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This thesis is an investigation of high potential identification, a practice which often identifies potential managers as part of a large succession management program in organizations. Once identified these leaders receive additional training and development and are expected to become future leaders in the organization, which prompts examination of the impact of being identified as high potential on the leaders themselves. Current research has predominantly examined the impact of high potential identification on the attitudes of identified and not identified employees. The current study seeks to understand whether, after being identified, high potential leaders are more confident, more positive and therefore considered to be better leaders. With this in mind high potential identification was manipulated in an experimental setting with student led peer instructional dyads. The impact of this information on leadership coaching behaviours and performance was assessed as mediated by leadership self-efficacy and affect. The implications for research and practice in high potential identification are discussed.
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**Introduction**

Succession management programs broadly involve identifying, developing, and strategically preparing a pool of employees for advancement within an organization (Busine & Watt, 2005; Sengupta, 2012). These programs have become a popular topic in various business and HR media (e.g. DeRosa, 2015; Hirsh, 2015), including HRPA Today (Gordon, 2015), and can even be found on Forbes.com (Higginbottom, 2014). Unfortunately, the empirical research regarding these programs is lacking. Empirical research on succession management is lacking and what is empirical, merely profiles current practices (Sengupta, 2012), examines the perceived effectiveness (Busine & Watt, 2005; Taylor & McGraw, 2004), or explores succession management in a very specific context (i.e. non-profits and universities; Gothard & Austin, 2013; McMurray et al., 2012; Myung, Loed, & Horng, 2011).

Research into high potential identification, a specific aspect of succession management, has gone further by examining the influence on employees’ attitudes (Bjorkman, Ehrnrooth, Makela, Smale, & Sumelius, 2013; Gelens, Hofmans, Dries, & Pepermans, 2014; Slan Jerusalem & Hausdorf, 2007). While the influence on employees’ attitudes is important, it is not enough. As one component of succession management practices, high potential programs deal directly with current and future organizational leaders, and research has yet to examine the influence these practices have on the behaviour and performance of these leaders both in the short and long term.

This study examines the influence of high potential identification (HPI) on leadership behaviours and performance using an experimental design. Accordingly, the following sections will outline the literature profiling succession management, the attitudinal impact of high potential identification, as well as relevant literature regarding leadership behaviours, leadership
self-efficacy, affect, task performance, and relationship satisfaction. These sections will provide justification for the hypotheses regarding the influence of HPI on leaders’ task performance and relationship satisfaction through their leadership self-efficacy, affect, as well as task and relational leadership behaviours. Following the hypotheses, the method, results and statistical analyses will be reviewed. Finally, a discussion of the findings and limitations, in context with the corresponding literature, will allow for future research and evidence-based practical recommendations.

**Succession Management and High Potential Identification**

In general, succession management consists of the following steps: a job analysis or some understanding of the skills needed to perform key jobs within the organization, the identification of lower level employees who might occupy these jobs in the future, some form of development (i.e. mentoring or training) for identified employees, and evaluation of the succession management program with respect to individual and organizational outcomes (Sengupta, 2012). Business/HR magazines and popular press’s interest in succession management programs is not without warrant, one study found that approximately half of organizations surveyed had some form of succession management program (Taylor & McGraw, 2004). Further, the reasons for implementing a succession management program cover a wide range of pressing business concerns, which justify why an organization might implement this practice without investigating further empirical evidence. Specific reasons for implementing succession management include: increasing business results; reacting to new business opportunities; increasing employee diversity; retaining employees; and developing employees’ careers within the company (Busine & Watt, 2005; Taylor & McGraw, 2004). As a result, criteria to evaluate these programs should reflect these objectives.
Current criteria to evaluate succession management programs does include employee turnover rates, percentage of jobs filled internally and HR manager ratings of effectiveness (Busine & Watt, 2005; Taylor & McGraw, 2004). A wide range of program components have been linked to these criteria, including: number of program aspects implemented; number of employees involved; organizational support; senior management involvement; line management involvement in the process design, implementation, and execution; links to larger organizational strategy; open communication; and a set timeframe for processes (Busine & Watt, 2005; Taylor & McGraw, 2004). Overall, these program aspects are mostly linked to subjective measures of effectiveness, but there is still a lot of research needed to further understand the impact of the components on individual employees.

One program component that has been examined in more depth is HPI. High potential candidates are loosely defined as those individuals within an organization who are recognized as the organization's likely future leaders (Cope, 1998), although organizations define high potential candidates as anything from future leaders, those with learning agility, or general ability to, individuals who have aspiration, perform well, or even a combination of all of the above (Aon Hewitt, 2013; Conrad, 2013; De Meuse, Dai, Hallenbeck, & Tang, 2009). High potential employees often make up less than 25% of organizations, and have been described as an elite workforce (Church, Rotolo, Ginther, & Levine, 2015). Similar to succession management programs, HPI practices are growing in popularity, with anywhere from one to two thirds of organizations having some level of HPI practice in place (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Pepermans et al., 2003; Slan Jerusalim & Hausdorf, 2007). Larger organizations, international in scope and with a flexible culture are more likely to have HPI programs (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Pepermans et al., 2003; Slan Jerusalim & Hausdorf, 2007).
Unfortunately, HPI practices have been referred to as the “result of a coincidental policy” (Pepermans et al., 2003, p. 675), such that HPI practices are designed without thorough evidence or forethought (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Church et al., 2015). Due to the lack of evidence or forethought and their rise in popularity, there is dissent regarding the specifics of this practice. For example, organizations disagree on whether employees should know their high potential status, whether to assess senior executive and/or mid-level managers for high potential identification, as well as what percentage of employees should be identified (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Church et al., 2015). Additionally, organizations disagree at what point in their career employees should be identified, often somewhere between 1-5 years of their tenure with the organization (Pepermans et al., 2003). The variability in HPI practices limits an integrated investigation of program impact across organizations. Despite this, some research has explored the impact of HPI on a range of individual outcomes.

Current research evidence examining HPI specifically, suggests its positive impact on various employee attitudes, such as justice perceptions, turnover intentions, and job satisfaction (Björkman et al., 2013; Dries & Pepermans, 2008; Gelens et al., 2014; Slan Jerusalim & Hausdorf, 2007). As well, identification as a high potential has been found to relate to: perceptions of distributive justice; acceptance of increasing performance demands; commitment to building competencies; active support of strategic priorities; identification with the unit; decreased turnover intentions; higher job satisfaction; and increased work effort (Björkman et al., 2013; Gelens et al., 2014; Slan Jerusalim & Hausdorf, 2007).

Interviews reported by Dries and Pepermans (2008) found that employees who were identified as high potentials stayed with their organizations because they viewed upward moves as short-term extrinsic rewards, and that these high potential employees actively sought their
career aspirations. Slan Jerusalim and Hausdorf (2007) went beyond attitudes to examine specific aspects of high potential identification programs that influence managers' perceptions of procedural justice, specifically: input into the high potential process; communication strategy; and evaluation of high potential process. The impact of identification has even been examined experimentally, examining the differential impact of feedback on change in performance satisfaction and task commitment using a cognitive task (Kotlyar, 2013). It is clear from previous research that HPI has an impact on individuals’ attitudes, and self-reported behaviours.

As succession management and HPI practices are often implemented in response to low confidence in current leader abilities and weak senior leadership talent (Busine & Watt, 2005) understanding their impact on leader behaviour and performance is critical. Research has yet to examine the influence of HPI on the behaviours and/or performance of the individuals who are identified as high potential (or not identified). Further, employees who are identified as high potential are often moved upward within the organization, which makes their leadership behaviour all the more important to examine (Dries & Pepermans, 2008). In order to examine the influence of HPI communication on leadership behaviours and outcomes I present a model articulating how the communication of HPI status leads to leadership behaviours, through one’s leadership self-efficacy and affect, ultimately leading to task performance and follower satisfaction, depicted in Figure 1, and articulated in the following sections.

Leadership Behaviour

A recent and prominent conceptualization of leadership behaviours involves charismatic-transformational leadership (Dinh et al., 2014). Charismatic-Transformational leadership is conceptualized with four components, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985). Judge and Piccolo (2004) reported
evidence for the validity of transformational leadership, across both longitudinal and multisource research designs. They reported that transformational leadership is a stronger predictor of follower satisfaction with the leader and leadership effectiveness as compared to the components of transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Further, Piccolo et al. (2012) found evidence that, in comparison to a handful of leadership theories, transformational leadership was one of the most important predictors of employee job satisfaction and leadership effectiveness. Despite its popularity, some experts have raised concerns with the conceptualization of charismatic-transformational leadership, especially the importance of particular dimensions, and the measurement of the construct (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1994; Dionne et al., 2013; House & Shamir, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013).

One simpler conceptualization of leadership behaviour comes from the collection of Ohio State Leadership Studies, based on United States military research aimed at uncovering a universally effective leadership structure (Schriesheim & Bird, 1979; Shartle, 1979). These studies purported a two-factor structure (Fleishman, 1973), involving initiating structure, “the degree to which a leader defines and structures his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment” (Yukl, 1971, p. 415), and consideration, “the degree to which a leader acts in a warm and supportive manner and shows concern and respect for his subordinates” (Yukl, 1971, p. 415). These factors were viewed as complementary and dependent on the situation rather than the individual, making for a multi-factor theory of behavioural leadership.

The constructs of initiating structure and consideration, while not prominent in recent empirical work (Dinh et al., 2014), still have strong evidence supporting their value. Specifically, a meta-analytic investigation found that both initiating structure and consideration, were moderately correlated with various measures of leadership criteria, specifically follower job
satisfaction ($r = .19$, and $r = .40$ respectively), follower satisfaction with leader ($r = .27$, and $r = .68$ respectively), follower motivation ($r = .26$, and $r = .36$ respectively), leader job performance ($r = .19$, and $r = .18$ respectively), group–organization performance ($r = .23$, and $r = .23$ respectively), and overall leader effectiveness ($r = .28$, and $r = .39$ respectively; Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004).

Some researchers have promoted an integration of initiating structure and consideration with transformation-charismatic leadership. Specifically, DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, and Humphrey (2011) categorized initiating structure and consideration under task-oriented and relational-oriented leader behaviours, respectively, in their meta-analytic integration of leadership theories. Their conceptualization of various leader behaviours (such as initiating structure, contingent reward, and management by exception-active) as task-oriented, and other leader behaviours (such as consideration, empowerment, and participative) as relational-oriented, reflects a taxonomy similar to that presented by Yukl (2012), which breaks down task, relations, external, and change-oriented leadership behaviour. As well, Piccolo et al. (2012) demonstrated that initiating structure overlaps with other conceptualizations of leadership behaviour, such as transformational leadership and contingent reward. Further, while transformational leadership encompasses, both initiating structure and consideration (Bass, 1985), a discussion of leadership behaviours can benefit from a broadened discussion of leader behaviours as task or relational-oriented.

The literature on leadership behaviour examines this as an antecedent of performance, specifically finding that consideration is related to job satisfaction and leader effectiveness (relational measures of leadership effectiveness), while initiating structure is related to task measures of leadership effectiveness (DeRue et al., 2011; Prochazka, Vaculik, & Smutny, 2014).
Further, Piccolo et al. (2012) examine the relative impact of various leadership behaviours and found that consideration explains unique variance, beyond initiating structure, laissez-faire and contingent reward, in job satisfaction and ratings of leader effectiveness. Beyond leader effectiveness both of these leadership behaviours also relate to leadership self-efficacy.

**Leadership Self-Efficacy**

Leadership self-efficacy is generally thought of as one’s assessment of their own ability to perform in a leadership role (Paglis, 2010). It is based on Bandura’s (1986) social-cognitive theory of behaviour, which described general self-efficacy as one’s assessment of their ability to perform some action at a desired level. Research shows that Bandura’s (1986) social-cognitive theory, and therefore self-efficacy, can be applied to the work environment (Harrison, Rainer, Hochwarter, & Thompson, 1997), and leadership (McCormick, Tanguma, & López-Forment, 2002). Leadership self-efficacy has been found to be related to task and relational leadership behaviours (Anderson et al., 2008; Galoji, Ahmad, & Johari, 2013), attempting to lead (McCormick et al., 2002), and broad ratings of leadership effectiveness (Chemers et al., 2000; Ng et al., 2008).

As well as being related to leadership behaviours and effectiveness, leadership self-efficacy has been examined as a mediating link between environmental factors and various behaviours (e.g., Allen et al., 2014). Specific antecedents to one’s self-efficacy include: enactive mastery experience which involves processing situational and individual factors as accomplishing a challenging task at or above a standard; vicarious learning; verbal persuasion; and psychological and emotional arousal (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). It is understood that through verbal persuasion, situational factors, self-referenced information, social comparison or specific training, one’s self-efficacy can be modified (Eden, Ganzach, Flumin-Granat, &
It is for these reasons that the relationship between HPI and task/relational behaviours should be mediated by leadership self-efficacy. Specifically, HPI communicates to individuals that they are viewed as a competent leader by others, persuading them to have confidence in their own leadership abilities. Therefore, the communication of HPI should positively influence their leadership self-efficacy, which should be positively related to their task and relational behaviours. In contrast, the communication of no HPI should negatively influence one’s leadership self-efficacy, which should be negatively related to their task and relational behaviours, providing evidence that self-efficacy may explain the differences between HPI and no HPI groups on task/relational behaviours. While self-efficacy represents one mechanism through which HPI may relate to behaviours/performance, affect represents another mechanism through which HPI may relate (in a positive, when identified, or a negative way, when not identified) to behaviours/performance (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).

**Positive and Negative Affect**

Affect research has also been explored in relation to transformational leadership effectiveness (Chuang, Judge, & Liaw, 2012). Specifically, positive affect has been found to be related to engaging in transformational leadership behaviours (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). High positive affect involves feelings of enthusiasm, being active, and alert, being in a state of “high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable engagement” (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p. 1063). High negative affect involves “subjective distress and unpleasurable mood states, including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, and nervousness” (Watson et al., 1988, p.1063). Meta-analytic support has been found for both positive and negative affect being related to job
performance in general, with estimated mean population correlations of .19 and -.15 respectively (Kaplan, Bradley, Luchman, & Haynes, 2009).

Evidence points toward the influence of both positive and negative emotions on behaviours (Baumeister, Vohns, DeWall, & Zhang, 2007). Further, the induction of affect based on feedback or specific messages/information and affect as the link between feedback and behaviour have also gathered empirical support (Kluger, Lewinsohn, & Aiello, 1994; Lam, Yik, & Schaubroeck, 2002). Therefore, HPI should positively influence individuals’ positive affect, which should be positively related to their task and relational behaviours whereas non HPI should be negatively related to positive affect as well as task and relational behaviours. The opposite should be true for negative affect in that, HPI should negatively influence negative affect, whereas non HPI should be positively related to negative affect. As mentioned previous these task and relational behaviours are related to leader performance.

**Task Performance**

DeRue et al. (2011) found, through a meta-analysis, that leadership behaviours explained 20 percent of the variance in objective, behavioural, group level measures of task performance, while initiating structure specifically explained 33 percent of the variance. Further, Judge et al. (2004) found that both consideration and initiating structure leadership behaviours were significantly positively correlated with objective measures of group/organizational performance, with mean observed correlations of .23. Similarly, under a manipulation of leader’s consideration behaviours (with confederates saying things such as, “…don’t worry I’ll stand up for you” compared to “I have enough to do without worrying about you and getting on the boss’ bad side”), followers were found to be more productive, in cleaning, filing and adjusting spark plugs, with objective measures of speed and accuracy (Lowin, Hrapchack, & Kavanagh, 1969). In
addition to task performance for followers, groups, and organizations, leadership behaviours are also related to follower satisfaction.

**Follower Satisfaction**

To round out the measurement of leadership effectiveness, beyond measures of task performance, research often examines follower ratings of satisfaction. Follower ratings of satisfaction generally capture affect towards the leader (e.g., Erez, LePrine, & Elms, 2002), and are conceptualized as a measure of leadership effectiveness (Derue et al., 2011; Hiller, DeChurch, Murase, & Doty, 2011), because of the notion that followers should evaluate leaders positively. Similarly, relationship satisfaction is often conceptualized more broadly as job satisfaction, because followers who are satisfied with their leader should be satisfied with their jobs (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Judge et al., 2004).

Research supports a relationship between various leadership behaviours and follower satisfaction of the leader, in that leadership behaviours, and specifically consideration, initiating structure, and transformational leadership behaviours explain 51, 14, 3, and 21 percent of the variance in follower satisfaction, respectively (DeRue et al., 2011). Further, Judge et al. (2004), found that both consideration and initiating structure leadership behaviours were significantly positively correlated with follower satisfaction with the leader, with mean observed correlations of .68 and .27, respectively. As well, initiating structure and consideration have also both been found to mediate the relationship between leader position power and follower job satisfaction, such that increasing a leader’s position power leads to even higher follower job satisfaction under conditions of increased initiating structure and consideration (Blickle et al., 2013). Schriesheim (1982) found that leaders who exhibited high levels of consideration behaviour had more satisfied followers, while Piccolo et al. (2012) found that consideration leadership
behaviours predicted follower job satisfaction. Similarly, under a manipulation of leader consideration behaviours, followers were found to be more satisfied with their job (Lowin et al., 1969). Meanwhile, Lambert, Tepper, Carr, Holt, and Barelka (2012) found that needed and received consideration is related to attitudinal outcomes such as trust in the supervisor, job satisfaction and affective commitment to the organization. Overall, it has been shown that followers’ satisfaction with the leader, whether measured directly or through job satisfaction, is related to both task and relational leadership behaviours.

**Hypotheses**

In summary, given the lack of consideration for the influence of HPI on employee behaviours and the importance of leadership behaviour in relation to HPI, this research explores the influence of high potential identification on task and relational leadership behaviour, as well as leadership outcomes (task performance and relationship satisfaction). Specifically, I will compare three groups: those who receive feedback that they are high potential, those who receive feedback that they are not yet high potential, and those who receive no information about their high potential status (i.e. control), on ratings of their task performance, relationship satisfaction, and respective behaviours while in a leadership position. I will also examine whether individuals’ leadership self-efficacy or positive or negative affect mediate the relationship between condition and task performance/relationship satisfaction.

Based on the leadership self-efficacy literature reviewed above, being identified as high potential can be conceptualized as a form of positive feedback, which has been shown as positively related to behaviours specific to various tasks, and broader leadership behaviours and effectiveness (Anderson et al., 2008; Chemers et al., 2000; Galoji, Ahmad, & Johari, 2013; McCormick et al., 2002; Ng et al., 2008). Specifically, if HPI is viewed as a form of verbal
persuasion and influencing one’s conception of ability, it should be related to higher leadership self-efficacy, compared to a control or no HPI condition. As well, because leadership self-efficacy has been linked to general task performance and leadership performance, it should be related to more task and relational behaviours. Therefore, HPI should be positively related to ratings of task and relational behaviours (hypotheses 1 & 2), compared to groups not identified or not informed about identification. Similarly, based on the affect literature reviewed above, feedback has been shown to induce affect, while affect is shown to be related to behaviours and general job performance (Baumeister et al., 2007; Kluger et al., 1994; Lam et al., 2002). Thus, one’s leadership self-efficacy, positive affect, and negative affect should mediate the relationship between HPI leadership behaviours (hypotheses 3a-c).

*Hypothesis 1*: HPI is related to higher ratings of task behaviours.

*Hypothesis 2*: HPI is related to higher ratings of relational behaviours.

*Hypothesis 3a*: Leadership self-efficacy mediates the relationship between HPI and leadership behaviours (hypotheses 1&2).

*Hypothesis 3b*: Positive affect mediates the relationship between HPI and leadership behaviours (hypotheses 1&2).

*Hypothesis 3c*: Negative affect mediates the relationship between HPI and leadership behaviours (hypotheses 1&2).

Further, the relationship between HPI and task performance should be explained by task and relationship leadership behaviours, as both task and relationship leadership behaviours have been shown as being related to both task performance and relationship satisfaction (DeRue et al., 2011). Specifically, one’s task and relational behaviours should explain the difference between HPI and no HPI groups on leadership outcomes (hypothesis 4). Overall, as depicted in Figure 1,
HPI should be related to task and relational behaviours through leadership self-efficacy and positive and negative affect, resulting in both task performance and relationship satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 4*: Task and relationship behaviours mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership outcomes (relationship satisfaction, tower score, and time left).

**Methods**

This study manipulated HPI to examine its impact on leadership behaviours and outcomes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: HPI, no HPI, and control.

**Participants and Procedure**

Prior to the study, an effect size of .115 from past research was used to conduct a safeguard power analysis, which revealed that approximately $N = 135$ participants would be necessary to adequately test the hypothesis, which works out to $n = 45$ participants per condition (Field, Miles, & Field, 2012; Galoji et al., 2013). Due to time constraints and limited scheduling with confederates, $N = 115$ participants took part in the study. Participants were introductory psychology students at the University of Guelph participating for research credit in their course. Following data cleaning and a manipulation check, described in the results section, we analyzed a total of 100 participants with $n = 37$ participants in the control condition, $n = 27$ participants in the no HPI condition, and $n = 36$ participants in the HPI condition, who were mostly female ($n = 79$), 18-19 years old ($n = 83$), and mostly Caucasian ($n = 73$).

Participants signed up to participate in the study advertised as focusing on the prediction of task performance, to disguise the HPI aspect for all participants. Upon entering the lab, participants were introduced to the study by the primary researcher, who was blind to which condition participants were randomly assigned. Random assignment was achieved using the
survey flow capabilities of Qualtrics which randomized the condition that was shown to participants, while making sure that each condition was evenly presented. Overall, as depicted in Figure 2, participants completed an online questionnaire, a tower building activity, and a task performance and leadership behaviour/relationship assessment.

The online questionnaire involved participants completing a measure of demographics, leadership potential, and personality, receiving feedback (on HPI, no HPI, or no information), being assigned to a task and role in the task that appears random to participants, as well as completing a measure of leadership self-efficacy and positive/negative affect. The leadership potential and personality measures were used to establish the credibility of the high potential identification. In the HPI condition participants received a summary report informing them of their status as high potential. In the non HPI condition participants received a similar summary report with the exception that they were informed of their status as not high potential at this time. A manipulation check verified that participants read and understood the feedback. The control condition received a thank you regarding their participation, as well as an attention check measure (see Appendix B for summary report and feedback). Assignment to the condition was followed with a brief description of the tower building task and assignment to the leader role. Despite the appearance of random assignment, all participants were given the leadership role and completed a short questionnaire regarding their leadership self-efficacy and positive/negative affect prior to being joined by the confederate for the tower building task.

Following this online process, the primary researcher asked participants which role they were assigned in the task (as participants were lead to believe that this assignment was randomized using the online questionnaire, although all participants received the assignment of the leader role). Participants were then re-introduced to the task and the confederate was brought
into the room and introduced as a fellow participant by the primary researcher. The confederate was trained on completing the task in a similar manner across participants in order to control the experimental situation and focus the study on the leaders’ behaviours (see Appendix C for scripted behaviours and statements).

The primary research instructed participants and confederates that that the goal of the task was to build a tower, to match the tower in the diagram which was only shown to the leader (participants), and that they have ten minutes to complete this task. Participants (leaders) were informed that they would need to verbally instruct the blindfolded follower (confederate) to build the tower as the leader is not allowed to touch the blocks or the follower. During the task, the follower (confederate) sat blindfolded with the leader (participant) standing or sitting behind/beside them, with 16 1-inch rectangular blocks placed on the table. Following completion of the task, the participant’s leadership behaviours were rated by both themselves and the confederate, before being debriefed by the primary researcher (see Appendix D).

Materials and Measures

Demographics. Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, and ethnicity (Aboriginal/First Nations/Metis, White/Caucasian, Black/African/Caribbean, Southeast Asian, South Asian, Latin American, West Asian).

Leadership potential. The measure of leadership potential utilized a multiple choice situational judgement test adapted from Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) situational leadership theory (Hersey, 1985). This measure was chosen so that participants would believe that the high potential identification was credible. The measure consisted of ten multiple choice situational questions, each with four potential answers (see Appendix E). For example, “your team is unhappy with a recent decision that you made. You had no choice in making this decision but the
team is not aware of that. What would you do?” Participants chose one of several options from “get them together and explain that you had no choice in the decision”, “get them together and explain why they should not be worried about the decision”, “get the team together and bring in your manager to explain that you had no choice in the decision”, or “get them together and ask for what they would have done in the same situation”. This measure was pilot tested with three graduate students for credibility and believability along with the rest of the study procedure.

**Personality.** The 60-item HEXACO personality measure (Ashton & Lee, 2009), which measures honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience was also used to add credibility to the high potential identification (see Appendix F).

**Affect.** Positive and negative affect was measured using Watson, Clark and Tellegen’s (1988) Positive and Negative Affect Scales (see Appendix G). This set of scales has undergone thorough development and has shown reliability and validity across many studies (e.g., Lonigan, Hooe, David, & Kistner, 1999; Tuccitto, Giacobbi, & Leite, 2010; Villodas, Villodas, & Roesch, 2011; Watson & Clark, 1994). The scale consisted of 20 items which were rated on a 5 point Likert scale from “very slightly or not at all” to “extremely” in terms of the extent participants felt this way at the present moment.

**Leadership Self-Efficacy.** Leadership self-efficacy was measured using an adaptation of Murphy’s (1992) leadership self-efficacy scale (see Appendix H). This measure has been similarly adapted by others (Hoyt et al., 2010; Hoyt et al., 2003), although their adaptations were not available. This measure of leadership self-efficacy consists of 6 items rated on a 5 point Likert scale. While this measure is not exactly what has been used in past research, the similar measures have shown a reliability ranging from .75 to .86 as well as convergent validity through
correlations with self-esteem and leadership experience (Murphy, 1992; Murphy & Ensher, 1999).

**Task.** The tower building task was adapted from previous research (Goldberg & Maccoby, 1965; Kramer, Bhave, & Johnson, 2014; Mitchell & Silver, 1990; Rieck, 2008). This task has been shown to elicit a wide range of behaviours and is reflective of some supervisor-subordinate relationships (i.e., regional sales manager and sales representative; Rieck, 2008). For the current study, five tower diagrams were rotated through each participant, which all had the same number of blocks (16) in various formations with the goal of the task to complete the given tower to match the diagram in the 10 minutes allotted. The task was completed in dyads with a leader and a follower. Participants were given instructions (see Appendix I), by the primary researcher. As participants took on only the leader role, confederates were used to fill the role of follower.

**Leadership behaviour.** *Self-ratings.* Self-ratings of leadership behaviour were rated using the tower-building assessment form (see Appendix J). This measure was developed for specific use with the tower building task and has thus already undergone measurement development in terms of internal consistency (Rieck, 2008). The items in the form reflect task behaviours ($\alpha = .70$), self-insight ($\alpha = .71$), social insight ($\alpha = .67$), and relationship management ($\alpha = .67$), which map onto the theoretical concepts of task behaviours and relational behaviours (social insight and relationship management) (Rieck, 2008). The assessment form consisted of 12 items on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree to assess self-perceptions of effective enacted leadership behaviours. For example, “My instructions were specific” is a task behaviour, whereas “I needed to help the builder stay calm” is a social-insight or relational behaviour.
Confederate ratings. Confederate ratings of leader behaviour were provided using an adapted version of the tower building assessment form (see Appendix J). This assessment form also consists of 12 items on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree to assess other-perceptions of effective enacted leadership behaviours. Three confederates were used over the course of the study, with one of the confederate providing a rating of one participant per session. In total, confederates rated anywhere between 32 and 44 participants.

Relationship Satisfaction. Along with measuring leadership behaviours, the tower building assessment that was given to the confederate will also use a previously utilized measure of relationship satisfaction (Rieck, 2008). The measure consisted of five questions rated on a 5 point Likert scale. For example, “I would work with this leader again”.

Task Performance. Task performance was measured by the primary researcher in two ways. Once the time was up, or upon the participants’ decision that the tower was complete, the primary researcher took a photograph of the tower and recorded if there was any time left (in seconds). Taking a photograph of the tower allowed the primary researcher to compare it to the tower building diagram that the participant was given and calculate a tower score based on the number of blocks correctly placed minus those incorrectly placed. Time remaining after task completion has been used previously as a measure of performance with this task (Goldberg & Maccoby, 1965; Kramer, Bhave, & Johnson, 2014; Mitchell & Silver, 1990; Rieck, 2008).

Research Assistant Training. Three research assistants were trained to perform the role of confederate in a consistent manner across participants (see Appendix C for further training description). Specifically, they were instructed to not to ask the participant any questions and to respond to any questions with minimal or deflective responses such as, “Yes”, “No”, “I can’t see”, or “What do you think”. Additionally, they were instructed to only make movements as
indicated by the participant, and to avoid purposefully knocking blocks down. Confederates practiced their role twice in order to receive feedback and to adjust their behaviour. Finally, as the confederates would be performing the task multiple times five different tower diagrams were utilized and not shown to them to guard against practice effects.

**Results**

Before proceeding to the primary tests of the hypotheses, the assumption of normality and correlations between dependent variables were checked and reported. All variables were checked for skewness and kurtosis, with $z$ values (i.e. skewness divided by the standard error of skewness within the acceptable range of +/-3.29) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Additionally, checking for outliers resulted in deletion of three participants (whom were greater than +/- 3.29 standard deviations from the mean on time left, negative affect, or leadership self-efficacy) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Further, the manipulation check, verifying that participants understood that they were or were not identified as high potential by asking, “Have you been identified as high potential?”, resulted in 10 participants being removed from the no HPI condition, 1 participant being removed from the HPI condition, with an additional participant removed because they were falling asleep.

As this study aimed to utilize confederate ratings of leadership behaviours the potential non-independence of these ratings was first examined. Following this examination, the factor structure of the self-ratings of leadership behaviours were explored to provide justification for the breakdown of the leadership behaviours in the primary analyses. Upon examining these aspects, each hypothesis was examined. Specifically, hypotheses 1 & 2 were explored using a MANOVA, while hypotheses 3 & 4 were examined using the process macro for mediation (Hayes, 2013) to estimate the direct and indirect effects, after testing for assumptions related to
these specific tests. Full and partial mediation were not discussed, rather indirect effects are utilized to examine mediation, as is recommended when using the bootstrapping method (Hayes, Preacher, & Myers, 2011).

As each confederate provided leadership behaviour ratings for multiple participants, the independence of these ratings was examined. Two analyses of variance (ANOVA) compared the three confederates’ ratings of task behavior and relational behavior. Levene’s test revealed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated for task behaviour scores, $F (2, 97) = 10.79, p < .000$, therefore the Welch $F$-ratio was used, which weights the means by the group’s sample size to account for the imbalance (Field, 2013). The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of confederate on ratings of task behaviours, $F (2, 60.7) = 13.52, p < .000$, $\eta^2=.26$. Further, Games-Howell post-hoc comparisons between the three confederates revealed that confederate three ($M = 4, SD = .38$) provided statistically significantly higher ratings than confederate one ($M = 3.43, SD = .69$), $p = .001, d = .60, 95\% CI [.24, .95]$, and confederate two ($M = 3.34, SD = .22$), $p < .000, d = .42, 95\% CI [.19, .65]$.

For ratings of relational behaviour, Levene’s test revealed the homogeneity of variance assumption was also violated, $F (2, 97) = 12.53, p < .000$, therefore the Welch $F$-ratio was used. The ANOVA revealed a statistically significant effect of confederate on ratings of relational behaviours, $F (2, 49.28) = 32.45, p < .000, \eta^2 = .16$. Further, Games-Howell post-hoc comparisons between the three confederates revealed that confederate three ($M = 4.13, SD = .35$) provided statistically significantly higher ratings than confederate one ($M = 3.53, SD = .76$), $p < .000, d = .57, 95\% CI [.23, .90]$, and confederate two ($M = 3.70, SD = .42$), $p < .000, d = .66, 95\% CI [.46, .86]$. 

Given the higher ratings from confederate three and the possibility of removing this confederate’s data from the study, additional comparisons were made for the other two confederates. A t-test was computed comparing confederate one and two on ratings of task behaviour, Levene’s test was found to be statistically significant ($F = 11.38, p = .001$), so homogenous variances were not assumed. The t-test revealed no statistically significant differences between the confederates on ratings of task behaviour, $t (49.55) = -1.17, p = .246$, 95% CI [-.47, .12], $\eta^2 = .16$. Similarly, a t-test was computed comparing confederate one and two on ratings of relational behaviour, Levene’s test was found to be statistically significant ($F = 22.12, p < .000$), so homogenous variances were not assumed. The t-test revealed no statistically significant differences between the confederates on ratings of task behaviour, $t (38.82) = .73, p = .091$, 95% CI [-.16, .34], $\eta^2 = .12$. Due to moderate amount of between-confederate variance, with all three confederates (task $\eta^2 = .26$ and relational $\eta^2 = .16$) and with the lenient confederate excluded (task $\eta^2 = .16$ and relational $\eta^2 = .12$), as well as the impact that removing the lenient confederate would have on the sample, the decision was made to remove all confederate ratings from the analyses.

As leadership behaviours based on the tower assessment scores were the main focus of the hypotheses, it was necessary to explore the factor structure of this tower building assessment. Thus, a factor analysis was undertaken. First, in order to determine the number of factors which will be retained for the principal component analysis, a parallel analysis was conducted (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004), which indicated a three-factor solution, accounting for 39.62% of the total variance. A principal component analysis with oblique (oblimin) rotation (accounting for a maximum correlation of .746) was then conducted to reveal the factor structure (see Table 1 for
factor loadings), accounting for the inter-item correlations and minimizing items loading across multiple factors (Brown & Moore, 2012).

Retaining items loading greater than or equal to .5, with the relative distance between factor loadings being more than .2 (i.e. TB1 loaded -.515 on factor 2, but .411 on factor 1, which represents an overlap of .104), left eight items across the three factors and eleven of the tower building assessment items obsolete (Eamonn & Cox, 1993; Snook & Gorsuch, 1989). Factor 1 involved emotional management items, which were drawn from all four original sections of the tower building assessment. This factor included seven items stating, “When I needed I tried different approaches with the builder”, “I knew that I needed to stay calm”, “I was motivated to perform well on the task”, “I was aware of the builder’s feelings”, “I needed to help the builder stay calm”, “The builder was motivated to perform well on the task”, and “I developed a good rapport with the builder”. Factor 2 involved task focus items, which were originally a part of the self-insight section of the tower building assessment. This factor included three items stating, “I felt stressed during the activity”, “I found it difficult to not touch the blocks”, and “I was frustrated by the task”. As these items were phrased negatively, task focus scores were reversed so that higher scores reflected more focus, in order to ease interpretation. Factor 3 involved builder support items, which were originally a part of the social insight and relationship management sections of the tower building assessment. This factor included three items stating, “I needed to tell the builder how he/she was doing”, “I told the builder how s/he was progressing”, and “I said supportive statements to the builder”.

Subsequently, the hypotheses being tested and by extension the primary analyses were modified to reflect the supported factor structure. Specifically, relationship management was replaced with emotional management, relationship satisfaction was replaced with builder
support, and task behaviour was replaced with task focus. Thus, hypothesis 1 was restated as, HPI will be positively related to self-ratings of task focus, and hypothesis 2 was restated as, HPI will be positively related to self-ratings of emotional management. Further, hypothesis 3 was restated as, leadership self-efficacy, positive, or negative affect will mediate the relationship between HPI and self-ratings of emotional management and task focus. Additionally, hypothesis 4 was restated as, self-ratings of task focus and emotional management will mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership outcomes (builder support, tower score, and time left).

Internal consistency reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s coefficient alphas (α), to estimate the internal consistency of self-rated emotional management, self-rated task focus, leadership self-efficacy, positive affect, negative affect, and self-rated builder support. Table 2 displays these Cronbach’s coefficient alphas (α), the means and standard deviations, and correlations between measures, including time left in seconds, with 95% confidence intervals. As can be seen in table 2, most Cronbach’s coefficient alphas (α) are above acceptable (.70), however the alpha for task focus falls below acceptable (Cortina, 1993). Despite the low alpha for the self-ratings of task behaviour (.59), it was deemed acceptable as the scale consisted of a small number of items (three), which can artificially attenuate the scale’s reliability (Cortina, 1993).

Test of hypotheses 1 & 2

Hypotheses 1 & 2 that the HPI condition will have higher self-ratings of task focus and emotional management compared to the control and no HPI conditions, was tested using a multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA). Before conducting the MANOVA, Box’s M and Levene’s test were conducted to determine whether assumptions of homogeneity were met. Box’s M was found to be non-significant at 8.07, $F(6, 143239.97) = 1.303, \ p = .252,$
confirming the assumption that the co-variance matrices of the dependent variables were equal. Levene’s test was also found to be non-significant, for both task focus \( F(2, 97) = .895, p = .412 \), and emotional management \( F(2, 97) = .166, p = .847 \), allowing us to assume homogeneity of variance for both dependent variables. Overall, the factorial MANOVA revealed no statistically significant effect of condition on the combined dependent variables of task focus and emotional management, Wilk’s \( A = .96, F(4, 192) = 0.89, p = .47, \eta^2 = .02, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.06,.32] \) (see Table 3). Further, the confidence interval shows the sample effect could have been produced by a population effect anywhere between -.06 and .32, showing a large degree of uncertainty as the range was 19 times larger than the effect, although the population effect was most likely positive. Given the non-statistically significant multivariate test, further the univariate tests were not explored (Field, 2013). Therefore, the self-ratings of participants’ task focus did not differ across the HPI \( (M = 2.96, SD = .97) \), no HPI \( (M = 2.95, SD = .71) \), and control \( (M = 2.96, SD = .85) \) conditions, providing no support for hypothesis 1 (see Table 3). Similarly, the self-ratings of participants’ emotional awareness did not differ across the HPI \( (M = 3.94, SD = .53) \), no HPI \( (M = 3.95, SD = .47) \), and control \( (M = 3.75, SD = .49) \) conditions, providing no support for hypothesis 2 (see Table 3).

**Test of hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3, that leadership self-efficacy, positive or negative affect would mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership behaviours, was tested for mediation using the process macro (Hayes, 2013). Direct and indirect effects were assessed with standard errors estimated using 10,000 bootstraps. As statistically significant differences were found between the HPI condition and the combination of the control and no HPI conditions, this comparison \( (\text{HPI} = 1, \text{no HPI and control} = 0) \) was utilized within the path analysis so that the HPI variable was a
dichotomous categorical variable. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, as demonstrated by variance inflation factors below 10 and tolerances above 0.1. The assumption of independent errors, that the residuals were not correlated, was met with Durbin-Watson statistics between 1 and 3 (Field, 2013). The assumption of homoscedasticity was assessed with Hartley’s $F_{\text{max}}$ which reveals equality of error variances for task focus, emotional management, positive affect, negative affect, and leadership self-efficacy, with values below the suggested critical value of 3. Unstandardized coefficients were reported as they are preferred when path models are used, especially when the predictor is a dichotomous variable (Hayes, A. F., n.d.).

Mediation of the relationship between HPI and task focus was not supported as the indirect effect of leadership self-efficacy ($b = -0.00, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.10, 0.05]$), positive affect ($b = 0.038, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.24, 0.21]$), and negative affect ($b = -0.05, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.19, 0.04]$) were not statistically significant. Further, there was no statistically significant total ($b = -0.02, p = .91, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.38, 0.34]$), or direct effects ($b = -0.02, p = .89, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.36, 0.32]$) between HPI and self-ratings of task focus. Additionally, there was no significant effect of leadership self-efficacy ($b = -0.22, p = .31, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.66, 0.22]$) on task focus. In contrast, there were statistically significant effects of positive affect ($b = 0.38, p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.14, 0.63]$), and negative affect ($b = -0.52, p = .006, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.88, -0.15]$) on task focus.

Additionally, the sample path coefficient for the effect of positive affect on task focus could have been produced by a population coefficient between 0.14 and 0.63, representing a small degree of uncertainty that was only 1.3 times larger than the sample path coefficient. Similarly, the sample path coefficient for the effect of negative affect on task focus could have been produced by a population coefficient between -0.88 and -0.15, representing a small degree of uncertainty that was only 1.4 times larger than the sample path coefficient. In sum, it appears
as though the HPI manipulation was not related to self-ratings of task focus, as depicted in Figure 4, but that one’s positive and negative affect were related to self-ratings of task focus.

Mediation of the relationship between HPI and emotional management was not supported as the indirect effect of leadership self-efficacy ($b = 0.00$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.06]), positive affect ($b = 0.04$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.14]), and negative affect ($b = 0.00$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.06]) were not statistically significant. The sample path coefficient for the indirect effect of positive affect on emotional awareness could have been produced by a population coefficient between -0.02 and 0.14, representing a large degree of uncertainty that was 4 times larger than the sample path coefficient, although the population coefficient was most likely positive. Further, there was no statistically significant total ($b = .11$, $p = .31$, 95% CI [-.11, .32]), or direct effects ($b = .06$, $p = .56$, 95% CI [-0.12, 0.25]) between HPI and self-ratings of emotional management. Further, there were no statistically significant effects of leadership self-efficacy ($b = .10$, $p = .41$, 95% CI [-.15, .36]) or negative affect ($b = .03$, $p = .77$, 95% CI [-.18, .24]), and a statistically significant effect of positive affect ($b = .24$, $p = .001$, 95% CI [.10, .37]) on emotional management.

The sample path coefficient for the effect of leadership self-efficacy on emotional awareness could have been produced by a population coefficient between -.15 and .36, representing a large degree of uncertainty that was 5.1 times larger than the sample path coefficient, although the population coefficient was most likely positive. Similarly, the sample path coefficient for the effect of negative affect on emotional awareness could have been produced by a population coefficient between -.18, and .24, representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was 2 times larger than the sample path coefficient. Additionally, the confidence interval for the relationship between positive affect and emotional management provides evidence for the relationship, as the sample path coefficient could have been produced by a
population coefficient anywhere between .10 and .37, representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was almost 2 times larger than the sample path coefficient. In sum, it appears as though the HPI manipulation was not related to self-ratings of emotional management, as depicted in Figure 5, but that one’s positive affect was related to self-ratings of emotional management.

**Test of hypothesis 4**

Investigation of hypothesis 4, that task focus and emotional management would mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership outcomes (tower score, time left, and relationship satisfaction), was tested using the process macro for mediation (Hayes, 2013) to estimate the direct and indirect effects, with standard errors estimated using 10,000 bootstraps. The assumption of multicollinearity was met, as demonstrated by variance inflation factors below 10 and tolerances above 0.1. The assumption of independent errors, that the residuals are not correlated, was met with Durbin-Watson statistics between 1 and 3 (Field, 2013). The assumption of homoscedasticity was assessed with Hartley’s $F_{\text{max}}$ which reveals equality of error variances for task focus, emotional management, builder support, time left, and tower score, with values below the suggested critical value of 3. Unstandardized coefficients were reported as they are preferred with path analysis, especially when the predictor is a dichotomous variable (Hayes, A. F., n.d.).

Mediation of the relationship between HPI and time left was not supported as there was no statistically significant indirect effect of task focus ($b = -1.03$, 95% CI [-18.69, 20.94]), or emotional management ($b = 2.89$, 95% CI [-1.49, 14.81]). The sample path coefficient for the indirect effect of emotional awareness could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between -1.49 and 14.81, representing a large degree of uncertainty that was 5.6 times
larger than the sample coefficient, although the population coefficient was most likely positive. The total \( (b = -5.52, p = .80, 95\% \text{ CI} [-48.65, 37.60]) \), and direct effects \( (b = -7.35, p = .71, 95\% \text{ CI} [-46.44, 31.73]) \) between HPI and time left on the tower building task were also found to be not statistically significant. Further, there was no statistically significant effect of emotional management \( (b = 26.30, p = .17, 95\% \text{ CI} [-11.05, 63.66]) \), and a statistically significant effect of task focus \( (b = 50.65, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [28.61, 72.69]) \) on time left.

The sample path coefficient for the effect of emotional management on time left could have been produced by a population coefficient between -11.05 and 63.66, representing a most likely positive and potentially practically important coefficient of 63.66 seconds within a 600 second time limit, although this range represents a moderate degree of uncertainty being 2.8 times larger than the sample path coefficient. The statistically significant effect of task focus on time left was further supported by the confidence interval, which represented a potential population coefficient anywhere between 28.61 and 72.69, representing a potentially practically important coefficient of 72.69 seconds within a 600 second time limit, although the range represents a little uncertainty being smaller than the sample path coefficient. In sum, it appears as though the HPI manipulation was not related to time left of the task, as depicted in Figure 6, however self-ratings of task focus were related to time left on the task.

Mediation of the relationship between HPI and tower score was not supported as there was no statistically significant indirect effect of task focus \( (b = -0.02, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.49, 0.44]) \) or emotional management \( (b = 0.12, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.06, 0.53]) \). The sample path coefficient for the indirect effect of emotional awareness on tower score could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between -0.06 and 0.53, representing a large degree of uncertainty that was almost 5 times larger than the sample coefficient. The total \( (b = -0.36, p = .55, 95\% \text{ CI} [-1.54,} \)
.83), and direct effects ($b = -0.45, p = .42, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-1.54, 0.65\right]$) between HPI and tower score on the tower building task were also found to be not statistically significant. Further, there were no significant effect of emotional management ($b = 1.05, p = .05, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.00, 2.09\right]$), and a statistically significant effect of task focus ($b = 0.20, p = .04, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[0.01, 0.39\right]$) on tower score.

The sample path coefficient for the effect of emotional management on tower score could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between -0.00 and 2.09, representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was almost 2 times larger than the sample coefficient. Additionally, the sample path coefficient for the effect of task focus on tower score could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between 0.01 and 0.39, representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was almost 2 times larger than the sample coefficient. In sum, it appears as though the HPI manipulation was not related to tower score ratings, as depicted in Figure 7, although self-ratings of task focus were related to tower score.

Mediation of the relationship between HPI and builder support was not supported as there was no statistically significant indirect effect of task focus ($b = -0.00, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.08, 0.05\right]$) or emotional management ($b = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.02, 0.01\right]$). The total ($b = 0.12, p = .43, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.18, 0.43\right]$), and direct effects ($b = 0.08, p = .60, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.21, 0.37\right]$) between HPI and self-ratings of builder support were also found to be not statistically significant. Further, there was a statistically significant effect of emotional management ($b = 0.44, p = .002, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[0.17, 0.72\right]$), and no statistically significant effect of task focus ($b = 0.13, p = .13, 95\% \text{ CI} \left[-0.04, 0.29\right]$) on self-ratings of builder support.

Further, the sample path coefficient for the effect of emotional management on builder support could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between 0.17 and 0.72,
representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was 1.25 times larger than the sample coefficient. Additionally, the sample path coefficient for the effect of task focus on builder support could have been produced by a population coefficient anywhere between -0.04 and 0.29, representing a moderate degree of uncertainty that was 2.5 times larger than the sample coefficient. In sum, it appears as though the HPI manipulation was not related to self-ratings of builder support, as depicted in Figure 8, although self-ratings of emotional management were related to builder support.

**Summary of Main Analyses**

Overall, none of the hypotheses were fully supported by the results, as depicted in Table 4. Hypothesis 1, that HPI will be positively related to self-ratings of task focus, was not supported by the MANOVA. Similarly, hypothesis 2, that HPI will be positively related to self-ratings of emotional management, was not supported by the MANOVA. Further, hypothesis 3, that leadership self-efficacy, positive, or negative affect will mediate the relationship between HPI and self-ratings of emotional management and task focus, was not supported by testing for indirect effects with process. Finally, hypothesis 4, that self-ratings of task focus and emotional management will mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership outcomes (builder support, tower score, and time left), was not supported by testing for indirect effects with process.

**Additional Analyses**

In addition to testing the hypothesized relationships, further analyses were desired to understand what was going on with the manipulation. Specifically, it was desirable to understand the differences between the conditions on the outcome variables (time left, tower score, and builder support) as these had not been explored in the primary analyses. Further, a question
included in the manipulation, asking if participants considered the assessment as representative of themselves warranted exploration to understand participant reactions to the manipulation which would guide future research.

Before testing differences between conditions on time left, Levene’s test was found to be non-significant \(F (2, 97) = 0.02, p = .99\) supporting the assumption of homogeneity of variance. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences between the HPI \((M = 55.44, SD = 108.67)\), no HPI \((M = 69.07, SD = 98.60)\), and control \((M = 55.05, SD = 105.06)\) conditions on time left, \(F (2, 97) = 0.17, p = .84\). Similarly, for the ANOVA testing differences between conditions on tower score, Levene’s test was found to be non-significant \(F (2, 97) = 0.40, p = .68\) allowing us to assume homogeneity of variance. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences between the HPI \((M = 6.36, SD = 3.10)\), no HPI \((M = 6.70, SD = 2.88)\), and control \((M = 6.73, SD = 2.66)\) conditions on tower score, \(F (2, 97) = 0.18, p = .84\). Additionally, for the ANOVA testing differences between conditions on builder support, Levene’s test was found to be non-significant \(F (2, 97) = 0.63, p = .55\) allowing us to assume homogeneity of variance. The ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences between the HPI \((M = 3.80, SD = .80)\), no HPI \((M = 3.70, SD = .78)\), and control \((M = 3.70, SD = .66)\) conditions on builder support, \(F (2, 97) = 0.32, p = .73\). Finally, for the t-test examining differences between the HPI and no HPI conditions on assessment acceptance, Levene’s test was found to be statistically significant \(F = 5.65, p = .02\), so homogenous variances were not assumed. The t-test revealed statistically significant differences between the HPI \((M = 4.33, SD = .79)\) and no HPI \((M = 3.44, SD = 1.09)\) conditions on assessment acceptance, \(t (45.53) = -3.60, p = .001, 95\% CI [-1.39, -0.39]\). Thus, those receiving the high potential identification rated the
feedback as more representative of themselves than those receiving the not high potential assessment. The implications of these additional analyses will be explored in the discussion.

Discussion

The hypothesized relationships of affect leading to leadership behaviours, which in turn influenced task outcomes, were supported in the experimental paradigm, despite the ineffective manipulation. Specifically, the performance criteria of time left on the task, tower score, and self-rated builder support were related to both self-rated task focus and self-rated emotional management. As described in the results, self-ratings of task focus were related to time left on the task and tower score, objective performance criterion. Additionally, self-ratings of emotional management were related to self-ratings of builder support, a subjective performance criterion. While these statistically significant findings offer useful interpretations, over-reliance on statistical significance testing does limit scientific understanding of empirical data (Schmidt, 1996), thus, the interpretation of confidence intervals around the effect sizes is offered in addition. Upon examining the confidence intervals of the sample path coefficients, self-ratings of task focus may also be related to self-ratings of builder support, and self-ratings of emotional management may also be related to the objective performance criterion of time left and tower score. These findings support the research around leadership performance, which purports that enhanced leadership behaviours will lead to improved objective and subjective performance (DeRue et al., 2011; Judge et al., 2004; Lowin et al., 1969). Further, these relationships support the proposition that behaviours which are both task and relationally oriented are related to both task specific and relational outcomes (DeRue et al., 2011; Judge et al., 2004; Piccolo et al., 2012).
Similarly, the leadership behaviours of self-rated task focus and emotional management were related to self-ratings of positive and negative affect. As described in the results, positive affect was positively related to self-ratings of task focus and emotional management, and negative affect was negatively related to self-ratings of task focus. Further, the interpretation of confidence intervals show that self-ratings of negative affect may also be related to self-ratings of emotional management. These findings support the research on affect influencing one’s behaviour leading to job related outcomes, or in this case leadership behaviours which lead to leadership outcomes (Baumeister et al., 2007; Kaplan et al., 2009). The induction of affect through feedback or specific messages/information has been linked with certain behaviours (Kluger et al., 1994; Lam et al., 2002), and while the induction of affect, through the manipulation, was not successful, the link between affect and performance behaviours was supported by the findings. Further, while the PANAS scale, when used with the short-term instruction (right now), is seen as assessing state affect (Watson et al., 1988), it may be the case, since affect was not induced through the manipulation, that trait affect is related to leadership behaviours, rather than the assumed state affect. Within the leadership domain specifically, this finding supports the relationship between affect and transformational leadership behaviours (Chuang et al., 2012; Rubin et al., 2005), especially with self-ratings of emotional management items resembling transformational leadership components, such as individualized consideration.

Further, upon examination of the confidence intervals, one’s leadership self-efficacy may also be related to self-ratings of emotional management. This finding shows potential support for the research around self-efficacy influencing one’s behaviours, leading to specific outcomes (Allen et al., 2014; Anderson et al., 2008; Galoji et al., 2013). The use of a student sample could have contributed to the potentially small sample path coefficient, as student samples have been
shown to elicit different results, in comparison to adult samples (Peterson, 2001), and have been shown to be inappropriate for some organizational concepts (Barr & Hitt, 1986). Given the strong evidence of leadership self-efficacy (Allen et al., 2014; Anderson et al., 2008; Galoji et al., 2013; McCormick et al., 2002), strong theoretical background (Bandura, 1986), and potentially under-representative sample, it would be unwarranted to draw conclusions from this single study.

Overall, while the manipulation falls short of conclusive evidence, the experimental paradigm played out mostly as expected. Performance criteria, both objective task related and subjective relational, were related to self-rated leadership behaviours, which were influenced by both self-rated positive and negative affect, and possibly leadership self-efficacy. Since self-rated leadership behaviours are linked with task relevant outcomes, then putting participants in the leadership role of the tower building task elicits leadership behaviours which are related to appropriate performance on the task. Additionally, since self-rated positive and negative affect are linked with task relevant behaviours, then participants with more positive and less negative affect perform more leadership behaviours related to appropriate performance on the task.

Limitations and Future Research

While the results support the continued use of the tower building task for eliciting appropriate leadership behaviour, and performance, the tower building assessment currently utilized along with this task could use further development. Specifically, given the results of the principal component analysis, the tower building assessment form appears inefficient for capturing self-ratings of leadership behaviours. Specifically, there appear to be a number of items not clearly loading on any one factor, and the current three factor structure only accounts for less than 40% of the total variance. Additionally, the cronbach’s alpha for the task focus
factor of the tower building assessment was relatively low, at .58, representing questionable reliability (Peterson, 1994). Future research should attempt further item development and factor exploration, prior to utilizing the current tower building assessment forms.

In an attempt to control the tower building task, confederates were utilized in the follower role. Confederates were also used to capture follower ratings of leaders’ behaviours, but concerns over the non-independence of these ratings, in that confederates ratings of one participant were related to their ratings of another participant, these ratings were removed from primary analyses. Additionally, one confederate was found to rate more leniently than the other two confederates. The non-independence of these ratings influences the accuracy of the standard error estimates of regression coefficients (Hayes, 2013). While Kenny and Judd (1986) describe methods for working around the assumption of independence through statistical means, due to the small sample size and the potential to analyze self-rated leadership behaviour, the confederate ratings were removed from the primary analyses.

Future research should aim to explore both independent other ratings and self-ratings of leadership behaviours as the combination of these sources reflects a more complete understanding of participants’ leadership behaviours (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992). Given the benefit of having multiple rating sources, it would have been advantageous to have utilized other ratings of the video recordings of the task. However, given the time constraints this was not feasible. Nonetheless, self-ratings of leadership behaviour do offer a legitimate perspective of one’s own leadership behaviours (Hiller et al., 2011).

Another issue with the tower building assessment capturing leadership behaviours is its self-assessment nature. In linking leadership behaviours with leadership self-efficacy and affect, which were similarly self-rated, there is potential issue with these ratings coming from the same
source. Specifically, because we are attempting to establish links between various self-rated measures, these relationship may be distorted because they are coming from the same source, specifically the participant themselves (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). As leadership self-efficacy and affect are internal states, self-ratings are conceptually accurate, providing evidence that common method bias is not an issue with these ratings specifically (Conway & Lance, 2010). While self-ratings of leadership behaviour are not obviously appropriate to measure with self-ratings, some procedural measures protect against common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Specifically, reduction of evaluation apprehension with steps to ensure anonymity, by allowing the participants to complete their ratings alone in a closed room submitted online or submitted independently, protected against common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Additionally, temporal distance protected against common method bias, by having participants first take the online assessment, which included the self-ratings of affect and leadership self-efficacy, then take part in the task, which was followed by self-ratings of leadership behaviours, making these ratings temporally distinct from self-ratings of affect and leadership self-efficacy (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Another procedural safeguard against common method bias is multiple rating sources (Podsakoff et al., 2003), and while this was attempted with confederate ratings, as discussed above these ratings were non-independent and therefore not included in the final analyses. Further, objective measures of task performance provide another ratings source corroborating evidence for these relationships as they are conceptually related. Future research could attempt outside ratings of behaviours by recording tower building sessions, which would also allow for inter-rater reliability.
Beyond the tower building assessment the main issue with the current study was the manipulation. Firstly, student’s understanding/awareness of HPI may have been problematic, as some participants failed to pass a simple manipulation check asking about their status. Specifically, those in the no HPI status condition failed to correctly identify themselves as not high potential more often than those in the HPI status condition failed to identify themselves as high potential, resulting in a number of participants from the no HPI condition failing this simple manipulation check. This differential attrition rate between the conditions calls into question students’ ability to understand the no HPI status condition, and the use of student samples to experimentally manipulate HPI.

The use of student samples in social science research has been shown to result in effect sized of different size and direction, compared to adult samples (Peterson, 2001). Although some research shows student samples elicit similar results as professional samples (Singer, 1990), at least when it comes to leadership, a comparison of manager and student samples with selection decisions shows cause for concern in using student samples for organizational research (Barr & Hitt, 1986). Future research would benefit from the use of employee samples, who would understand HPI in the same manner as organizations. Alternatively, more explicit manipulations dictating the follow-up associated with HPI status may improve the impact of the manipulation and make it more salient for a student population. Further, adjustment of the HPI status meaning to something more prevalent to a student sample, such as academic achievement or job attainment, might improve the impact of the manipulation, although this would reduce the generalizability to an organizational setting.

Secondly, the manipulation may have fallen short with the credibility of the assessment tool and/or feedback, as participants in the no HPI communication dismissed the communication
as not representative of themselves. The influence of feedback is tied to the source of the feedback (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979), which in this case would have been the assessment tools from which the feedback was based and the feedback itself as it was provided electronically. While electronic feedback has received previous empirical support (Northcraft & Earley, 1989), the combination of feedback credibility along with the other manipulation issues could have misled student’s reactions to the manipulation. Additionally, while the acceptance of feedback is compounded with the directionality of the feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979), research has found that high credibility sources are associated with feedback satisfaction (Van De Ridder, Berk, Stokking, & Cate, 2015). Thus, a higher credibility source may have resulted in fewer participants disassociating with the feedback. Future research could provide feedback face-to-face or offer more justification for the assessments guiding the feedback.

Thirdly, and alternatively, participants’ dismissing the no HPI status communication as not representative of themselves could have been due to participants’ own self-serving bias. Specifically, people reject negative feedback in order to protect their own self-esteem (Heider, 1958). Thus, participants in the no HPI status condition may have been disassociating from the no HPI status as a means to protect their own self-esteem. It was thought that this manipulation would not be strong enough to elicit a self-serving bias, as the no HPI status condition was not operationalized as negatively as it could have been. Although it may not be entirely clear if a self-serving bias is taking place, due to the limited evidence, there is meta-analytic evidence that threats to the one’s self elicit self-serving bias (Campbell & Sedikides, 1999). Thus, the no HPI status communication was threatening, which may have resulted in participants’ rejection of the feedback.
Fourthly, the inability of the manipulation to impact participants’ leadership self-efficacy could be due to the use of only one self-efficacy antecedent. Specifically, one’s leadership self-efficacy can be manipulated through, not only self-referenced information, such as the communication of assessment results, but also through verbal persuasion, situational factors, social comparison, or specific training (Eden, Ganzach, Flumin-Granat, & Zigman, 2010; Fitzgerald & Schutte, 2010; Mencl, Tay, Schwoerer, & Drasgow, 2012; Steyn & Mynhardt, 2008). Thus, perhaps self-referenced information is not strong enough on its own, and perhaps manipulating no HPI status through other means might have more of an influence. For example, the use of training or situational factors could be invoked, with an earlier task made to be impossible to complete, either in addition to or as an alternative for the self-referenced information. However, theoretically it might be the case that manipulating low levels of leadership self-efficacy is not possible, as only the manipulation of high levels of leadership self-efficacy have been currently explored.

The reaction to the no HPI feedback is clearly more complex than original postulated. The reactions to this communication warrant further exploration to ensure organizations utilizing HPI are not aggrieving a large portion of their employees, as individuals given the no HPI status are often overlooked. Further research would benefit organizations trying to put together a succession management program or specific high potential identification practices in order to offer specific empirical evidence-based recommendations. These recommendations would go beyond the current literature which offers recommendations based on the practices of other organizations, which have limited evidence (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Church et al., 2015; Pepermans et al., 2003). Further research should not only seek to thoroughly manipulate HPI
communication, making the manipulation more relevant and adding follow-up, especially with a sample which is not currently working and potentially not currently pursuing a leadership role.

**Practical Implications**

Potential practical implications from these preliminary results are the usefulness of the experimental paradigm in its potential for training/development, and the potential for affect to influence leadership performance. Specifically, as it appears that there are links between leadership behaviours and task outcomes, with the tower building task clearly eliciting relevant leadership behaviours, then this task could be used to train future leaders or develop the leadership abilities of current employees or those identified as high potential. Further, as it appears that affect, both positive and negative, is related to leadership behaviours, this insight could be leveraged to elicit effective leadership behaviours from those in leadership positions.

**Conclusion**

The aim of this study was to examine the influence of HPI on leadership behaviours and performance, and while the manipulation fell short of providing conclusive evidence, the experimental paradigm provides support for the links between affect, leadership behaviours and performance. Further, while participants in the HPI communication condition found the status representative of themselves, those in the no HPI communication condition were not accepting of the status and rated it as not representative of themselves. This finding, while not the main focus of this study, provides indication for future research around how to adjust the HPI manipulations and does support the self-serving bias research (Heider, 1958).

In summary, despite the non-conclusive nature of the findings and an inadequate manipulation, the leadership and task components operate in the expected manner. Support was found for the impact of both positive and negative affect on leadership behaviours and ultimately
task performance. Further exploration is required around the manipulation of HPI with students, and additionally around the communication of HPI and no HPI. Overall, the current study acts as a stepping stone for future research, with more thorough manipulations and developed measures, to explore the nuances of HPI communication and HPI practices in general to provide more evidence for current succession management programs.
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Appendix of Tables.

Table 1.

*Factor loadings for principal component analysis of tower building self-assessment items with oblimin rotation with kaiser normalization.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Emotional Management</th>
<th>Task Focus</th>
<th>Builder Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB1</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB2</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>-.588</td>
<td>-.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB3</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB4</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB5</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB6</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB7</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB8</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI4</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI5</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM1</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM4</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM5</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Factor loadings >.50 with relative distance between factors being more than .2, are in boldface.
Table 2.

Descriptive statistics, correlations and internal consistency reliabilities for continuous variables of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$ (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Left in Seconds</td>
<td>58.98 (103.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Score</td>
<td>6.59 (2.86)</td>
<td>.44** [.26, .59]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Awareness</td>
<td>3.87 (0.51)</td>
<td>.18 [-.62, .30]</td>
<td>.22* [.02, .40]</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Focus</td>
<td>2.97 (0.86)</td>
<td>.43** [.25, .58]</td>
<td>.38** [.19, .54]</td>
<td>.12 [-.08, .31]</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.79 (0.48)</td>
<td>.10 [-.09, .29]</td>
<td>.13 [-.07, .32]</td>
<td>.32** [.13, .49]</td>
<td>.15 [-.05, .32]</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>2.87 (0.85)</td>
<td>.07 [-.13, .26]</td>
<td>.20* [.00, .38]</td>
<td>.46** [.29, .60]</td>
<td>.27** [.08, .44]</td>
<td>.57** [.42, .69]</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.61 (0.50)</td>
<td>-.20 [-.38, -.00]</td>
<td>-.04 [-.23, .16]</td>
<td>.07 [-.13, .26]</td>
<td>-.21* [-.39, -.01]</td>
<td>-.20* [-.38, -.00]</td>
<td>.13 [-.07, .32]</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder Support</td>
<td>3.72 (0.74)</td>
<td>.18 [-.02, .36]</td>
<td>.24* [.05, .42]</td>
<td>.33** [.14, .49]</td>
<td>.19 [-.01, .37]</td>
<td>.21* [.01, .39]</td>
<td>.17 [-.03, .32]</td>
<td>.05 [-.15, .24]</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * indicates p < .05; ** indicates p < .01, numbers at item intersect represent Cronbach’s alpha, numbers in square brackets represent 95% CIs.
Table 3.

Means and standard deviations for leadership behaviours and task performance by condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Leadership Behaviours</th>
<th>Task Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Focus</td>
<td>Emotional Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPI</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.96(.97)</td>
<td>3.94(.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HPI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.95(.71)</td>
<td>3.95(.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.96(.85)</td>
<td>3.75(.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.97(.86)</td>
<td>3.87(.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.

Table articulating the hypotheses with associated statistical findings and concluding statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: HPI will be positively related to task focus.</td>
<td>HPI was not positively related to task focus (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4, 192) = 0.89$, $p = .47$, $\eta^2 = .02$, 95% CI [-.06, .32]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: HPI will be positively related to emotional management.</td>
<td>HPI was not positively related to emotional management (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4, 192) = .89$, $p = .47$, $\eta^2 = .02$, 95% CI [-.06, .32]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: LSE will mediate the relationship between HPI and</td>
<td>LSE did not mediate the relationship between HPI and task focus ($b = -0.00$, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.05]), or HPI and emotional management ($b = 0.00$, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.06]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership behaviours (task focus &amp; emotional management).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: PA will mediate the relationship between HPI and</td>
<td>PA did not mediate the relationship between HPI and task focus ($b = 0.038$, 95% CI [-0.24, 0.21]), or HPI and emotional management ($b = 0.043$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.14]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership behaviours (task focus &amp; emotional management).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c: NA will mediate the relationship between HPI and</td>
<td>NA did not mediate the relationship between HPI and task focus ($b = -0.05$, 95% CI [-0.19, 0.04]), or HPI and emotional management ($b = 0.00$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.06]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership behaviours (task focus &amp; emotional management).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H4: Task focus and emotional management will mediate the relationship between HPI and leadership outcomes (time left, tower score, builder support).**

Task focus did not mediate the relationship between HPI and time left ($b = -1.03$, 95% CI [-18.69, 20.94]), tower score ($b = -0.02$, 95% CI [-0.49, 0.44]), or builder support ($b = -0.00$, 95% CI [-0.08, 0.05]).

Emotional management did not mediate the relationship between HPI and time left ($b = 2.89$, 95% CI [-1.49, 14.81]), tower score ($b = 0.12$, 95% CI [-0.06, 0.53]), or builder support ($b = 0.05$, 95% CI [-0.02, 0.01]).
Appendix of Figures.

Figure 1. Overview of proposed relationships between variables.
Figure 2. Overview of study procedure.

1. Online Questionnaire
   a. Demographics
   b. Leadership Potential
   c. Personality
   d. Random Condition Assignment (HPI, Control, no HPI)
   e. ‘Random’ Task and Role Assignment
   f. Leadership Self-Efficacy

2. Task completion

3. Task Performance & Leadership Behaviour/Relationship Assessment
Figure 3. Overview of proposed relationships between variables following factor analysis
Figure 4. Overview of mediation relationship between HPI and task focus
Path coefficients are unstandardized, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Figure 5. Overview of mediation relationship between HPI and emotional management
Path coefficients are unstandardized, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Figure 6. Overview of mediation relationship between HPI and time left and tower score
Path coefficients are unstandardized, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Figure 7. Overview of mediation relationship between HPI and builder support
Path coefficients are unstandardized, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Appendix A.

Present study: Leadership Assessment Predicting Task Performance

Research personnel. The following people are involved in this study, and may be contacted at any time if you have questions or concerns: Jessica Sorenson (email: jsorenso@uoguelph.ca), and Dr. Peter A. Hausdorf (Faculty Advisor, email: @uoguelph.ca).

Concerns. Should you have any ethical concerns about this research, please contact.

Purpose. The purpose of this study is to examine the ability of a leadership assessment measure in predicting task performance.

Task requirements. Taking part in this study will involve filling out a handful of online questionnaires on Qualtrics, performing a task with another participant, and assessing your performance once the task is complete. The online questionnaires will involve some demographic questions, a leadership potential assessment, a personality measure, and a self-efficacy measure. Including the questionnaire, the task and the self-assessment, the study will take no more than an hour to complete.

Benefits/compensation. You will receive one course credit for your participation in this study.

Potential risk/discomfort. There are no physical risks to participating in this study. Some individuals might feel stressed when asked to perform a task within a short time frame. If you feel any discomfort or stress, you may choose to stop participating, and you will not be penalized in any way if you do this. The debriefing form at the end of the study provides contact information for local support services that you may contact if you need or want help.

Video Recording. The task completion portion of this study will be video recorded from the time participants confirm that they understand the task, either for 10 minutes or until the task is complete, whichever comes first. The video recording data will be kept in a secured file by the research investigators who will only use this data for research purposes. The task will not be recorded if any one participant requests they not be recorded. Please let the researcher know if you wish to not be recorded. You will receive the course credit regardless of whether or not the session is recorded.

Confidentiality. The data collected in this study are strictly confidential. All data are coded such that identifying information is not associated with the responses you provide. Any identifying information associated with your code will not be collected from the online questionnaire system, Qualtrics. Since the task is being video recorded anonymity is not possible, however the video recordings will be kept in a secured file by the research investigators who will only use this data for research purposes. The informed consent and all other identifying information will be destroyed after five years. The coded data will be kept and will be used only for research purposes.
**Right to withdraw.** Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. At any point during the study, you have the right to not complete certain questions, or to withdraw without penalty. If you withdraw, you have the right to request that your data be deleted.

This study has received clearance by the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board.

I [Insert your name here] have read the above form and understand the conditions of my participation. My participation in this study is voluntary, and I understand that if at any time I wish to leave the study, I may do so without having to give an explanation and with no penalty whatsoever. Furthermore, I am also aware that the data gathered in this study are confidential with respect to my personal identity. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in this study.
Appendix B.

Dear [participant name],

Thank you for participating in this research. We hope you enjoyed filling out the leadership potential and personality assessments. These assessments are used by some organizations to identify individuals as high potential. Being identified as high potential means that you are well suited for leadership opportunities, such as leading a work or sports team or working in a management capacity as a supervisor or manager. Based on your leadership potential scores and the personality assessment you have been identified as high potential. This means that you have the capacity to fulfill leadership roles. Congratulations on being identified as a high potential!

Is this assessment representative of how you view yourself? Circle one option below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all like me</td>
<td>Not much like me</td>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>Somewhat like me</td>
<td>Very much like me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGH POTENTIAL IDENTIFICATION EXPERIMENTATION

Dear [participant name],

Thank you for participating in this research. We hope you enjoyed filling out the leadership potential and personality assessments. These assessments are used by some organizations to identify individuals as high potential. Being identified as high potential means that you are well suited for leadership opportunities, such as leading a work or sports team or working in a management capacity as a supervisor or manager. Based on your leadership potential scores and the personality assessment you are not currently identified as high potential, although with more experience and development you may be suited for leadership opportunities in the future.

While you have not been currently identified as high potential, there are some areas you can seek out experience and development in, which may help you become better suited for leadership opportunities in the future. The areas you could focus your training, mentorship and development on are; general and analytic problem solving, social/communication attributes such as persuasiveness, giving autonomy with information sharing, role modeling, and assuming responsibility.

Is this assessment representative of how you view yourself? Circle one option below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all like me</td>
<td>Not much like me</td>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>Somewhat like me</td>
<td>Very much like me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear [participant name],

Thank you for participating in this research. We hope you enjoyed filling out the leadership potential and personality assessments.

As we are currently assessing these measures in their ability to predict task behaviours and performance and we appreciate your help in doing this. Due to these measures being under development we cannot give you any feedback at this time, however contact information will be provided at the end of the study if you wish to know more.

How curious are you about your leadership ability score? Circle one option below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all curious</td>
<td>Not much curious</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Somewhat curious</td>
<td>Very much curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How curious are you about your personality profile? Circle one option below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all curious</td>
<td>Not much curious</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Somewhat curious</td>
<td>Very much curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C.

Confederate Training

A research assistant will be needed as a confederate, and will be trained in a pilot test of the study, by performing the task with graduate student volunteers, who will provide feedback to the research assistant on whether or not they believed them. This pilot test will be observed by the primary researcher for uniformity and adherence to the leader’s instructions. This research assistant will also receive practice using the adapted tower building assessment form to rate the leaders’ behaviour.

The confederate will be trained to give each participant similar responses that do not involve asking questions which may elicit task or relational behaviours. Acceptable responses include; “This is really difficult”, “I’m confused”, “Sorry”, and other natural responses such as “I wish I could take off this blindfold”. Unacceptable responses include mostly questions, such as; “What next”, “Is this correct”, “Where does this go”, “How am I doing”, and “Can you be more clear”. The confederate will be brought into the room with the participant and introduced as a fellow participant. The confederate will be given their tower building assessment form after the task, at the same time as the participant, but facing different directions so they cannot see each other’s’ papers.
Appendix D.

High Potential Identification Experimentation: Manipulating High Potential Identification to uncover the influence on leadership behaviours and outcomes

Debriefing Form

Was deception involved? You were not told the true purpose of the project in the consent form as this study involved some random assignment and manipulation regarding high potential identification and required participants to be blind to the true purpose of the study. Some individuals were randomly assigned to a control condition that did not receive high potential identification, which meant the true purpose of the project could not be disclosed. Random assignment also means that the high potential identification feedback that some individuals received is completely unfounded, as the current study has no basis for identifying individuals as high potential of not. As well, in order to control the task setting a confederate was used, this means that the other task participant was actually a research assistant is was trained by the primary researcher to act a particular way in the task that involved not asking questions and making minimal movements.

What are we trying to learn in this research? The true purpose of this research is to investigate the influence of high potential identification on individual’s leadership behaviours, task performance, and relationship satisfaction. The study is examining whether or not high potential identification leads to effective and more frequent task and relational leadership behaviours through individual’s leadership self-efficacy (confidence), as well as improved task performance, and improved relationship satisfaction of the follower with the leader. I hypothesize that those identified as high potential will exhibit more frequent and effective task and relationship behaviours, because of their increased leadership self-efficacy (confidence). I also hypothesize that those identified as high potential will get the task done faster and receive higher relationship satisfaction ratings due to increased frequency and effectiveness of their task and relationship behaviours.

Why is this important to scientists or the general public? Previous research has focused mainly on profiling high potential identification practices and examining the influence of employee attitudes. Given the wealth of discussion on this topic across management and HR journals, I believe it is a topic worth exploring as it applies to employees, management, and the HR profession. I believe that this research is important to scientists and the general public because of the implications for high potential identification programs and the ability of scientists to further research the influence of these programs in an experimental setting.

Where can I learn more? If you are interested in learning more about high potential identification you can follow this link to https://hbr.org/2010/06/are-you-a-high-potential. There are also some great articles about high potential identification including “Succession Management: Trends and current practice” by Busine and Watt (2005) and “How are Top Companies Designing and Managing Their High-Potential Programs? A follow-up talent management benchmark study” by Church et al (2015).
What if I have a question later? If you feel any distress or anxiety after participating in this study, please feel free to contact the University Counselling Services at: 519-824-4120 (ext. 53244), or the County Distress Line at 519-821-3760 (http://torchlightcanada.org/phone-lines/services/). If you have any remaining concerns, questions, or comments about the study, please feel free to contact Jess Sorenson (Principle Investigator), at: jsorenso@uoguelph.ca, Dr. Peter A. Hausdorf (Faculty Advisor), at: phausdorf@uoguelph.ca. Should you have any ethical concerns about this research, please contact Sandra Auld (Director, Research Ethics Board, at sauld@uoguelph.ca, 519-824-4120 ext. 56606). For other concerns, please contact Dr. Francesco Leri (Chair, Department of Psychology, fleri@uoguelph.ca, 519-824-4120 ext. 58264).

Thank you again for your time and your participation.
Appendix E.

Leadership Potential Assessment

This assessment is based on the theory of situational leadership established by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard\(^1\). This theory has been used in a considerable amount of research studies. The 10 questions and their responses below were developed based on this theory. Your overall score on the 10 questions is considered to provide an accurate assessment of leadership potential in university students.

1) You have just been given a new project team to manage. Although all of the team members are highly competent in their roles, this team has been struggling in the past few months partly due to a difficult leader who has now been fired from the organization. In your first meeting with the team which of the following would you do?
   
a) Get involved with specific aspects of the design and implementation of project tasks and closely monitor the team’s performance.
b) Facilitate the planning and implementation of the team’s work and focus on increasing the ability of team members to work together.
c) Do what you can to make the team feel important and involved, and support their continued competence.
d) Attend the team meetings, but let the team continue to work as it has in the past few months.

2) Your team which has worked well together in the past has begun to struggle working together. The problem seems to stem from a conflict between two team members. You are not sure what the conflict is nor how things got so difficult so quickly. What would you do?
   
a) Get them together and tell them how they can resolve their conflict and see that they do it.
b) Talk to them separately about the problem, and then get them together to discuss the problem.
c) Encourage them to get along together and support their efforts at cooperation.

---

d) Tell them you are concerned about the problem but give them time to work it out by themselves.

3) You have been told that you must lead a new project with your team that is extremely important to your company. Although they have been successful in many projects in the past, you expect that this one will be particularly challenging and may be beyond their skill level. What will you tell the team when you let them know that they will be taking on this new challenge?
   a) E-mail them as a group and explain the project will be really good for their careers.
   b) Get them together and tell them how you believe that they are up to the challenge.
   c) Talk to them separately to get their reactions to the project, and then bring them together to discuss how to implement it.
   d) Get them together and discuss the risks and rewards of the project.

4) You have been temporarily appointed to a new position in the company for 6 months. While you are away your team will need to work independently but still meet its project deliverables. You know that the team will not be happy about the lack of your leadership. What would you do?
   a) E-mail them as a group advising them of the situation.
   b) Get them together and tell them that you will continue to support them informally.
   c) Talk individually to the team member with the most leadership potential and ask him/her to take on an informal leadership role with the team.
   d) Get them together and discuss how they will manage in your absence.

5) Your highly functioning team recently experienced a major setback in a project. The team has never experienced a problem of this magnitude in the past. You need to help get the team back on track. What would you do?
   a) Get them together and discuss all of the issues that led to the problem.
   b) Get them together and tell them that you are confident that they can fix the situation quickly.
c) Focus the team on their past successes and identify what aspects supported their success.

d) Get them together and problem solve how to avoid the problem in the future.

6) Your team disagrees how to approach a critical project task. Half of the team members want to try a new approach and the other half want to implement a well-established process. The new approach, if successful, would reduce the time to complete the task by 50%. What would you do?

   a) Get them together and share your decision with them based on the situational details.
   b) Get them together and tell them that they need to resolve the conflict in the meeting.
   c) Get the team together and bring in an external facilitator to resolve the disagreement.
   d) Get them together and ask each group to argue the merits of the other group’s approach.

7) You just fired a strongly opinionated member of your team who was well liked by his other team members. You are worried that the team will retaliate by reducing their performance. What would you do?

   a) Get them together and explain why you fired the person.
   b) Get them together and tell them that the person quit.
   c) Give each team member the next day off to re-energize.
   d) Get them together and explain how all of their jobs are at risk if they do not perform to expected levels.

8) Your team has been working exceptionally well recently. In fact they have never worked this well in the past and are considered to be the best project team in the organization. What would you do?

   a) Send them an e-mail acknowledging their recent accomplishments.
   b) Send each of them a small amount of money as a bonus.
c) Get the team together to discuss what they have been doing recently that has contributed to the high level of performance.

d) Get them together and celebrate their recent accomplishments.

9) Half of your team members want to take on some new projects but you are not sure if they are ready. These team members have come to your office individually to encourage you to support the new projects. What would you do?

   a) Talk to the other team members individually and then make a decision.
   b) Get them together and ask them to discuss what they want to do.
   c) Ask the team members who want the new projects to convince the others.
   d) Tell them that they are not ready and discuss what they need to do to be ready in the future.

10) Your team is unhappy with a recent decision that you made. You had no choice in making this decision but the team is not aware of that. What would you do?

   a) Get them together and explain that you had no choice in the decision.
   b) Get them together and explain why they should not be worried about the decision.
   c) Get the team together and bring in your manager to explain that you had no choice in the decision.
   d) Get them together and ask for what they would have done in the same situation.
Appendix F.

On the following pages you will find a series of statements about you. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Then write your response in the space next to the statement using the following scale:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please respond to every statement, even if you are not completely sure of your response.

I would be quite bored by a visit to an art gallery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I often push myself very hard when trying to achieve a goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
People sometimes tell me that I am too critical of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I rarely express my opinions in group meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I sometimes can't help worrying about little things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If I knew that I could never get caught, I would be willing to steal a million dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would enjoy creating a work of art, such as a novel, a song, or a painting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When working on something, I don't pay much attention to small details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

People sometimes tell me that I'm too stubborn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I prefer jobs that involve active social interaction to those that involve working alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When I suffer from a painful experience, I need someone to make me feel comfortable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Having a lot of money is not especially important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I think that paying attention to radical ideas is a waste of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I make decisions based on the feeling of the moment rather than on careful thought.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

People think of me as someone who has a quick temper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On most days, I feel cheerful and optimistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I feel like crying when I see other people crying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I think that I am entitled to more respect than the average person is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If I had the opportunity, I would like to attend a classical music concert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When working, I sometimes have difficulties due to being disorganized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

My attitude toward people who have treated me badly is “forgive and forget”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I feel that I am an unpopular person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When it comes to physical danger, I am very fearful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If I want something from someone, I will laugh at that person's worst jokes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I’ve never really enjoyed looking through an encyclopedia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I do only the minimum amount of work needed to get by.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I tend to be lenient in judging other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In social situations, I’m usually the one who makes the first move.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I worry a lot less than most people do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would never accept a bribe, even if it were very large.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

People have often told me that I have a good imagination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I always try to be accurate in my work, even at the expense of time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am usually quite flexible in my opinions when people disagree with me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The first thing that I always do in a new place is to make friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I can handle difficult situations without needing emotional support from anyone else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would get a lot of pleasure from owning expensive luxury goods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I like people who have unconventional views.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make a lot of mistakes because I don’t think before I act.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people tend to get angry more quickly than I do.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are more upbeat and dynamic than I generally am.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel strong emotions when someone close to me is going away for a long time.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want people to know that I am an important person of high status.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think of myself as the artistic or creative type.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People often call me a perfectionist.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even when people make a lot of mistakes, I rarely say anything negative.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel that I am a worthless person.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even in an emergency I wouldn’t feel like panicking.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t pretend to like someone just to get that person to do favors for me.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I find it boring to discuss philosophy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I prefer to do whatever comes to mind, rather than stick to a plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When people tell me that I’m wrong, my first reaction is to argue with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When I’m in a group of people, I’m often the one who speaks on behalf of the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I remain unemotional even in situations where most people get very sentimental.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I’d be tempted to use counterfeit money, if I were sure I could get away with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix G.

Positive and Negative Affect Scales

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer using the following scale. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment.

Interested
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Disinterested
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Excited
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Upset
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Strong
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Guilty
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Scared
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Hostile
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Enthusiastic
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Proud
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Irritable
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Alert
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

Ashamed
- Very slightly or not at all
- A little
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely
Inspired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Nervous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Attentive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Jittery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Active

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Afraid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix H.

Leadership Self-Efficacy Assessment

Below are statements regarding your leadership self-efficacy.\(^2\) Please indicate the level of confidence you have in your ability to fulfill these leadership roles.

1. **I am capable of influencing others.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **I am capable of directing others to accomplish a task.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **I am capable of persuading others to perform well.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **I am capable of keeping others on task.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **I am capable of allowing others to contribute their knowledge.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **I am capable of leading this task.**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Neither confident nor unconfident</th>
<th>Completely confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Adapted from Murphy (1992) to fit the task situation, removing two items that did not fit the task situation.

Appendix I.

Tower-Building Exercise Description

Materials

Enough small wooden blocks to complete the design presented to participants (note that you will need a sufficient number of different colours as per the design). One blindfold for the builder. Two different construction diagrams: one set for builders and the other for coaches. Workspace that includes a flat table and chairs.

Facilitator Instructions

Give participants the designated envelops to decide who will be the coach and builder. Set up the blocks and the builder schematic at the table where the builder will sit. The coach can sit or stand in front of the builder. The builder is then blindfolded. After the blindfold is in place the coach is presented with the block diagram. The coaches will be instructed not to tell the builder that the blocks are colour coded. Note: We anticipate that the uncertainty of the diagram (i.e., the builder’s reliance on the coach for direction) will make the process difficult and create some slight conflict, which the participants will have to work through.

Participant Instructions

You have been presented with a building diagram (coach). It is your job to build the structure according to the diagram as quickly as possible within the 10 minutes of time allotted. Coaches are not allowed to touch the blocks or the builder’s hands at any time. They can only direct the person verbally throughout the activity. Builders must keep the blindfold on at all times. Verbal interaction is encouraged.
Note: All blocks are the same size.
Note: All blocks are the same size.
Tower-Building Task Diagram

Note: All blocks are the same size.
Note: All blocks are the same size.
Note: All blocks are the same size.
Appendix J.

Tower-Building Assessment Form

Participant Code: _______

Were you the Leader? Yes  No

Please respond to each question using the scale provided based on your experience in the tower building activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK BEHAVIOUR**

My instructions were specific.

My instructions were clear.

When I found an approach that worked I stuck with it.

When I needed I tried different approaches to help the builder.

I spoke slowly.

I helped the builder to stay focused on the task.

I told the builder how to adjust his/her movements throughout the task.

I kept my comments focused on the task itself.

**SELF-INSIGHT**

I felt stressed during the activity.

I knew that I needed to stay calm.

I found it difficult to not touch the blocks.

I was frustrated by the task.

I was motivated to perform well on the task.
Please respond to each question using the scale provided based on your experience in the tower building activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL INSIGHT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was aware of the builder's feelings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I needed to help the builder stay calm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I needed to tell the builder how s/he was doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to anticipate the builder's next question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to anticipate the builder's challenges before s/he experienced them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The builder was motivated to perform well on the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I developed a good rapport with the builder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told the builder how s/he was progressing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I said supportive statements to the builder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I argued with the builder during the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spoke harshly to the builder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Tower-Building Assessment Form

Please respond to each question using the scale provided based on your experience in the tower building activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TASK BEHAVIOUR

- The Leader’s instructions were specific.
- The Leader’s instructions were clear.
- When the Leader found an approach that worked s/he stuck with it.
- When I needed the Leader tried different approaches to help the builder.
- The Leader spoke slowly.
- The Leader helped me to stay focused on the task.
- The Leader told me how to adjust his/her movements throughout the task.
- The Leader kept his/her comments focused on the task itself.

## SOCIAL INSIGHT

- The Leader was aware of my feelings.
- The Leader needed to help me stay calm.
- The Leader needed to tell me how I was doing.
- The Leader was able to anticipate my next question.
- The Leader was able to anticipate my challenges before I experienced them.
- The Leader was motivated to perform well on the task.

Please respond to each question using the scale provided based on your experience in the tower building activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Leader developed a good rapport with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader told me how I was progressing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader said supportive statements to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader argued with me during the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader spoke harshly to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION WITH THE LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would work with this Leader again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader’s behaviours helped us accomplish the task faster.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader helped me achieve my best performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader was effective in helping me to stay focused.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader made me feel confident in being able to accomplish the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>