multiple socials throughout the year to develop interpersonal and networking skills while reinforcing the Alpha Beta Gamma reputation across campus

Volunteer Experience

Camp Counselor at Lake Geneva Youth Camp
June 2013 – Present
• As camp counselors, we hang out with less fortunate kids during the summer doing various activities: campfires, coloring books, playing games, role playing, and arts and crafts
• Occasionally tutor children and inform them about what is needed to attend college
Appendix G

Anti-Conformity*Qualified

Mark O’Conner
Attending DePaul University
markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Assistant Supervisor at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)

• Recruit, train, and supervise local sales staff to deliver excellent service in a fast-paced environment
• Assign shifts, establish quotas, prepare and supervise sales promotion projects, make decisions that impact store operations, and supervise achievement of quarterly goals
• Engage customers and community with strong communication skills to understand their needs and model actions from them

Resident Advisor and Social Director at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)

• Planned events that support academic mission, create safe environments, promote responsible citizenship, and foster student development for residents in both local (115 residents) and larger (~700 residents) communities
• Maintained DPU On Campus Housing policies in order to provide emotionally and physically safe community for residents, acting as the first responder to high-pressure situations
• Consistently received above average ratings in peer reviews, supervisor feedback, and resident surveys for two years, commended for excellent interpersonal skills, knowledge of resources, and counseling

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)
• Assisted Managing Director in creating marketing reports and asset allocation proposals
• Prepared marketing materials for prospective corporate clients by applying strong research skills, developing comprehensive media lists, and frequently performing media outreach

Education

DePaul University
Bachelor’s Degree, Computer Science, 2012-2016
Grade: 3.9

Organizations

Alpha Beta Gamma

President
October 2014 to June 2016
• Compiled and created Annual Business report and submitted final copy to the National Chapter
• Managed financial statements, re-coded activities, and contacted employers to support organization’s efforts
• Organization events and strategies for volunteer recruitment and awarded for my work at the 2015 DePaul Volunteer Awards

Volunteer Experience

Camp Leader at Lake Geneva Youth Camp
June 2013 – Present
• Lead a team of 10 camp counselors each summer and train them on interpersonal, time management, and decision making skills
• Plan programs that encourage teamwork, communication skills, leadership, and education goals for at-risk youth at a charity summer camp while mentoring and tutoring them

Languages

English
Spanish
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Conformity*Qualified

Mark O’Conner

Attending DePaul University

markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Assistant Supervisor at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)

- Recruit, train, and supervise local sales staff to deliver excellent service in a fast-paced environment
- Assign shifts, establish quotas, prepare and supervise sales promotion projects, make decisions that impact store operations, and supervise achievement of quarterly goals
- Engage customers and community with strong communication skills to understand their needs and model actions from them

Resident Advisor and Social Director at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)

- Planned events that support academic mission, create safe environments, promote responsible citizenship, and foster student development for residents in both local (115 residents) and larger (~700 residents) communities
- Maintained DPU On Campus Housing policies in order to provide emotionally and physically safe community for residents, acting as the first responder to high-pressure situations
- Consistently received above average ratings in peer reviews, supervisor feedback, and resident surveys for two years, commended for excellent interpersonal skills, knowledge of resources, and counseling

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)
• Assisted Managing Director in creating marketing reports and asset allocation proposals
• Prepared marketing materials for prospective corporate clients by applying strong research skills, developing comprehensive media lists, and frequently performing media outreach

Education

**DePaul University**

Bachelor’s Degree, Computer Science, 2012-2016

Grade: 3.9

Organizations

**Alpha Beta Gamma**

*President*

October 2014 to June 2016

- Compiled and created Annual Business report and submitted final copy to the National Chapter
- Managed financial statements, re-coded activities, and contacted employers to support organization’s efforts
- Organization events and strategies for volunteer recruitment and awarded for my work at the 2015 DePaul Volunteer Awards

Volunteer Experience

**Camp Leader at Lake Geneva Youth Camp**

June 2013 – Present

- Lead a team of 10 camp counselors each summer and train them on interpersonal, time management, and decision making skills
- Plan programs that encourage teamwork, communication skills, leadership, and education goals for at-risk youth at a charity summer camp while mentoring and tutoring them

Languages

English
Spanish
Appendix I

Independence*Qualified

Mark O’Conner
Attending DePaul University
markoconner@gmail.com

Experience

Assistant Supervisor at Walgreens
June 2015 – Present (1 year, 1 month)

- Recruit, train, and supervise local sales staff to deliver excellent service in a fast-paced environment
- Assign shifts, establish quotas, prepare and supervise sales promotion projects, make decisions that impact store operations, and supervise achievement of quarterly goals
- Engage customers and community with strong communication skills to understand their needs and model actions from them

Resident Advisor and Social Director at DePaul University
September 2013 – June 2015 (1 year, 10 months)

- Planned events that support academic mission, create safe environments, promote responsible citizenship, and foster student development for residents in both local (115 residents) and larger (~700 residents) communities
- Maintained DPU On Campus Housing policies in order to provide emotionally and physically safe community for residents, acting as the first responder to high-pressure situations
- Consistently received above average ratings in peer reviews, supervisor feedback, and resident surveys for two years, commended for excellent interpersonal skills, knowledge of resources, and counseling

Public Relations Intern at TDM Public Relations
November 2013 – August 2014 (10 months)
• Assisted Managing Director in creating marketing reports and asset allocation proposals
• Prepared marketing materials for prospective corporate clients by applying strong research skills, developing comprehensive media lists, and frequently performing media outreach

Education

DePaul University
Bachelor’s Degree, Computer Science, 2012-2016
Grade: 3.9

Organizations

Alpha Beta Gamma
President
October 2014 to June 2016
• Compiled and created Annual Business report and submitted final copy to the National Chapter
• Managed financial statements, re-coded activities, and contacted employers to support organization’s efforts
• Organization events and strategies for volunteer recruitment and awarded for my work at the 2015 DePaul Volunteer Awards

Volunteer Experience

Camp Leader at Lake Geneva Youth Camp
June 2013 – Present
• Lead a team of 10 camp counselors each summer and train them on interpersonal, time management, and decision making skills
• Plan programs that encourage teamwork, communication skills, leadership, and education goals for at-risk youth at a charity summer camp while mentoring and tutoring them

Languages

English
Spanish
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Perceived Competence Scale

Please rate your perceptions of Mark on the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark is a strong candidate for this position.</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend Mark for this position.</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark would be successful right away in the position, if hired.</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark has potential to become a top performer in the organization.</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark possesses the skills necessary to be successful in the position.</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix K

**Sense of Power Scale**

Please answer the following about how you feel towards the upcoming negotiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My counterpart will listen to my demands in the negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My demands will not carry much weight with my counterpart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can get my counterpart to do what I want in the upcoming negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I have power over my counterpart in the negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I will ultimately have the final say in the negotiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix L

### Manipulation Check

Based on your initial perceptions, please rate how you believe Mark will behave in his interactions with fellow employees and his supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark would be easily swayed by the opinions of his peers.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark would rely on the advice of others in the organization to make decisions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark would be reluctant to challenge the decisions of his boss.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark would feel comfortable presenting ideas that are opposite of what his boss suggests.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M

First Offer Submission Page

Please take a few minutes to go over the options and plan out what options you would like to include in your first offer to the other negotiator. When you are ready to submit an offer, go to the next page and submit your options.

Once you click next, the first offer will be submitted to the other participant and a chat box will be opened for you to talk about preferences and negotiate. You will have five minutes to negotiate before your counterpart must submit a counter-offer. The offer will pop up on the page when it is ready. You will have 20 total minutes to come up with a final offer with your counterpart. There will be a button to accept an offer on the next page. Please submit whenever you are ready to begin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annual Salary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>First Year Vacation Days</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Insurance Effective Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Day Hired</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1 month after hire date</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2 months after hire date</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3 months after hire date</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relocation Stipend</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Professional Development Stipend</strong></th>
<th><strong>Point Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Salary
- $54,000
- $51,000
- $48,000
- $43,000
- $40,000

Relocation Stipend
- $9,000
- $7,500
- $6,000
- $4,600
- $3,000

First Year Vacation Days
- 10 days
- 7 days
- 6 days
- 2 days
- 0 days

Insurance Effective Date
- Day Hired
- 1 month after hire date
- 2 months after hire date
- 3 months after hire date

Professional Development Stipend
- $0
- $500
- $1,000
- $1,500
- $2,000
- $2,500
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Job Position Description

CellCom Inc.

Customer Service Representative Supervisor

CellCom is a small Toronto-based cellphone company founded in 2005. At CellCom, we are committed to providing superior cellphone services. We have a loyal client base in the Greater Toronto Area, and we are known for our customer service – for us, customers are a priority. We are looking for a new customer service representative supervisor with great interpersonal skills. We are looking for a disciplined employee who can perform in a fast-paced environment and provide leadership and direction for their team.

Position responsibilities:

- Confer with customers by telephone or in person to provide information about products or services, take or enter orders, cancel accounts, or obtain details of complaints.
- Resolve customers’ service or billing complaints by performing activities such as exchanging merchandise, refunding money, or adjusting bills.
- Schedule and assign tasks to a team of 6 customer service representatives.
- Coach, counsel, and discipline employees appropriately and monitor performance.
- Keep records of customer interactions or transactions, recording details of complaints and comments.

Required skills:
• Communication Skills
• Active Listening
• Leadership Skills
• Service Orientation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school not completed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or GED</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Associate</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Bachelor’s</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Total n = 220*
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.855**</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business Degree</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.489**</td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>-.497**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.166*</td>
<td>-.497**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>First Offer</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.219**</td>
<td>-.462**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Average Power</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Cronbach alpha is in the diagonal
Total n ranges from 203 to 220
* p < .05.  ** p < .01
Table 3

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Competency for ICQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>1.41*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Competence items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified
CQ = Conforming*Qualified
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified
ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified
CU = Conforming*Unqualified
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 4

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Power for ICQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Power items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified
CQ = Conforming*Qualified
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified
ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified
CU = Conforming*Unqualified
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 5

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on First Offers for ICQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Condition</th>
<th>(J) Condition</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>-219.78</td>
<td>152.09</td>
<td>-657.16</td>
<td>217.6</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>-483.92*</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>-918.45</td>
<td>-49.39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>-1282.62*</td>
<td>152.09</td>
<td>-1720</td>
<td>-845.24</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>-794.44*</td>
<td>153.13</td>
<td>-1234.81</td>
<td>-354.08</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>-840.28*</td>
<td>154.84</td>
<td>-1280.64</td>
<td>-399.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified  
CQ = Conforming*Qualified  
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified  
ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified  
CU = Conforming*Unqualified  
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 6

*Descriptives for Conditions for Competence, Power, and First Offers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th></th>
<th>Power</th>
<th></th>
<th>First Offer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Unqualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Conform</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*  
N ranged from 36 to 38 for each condition
Table 7

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Competency for ACU*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>-1.90*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>-1.70*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>-1.52*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>- .49*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>- .98</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>- .50*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>- .99</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Competence items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified

ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified

CQ = Conforming*Qualified

ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified

CU = Conforming*Unqualified

ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 8

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Power for ACU*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Condition</th>
<th>(J) Condition</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Power items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

- ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified
- ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified
- CQ = Conforming*Qualified
- ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified
- CU = Conforming*Unqualified
- ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 9

Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on First Offers for ACU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>1282.62*</td>
<td>152.09</td>
<td>845.24</td>
<td>1720.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>1062.84*</td>
<td>151.05</td>
<td>628.46</td>
<td>1497.21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>798.70*</td>
<td>150.05</td>
<td>367.20</td>
<td>1230.21</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>488.18*</td>
<td>152.09</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>925.55</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>442.34*</td>
<td>152.58</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>879.72</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified  
ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified  
CQ = Conforming*Qualified  
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified  
CU = Conforming*Unqualified  
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 10

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Competency for ACQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.51*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Competence items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified
ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified
CQ = Conforming*Qualified
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified
CU = Conforming*Unqualified
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 11

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on Power for ACQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Competence items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.*

ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified

ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified

CQ = Conforming*Qualified

ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified

CU = Conforming*Unqualified

ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* p < 0.05
Table 12

*Tukey HSD Comparison for Conformity and Qualified on First Offers for ACQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>ICQ</td>
<td>483.92*</td>
<td>151.10</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>264.14</td>
<td>150.08</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-167.37</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-798.70*</td>
<td>144.54</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-1230.21</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-310.53</td>
<td>151.89</td>
<td>- .98</td>
<td>-745.06</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-356.36</td>
<td>159.34</td>
<td>- .99</td>
<td>-790.89</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Competence items were rated on 1-7 Likert Scales and averaged.

ACU = Anti-Conformity*Unqualified
ICQ = Independence Conformity*Qualified
CQ = Conforming*Qualified
ACQ = Anti-Conformity*Qualified
CU = Conforming*Unqualified
ICU = Independence Conformity*Unqualified

* $p < 0.05$