

Personality and power in work organizations - results analyses (#17473)

Created: 12/05/2018 08:56 AM (PT) Public: 08/06/2020 09:35 AM (PT)

Author(s)

Cameron Anderson (University of California, Berkeley) - anderson@haas.berkeley.edu Daron Sharps (University of California, Berkeley) - daron@berkeley.edu Oliver John (University of California, Berkeley) - o_johnx5@berkeley.edu

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?

It's complicated. We have already collected some data but explain in Question 8 why readers may consider this a valid pre-registration nevertheless.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

This preregistration follows up on a prior preregistration titled "Personality and power in work organizations – methods analyses" (#15537), that includes further details about our methods.

This study examines whether or when disagreeable individuals (i.e., those low in agreeableness) are more likely to achieve power in their workplace over time, as compared to agreeable individuals. The data are longitudinal. The first data collection (Time 1) occurred while the participants were in college or MBA program, 10-20 years ago; the second assessment (Time 2) occurred recently. The Time 1 data will include self-reported agreeableness, measured with the BFI and NEO-PI-R, as well as student records obtained from the University admissions and registrar's offices (e.g., SAT scores, GPA at the end of college). The Time 2 data includes self-reported agreeableness, and self-reported power in one's work organization, and other work (e.g., industry) and demographic (e.g., social class) data.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

The key dependent variable is the power participants have attained in their work organization, measured with three separate indices: 1) informal power, or how much power they have in their workplace; 2) power over subordinates, or whether they can reward/punish, promote/demote, and evaluate subordinates' work; and 3) formal power, or at what level they are in the organization's hierarchy (divided by the total number of levels there are in their organization's hierarchy).

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

Participants will not be assigned to a condition - this is not an experiment. The key independent variable is agreeableness at Time 1 and Time 2.

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

Correlation and multiple regression analyses.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.

We will exclude those who work as a stay-at-home parent, are currently a full-time student or post-doctoral fellow, or work in an organization with less than 5 employees (which includes those who were self-employed, independent contractors, etc.).

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.

504 participants responded to our Time 2 survey. We will exclude those who work as a stay-at-home parent, are currently a full-time student or post-doctoral fellow, or work in an organization with less than 5 employees (which includes those who were self-employed, independent contractors, etc.). All remaining participants will be included, which in turn determines our sample size.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

The data have been collected for this study. Thus far we have only conducted analyses for the methods section, which were preregistered (#15537). Those analyses focused on identifying criteria for exclusion of participants, determining which personality measures we will include in our hypothesis tests, and conducting psychometric analyses of our measures.

Rather than test one directional hypothesis, we will test a number of competing hypotheses:

- 1. Disagreeableness has a positive effect on power
- 2. Disagreeableness has a negative effect on power
- 3. Disagreeableness has a curvilinear effect on power
- 4. Only some facets of the (dis)agreeableness factor predict power, such as modesty or compliance
- 5. The effects of disagreeableness on power depend on:
- a. Culture, such that it only helps individuals attain power in cultures characterized as political, selfish, harsh, mean, etc.
- b. Company size, such that it only helps individuals attain power in larger companies
- c. Industry, such that it only helps individuals attain power in industries with more political, cutthroat environments (e.g., investment banking)
- d. Whether the individual changes jobs frequently

Wharton credibility lab



e. Individual differences in: gender, assertiveness, or cognitive ability (as measured with SAT scores, for example)

