Study Protocol

Pre-Test T1

A. After providing their consent, participants were asked to think about their current (or most recent) work supervisor. In order to do so, participants were shown, randomly but evenly in terms of frequency, 16 out of 200 pre-rated attributes (Jarymowicz, 1992). Participants were then asked to drag and drop those attributes that are the most definitional traits of their current work supervisor. They were asked to select the 10 most definitional attributes and rank them accordingly.

B. Upon task completion, participants were asked the following questions regarding their current work supervisor:
   a. Interpersonal Justice T1, 4 items (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011).
   b. Leader Effectiveness T1, 1 item.
   c. PANAS, 20 items (Watson & Clark, 1991).
   d. Demographics (work experience, occupation, industry, job level, education, age, gender).

C. Participants were thanked for their participation and were informed they will be contacted again in about one week’s time to complete the second part of our study (T2).

Pre-Test – T2

A. After consenting to participating in our study, participants were presented with an experimental task, which included two conditions: a high similarity or low similarity leader description.
   a. Participants were told to imagine that they have been assigned a new head of department and direct work supervisor. They do not know this new supervisor, but one of their colleagues has previously worked with that person. Participants were then told they head to their colleague to ask about the new work supervisor.
   b. Participants were then presented with one of two conditions. They were either shown a description of a highly similar (to their current) leader, based on their answers one week prior (T1) or a description of another participant’s current leader from a week prior (T1).

Participants were most likely to best remember the attribute they rated highest (out of 10 ranked attributes) a week prior. Hence, in the high similarity leader condition, we showed participants their previously ranked attributes 2-5, together with three neutral attributes.

In the low similarity leader condition, we showed participants another random participant’s previously ranked attributes 2-5, together with three neutral attributes.
In both conditions, we ensured that there was no overlap between the neutral attributes and previously rated attributes. Hence, whenever participants had previously indicated a neutral attribute to describe their current leader, we inserted another neutral attribute in the leader description.

B. On the next screen, participants were then asked to evaluate the new supervisor their colleague just described to them.
   a. Interpersonal Justice T2, 4 items (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011)
   b. Leader Effectiveness T2, 1 item.
   c. PANAS T2, 20 items (Watson & Clark, 1991).

The items for interpersonal justice and leader effectiveness were rephrased to reflect participants’ expectations of their new supervisor. Items were rephrased as follows:

d. Interpersonal Justice T2:
   “Do you expect this new supervisor to treat you in a polite manner?”
   “Do you expect this new supervisor to treat you with dignity?”
   “Do you expect this new supervisor to treat you with respect?”
   “Do you expect this new supervisor to refrain from improper remarks or comments?”

e. Leader Effectiveness T2:
   “My new supervisor seems very effective as a leader”.

C. As a manipulation check, participants were then asked to indicate how similar the new supervisor their colleague just described, seems to participants’ current supervisor, previously described a week prior in the first part of the study.
   a. 1 item (“The new supervisor your colleague described seems _______ to the supervisor I described in the previous survey”, 1 = not at all similar, 5 = extremely similar).

D. Participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed.
Study 1 (and 2 for all three samples) – T1

A. Prior to the computerized experimental task participants individually completed a series of questions. Questions included the following:
   a. Introduction to the study and participant consent form
   b. Big-5 Personality dimensions, 20 items (Goldberg et al., 2006).
   c. Trait Anxiety, 20 items (Spielberger, 1983).
   d. ECR-Attachment, 36 items (Richards & Schat, 2011).

B. Participants were then asked to think about their current (or most recent) work supervisor. In order to do so, participants were shown, randomly but evenly in terms of frequency, 16 out of 180 pre-rated attributes (Jarymowicz, 1992). Participants were then asked to drag and drop those attributes that are the most definitional traits of their current work supervisor. They were asked to select the 10 most definitional attributes and rank them accordingly.

C. Upon task completion, participants were then asked the following questions regarding their current work supervisor. These included the following:
   a. ECR-RS Attachment, 9 items +1 attention check question (Fraley, Hudson, Heffernan, & Segal, 2015).
   b. Interpersonal Justice, 4 items (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011).
   c. Leader Effectiveness, 1 item.
   d. Importance of Relationship, 1 item (My supervisor is ______ important to me; 1 = not at all, 5 = extremely).
   e. Daily Contact, 1 item (On a daily basis, I have ______ to my supervisor; 1 = No or barely any contact, 5 = A lot of contact).
   f. Demographics (work experience, occupation, industry, job level, education, age, gender).

D. Participants were thanked for their participation and were told they will be contacted again in about one week’s time to complete the second part of our study (T2).

Study 1 (and 2 for all three samples) – T2

E. After consenting to participating in our study, participants were presented with an experimental task, which included two conditions, either a high similarity or low similarity leader description.
   a. Participants were told to imagine that they have been assigned a new head of department and direct work supervisor. They do not know this new supervisor, but one of their colleagues has previously worked with that person. Participants were then told they head to their colleague to ask about the new work supervisor.
   b. Participants were then presented with one of two conditions. They were either shown a description of a highly similar (to their current) leader, based on their answers one week prior (T1) or a description of another participant’s current leader from a week prior (T1).
Participants were most likely to best remember the attribute they rated highest (out of 10 ranked attributes) a week prior. Hence, in the high similarity leader condition, we showed participants their previously ranked attributes 2-5, together with three neutral attributes.

In the low similarity leader condition, we showed participants another random participant’s previously ranked attributes 2-5, together with three neutral attributes.

In both conditions, we ensured that there was no overlap between the neutral attributes and previously rated attributes. Hence, whenever participants had previously indicated a neutral attribute to describe their current leader, we inserted another neutral attribute in the leader description.

F. On the next screen, participants were then asked to evaluate the new supervisor their colleague just described to them. Again, rephrased items were used to reflect participants’ expectations of their new supervisor (see B above; Pre-Test T2).
   a. Leader Effectiveness, 1 item.
   b. Interpersonal Justice, 4 items (Colquitt & Rodell, 2011)

G. Participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed.
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