

THE EFFECTS OF RELATIVE POWER ON ROLE-TAKING ACCURACY

A Dissertation

by

TONY PAUL LOVE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2012

Major Subject: Sociology

THE EFFECTS OF RELATIVE POWER ON ROLE-TAKING ACCURACY

A Dissertation

by

TONY PAUL LOVE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,
Committee Members,

Head of Department,

Jane Sell
Holly Foster
W. Alex McIntosh
Dudley L. Poston, Jr.
Jane Sell

August 2012

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

The Effects of Relative Power on Role-Taking Accuracy. (August 2012)

Tony Paul Love, B.S., Texas A&M University;

M.S., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Jane Sell

I conduct an experiment to test the impact of relative power differential on the relationship between gender and role-taking accuracy. First in an 80 subject study, and then in the current study, role-taking accuracy is conceptualized as the accuracy with which one can predict the behavior of another or others. In Study 1, I examined self-evaluative measures of role-taking ability and found that self-evaluative measures of role-taking do not correlate with actual role-taking accuracy. In addition, women were more accurate role-takers than were men in same-gender dyads regardless of the existence of a prior relationship between the two individuals. This prior experimental research showed that female friends were much more accurate role-takers than were male friends. In fact, female strangers were more accurate role-takers than were male friends. It is my conjecture however, that role taking ability is not directly connected to gender; rather I propose that it is a situationally prompted ability based on the need for individuals of relatively less power to predict the behavior of individuals with relatively more power. In other words, while women are, indeed, better role takers, this is not a general ability; rather it is prompted by their relatively low positions of power. In Study 2, I examine role-taking accuracy under conditions in which differential power is assigned to one member of a dyad and established through interaction. I predict that power position will account for variability in role-taking accuracy, but gender

will not. I tested this hypothesis using power balanced and power-imbalanced, task-oriented, same and cross gender dyads. I found that power position does account for variation in role-taking accuracy while gender and gender composition of the dyad do not account for variation in role-taking accuracy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	1
Role-Taking	1
Role-Taking Accuracy and Gender	3
Role-Taking Accuracy and Power	4
The Effect of Power on the Relationship Between Role-Taking Accuracy and Gender	7
Building Legitimate Power Differences	8
II CREATING THE EXPERIMENTAL PARADIGM FOR ROLE-TAKING	10
A Behavior-Based Definition of Role-Taking.....	10
Creating a Behavioral Measure of Role-Taking	11
Development of Scenarios	11
Study 1 Procedure	13
Study 1 Dependent Variables.....	15
Study 1 Results	15
Summary of Study 1 and Introduction to the Current Study	17
III THE CURRENT RESEARCH DESIGN	18
Hypothesis.....	18
Study Design.....	18
Participants.....	19
Procedure	20
Tasks	22
Scope Conditions	24
Independent Variables	24
Dependent Variables.....	25
Hypothesis (Reprised).....	25

CHAPTER	Page
IV RESULTS	27
Manipulation Checks	27
Descriptive Statistics.....	29
Primary Results	29
Secondary Results	31
Summary of Results	33
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	34
REFERENCES	37
APPENDIX A	40
APPENDIX B	42
APPENDIX C	43
APPENDIX D	45
APPENDIX E	46
APPENDIX F	48
APPENDIX G	65
APPENDIX H	67
APPENDIX I	71
VITA	72

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Experimental Conditions	19
2	Mean Role-Taking Accuracy Score.....	29
3	Analysis of Variance, Role-Taking Accuracy by Power Position, Gender, and Gender Composition of the Dyad.....	30
4	Mean Role-Taking Score by Experimental Condition.....	31
5	Mean Perceived Role-Taking Accuracy by Experimental Condition.....	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most social psychologists agree that role-taking is a very important behavior, and many of them include the concept in models of interpersonal interaction.(Coutu 1951, Flavell 1974, Keller 1976, Miller 1981, Schantz 1975, Schwalbe 1988, Sherohman 1977, Turner 1956). Given this, it is surprising that relatively little recent sociological research addresses the conditions under which people might be more or less accurate role-takers. The present work attempts to add to this underdeveloped literature and improve it in several ways. I first develop a definition of role-taking that emphasizes behavior rather than cognition. I then develop a measurement technique. Finally, I test whether individuals' role-taking can be changed by changing the context in which they interact.

Role-Taking

One of the most influential discussions of taking the views of others within the field of social psychology was that of George Hubert Mead. Mead (1934) first explained role-taking, or "taking the role of other," in conjunction with his explanation of the self as an object. According to Mead, this is a vital mechanism in the development of the self and is essential for the social process. It is necessary for rational conduct that the individual should take an objective, impersonal attitude toward himself. In other words, that he should become an object to himself. Failure to do so is failure to act intelligently or rationally. In fact, Mead's view of role-taking implies that the organization of society is possible only to

This dissertation follows the style of *Social Psychology Quarterly*.

the degree to which individual members of society can perceive the general attitude of all the other individual members of the society (see Lauer and Boardman 1971 for clarification).

While role-taking is a central concept in the social psychology of Mead, there seems to be little agreement about exactly what it involves. Role-taking has been described as necessarily involving shared gestures (Schwalbe 1988, Miller 1981) or as understanding and then reconstructing the other's or others' attitudes (Coutu, 1951; Turner, 1956) or as imagining or constructing what others' might do (Keller, 1976; Sherohman, 1977); or as developing others' perspectives (Schantz 1975; Flavell, 1974). Recent reflection on the concept promotes the understanding of role-taking as entering the perspective of an other, or describes role-taking as imagining the world from the perspective of another (Charon 2007). It seems then, that role-taking is to be defined as the act of cognitively entering, or imagining the perspective in which others view their world in order to imagine their behavior. Given the different factors involved in defining role-taking, it is no surprise that Schwalbe (1988) and others call for more definitional consistency when considering the concept of role-taking.

As noted by Schwalbe (1988), while the ability to think in the way another person thinks may be important, role-taking involves being able to predict others' behavior. The role-taking process entails perceiving and interpreting the meanings of gestures and symbols in a social interaction. These interpretations, if accurate, allow an individual to anticipate the behavior of the actor. Thus, one conception of role-taking is the accuracy with which one can predict the behavior of another or others. To remove any ambiguities as to whether I am speaking of the broad general type of role-taking of which Mead speaks or a more specific form that is directed at predicting a particular individual's behavior, I use the term role-taking accuracy in developing this theoretical perspective.

Role-Taking Accuracy and Gender

Prior research has linked gender to capacities that are similar to role-taking such as empathy (Eisenberg and Lennon 1983) and accuracy in decoding non-verbal communication (Hall 1978, Rosip and Hall 2004). Their results have shown women rank higher than men on empathic accuracy and the ability to understand non-verbal communication. However, the nature of the links among power, gender, and role-taking remain unclear (Eisenberg et al, 1987).

There are two types of explanations that are usually given for gender difference: socialization explanations and structural/situational explanations (See Gerber 2009; Johnson 1994; Webster and Rashotte 2009.) These views are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but they tend to emphasize different things. Socialization explanations of women's capacity for greater empathic accuracy or interpretation of non-verbal cues focus on how men and women are taught to interact in different ways. The ability of women to take the role of the other more accurately, then, could be described as a skill that is learned. This socialization process takes on a cyclical nature and can reinforce the idea that "women are better role-takers." The fact that girls and women are stereotyped as more empathetic, more sensitive and better able to think about others and how others would act, creates its own reality, serving to reinforce the stereotypes. This becomes further nuanced when gender identities become enmeshed in the stereotypes and then serve to "instruct" those for whom the identity is salient (Ridgeway and Bourg 2004; Sell and Kuipers 2009).

Structural or situational explanations describe gender differences as a byproduct of the pervasive differences in power between men and women within the larger social structure (Gerber 2009; Johnson 1994, Ridgeway 2006, Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999; Ridgeway

and Correll 2004, Risman 2004; Webster and Rashotte 2009). Consequently, one way that gender stereotypes can appear to be confirmed is by virtue that women are more likely to be in lower status positions than men. Once this pattern obtains, referential beliefs become formed about the way things are. Then in further reinforcement of the status quo, these beliefs are presumed to be shared and therefore socially valid (Berger et al. 1998 Ridgeway 2011; Ridgeway and Berger 1986).

If it is true that individuals of relatively less power are, on average, more accurate role-takers, then women's high role-taking accuracy might be explained by their position of relatively low power in the overall social structure.

Role-Taking Accuracy and Power

While there have been studies that consider role taking and power, there is inconsistency in context and measurement that may account for differences in their conclusions (Cast, 2004; Forte 1998, Thomas et al., 1972). Wheeler (1961) examined what he called "role perceptions" by administering questionnaires to prison inmates and prison staff. The questionnaire was composed of vignettes, each followed by an associated Likert-type statement asking the respondent to approve or disapprove of the behavior of the primary actor. Some of the vignettes related to the behavior of an inmate, while others focused on the behavior of prison staff. After completing the vignettes privately, the researchers obtained from both the inmates and the staff their perceptions of the proportion of inmates and staff that would approve of the primary actors behavior in the vignettes. Wheeler found in each instance that prison inmates' perceptions of the proportion of inmates approving of the primary actor's behavior were more accurate than their perceptions of the proportion of

prison staff approving of the primary actor's behavior. Similarly, the prison staff members were better predictors of the proportion of prison staff approving of the primary actor's behavior. In other words, individuals were better role-takers with people who were like themselves.

Preiss & Ehrlich (1966) examined role-conflict as a means to better understand the relationships among actual role-expectations, perceived role-expectations, and role performance. The researchers conducted face to face interviews with police officers. The officers were asked several questions regarding time among different aspects of the job, attitudes about informing on other officers, and expectations for obligations as a citizen. After police officers answered these questions, they were then asked about their perceptions of the command staff's expectations of them in each area. Members of the command staff were asked the same questions regarding their expectations of the police officers in the four areas. The researchers then compared the police officers' perceptions of the command staff's expectations with the actual expectations of the command staff. Preiss and Ehrlich found that police officers varied in their ability to predict the expectations of command staff, and that generally police officers were not that accurate in assessing the command staff's expectations of them. However, even though the police officers were inaccurate the majority of the police officers' actual observed behavior conformed to the expectations of the command staff.

Howells and Brosnan (1972) investigated the ability of management personnel to predict workers' preferences. The researchers distributed a questionnaire to employees in which they were told to assume that the firm was prepared to give them extra benefits worth \$200 in the coming year. The workers were then asked choose the way that they would like

this money distributed among seven possible alternatives. Foremen were most accurate in predicting the workers choices while officers were least accurate.

In an effort to measure role-taking within the nuclear family, Thomas, et al. (1972) employed a type of judgment test. Respondents were given hypothetical situations in which a fictional actor was placed in a dilemma. The respondent was then asked to indicate how he or she would advise the fictional actor. The parents were asked to predict the way in which each of their children would respond to the items, and the children were asked to predict the way in which each of their parents would respond to the items. Following Goffman (1959), the researchers proposed that subordinates could use role-taking to control others' responses by pleasing them on their own terms. The researchers hypothesized and found that the daughter would be most accurate, followed by the son, then the mother, and finally the father.

Cast (2003) found that structural power affects an individual's ability to define the situation when interacting with another individual. She showed that individuals with power were better able to behave in ways consistent to their identity, better able to influence the behavior of others in the situation, and better able to resist identities that the other attempted to impose upon them. In subsequent research, Cast (2004) employed longitudinal data to analyze spouses' self-evaluated role-taking ability. Using Stets' (1993) perspective taking scale for spouses in which both husband and wife rate several self-evaluation items (I have difficulty seeing my spouse's viewpoint in an argument; When something affects my spouse, I am understanding; I see myself in the same way that my spouse sees me; I understand my spouse's feelings quite well; My spouse does things that I don't understand.), she found that husbands and wives rated themselves as increasingly better role-takers over time. She also

found that women rated themselves as better role-takers than their husbands. Additionally, Cast and Bird (2005) extended this idea to find that when spouses experience situations and activities that are typically associated with the other, they rate themselves higher on perceived role-taking ability. That is, when husbands participate in activities that are normally stereotyped as the wife's realm, and when wives participate in activities that are normally stereotyped as the husband's realm, they assume that they can better role-take with their spouse. However, it was found that this outcome depends heavily on the couple's gender ideology. Cast acknowledges that a self-perception measure is not ideal, however, by admitting that individuals may not be able to assess their ability to understand the spouse's perspective accurately.

Taken together, these studies indicate that the ability to project another's preferences and some types of role-taking accuracy varied among individuals and contexts. Moreover, this variation was found to be associated with structural conditions. For example, persons who interacted regularly were found to take one another's roles more accurately than those who did not, and people were better role-takers with others like themselves.

The Effect of Power on the Relationship Between Role-Taking Accuracy and Gender

The current research builds upon the literatures of role-taking (or role-taking types of behaviors) and power by isolating the effect of power on role-taking accuracy and comparing it directly to the effect of gender on role-taking accuracy. In this manner, we can discern whether gender has effects on role-taking that are independent of structural/situational characteristics. An experimental design is the most powerful way to achieve this goal, because the experiment affords the ability to control for other possible factors. By creating a

situation in which only power differential and gender differ, their effects can be examined in isolation. Prior research on this topic employs methods that do not allow for the disentanglement of the effects of gender and power.

If role-taking ability is an ability that is honed through practice, those who use the ability more often will be more accurate role-takers. One interpretation of the varied studies is that individuals with relatively less power have an interest in predicting the behavior of the powerful. Thus, they must role-take more often and more accurately. It is linked to their very well-being, and in extreme settings, their survival. Individuals with relatively more power need not worry about the actions of the relatively insignificant as it does not affect their lives in meaningful ways.

Given that the United States is a patriarchal society, by definition women are relatively less powerful while men are relatively more powerful. As such, females must role-take more often and more accurately in order to maneuver through the social world. Males, however, need not consider the actions of females, generally speaking, because the actions of females have less effects upon them. If women are attending to men's behavior in greater detail, men have less need to consider role-taking with women. Women are doing the interaction work so that men do not need to.

Building Legitimate Power Differences

If power positions lead to important (and pervasive) difference between men and women, then when the power differences are reversed, some of the usual differences between men and women should also be reversed or, at least decreased in strength. But because the

status beliefs have been validated to such high degrees, changes are difficult, although not impossible (Ridgeway and Correll 2006; Ridgeway and Erickson 2000).

Such change appears to be the case for at least some behaviors if the power differences are legitimized through multiple dimensions. Dornbusch and Scott (1975) and Zelditch and Walker (1984 and 1993) and Walker and Zelditch (1993), detail some of these dimensions. Propriety is an actor's personal approval, endorsement is the support by others and authority is support by those in charged or viewed as superiors.

In Gerber's study of police officers (Gerber 1996), for example, gender did not make a difference in officer's own ratings of their instrumental-assertive traits. Both males and females rated themselves as higher on these assertive traits than the norm for college males. While it is difficult to separate out selection effects, this seems strong evidence that the job requirements for police officers (that would be legitimated on all dimensions), creates less stereotypically "female" personality characteristics.

In laboratory studies, there have been investigations of creating power differences, especially through legitimated authority. Johnson (1994) created hierarchical organizations to investigate how the occupation of positions affected observable power and prestige behaviors of those in charge. Results indicated that for many verbal behaviors, such as action rates, position mattered more than the gender of the person in the position. Lucas (1993) created an entire organization that layered different dimensions of authority. His results indicated that when their positions were legitimated, women gained influence. These studies suggest that many gender differences are the result of power and that changing power relations can change these seemingly "stable" differences.

CHAPTER II

CREATING THE EXPERIMENTAL PARADIGM FOR ROLE-TAKING¹

There are two major deterrents to the advancement of research on role-taking. The first is the lack of precision in definitions of the concept; the second, related to the first, concerns the inappropriate measures of the concept. To examine the factors that lead to variation in role-taking accuracy, a precise definition of role-taking is necessary. Once an explicit theoretical definition is in place, a measurement of the concept can be addressed.

A Behavior-Based Definition of Role-Taking

As discussed earlier, a commonly used definition of role-taking: to place yourself in another person's shoes, to understand the ways in which the other defines the situation. A central tenet of many social psychological theories is that expectations of interactants condition responses. For example, expectations are at the core of theories of comparison processes and identity processes). Role taking is one means by which we compare ourselves to others, to generalize abilities to others, to determine who we are, and to make decisions about concepts in our world and how we should act toward them. In this way, role-taking is used to predict the behavior of others and to determine appropriate responses of our own. Consequently, I define role taking as the accuracy with which one can predict the behaviors of another.

This definition is useful because it is parsimonious and it can be measured independently of the individual. It also makes no necessary reference to cognition so as to remain agnostic about how much and what kind of cognition is necessary. Such omission

¹ This part of the study was completed in fulfillment of the requirements for a master's thesis.

solves many conceptual problems and consequently measurement issues about how best to measure cognition and whether consciousness is or is not necessary

It is important to note that role-taking is not role playing. Role playing refers to the performance of a behavioral pattern related to a social position (Lauer & Boardman 1971). While it is true enough that in order to play at roles an individual must indeed engage to some degree in the process of role-taking (Mead 1934, Lauer & Boardman 1971), role-taking precedes role play and is a very different concept.

Creating a Behavioral Measure of Role-Taking

Once a definition is developed, an instrument for measuring accuracy is possible. In a prior test, I constructed a method in which role-taking accuracy, or the ability to predict behavior, is measurable in a way. Through a series of pretests it was determined that problem solving scenarios allow great variation in individual responses, and enabled a precise way to measure accuracy. Below, I describe this previous study.

Development of Scenarios

The problem solving scenarios were developed specific to the group from which the participants would be chosen. Because I conducted studies with college students, I first asked students to write about common conflict they might experience that required problem solving. An extremely common response was roommate problems. To determine the specific issues addressed in the roommate conflicts, a survey consisting of a single, open-ended item was administered to a class of undergraduate students. The students were asked to write down some common problems that they had faced or that they face with roommates.

These responses were collected and tallied. The roommate issues that were listed with the highest frequency were adopted and used as the target problems in the fictional roommate scenarios that were used to develop scripts for videos portraying two roommates discussing their conflicts.

The first roommate video depicted two males discussing issues that include: dirty clothes scattered about the room, dirty dishes left in sink or elsewhere, watching television at a very high volume, monopolization of the television, microwaving smelly food, leaving a messy microwave, interrupting study time, listening to loud music, and late night video games. The second roommate video depicted two females discussing issues that include: friends coming over, not getting along with the roommate's friends, monopolizing the bathroom, using the other's soap/shampoo, sharing chores, taking out trash, pet ownership, and cleaning up after a dog.

Subsequent questions were developed that asked the study participants to judge various aspects of each of the two roommate discussions. These questions explored the motives behind the problem solving approaches taken by the subjects. For example, the participants are asked to rate each specific issue discussed by the roommates as either not important or very important. Participants were also asked to rank the importance of broader issues such as messiness in general, lack of communication, disrespect, and responsibility

To validate the measurement instrument, a validation study (Study 1) was completed to determine whether the method differentiated between pairs who have known each other and interacted for a relatively long period of time and those who had not. The validation study used same-gender dyads who knew each other well (Friends) and same-gender dyads who had met one another (Strangers). There were 10 dyads for each of the four conditions

making a total of 40 dyads. Presumably those that had known each other and had interacted with one another for a relatively long period of time would be better predictors of each other's behavior than those who had just met and have had limited interaction with one another.

Study 1 Procedure

Participants were eighty college students, forty males and forty females, enrolled in courses at Texas A&M University. Potential participants were recruited in their classes and asked to volunteer for the study by completing a sign up sheet. Potential participants were then contacted by telephone and scheduled to participate in the study. The students received compensation in the amount of twenty dollars for their participation.

At the time of telephone contact, participants were randomly assigned to the friends or strangers condition to make ten dyads in each of the four conditions: male-strangers, male-friends, female-strangers, female-friends. Participants who were randomly chosen to be in the Strangers condition were simply scheduled to come alone to the study and were subsequently paired with a same gender participant in the same condition. Participants who were randomly chosen to be in the Friends condition were asked at the time of the phone call to bring a same-gender friend with them to the study. Every participant who was assigned to the Friends category had a friend who was willing to participate.

Upon arrival, participants were greeted by a research assistant and briefly introduced to one another if they were strangers; the introduction was not needed if they were friends. The participants were lead into a common room and seated. Consent was obtained at this time through the signing of a standard informed consent sheet. Next, the research assistant read instructions to the participants regarding the activity.

Participants viewed a video clip depicting male roommates discussing common roommate problems, then were prompted to record their suggestions to the roommates for reconciliation, then were asked other questions about the roommate situation. These questions asked the participants to determine which issue they thought was most important, which roommate was at fault the most, and whether they thought the roommates would remain roommates in the future. Next, a similar video was shown depicting female roommates discussing common roommate problems. The participants were prompted again to give video suggestions on how to resolve the problems. The participants were then asked a similar series of questions as described above asking the participants to determine which issues were most important, which roommate was the most at fault, and whether the roommates would remain roommates in the future.

After the completion of the Roommate Arbitration section the participants are asked to try to predict the answers of their study partner for the same sections. The participants are asked to do this in the following manner:

You are now finished with the first part of the study. For the second part of the study, we would like you to complete the same questions again. This time we want you to PREDICT THE ANSWER THAT YOUR STUDY PARTNER GAVE. We would like you to do this even if you do not know your study partner personally.

So, the participants go through the entire exercise again. Only this time, they answer the questions in the way that they believe their study partner has answered the questions. The resulting responses are used to determine the role-taking accuracy score.

Gender was recorded through self categorization by the subject. Friends versus Strangers condition was randomly assigned and recorded through the use of a simple binary variable coded 0 for strangers and 1 for friends. Length of association was recorded only for

those subjects in the Friends condition. The subjects were allowed to enter text describing the length of their relationship. This text was converted manually into length in months.

Study 1 Dependent Variables

Role-taking accuracy score was measured by comparing the participant's predictions of his or her partner's answers to the partner's actual answers for the roommate conflict scenarios. These questions addressed the importance of specific issues discussed by the roommates, which roommate was at fault, and other topics. The accuracy score was constructed by dividing the number of correct predictions by the total number of predictions to create a number that represents the proportion correct. Since it is a proportion, the role-taking score ranges in value from 0 to 1, with 0 meaning no correct predictions and 1 meaning all predictions were correct. The higher the role-taking score, the more accurate the prediction.

Perceived role-taking accuracy was measured by asking participants, "On a scale from 1 to 10, how accurately do you think you have predicted all of your study partner's answers? Please select one." A scale from 1 to 10 was presented with the 1 labeled "Not at all accurate" and the 10 labeled "Very accurate". Participants' chose the number they thought best represented their accuracy.

Study 1 Results

Role-taking accuracy scores were calculated for each participant based on their predictions of their partner's answers regarding the roommate scenarios. Gender, friendship status, and the interaction between gender and friendship status were entered into an Analysis

of Variance (ANOVA) to determine whether these factors contributed to the observed variation in role-taking accuracy. The F for the overall ANOVA was significant for both gender type ($p = .027$) and friendship status ($p = .017$). In addition, the interaction term was statistically significant p value of .060 which indicating that the effect of being in the Friends or Strangers condition is not the same for men and women.

The overall mean role-taking score for the study was .806. Regarding the Friends or Strangers conditions, friends exhibited a mean of .819 and strangers exhibited a mean of .793. The means for women and men exhibited were .820 and .792 respectively. The mean role-taking scores were shown to be ranked in this manner: Female Friends (.844), Female Strangers (.796), Male Friends (.794), and Male Strangers (.790). The overall standard deviation associated with Roommate Role-Taking score was 0.055. Thus, on this scale the difference between Female Friends and the other categories was a full standard deviation. The other three categories were clustered closely together. Duration of friendship had no significant effect on role taking accuracy.

Study 1 allows the comparison between the participant's actual role-taking accuracy and their self-evaluated role-taking accuracy. Such a comparison is particularly important because prior studies of role-taking accuracy or ability rely on self-reported measures of the concept. Self-evaluated role-taking accuracy was not statistically significantly correlated with actual role-taking accuracy ($r = .210$; $p = .193$). The only conclusion to be made is that individuals can not realistically estimate their own ability to predict another individual's behavior.

Summary of Study 1 and Introduction to the Current Study

A method for measuring role-taking accuracy that departs from the measures relying on self-evaluation was designed and tested with an experimental design. A computer-based survey instrument was created consisting of video and written vignettes designed to test subjects' ability to predict their study partner's behavior. It was found that women, regardless of whether they were friends or strangers, recorded higher role-taking scores than did their male counterparts. Additionally, participants' self-reported role-taking accuracy was not correlated with their actual role-taking accuracy scores.

The most striking finding was that women regardless of experimental condition, recorded higher role-taking scores than did men. This finding showed that it is possible that women as a group are more accurate role-takers than men. Even female strangers could more accurately predict their partner's behavior than could men who were friends. There are several possible explanations for this result. It could be that women are naturally better role-takers due to some biological difference. A preponderance of data exists that this explanation is unlikely to be accurate. However, it could be the case that women are somehow socialized to be better role-takers than men or that men are socialized to be poor role-takers. It could be the case that this gendered effect could, in some part, be a function of structural power position.

CHAPTER III

THE CURRENT RESEARCH DESIGN

The first study creates the measurement framework to investigate the central question: how do power, gender and gender composition relate to role-taking? In this study, we found that other things being equal, women are better role-takers than men. In this second study, we ask if this relationship is directly tied to gender or if it can be changed by changing context. I predict that it is power position that will be the primary factor affecting role taking.

Normally the relationships among gender, power, and role-taking are inextricably intertwined. However, an experimental design that isolates the effects of gender, formal authority, and gender composition of the group on role-taking accuracy was employed to measure each of the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis

There is one general hypothesis: All else equal, the relatively powerful will exhibit lower role-taking accuracy than the relatively powerless, regardless of the gender composition of the two-person group.

Study Design

The primary idea is that the relationship between gender and role-taking accuracy can be explained, for the most part, by the relationship between power and role-taking accuracy. I test a total of five hypotheses using a four condition design. (See Table 1).

	Superordinate	Subordinate
<i>a</i>	Female	Female
<i>b</i>	Female	Male
<i>c</i>	Male	Male
<i>d</i>	Male	Female

The gender of the superordinate will be crossed with the gender of the subordinate to create four types of two-person organizational groups: (*a*) a female manager with a female employee; (*b*) a female manager with a male employee; (*c*) a male manager with a male employee; and (*d*) a male manager with a female employee. This design also allows for the comparison of role-taking between same-gender and mixed-gender groups.

Participants

Undergraduate students were recruited from introductory level social science classes at Texas A&M University. Although a specific payment was not mentioned, students were told that all of the studies being recruited involved money as payment. At the time of recruitment, students were asked to indicate times at which they would be willing to participate in the study, and they were asked to provide contact information. They were also asked to self-identify themselves in terms of race/ethnicity. Volunteers chosen to participate were contacted by telephone, and were scheduled to participate based on their availability. In instances in which potential subjects agreed to participate, they were asked to volunteer information regarding their previous job experience. This information was not recorded by the scheduling research assistant, but is important for subsequent assignment into condition. See Appendix A for exact wording of the standard in-class recruitment presentation as well

as the script used for telephone scheduling. See Appendix B for the form that the potential participants were asked to complete in their class.

Participants were randomly scheduled to work within a same gender or mixed gender dyad. To control for any possible interactions with regard to the participants' race, only white volunteers were included in the study. This ensured that the only status characteristics separating participants was their assigned position and their gender. There were 20 individuals in each of the 8 possible conditions, for a total of 160 subjects. Based on Study I data for 80 subjects (40 male and 40 female), with mean role-taking accuracy scores of .792 and .820 respectively and standard deviations of .052 and .055 respectively, the effect size is approximately 0.5. With twenty subjects per condition, power estimates are above .90.

Procedure

Once at the laboratory, participants were informed that they would be working together to complete a complex task. If the individuals were scheduled to participate in a mixed gender dyad, their power position was already determined by their gender and the randomly assigned condition. If the individuals were scheduled to participate in a same gender group, their power position was determined by a virtual coin toss conducted by the research assistant just prior to their scheduled arrival.

Power was manipulated by position in a constructed organization. There are different ways of constructing organizations with different hierarchies (see Lucas 2003, Johnson 1994, Zelditch and Walker 1984) Because my question required quite a bit of interaction within the hierarchical setting, I adopted many of the same manipulations developed by Johnson (1994). I employed legitimate authority as the form of power in this study. Legitimate authority is a

type of power, which includes the right to dictate another's compliance within the scope of that authority, and it is the obligation of subordinates to obey the authority regardless of their personal preference. Authority includes the right to allocate tasks, direct performance, set criteria, inspect and evaluate performance, and allocate sanctions based on performance (Sell and Martin 1983; Zelditch and Walker 1984).

In line with the already validated methods used by Johnson (1994), I created a scenario in which subjects worked in an employer and employee relationship. When participants were initially recruited, they answered questions regarding their two most recent jobs and the responsibilities entailed therein. When the two subjects arrived to the study, they were assigned to the employer or employee condition randomly. However, the subjects will be led to believe that they were assigned these positions based on their answers about work history.

Specifically, formal authority was manipulated by differentiating the superordinate and subordinates on several characteristics of formal position. The manager: (1) received higher pay, (2) performed complex decision-making tasks while the employee performed mundane tasks, (3) had access to information not given to the employees, (4) directed the employees on a variety of tasks, (5) inspected employee performance, and (6) had a work space that is decorated to reflect higher status.

Upon arrival, the participants were seated at a large table and a research assistant reviewed the informed consent materials with them. Once the consent forms were properly completed, the research assistant began an instructional video in which the participants were given an overview of the study. A transcript of the instructions is contained in Appendix D. At the conclusion of this video, the participants were shown to their workspace.

Participants were given areas in which to work that reflected this difference in status. For example, the employer was given a vacant faculty office. This office had live plants, a beautiful window view, a desk suitable for a supervisor, and a nice desk chair. The employee was given a small, built-in desk that was barely tall enough to fit one's knees under. The chair was plastic and obviously cheap, and the only view from this position was a wall. Marked on the wall were the words, "If you have questions, ask the supervisor." When in their places, the participants were given an overview of their job descriptions. This phase lasted one-half hour and established the subjects in their roles and context.

Tasks

There were three tasks completed by each group (two cooperative tasks and an individual task). The purpose of the first task is to establish the artificially assigned power designation. The purpose of the second task is to determine the amount of influence each subject has over the other. The purpose of the final task was to measure the dependent variable, role-taking accuracy.

The first task, or set of tasks, established the difference in power. The employees performed mundane, repetitive tasks as directed by the employer. These tasks included folding flyers and addressing them to customers, alphabetizing coupons, and creating signs for sale items. The supervisors, on the other hand, engaged in more complex decision-making tasks. These tasks included instructing the employee in his or her work, inspecting the employee work, grading the quality of the employees work, determining which items to order and which should go on clearance, and review profit margins. The total time for this

interaction was approximately thirty minutes. The directions for these tasks are listed in Appendix F.

The second task, in Appendix G, requires the subjects to first work separately and then together on a ranking task. A problem was presented to the participants and they were asked to rank the most effective strategies for decreasing the likelihood of shoplifting. After the participants completed the task individually, they were asked to come together, in the supervisor's office, to complete a third sheet that would reflect their group effort. The individual rankings are compared to the final group rankings to determine which individual had the most influence over the final ranking. This task lasted roughly 15 minutes.

The final task, the Roommate Arbitration Task, was completed individually. Participants viewed a video clip depicting male roommates discussing common roommate problems, and then were asked various questions about the roommate situation. These questions asked the participants to determine which issue they thought was most important, which roommate was at fault the most, and whether they thought the roommates would remain roommates in the future. Next, a similar video was shown depicting female roommates discussing common roommate problems. The participants were then asked a similar series of questions as described above asking the participants to determine which issues were most important, which roommate was the most at fault, and whether the roommates would remain roommates in the future. These tasks are the same tasks that were tested in Study 1.

After the completion of the Roommate Arbitration task the participants are asked to try to predict the answers of their study partner for the same sections. The resulting submissions are used to determine the Role-Taking Accuracy Score by comparing the

predictions to the actual answers of their study partner. This task lasted approximately thirty minutes. Although this portion of the study was conducted with the assistance of a computerized survey, a written version of the questions is attached in Appendix H.

Scope Conditions

To test our theoretical assertions, the following conditions must be met by the experimental setting:

1. No prior interaction between the subjects;
2. Recognized power differentials on the tasks;
3. Ceteris Paribus.

Independent Variables

There are three independent variables in the present study: Power position, gender and gender composition. Participants were randomly assigned to the position of supervisor or to the position of employee. The supervisor is the power high actor and the employee is power low actor. To strengthen the differentiation between supervisor and employee, the participant in the supervisor position was under the assumption that he or she would receive four extra dollars of monetary compensation. The differential compensation was announced at the beginning of the study during the instruction video. Gender is the respondent's self-reported sex category as either a man or a woman. Gender composition is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the members of the dyad are the same gender and coded 0 if the members of the dyad are of opposite gender.

Dependent Variables

I examine role-taking accuracy score. I also asked participants to estimate their accuracy so that I could measure differences between estimated accuracy and actual accuracy. Role-taking accuracy score was measured by comparing the participant's predictions of his or her partner's answers to the partner's actual answers for the roommate conflict scenarios. These questions addressed the importance of specific issues discussed by the roommates, which roommate was at fault, and other topics. The accuracy score was constructed by dividing the number of correct predictions by the total number of predictions to create a number that represents the proportion correct. Since it is a proportion, the score ranges in value from 0 to 1, with 0 meaning no correct predictions and 1 meaning all predictions were correct. The higher the role-taking accuracy score, the more accurate the prediction.

Hypothesis (Reprised)

To reiterate, I have one major hypothesis: All else equal, the relatively powerful will exhibit lower role-taking accuracy than the relatively powerless, regardless of the gender composition of the two-person group.

If this hypothesis is supported, I will have contributed to the existing literature regarding gender and role-taking ability and power and role-taking ability by isolating the effect of situation/structure from the effect of gender, effectively falsifying the commonly held stereotype that women are "just naturally intuitive". Further, I can contrast self-evaluative measures of role-taking accuracy with actual, behaviorally measured, role-taking accuracy, challenging the wide-spread use of self-evaluative measures of role-taking ability.

Additionally, if all hypotheses are supported, it will demonstrate that the effect of gender on role-taking accuracy is most likely due to the close relationship between gender and power, not biological or socialization determinants.

If these predictions are not supported (assuming that the experimental manipulations are sound as indicated through manipulation checks), it could mean that gender has an effect on role-taking that is independent of power position. This finding would suggest that role-taking might need further examination in terms of its components. If this is the case, information from the post-experimental questionnaire regarding participants' experiences might be particularly important.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Manipulation Checks

There were seven checks to ensure that the scope conditions were met and that the experimental manipulations were salient in each group. The first scope condition was that there was no prior interaction between the participants. When participants arrived at the laboratory, they were greeted by a research assistant and asked to sit in a chair in the hallway. There were two possible chairs approximately eight feet apart. The participants were asked not to speak to one another until the study began. Occasionally, participants arrived and they recognized one another from a class they had taken simultaneously in the past. In this situation, the research assistant would question the participants with regard to their prior interaction history. None of the participants in the current study knew one another beyond the level of having seen the person in the same class from time to time.

The second scope condition states that the participants should have recognized power differentials in the tasks. Whether the power differentials were recognized was tested through several questions administered after the collaborative tasks and before the participants began the role-taking phase of the study. The participants were asked several questions that were aimed at measuring how well they paid attention to the instructions of the study. They were asked, “What was your job title in today’s study?”, “How was your job title determined?”, “How many studies were you scheduled to complete today?”, “How much money can you earn today?”, “Can you get bonus money if your group is especially efficient?” The only participants included in data analysis were those who answered these

questions appropriately. After the initial completion of eighty groups of two, it was determined that four of the groups had at least one member who did not answer all of these questions appropriately. As such, these four groups were excluded from the study for violating scope conditions, and four more studies were conducted to achieve the desired total of eighty viable studies.

The second half of the second scope condition states that the power differentials must be enacted. One way that this part of the manipulation can be checked for efficacy is through the measurement of influence generated from the shop lifting rankings task. To complete the shop lifting rankings task, the participants were asked to complete the ranking task (Appendix G) individually. After completing the task individually, the participants were then asked to compare their responses to one another's responses and to complete the task again, working together. The final rankings, resulting from the cooperation of the two participants, was compared to the individual efforts of each participant. The difference in the final rankings and the individual rankings is quantified by taking the absolute difference in rank between the final and individual rankings sheet for each item in the task. The absolute difference is summed to produce a value that represents the total amount of deviation of the individual rankings from the final group rankings. The mean deviation for supervisors in the study was 19.075 and was 21.813 for employees. You would expect to find this pattern. Supervisors should be more influential than should employees. When tested with a one-tailed t-test, this difference is statistically significant ($t = 1.799$, $p = 0.037$).

Descriptive Statistics

Role-taking accuracy means are displayed in Table 2 for each of the possible categories in the study. It is important to note that these categories are not mutually exclusive. For example, the reported mean for supervisors necessarily includes all of the observations of male supervisors and female supervisors. Likewise, the reported mean for males includes both supervisor and employee means.

Table 2: Mean Role-Taking Accuracy Score

Category	N	Mean (SD)
Overall Mean	160	.7717 (.07)
Supervisors	80	.7627 (.06)
Employees	80	.7808 (.07)
Male	80	.7681 (.06)
Female	80	.7753 (.07)
Male Supervisors	40	.7529 (.06)
Female Supervisors	40	.7725 (.06)
Male Employees	40	.7834 (.06)
Female Employees	40	.7781 (.08)

Primary Results

To test the primary hypothesis, that the relatively powerful will exhibit lower role-taking accuracy than the relatively powerless, regardless of gender composition of the two-person group, I conduct an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) that includes power position, gender of the individual and gender composition of the group. Table 3 displays the results of this test.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance, Role-Taking Accuracy by Power Position, Gender, and Gender Composition of the Dyad

<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Pr>F</u>
Model	3	0.006	1.443	0.232
Error	156	0.004		
Corrected Total	159			
<u>Source</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Pr>F</u>
Supervisor	1	0.013	3.107	0.080
Male	1	0.002	0.488	0.486
Gender Same	1	0.003	0.735	0.392

In this model, there are F-statistics related to each of our three independent variables. 3.1 is the F value for power position, but the F-statistic for gender and for gender composition has an F value of only .488 and .738, respectively. These F values and respective alpha probability values are the results of testing the null hypothesis that each respective individual predictor in the model does not explain a significant proportion of the variance, given the other variables that are in the model. Thus, given these values, we reject the null hypothesis for power position, but not for individual gender or for gender composition. In other words, power position does account for the variability in role-taking accuracy, given the participant's gender and gender composition of the dyad. Individual's self-reported sex and gender composition DO NOT predict variability in role-taking, given power position. Additionally, in analyses not presented here, it was found that there are no statistically significant interactions among predictors. Given the results of these analyses, I can eliminate both gender and gender composition. Only supervisory position makes a

difference. The ANOVA becomes just a t-test with Employee versus Supervisor as the two groups.

Mean role-taking accuracy score for all supervisors is .7627 and for all employees is .7808. With 158 degrees of freedom, a t value of 1.767 results in a one-tailed probability of .038. Thus, the t-test supports Hypothesis 1. The relatively powerful exhibit lower role-taking accuracy than the relatively powerless. See Table 4 for the breakdown of mean role-taking accuracy for each cell of the experimental design. So, if ranked by accuracy the groups would be arranged as follows: male employee with female supervisor, female employee with female supervisor, female supervisor with female employee, male employee with male supervisor, female employee with male supervisor, male supervisor with female employee, female supervisor with male employee and male supervisor with male employee. This is especially interesting given the likelihood of real world occurrences of men supervising other men.

	Superordinate	Subordinate
<i>a</i>	Female .7909	Female .7962
<i>b</i>	Female .7542	Male .7977
<i>c</i>	Male .7481	Male .7692
<i>d</i>	Male .7576	Female .7599

Secondary Results

Given the previous literature, it is important to examine whether actual role-taking accuracy is correlated with self-evaluated role-taking accuracy. Each participant was asked to rank how accurately they thought they had predicted all of their study partner's answers on a scale of 1 to 10. The mean of self-evaluated role-taking accuracy is 5.25 with a standard

deviation of 1.72. Self-evaluated role-taking accuracy is in not statistically significantly correlated with actual role-taking accuracy. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient is .079 with an associated alpha probability value of .323.

An interesting finding is that some participants think that they are more accurate than others. Unsupported by reality, men believe that they are more accurate than women with mean perceived role-taking accuracy of 5.64 and 4.86, respectively. On the other hand, supervisors believe that they are less accurate than employees (means of 4.95 and 5.55), which mirrors reality. These differences in perceived role-taking accuracy are statistically significant. However, there is no statistically significant difference between the perceived accuracy of participants in same or mixed gender dyads. Table 5 displays the mean perceived accuracy for each group. If ranked from highest perceived accuracy to lowest, the groups would be in the following order: male supervisor with female employee, male employee with male supervisor, male employee with female supervisor, female employee with male supervisor, female employee with female supervisor, male supervisor with male employee, female supervisor with male employee, female supervisor with female employee. This ranking differs from reality in many ways. Perhaps the most stark comparison is that female supervisors believe themselves to be the least accurate of all, when in actuality, their mean real role-taking accuracy score is the third most accurate.

	Superordinate		Subordinate	
<i>a</i>	Female	4.30	Female	5.20
<i>b</i>	Female	4.75	Male	5.80
<i>c</i>	Male	4.75	Male	6.00
<i>d</i>	Male	6.00	Female	5.20

Summary of Results

Structural power position does affect role-taking in the hypothesized direction. The main research hypothesis of the study, that the relatively powerful will exhibit lower role-taking accuracy than the relatively powerless, regardless of the gender composition of the two-person group, was supported. Regardless of other factors, being randomly assigned to the role of supervisor resulted in decreased role-taking accuracy scores as compared to those individuals randomly assigned to the role of employee. This effect was most pronounced in the subgroup where women were supervising male employees. In this specific context, unlike previous studies, women exhibited lower role-taking accuracy than did the men. The effect was least pronounced in the subgroup where women were supervising women employees.

Additionally, the random assignment of individuals into positions of differential power translated readily into observed influence. As the rankings task indicated, after thirty minutes of interacting as supervisor and employee, supervisors were more influential than were employees, and this difference in influence was statistically significant. Their assigned position of power translated from one task, the supervisor and employee interaction, to two subsequent tasks, the rankings task and the role-taking portion of the study.

Finally, as discovered in Study 1, again actual role-taking accuracy was not correlated with self-evaluated role-taking accuracy. Men believed themselves to be better role-takers than they actually were while women underestimated their own accuracy. The use of self-evaluated role-taking accuracy in the literature should be considered highly suspect. Although self-evaluations are much easier to obtain, they suffer the same errors of other self-evaluations. They are highly inaccurate.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The current research addresses the nature of role-taking ability, an area that is important for all facets of social psychology. It is indeed difficult to imagine social situations in which taking the role of the other is not of utmost importance. Pragmatically, the goal of role-taking is to accurately develop a set of expectations for behavior and to thus predict behavior in interactive settings. Specifically, this study addresses the manifestation of role-taking accuracy, or the accuracy with which one predicts the behavior of another, one of the many facets of role-taking ability as described by Schwalbe (1988).

Unlike most previous research in the area, this research does not rely on self-evaluative measures of role-taking ability. As the pretests indicated, and as this subsequent test has shown, subjects' evaluation of their own role-taking ability did not correlate with their actual ability. This is a particularly important finding and is another indication that peoples' perceptions are often inaccurate predictors of their action performance. It is important to note that, although the method used in the current study to behaviorally assess role-taking accuracy might be applicable to a variety of subject pools, the specific tasks involved, the roommate arbitration exercise, is best suited for the subject pool studied in this particular study, undergraduate college students.

Finding a lack of interaction between gender and power on role-taking accuracy, this research adds depth to the existing research on gender and power as well as the existing research on role-taking, empathy, and non-verbal communication. This has implications for many different settings in which power differences obtain. So for example, we might expect

that work settings would be likely settings in which role-taking could be affected by power. An interesting question concerns whether there could be an intervention to disentangle the relationship between power and role-taking. The fact that the main hypothesis, that power position is a better predictor of role-taking than gender, is supported, suggests that power is one avenue through which role-taking is shaped. But are there others? Role-taking might be one way in which inequality is somewhat ironically maintained. Flipping this over, if role-taking ability or accuracy is increased for everyone, it is likely that inequality is also decreased. Literature from research on commitments would suggest that such settings might result in high cohesion and commitment (Lawler, Thye and Yoon 2007).

These findings add to a substantial literature regarding the ways in which structure overcomes ascribed characteristics like sex or race. As mentioned before, there are two types of explanations that are usually given for gender difference: socialization explanations and structural/situational explanations (Gerber 2009; Johnson 1994; Webster and Rashotte 2009.) These views are not mutually exclusive, but the current findings appear to have the ability to support just one of these explanations.

Socialization explanations of women's capacity for greater role-taking types of behaviors would focus on how men and women are taught to interact in different ways. Meanwhile, structural or situational explanations would describe gender differences as a byproduct of the pervasive differences in power between men and women within the larger social structure (Gerber 2009; Johnson 1994, Ridgeway 2006, Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999; Ridgeway and Correll 2004, Risman 2004; Webster and Rashotte 2009). The current findings support the latter explanation. That is, it appears that structural or situational position influences role-taking accuracy in that individuals with relatively higher power are

less accurate role-takers than those with relatively less power. Much like Gerber (1996) found in her studies of same-gender and mixed-gender police officer dyads, the findings here indicate that, as hypothesized, all of the findings were explained by structural differences, not by gender.

It could still be the case that women's better role-taking ability in later life could be a product of socialization. Perpetually occupying a status of relatively less power creates habitus of which taking the role of the other is a part. Future research would do well to conduct similar experiments with the inclusion of participants at later stages of life. Still, the fact that a thirty minute manipulation could moderate approximately twenty years' worth of socialization for these participants is a testament to the power of social position.

REFERENCES

- Berger, J., C. L. Ridgeway, M. H. Fisek and R. Z. Norman. 1998. "The Legitimation and Delegitimation of Power and Prestige Orders." *American Sociological Review* 63:379-405.
- Cast, A.D. 2003. "Power and the Ability to Define the Situation". *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66: 185-201.
- Cast, A.D. 2004. "Role-Taking and Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67: 296-309.
- Cast, A.D. and S.R. Bird. 2005. "Participation in Household and Paid Labor: Effects on Perceptions of Role-Taking Ability". *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 143-159.
- Charon, J. M. 2007. *Symbolic Interactionism: An Introduction, an Interpretation, an Integration*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Coutu, W. 1951. "Role-Playing vs. Role-Taking: An Appeal for Clarification." *American Sociological Review* 16: 180-187.
- Dornbusch S. M. and W. R. Scott. 1975. *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisenberg, N. and R. Lennon. 1983. "Sex Differences in Empathy and Related Capacities." *Psychology Bulletin*. 94: 100-131.
- Eisenberg, N., R. Shell, J. Pasternack, R. Lennon, R. Beller, and R. Mathy. 1987. "Prosocial Development in Middle Childhood: A Longitudinal Study." *Developmental Psychology* 23(5): 712-718.
- Flavell, J. H. 1974. *The Development of Inferences About Others. Understanding Other Persons*. T. Mischel. London: Academic Press: 66-116.
- Forte, J. A. 1998. "Power and Role-Taking: A Review of Theory, Research, and Practice." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 1:27-54.
- Gerber, G. L. 1996. "Status in Same-Gender and Mixed-Gender Police Dyads: Effects on Personality Attributions." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59:350-363.
- Gerber, G. L. 2009. "Status, Personality, and Gender Stereotyping." *Sex Roles* 5-6:297-316.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hall, J.A. 1978. "Gender Effects in Decoding Nonverbal Cues." *Psychology Bulletin*. 85: 845-857.

- Howells, J. M. and P. Brosnan. 1972. "The Ability to Predict Workers' Preferences: A Research Exercise." *Human Relations* 25: 265-281.
- Johnson, C. 1994. "Gender, Legitimate Authority, and Leader-Subordinate Conversations." *American Sociological Review*. 59: 122-135.
- Keller, M. 1976. "Development of Role-Taking Ability." *Human Development* 19: 120-132.
- Lauer, R. H. and L. Boardman. 1971. "Role-Taking: Theory, Typology, and Propositions." *Sociology and Social Research* 55: 137-148.
- Lucas, J. W. 2003. "Status Processes and the Institutionalization of Women as Leaders." *American Sociological Review* 68: 464-480.
- Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, D. L. 1981. "The Meaning of Role-Taking." *Symbolic Interaction* 4: 167-175.
- Preiss, J. J. and H. J. Ehrlich. 1966. *An Examination of Role Theory: The Case of the State Police*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ridgeway, C. L. 2006. "Linking Social Structure and Interpersonal Behavior: A Theoretical Perspective on Cultural Schemas and Social Relations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 5-16.
- Ridgeway, C.L. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ridgeway, C. L. and J. Berger. 1986. "Expectations, Legitimation, and Dominance in Task Groups." *American Sociological Review* 51:603-17.
- Ridgeway, C. and C. Bourg. 2004. Gender As Status: An Expectation States Theory Approach. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall and R. J. Sternberg (Eds.) *The Psychology of Gender* (2nd ed., pp 217-241) New York: Guilford.
- Ridgeway, C. and S. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations. *Gender and Society* 18:510-531.
- Ridgeway, C. and S. Correll. 2006. "Consensus and the Creation of Status Beliefs." *Social Forces* 85: 431-453.
- Ridgeway, C. and K. G. Erickson. 2000. "Creating and Spreading Status Beliefs." *American Journal of Sociology* 106: 579-615.

- Ridgeway, C. and L. Smith-Lovin. 1999. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:191-216.
- Risman, B. J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender & Society* 18: 429-450.
- Rosip, J.C. and J.A. Hall. 2004. "Knowledge of Nonverbal Cues, Gender, and Nonverbal Decoding Accuracy." *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*. 28: 267-286.
- Schantz, C. 1975. "Social Cognition". Pp. 495-555 in *Manual of Child Psychology, 3rd Edition*, edited by P. Mussen. New York: Wiley.
- Schwalbe, M. L. 1988. "Role Taking Reconsidered: Linking Competence and Performance to Social Structure." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 18(4) 411-436.
- Sell, J. and K. J. Kuipers. 2009. "A Structural Social Psychological Perspective on Gender Differences in Cooperation." *Sex Roles* 5-6 317-324.
- Sell, J. and M. W. Martin. 1983. "The Effects of Group Benefits and Type of Distribution Rule on Non-Compliance to Legitimate Authority." *Social Forces* 61: 1168-1185.
- Sherohman, T. 1977. "Conceptual and Methodological Issues in the Study of Role-taking Accuracy." *Symbolic Interaction* 1: 121-131.
- Thomas, D. L., D. D. Franks, and J. M. Caslonico. 1972. "Role-Taking and Power in Social Psychology." *American Sociological Review* 37: 605-614.
- Turner, R. H. 1956. "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference Group Behavior." *American Journal of Sociology* 61: 316-328.
- Walker, H.A. and M. Zelditch, Jr. 1993. "Power, Legitimation, and the Stability of authority: A theoretical research program." Pp 364-81 in *Theoretical Research Programs: Studies in the Growth of Theory*, edited by J. Berger and M. Zelditch Jr., Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
- Webster, M., Jr. and L. S. Rashotte. 2009. "Fixed Roles and Situated Actions." *Sex Roles* 61:325-337.
- Wheeler, S. 1961. "Role Conflict in Correctional Communities." Pp. 229-259 in *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change*, edited by D. R. Cressy. New York: Holt.
- Zelditch, M., Jr. and H. A. Walker 1984. "Legitimacy and the Stability of Authority." Pp. 1-27 in *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research*, vol. 1, edited by E. Lawler. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT OF RESPONDENTS

Recruiting Talk

My name is _____ and I am here to tell you about some studies that we are conducting and see if you are interested in volunteering for these studies. You have the opportunity to see how sociologists conduct experimental studies and you will be paid for your participation. Now, I can't tell you right now exactly what study you would be in and exactly how much you will be paid because we are recruiting for several different studies right now. But I can tell you *about* how much these studies would be paying. Some of the studies involve working with people and making different investment decisions. These studies pay from about \$15 to about \$40. Other studies (insert information that pertains to other studies we might recruit for). Examples of the studies include examining how face-to-face communication differs from communication over the computer.

I will hand out these sign up sheets which ask for your name, telephone number and the times you find most convenient for participating in the studies. If you decide to sign up, we will use these sheets and call you up and then schedule you. At the time we talk, we can tell you more about the specifics of the study, the time etc. And then, at that time, you can say yes, no or schedule some other time.

Now, you may have heard some stories about experiments that actually caused people to have negative experiences. There is a very famous study, for example, the Milgram study in which people thought that they were shocking other people to the point of hurting them--- they really weren't, but they thought that they were. This experiment is considered to have ethical problems because people suffered psychological trauma just from being in the study. Well, I want to assure you that nothing like this is going on in our studies. Partly because of some problems in experiments, new federal guidelines were developed for all studies that used human subjects. Here at A&M, all our studies go through the human subjects board (called the IRB). Importantly, if you should feel uncomfortable while in ANY study, you should just leave.

Another thing that I want to make sure you understand is that you are not obligated in any way to sign up. Your participation has nothing to do with this class. Dr. (fill in professor's name) won't know if you come or don't come. There is no extra credit for participation. So, just because I show up here in your class, don't feel obligated to sign up. If you are interested and would like to earn some money, fill out the form and pass it in to me. If you are not interested, simply hand in the blank form.

I appreciate your help. Any other questions?

Telephone Scheduling

Hello. This is _____. I am scheduling for some studies you volunteered for. You were probably recruited in one of your classes by Dr. Sell or one of her students for studies that pay for participation. I am calling to schedule one of those studies now. This study involves making decisions with others in your group. The time and the pay for the studies vary. Ordinarily, the study can take between half an hour and an hour and half. And the pay for the participation can vary from \$15 to \$30.

We run our studies in the Academic building room 325. Do you know where the Academic Building is? (give directions if they don't know). I have openings for participation at _____ and _____. Are any of those times good for you?

{if yes, person is scheduled}

{if no, the person is asked if there is a better time for them}

For this particular study, we are interested in your work history. Can you tell me a bit about the jobs you have held since you graduated high school until now?

Thank you very much for your participation. Again, we will see you at _____(time) in at Academic 325.

APPENDIX B
SCHEDULING SHEET

Social Science Research Laboratory

Name: _____ Sex: _____

Age: _____ Ethnic/Racial Identification: _____ Classification: _____

Have you ever been in any social science research studies? (Please circle the correct response)

No

Yes---if yes, please describe briefly

What times are MOST CONVENIENT for you to participate? (please fill in)

Mornings

Afternoons

Evenings

Monday

Tuesday

Wednesday

Thursday

Friday

Thank You

If you have any questions about these studies, feel free to contact Dr. Jane Sell,
Sociology Department: 845-6120

APPENDIX C

CONSENT DOCUMENTS

Consent Form Work Relationships and Problem Solving

Introduction

The purpose of this form is to provide you information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research study. If you decide to participate in this study, this form will also be used to record your consent.

You have been asked to participate in a research project studying work relationships and the problem solving skills of individuals with various characteristics. The purpose of this study is to learn about problem solving in a group setting. You were selected to be possible participant because you signed up to be considered for this study.

What will I be asked to do?

This study will take about 45 minutes to complete. You will be working on a joint task with the other person in this study. You will fill the roles of supervisor or supervisee. You will be asked your opinions regarding the solutions to various problems. At the end of the study, we will ask you some general questions concerning the tasks you encounter today, and we will allow you to ask any questions you have about any aspect of the study. Your participation within the group will be video recorded.

What are the risks involved in this study?

The risks associated with this study are minimal, and are not greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life.

You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study; however your interaction may help us explain why some groups are more successful than others.

Do I have to participate?

No. Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without your current or future relations with Texas A&M University being affected.

Will I be compensated?

You will receive between 15 and 20 dollars minimum for completing the study depending on your role as supervisor or supervisee. It is possible to earn more depending upon how well your group does on the tasks. You will be paid, in cash, at the end of the study. You may stop participation at any time and can keep the amount of money you have earned up until the time you stop. However, you are not eligible for the bonus payment unless you have finished the entire study.

No class credit is involved in these studies. Your professors will not know if you do or do not participate in these studies.

Who will know about my participation in this research study?

This study is confidential.

The records of this study will be kept private. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only Dr. Sell and her research team will have access to the records.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be video recorded. Any video recordings will be stored securely and only Dr. Sell and her research associates will have access to the recordings. Any recordings will be kept for 3 years and then erased.

Whom do I contact with questions about the research?

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Dr. Jane Sell, 979 845-6120, j-sell@tamu.edu.

Whom do I contact about my rights as a research participant?

This research study has been reviewed by the Human Subjects' Protection Program and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas &M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact these offices at 979 458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

Signature

Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the consent form for your records. By signing this document, you consent to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name: _____

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO SCRIPT

Hello. My name is Dr. Jane Sell. I am the director of the Social Psychology Research Laboratory at Texas A&M University. Thank you for choosing to participate in the studies today. Your cooperation is valuable to us. If you have any questions at any time, please feel free to ask.

You have been scheduled to participate in two separate studies that will last approximately 40 minutes and 20 minutes, respectively. The first study involves working together and the second study involves answering questions on a computer. For the first study, we are interested in different techniques used by work groups for successful management of employees. Because we are interested in individual and group work, we will be videotaping your interaction as a group.

Today you will be working in a simulated organizational setting. One of you will be a supervisor and the other an employee of GNB Supermarket. In this scenario, the supermarket grocery store has been in operation for one year and eight months and is owned by a successful parent corporation.

Based on the work history that you provided, one of you has been named the employee today, and one of you has been named the supervisor. For the first study, your compensation for the study will reflect your title. The supervisor will earn \$17 while the employee will earn \$10. We are offering bonuses for groups that are highly efficient. If your group does especially well, you can earn up to six extra dollars for the group.

Employee: it is your job to complete three tasks at the direction of the supervisor. Your three tasks will be at a level appropriate for employees, that is, non-supervisors. The supervisor will instruct you about your work and will also inspect your work to make sure that it is satisfactory.

Supervisor: it is your job to instruct the employee and inspect their work. You also have two additional tasks to complete which are appropriate for someone on a supervisory level.

You will have 30 minutes to complete your tasks as supervisor and employee. Then, you will work together on a problem solving task. The study conductor will give you instructions about the problem you are to solve. This will last about ten minutes.

Upon completion of the problem solving part of the study, you will be done with the first study. We will then move you to a computer where you will spend the remainder of your time here today answering a computerized questionnaire. You will receive 5 extra dollars for completing the electronic questionnaire. That means, the supervisor in the first study can earn up to \$25 and the employee will can earn up to \$18 when all is completed.

Once again, thank you for your time. The study is now ready to begin.

APPENDIX E

RESEARCH ASSISTANT SCRIPT

Participants are brought into the lab and seated at large table.

[Give the participants the Informed Consent Sheet and have them read it and sign it.]

[Play video instructions.]

[When video is finished.] “Do you have any questions?” answer their questions
 “Ok. Now we can begin the study. (name) you are the supervisor today. (name) you are the employee today. Supervisor, come with me. Employee, you sit here and wait for the supervisor to instruct you.”

[experimenter takes the Supervisor to the office and explains the tasks]

To Supervisor: “Based on the information you gave us about your work experience, you have been chosen as the supervisor. In the envelope in front of you labeled “Supervisor Instructions”, you will find three papers. One paper lists the tasks which you are responsible for completing; the other papers explain the tasks that your employee is responsible for completing. It is your job to tell your employee the tasks that he/she should complete and give them the materials to complete them. Read the instructions word for word to the employee. Instruct the employee in one task at a time. Read the instructions to the employee and set the timer for 6 minutes. Tell the employee to come to you when each task is completed or when the timer goes off so that you may check their work against the requirements listed on the page. When the employee brings the work to you, give them the next set of materials out of the "To be completed" box and read them the instructions. While the employee is working on the tasks, you must complete two tasks of your own. Not only do you have to grade the employee's work and give them marks on the grade sheet in front of you, you have to complete the tasks labeled "Review Inventory" and "Review Profit". It should take you less than 30 minutes to both complete the tasks listed for each of you. I'll check back in a little while. If you get done before I get back, return to your desks and wait. If you get lost or unsure on what to do, consult the information taped to your desk.”

To Employee: "The supervisor will instruct you on what to do. He/She will give you instructions about what to do, and he/she will check your work to make sure that you completed each task satisfactorily. You will have 6 minutes to complete each task, and the supervisor will set a timer to make sure that you stay on time. If you have any questions, ask the supervisor. When you have completed a task, or if the timer goes off, take your work to the supervisor and place it in the box labeled "Complete". The supervisor will then give you your next set of directions and give you the materials you need to complete the job. You will complete three tasks in all. After you finish the last task, put it in the "Complete" box and return to your seat."

To Both: "Remember, if you do well, you can earn extra money, so try your best to finish the tasks as well as best you can. Do you have any questions? Ok let's begin. Employee, go into the supervisor's office to receive your first set of instructions."

[After 25 minutes, check to see if they are done. If not, give them only 5 more minutes to finish.]

[When time is up, or when the tasks are complete, have the supervisor and employee go back to their separate stations. Tell them both what to do next.]

[hand out individual ranking sheet]

"For the next part of the study, we ask you to work on a problem solving task. First you will both sit separately, read the scenario, and rank the items. There are objectively correct answers as to which of these items will decrease shoplifting the most. I will give you 4 minutes to do this. Ready, begin.

[set timer for 4 minutes and wait]

"Now that you have completed the individual rankings sheet, you can both move to the desk in the supervisor's office and work to complete this group rankings sheet. Employee, take your individual ranking sheet with you for reference. We would like you two to work together to complete this group ranking sheet. Please use the line below each item to include a rationale as to why you decided to rank each item where you did. Remember, you can earn extra money here too. There are objectively correct answers to this scenario, and the closer you are to correct, the more bonus money you can receive. This is the portion of the study that is video taped, so I will turn it on now. You have 6 minutes to complete this task. Ready, begin."

[When time is up, or a solution has been reached, the two are now ready for the last part of the study, an electronic questionnaire.]

"That concludes the first study. Now we would like you to answer some questions on a computer. Leave everything here and move to the computers. It should take you less than 20 minutes, and it is the last part of your time here today. Thank you again for agreeing to complete this study."

"For this part of the study, you should do your best to answer each question as accurately as possible. If you have any questions, feel free to ask me, but do not talk to each other. You will need to wear headphones for this part of the study. One of the first questions asks your group number. It is on the post-it note beside the keyboard. When you have finished this questionnaire, remain in your seat until both of you are done."

[seat the participants at their separate computer stations and get them started if needed]

[when both participants are finished, pay them, have them sign the receipt, and begin debriefing]

APPENDIX F**SUPERVISOR/EMPLOYEE TASK MATERIALS****Tasks for Supervisor:**

1. Instruct employee in all tasks required of employee.
2. Inspect employee performance and compare the employee's work to the checklist on your desk.
3. Complete task labeled "Review Profit".
4. Complete task labeled "Review Inventory & Ordering"

Employee Tasks

1. Mail Flyers:

Fold the flyers in a trifold fashion as if to insert into envelopes, and staple them closed (see example). Address the flyers to the valued customers on the customer list. Write directly onto the flyers. Return completed mailers and any unused flyers to me. I will set the timer for 6 minutes. If you finish before 6 minutes is up, bring me your work so that I can inspect it. If you are still working when the timer goes off, stop working and bring your work to me.

2. Alphabetize Coupons by Product

The store brings in all kinds of coupons. In order to get credit for them, we have to send them to the proper manufacturer. It helps if we alphabetize them.

Alphabetize all of the coupons inside this black box by product name and place them in the appropriate section of the white note card box. If you are unsure which name to use, put it in the Not Sure section. I will set the timer for 6 minutes again. If you get done before the timer goes off, bring me your work so I can check it. If the timer goes off while you are working, stop your work and bring it to me.

3. Make Sales Signs for the Store:

Every week, different items go on sale in the store. This week is no different. Make some signs that will go near the merchandise to advertise the sale items listed on the mark down sheet. Make sure the signs are accurate, legible, and creative but professional. Once again I will set the timer for 6 minutes. If you complete the signs before the timer goes off, bring them to me. If the timer goes off while you are working, stop working and bring the work to me.

Supervisor Schedule:

1. Instruct the employee and give materials for the task labeled "Mail Flyers".
(6 minutes)
2. Complete your own task called "Review Inventory & Ordering", and place it in the proper box.
3. Instruct the employee and give materials for the task labeled "Sort Coupons".
(6 minutes)
4. Complete your own task called "Review Profit", and place it in the proper box.
5. Instruct the employee and give materials for the task labeled "Make Signs".
(6 minutes)
6. When employee is finished with "Make Signs", send him/her back to their desk while you finish your tasks and grading.

In between these things, you must grade the employee performance and complete the grading sheet by giving him/her a letter grade.

Checklist to grade employee performance:

Mail Flyers:

At least 30 flyers completed?	yes	no
Flyers neatly addressed?	yes	no
Flyers neatly folded?	yes	no

Sort Coupons:

Did the employee sort the entire stack of coupons?	yes	no
Are the coupons neatly placed in each section?	yes	no
Are there many coupons in the Not Sure section?	yes	no
Check a few coupons. Are they in the right place?	yes	no

Make Signs:

Are the signs accurate?	yes	no
Are the signs legible?	yes	no
Are they professional?	yes	no

Number of "Yes": _____ out of 10.

Employee assessment: A B C D F
(circle one)

Review Profit

Enclosed is a profit sheet for your review. GNB Grocery is being affected by the increased wholesale cost of fruits and vegetables. Our corporate office has given us the freedom to adjust the sale price of our fruits and vegetables to increase the profits of the store. However, it must be noted that we cannot afford to increase prices so much that customers will be less likely to buy our produce.

Your task is to calculate the most profitable sales price for each item on the list that meets these criteria.

- **We must make over 25 cents for each unit sold in order to recoup shipping costs.**
- **The profit margin for each item cannot exceed 50% or 0.5 using the formula below.**

Profit margin is calculated as gross profit divided by revenue.

Gross profit is calculated by revenue minus the cost of the good sold.

In other words:

1. Take the **price sold** of the item and subtract the **cost**.

$$\text{Gross Profit} = \text{Price Sold} - \text{Cost.}$$

2. Take the result of the first step and divide it by the **price sold**.

$$\text{Profit Margin} = \text{Gross Profit/Price Sold.}$$

If any of the produce on your list cannot have their price changed to meet the criteria above, make note of this on your sheet.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>price sold</u>	<u>units sold last weekend</u>
Fresh vegetables			
o Asparagus	\$ 0.66	\$ 0.96	28
o Broccoli	\$ 0.80	\$ 1.60	37
o Carrots	\$ 0.91	\$ 1.06	29
o Cauliflower	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.09	39
o Celery	\$ 0.96	\$ 1.74	42
o Corn	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.62	46
o Cucumbers	\$ 0.54	\$ 0.93	25
o Lettuce	\$ 0.80	\$ 1.28	32
o Mushrooms	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.55	20
o Onions	\$ 0.62	\$ 1.12	46
o Peppers	\$ 0.56	\$ 0.58	33
o Potatoes	\$ 0.92	\$ 1.22	27
o Spinach	\$ 0.90	\$ 1.74	28
o Squash	\$ 0.08	\$ 0.08	24
o Zucchini	\$ 0.67	\$ 1.17	31
o Tomatoes*	\$ 0.95	\$ 1.33	24
Fresh fruits			
o Apples	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.95	31
o Avocados	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.42	46
o Bananas	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.94	25
o Berries	\$ 0.46	\$ 0.72	44
o Cherries	\$ 0.14	\$ 0.21	27
o Grapefruit	\$ 0.96	\$ 1.80	42
o Grapes	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.78	45
o Kiwis	\$ 0.98	\$ 1.93	43
o Lemons / Limes	\$ 0.46	\$ 0.70	23
o Melon	\$ 0.60	\$ 1.12	25
o Nectarines	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.79	37
o Oranges	\$ 0.82	\$ 1.04	21
o Peaches	\$ 0.14	\$ 0.17	31
o Pears	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.55	28
o Plums	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.68	25

Review Inventory:

Review the inventory sheets included with this page. In your opinion, which items should go on sale to clear inventory? Which items should be ordered to be received next week?

Choose at least 20 items. Justify your suggestions. Record your answers below in sentence form.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Qty</u>
Fresh vegetables		
o Asparagus	Ea	70
o Broccoli	Ea	193
o Carrots	Ea	39
o Cauliflower	Ea	48
o Celery	Ea	6
o Corn	Ea	25
o Cucumbers	Lb	160
o Lettuce	Ea	56
o Mushrooms	Lb	84
o Onions	Lb	100
o Peppers	Lb	39
o Potatoes	Lb	158
o Spinach	Ea	104
o Squash	Lb	163
o Zucchini	Lb	88
o Tomatoes*	Lb	197

Fresh fruits		
o Apples	Lb	39
o Avocados	Lb	64
o Bananas	Lb	63
o Berries	Lb	123
o Cherries	Lb	62
o Grapefruit	Lb	105
o Grapes	Lb	108
o Kiwis	Lb	137
o Lemons / Limes	Lb	43
o Melon	Ea	155
o Nectarines	Lb	51
o Oranges	Lb	188
o Peaches	Lb	169
o Pears	Lb	78
o Plums	Lb	137

Refrigerated items		
---------------------------	--	--

o Bagels	case	126
o English muffins	case	197
o Chip dip	case	16
o Eggs	case	122
o Fruit juice	case	191
o Ready-bake breads	case	4
o Tofu	case	93
o Tortillas	case	108

Frozen

o Waffles	case	139
o Burritos	case	102
o Fish sticks	case	2
o Tater tots	case	64
o Ice cream	cartons	6
o Juice concentrate	cans	47
o Pizzas	case	67
o Popsicles	case	122
o Sorbet	case	165
o TV dinners	case	73
o Vegetables	case	139
o Veggie burgers	case	94

Condiments / Sauces

o BBQ sauce	case	138
o Gravy	case	160
o Honey	case	103
o Hot sauce	case	65
o Jelly	case	47
o Ketchup / Mustard	case	69
o Mayonnaise	case	17
o Pasta sauce	case	71
o Relish	case	73
o Salad dressing	case	10
o Salsa	case	154
o Soy sauce	case	110
o Steak sauce	case	147
o Syrup	case	55
o Worcestershire sauce	case	198

Various groceries

o Bouillon cubes	Pkg	151
------------------	-----	-----

o Cereal	case	13
o Coffee	cans	0
o Instant potatoes	Pkg	179
o Lemon / Lime juice	bottles	5
o Mac & cheese	case	140
o Olive oil	bottles	130
o Hamburger Helper	case	80
o Pancake / Waffle mix	Box	135
o Pasta	case	170
o Peanut butter	case	193
o Pickles	Jars	31
o Rice	case	111
o Tea	case	150
o Vegetable oil	bottles	90

Canned foods

o Applesauce	case	68
o Baked beans	case	192
o Broth	case	49
o Fruit	case	89
o Olives	Jars	29
o Tinned meats	Can	94
o Tuna	case	171
o Soup	case	71
o Tomatoes	case	41
o Veggies	case	96

Spices & herbs

o Basil	Pkg	66
o Black pepper	Pkg	6
o Cilantro	Pkg	8
o Cinnamon	Pkg	101
o Garlic	Pkg	85
o Ginger	Pkg	150
o Mint	Pkg	185
o Oregano	Pkg	44
o Paprika	Pkg	176
o Parsley	Pkg	54
o Red pepper	Pkg	37
o Salt	Pkg	98
o Vanilla extract	Pkg	150

Dairy		
o Butter / Margarine	case	199
o Half & half	case	77
o Heavy cream	case	154
o Milk	case	179
o Sour cream	case	194
o Whipped cream	case	56
o Yogurt	case	88
Cheese		
o Bleu cheese	case	170
o Cheddar	case	11
o Cottage cheese	case	47
o Cream cheese	case	117
o Feta	case	131
o Goat cheese	case	22
o Mozzarella	case	62
o Parmesan	case	50
o Provolone	case	74
o Ricotta	case	62
o Sandwich slices	case	141
o Swiss	case	33
Meat		
o Bacon	case	179
o Beef	Lb	104
o Chicken	case	37
o Ground beef	Lb	174
o Ham	case	78
o Hot dogs	case	116
o Lunchmeat	case	21
o Turkey (whole)	Ea	115
Seafood		
o Catfish	Ea	11
o Crab	Ea	132
o Lobster	Ea	16
o Mussels	Ea	194
o Oysters	Ea	106
o Salmon	Ea	2
o Shrimp	Lb	123
o Tilapia	Ea	169
o Tuna	Ea	85

Beverages		
o Beer	case	163
o Club soda / Tonic	case	161
o Champagne	case	187
o White Wine	case	128
o Juice	case	16
o Mixers	case	102
o Red wine	case	93
o Soda pop	case	6
o Sports drink	case	77
Baked goods		
o Bagels	Ea	86
o Buns	Ea	12
o Cookies	Ea	27
o Donuts	Ea	139
o Fresh bread	Ea	179
o Pie	Ea	20
o Pita bread	case	14
o Sliced bread	case	152
Baking		
o Baking powder	case	194
o Bread crumbs	Pkg	110
o Cake mix	case	1
o Cake icing	case	17
o Chocolate chips	case	10
o Flour	case	11
o Shortening	case	102
o Sugar	case	138
o Sugar substitute	case	178
o Yeast	Pkg	139
Snacks		
o Candy	case	69
o Cookies	case	73
o Crackers	case	30
o Dried fruit	case	128
o Granola bars	case	66
o Nuts	case	2
o Oatmeal	case	79
o Popcorn	case	106

o Potato chips	case	10
o Pretzels	case	22

Baby

o Baby food	case	155
o Diapers	case	198
o Formula	case	147
o Lotion	case	68
o Baby wash	case	98
o Wipes	case	157

Pets

o Cat food	case	189
o Cat litter	case	98
o Dog food	case	156
o Flea treatment	Pkg	68
o Pet shampoo	Pkg	135

Personal care

o Antiperspirant	case	73
o Bath soap	case	71
o Condoms	Pkg	177
o Cosmetics	Pkg	100
o Cotton swabs	Pkg	198
o Facial cleanser	case	171
o Facial tissue	case	145
o Feminine products	case	36
o Floss	case	164
o Hair gel	case	75
o Lip balm	Pkg	40
o Moisturizing lotion	case	189
o Mouthwash	case	179
o Razors	case	191
o Shampoo	case	73
o Sunblock	Pkg	67
o Toilet paper	case	115
o Toothpaste	case	134
o Vitamins	Pkg	159

Medicine

o Allergy	Pkg	192
o Antibiotic	Pkg	154
o Antidiarrheal	Pkg	156
o Aspirin	case	125

o Antacid	case	62
o Band-aids / Medical	case	93
o Cold / Flu / Sinus	case	164
o Pain reliever	case	20
o Prescription pick-up	pharmacy inventory	

Kitchen

o Aluminum foil	case	83
o Napkins	case	103
o Non-stick spray	case	94
o Paper towels	case	133
o Plastic wrap	case	95
o Sandwich / Freezer bags	case	118
o Wax paper	case	46

Cleaning products

o Air freshener	case	137
o Bathroom cleaner	case	20
o Detergent	case	55
o Dishwasher soap	case	186
o Garbage bags	case	55
o Glass cleaner	case	11
o Mop head	Ea	45
o Sponges	case	167

Office supplies

o CDRs / DVDRs	Pkg	190
o Envelopes	Pkg	195
o Tape	Pkg	58
o Printer paper	Pkg	175
o Pens / Pencils	Pkg	164
o Postage stamps	books	109

Other General Merchandise

o Batteries	Pkg	107
o Charcoal	Pkg	111
o Flowers	Ea	23
o Insect repellent	Pkg	110
o Light bulbs	Pkg	26
o Newspaper	Ea	11

Create signs to proclaim our sale items in the produce section:

Every week different items go on sale in the store.

This week we are focusing on produce. Here are the new sale prices:

White Seedless Grapes – 99 cents per pound

Raspberries (6 ounce cartons) – 4 for \$5

Red or Black Plums – 10 for \$10

Hass Avocados – 2 for \$3

Black or Red Seedless Grapes - \$1.69 per pound

Organic Red Seedless Grapes - \$1.99 per pound

Jumbo Navel Oranges – 10 for \$10

Organic Peeled Baby Carrots (16 ounce bag) - \$1.49 each

Create signs using the cardstock and markers provided to advertise these deals. The signs will be placed in the produce section above each item.

The supervisor will grade your signs, so do a good job.

Evaluation of Supervisor or Employee

The aim of this form is to determine your opinion of the person you worked with today. Please answer the questions below.

In today's study, were you the employee or the supervisor?

- a. Employee
- b. Supervisor

How was your job title (employee or supervisor) determined?

- a. Alphabetically
- b. Based on job history
- c. Based on age
- d. Based on gender

Rate the following words as to how accurately they describe the person you worked with today.

Competent

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Bossy

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Cooperative

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Easy to work with

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Nice

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Opinionated

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Incompetent

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Lazy

<i>Not At All Accurate</i>										<i>Perfectly Accurate</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Would you like to work with this person again?

<i>No, definitely not.</i>										<i>Yes, definitely</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

APPENDIX G

SHOPLIFTING RANKING TASK

Problem

About a week ago, while you were in the store, you noticed that a 14-year-old boy had just placed a board game under his coat and was starting to walk out the door. You were not sure what you should do, so you stopped the boy and told him to give back the board game. The boy looked frightened and ran out of the store with the board game. You were not sure how to handle the situation. You decided that it was too late to do anything about it at this time. However, because of this incident, you realized that the store needs a set of procedures outlining how you and your employees might work to prevent shoplifting in the future.

Please rank the following strategies in order of their importance with **1** being most important and **11** being least important. Be sure to tell us why you chose the ranking you chose in the blank provided.

- ___ **Greetings:** Greet every customer that enters the store. This lets the customer know you are aware of their presence.
- ___ **Bag Check:** Implement a policy and procedure for backpacks and bags brought in by customers.
- ___ **Sealed Shut:** Every bag should be stapled closed, with the sale receipt attached.
- ___ **Receipts:** Give each customer a receipt for every purchase. Trash any discarded receipts.
- ___ **Staffing:** Schedule an adequate number of employees to work at one time.
- ___ **Helping Hand:** Approach a suspicious person and ask if he/she is finding everything okay. Make a potential shoplifter feel watched.
- ___ **Be Attentive:** Make yourself available to all customers and never leave the store unattended.
- ___ **Code 3:** If you notice suspicious activities, alert other employees immediately.
- ___ **Stay Focused:** Don't allow customers to distract the cashier while another person is being checked out.
- ___ **Tag Swap:** Cashiers should watch price tags and be on the lookout for price switching. Ask for a price check if something seems out of place.
- ___ **Hidden Items:** Boxes, baskets with lids and any other product easily opened should be inspected by cashiers to be sure it does not contain other merchandise.

Solution to Shoplifting Ranking Task

1. Staffing: Schedule an adequate number of employees to work at one time.
2. Greetings: Greet every customer that enters the store. This lets the customer know you are aware of their presence.
3. Be Attentive: Make yourself available to all customers and never leave the store unattended.
4. Receipts: Give each customer a receipt for every purchase. Require receipts for refunds for cash. Trash any discarded receipts immediately.
5. Stay Focused: Don't allow customers to distract the cashier while another person is being checked out.
6. Bag Check: Implement a policy and procedure for backpacks and bags brought in by customers.
7. Code 3: If you notice suspicious activities, alert other employees immediately. Many stores have a security code to alert staff of possible shoplifters.
8. Helping Hand: Approach the suspicious person and ask if he/she is finding everything okay. Mention that you'll be near by should he/she need your help. Make the shoplifter feel watched.
9. Tag Swap: Cashiers should watch price tags and be on the lookout for price switching. Ask for a price check if something seems out of place.
10. Hidden Items: Shoe boxes, pocket books, baskets with lids and any other product easily opened should be inspected by cashiers to be sure it does not contain other merchandise.
11. Sealed Shut: Every bag should be stapled closed, with the sale receipt attached.

From "Use Customer Service to Prevent Shoplifting" by Shari Waters, retail expert.

APPENDIX H
ROLE-TAKING TASK

Roommate Questionnaire²

Regarding the first roommate video:

How important do you find the following issues faced by the roommates? Please mark your choice with an "X".

	I find the issue...					
	not at all					very
	important					important
Messiness in general	0	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of communication	0	1	2	3	4	5
Disrespect	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsibility	0	1	2	3	4	5
Dirty clothes	0	1	2	3	4	5
Dirty dishes	0	1	2	3	4	5
Loud television	0	1	2	3	4	5
Monopolization of tv	0	1	2	3	4	5
Microwaving smelly food	0	1	2	3	4	5
Messy microwave	0	1	2	3	4	5
Interrupted study	0	1	2	3	4	5

² The computer version of this questionnaire varies only visually; the text is the same.

Loud music

0	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Video games

0	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

On a scale from 1 to 10, how likely do you think it is that these two roommates will choose to be roommates next semester? Please circle one.

Not at all likely

Very Likely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Mark an "X" on the line below to show the degree to which you think one roommate is at fault more than the other in this situation.

John is at fault

Michael is at fault

|-----|

Explain below the reason(s) you marked the "X" where you did on the line above.

Regarding the second roommate video:

How important do you find the following issues faced by the roommates? Please mark your choice with an "X".

	I find the issue...					
	not at all					very
	important					important
Messiness in general	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Lack of communication	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Disrespect	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Friends coming over	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Not getting along w/ friends	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Hogging bathroom	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Using others soap/shampoo	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Sharing chores	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Taking out trash	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Pet ownership	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Dog chewing things	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Cleaning up after dog	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5

On a scale from 1 to 10, how likely do you think it is that these two roommates will choose to be roommates next semester? Please circle one.

Not at all likely

Very Likely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Mark an "x" on the line below to show the degree to which you think one roommate is at fault more than the other in this situation.

Jill is at fault

Karen is at fault

|-----|

Explain below the reason(s) you marked the "X" where you did on the line above.

APPENDIX I

DEBRIEFING SCRIPT

Role-taking and Power—Debriefing

Thank you for participating in our study today. You have both earned \$25 dollars for completing the study. The stated difference in pay was a way to make sure that you would behave as though one person had more power than the other. That is also why the supervisor has a nice office and the employee doesn't...to make certain that both of you understood which one of you had power and which one didn't. We videotaped your interaction to study the video later and make sure that you both behaved as though the supervisor had power and the employee did not.

The true reason for the study today concerns the ability of individuals to predict the behavior of others. Although we told you that this study concerned the behavior of work group organizations, we were really concerned with your ability to predict your study partner's behavior and judgments.

There are two different conditions or circumstances that we will be comparing in this study. Some people are assigned to be supervisors; some people are assigned to be employees. The assignment is random, and not based on your work history or any other characteristics of you as a person. We do this so that we can compare the two groups and determine whether being in a position of power or weakness truly affects an individual's ability to predict an other's behavior.

There are studies that show that people often think that they can accurately predict the behavior of another person, but there are few studies that try to specifically analyze whether individuals can truly predict the actual behavior of another person and also study the conditions that might affect their ability to predict behavior, like differences in power.

One thing I would like to ask you is that you not talk about the specifics of the study to your friends. We will be running experiments for the next couple of months, and it is very important that people do not know the specifics of the study because people sometimes act differently when they know about the study. **THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT.**

How do you feel now that you know the study is about something different than you may have thought?

Do you have any questions?
Thank you again for your time.

VITA

Name: Tony Paul Love

Address: Department of Sociology
311 Academic Building
MS 4351
College Station, TX 77843

Email Address: tonyplove@tamu.edu

Education: B.S., Sociology, Texas A&M University, 2004
M.S., Sociology, Texas A&M University, 2008