Business & Social Science
IJRBS

Research in Business & Social Science

IJRBS VOL 8 NO 6 ISSN: 2147-4478

Available online at www.ssbfnct.com
Journal homepage: <https://www.ssbfnct.com/ojs/index.php/ijrbs>

How a leader's status distance stimulates employee job performance: The moderating effect of employee loyalty and task interdependence

B.K.Sagarika Irangani^a, Zhiqiang Liu^{b*}, Weedige Sampath Sanjeeva^c

^{a,b} Department of Business Administration, School of Management, Huazhong University of Science & Technology, Wuhan, China

^c School of Economics, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, P.R. China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 September 2019

Received in revis. form 07 Oct. 2019

Accepted 15 October 2019

Keywords:

Status distance

Status threat

Task Interdependence

Loyalty

Job Performance

Power distance theory

JEL Classification:

G41

L14

L21

M11

ABSTRACT

Status is an important circumstance for People's subjective "well-being, self-esteem, and mental and physical health". The paper aimed to test how leader status stimulates the quality of employee job performance in the organization. We argue that in spite of the benefits of having low-status distance who be faced with a comparable loss of status individuals experience more "self-threat" and hence status is threatened tend to engage in disruptive behavior to deliberately inflicts others through actions such as disapproving and acting unkindly. consequently, when the leader -Team member relationship is worse less perception of leader provided less performance of team member and relatively more perception offered to better performance of employees. In this study, these assumptions were investigated involving 240 employees (N = 240). Our findings help to explain why leaders sometimes challenge others who present an immediate threat to their status. As such, we extend theorizing on the power distance, organizational bureaucracy, and leader-member exchange. Results from survey study show a curvilinear relationship between status distance and team member job performance, these detections offer an empirical basis and theoretical inspiration to consider status distance as a critical variable in the possessions of status differences on interpersonal dynamics. Importantly, this work also offers an applicable and timely viewpoint for managers debating the cost and benefits of various hierarchical alignment in organizations.

© 2019 Bussecon International Academy. Hosting by SSBFNET. All rights reserved.

Peer review under responsibility of Bussecon International Academy & SSBFNET.

Introduction

A person's wealth, power, and prestige comprise his statuses. According to C. Anderson, Hildreth, and Howland (2015) is defined as the "respect", "admiration", and "voluntary deference" individuals are afforded by others and Further found out that is a prominent feature from related constructs such as power, financial success, and social belongingness. According to Smith-Lovin (1987), they have researched on status distance concepts and has excavated the margins people's status and respect that they owe in their social role (DesJardins, Srivastava, Küfner, & Back, 2015). It is obvious that when two people are precisely own equal status, their status distance is zero. Individuals those who have experience an equal level of status acquire minimum restrictions to share things, therefore averagely they should maintain more stable associations (Phillips, Rothbard, & Dumas, 2009; Smith-Lovin, 1987; Stürmer, Snyder, Kropp, & Siem, 2006). However, status consider as an essential phenomenon affected by different emotional response (Sarah P. Doyle, 2014). It acts as an alarm and the understandings perceived by the emotions assist individuals to react perfectly to a threat (Neuberg & Cottrell, 2008). In general, at working circumstances, jealousy indicates if the people's position is threatened in their social ladder (Reh, 2017) and it forces an individual to take actions to eradicate the identified threat (Zhang, 2018). This would not be, in turn, increase team members motivation and effectiveness in the job performance. Recent experimental studies have shown that employees within a high task interdependence are in a position to assemble additional efforts when they believe that their poor performance would exacerbate their team performance (Hertel, Konradt, & Orlikowski, 2004). As well as M. Lee (1992) explored

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: x

Peer review under responsibility of Bussecon International Academy.

© 2019 Bussecon International. Hosting by SSBFNET- Center for Strategic Studies in Business & Finance. All rights reserved.

<https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v8i6.530>

employee who was loyal to the leader they tend to be "reliable", "passionate" about their job performance, and was eager to obey with the leader's pronouncement. This suggests there can be dissimilar benefits associated with job performance in the low status distance circumstances in the organization. Although the status distance is a phenomenon that has been investigated and researched by many scholars, it has remained as a black box (Eugene Kim, 2014; Flynn & Amanatullah, 2012). Also, researchers and practitioners still search for the possibilities of augmenting on the status distance scenario of leader and member relationship. Status distance in organizational studies is the extent to which one accepts that status within organizations is unequally distributed and that this unequal distribution has various effects on employee job behaviors (James R. Meindl, 1985). Since status distance can differ from country to country or from organization to organization, Therefore, further examinations are needed in truly understanding of what conditions determine performance in an organization on the low-status distance scenario of leader and team member relationship. For this purpose, our main objective of this study is to assess the moderation effect of team member loyalty and task interdependence on the relationship between status distance and the job performance. Accordingly, our study focused on considering the institutional level predictors of status distance scenario in Srilankan contexts. The researcher using quantitative survey strategy and unit of analysis is multilevel approach techniques to examined the effects of status distance on job performance. Simultaneously, it has been found that leader-team member understanding, policies and practices should be stronger presence of better performance climate in the organization.

Literature Review

The leader-team member relationship on the job performance

Commonly, every working setup reveals on status (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). According to Cameron Anderson, John, Keltner, Kring, and psychology (2001) status is the recognition, the importance and the encouragement that one can receive from others. The value of status is relative to each other and it is socially measured (Cameron Anderson, Srivastava, Beer, Spataro, Chatman, et al., 2006; J. Berger, S. J. Rosenholtz, & M. Zelditch Jr, 1980). Furthermore, ensuing an approach based on similarity attraction (Byrne, 1971) people spend considerable time with each other when they are same in status and therefore they tend to help each other compared to those who are indifferent status level. employees view equity as a sign of status distance. The managers are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that employees have access to the right mix of knowledge, information, resources, and power to work independently in all hierarchical levels (Popper, 2013). When employees feel this empowerment from their leader, they experience more autonomy over their responsibilities and become more motivated to do their work duties hence high job performance. According to Blau (1977) studies "similar status are likely to form high-quality relationships, whereas the reverse is true of individuals with dissimilar status". Each has been considered from viewpoints of that leader-team member relationship., the people who seem to maintain individual characteristics will assist their aims and objectives (Blau, 1977; Ridgeway, 1984). In normal circumstances, any individual who desires superiority will eventually behave in a manner tending towards causing submissiveness from the dyadic partner (Leary, Jongman-Sereno, & Diebels, 2014). However, when the other party does not give in into submissiveness, then the quality and the quantity of the interpersonal relations within the dyad are massively increased (Ren et al., 2012). These relational difficulties can also be expressed as leader-team member relationship conflict, expound as "awareness of interpersonal irreconcilabilities", feelings of tension and friction between the two parties which may involve personal issues like an annoyance, frustration, dislike, and irritation" (Grant, Gino, & Hofmann, 2011). Therefore, although both power and status make available individuals with the ability to influence others "modify others' thoughts, feelings, and behavior". Despite the facts, team member tends to gauge their interaction with their leader as either negative or positive creating a global status distance which will, in turn, affect their job performance (Triguero-Sánchez, C. Peña-Vinces, & Sánchez-Apellániz, 2013). However previous research has consistently found that the leader is usually more influential than other sources due to the supervisor's conspicuousness and their control of subordinates' time and resources (Netemeyer, 2010). As well as leader-Team member relationships and its implication on team member job outcomes have dominated the discourse in the field organizational psychology and behavior (Hen, Lalwani, & Duhachek, 2017; Hofstade, 2001; Shalini Sarin Jaina, 2018). If an employee feels that his/her leader may give inappropriate information or a task that will not benefit the company, the employee may take extra precautions. When trust in the leader is very low, team member may disregard directives from their leader out of fear that the information given to them is unreliable (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). By borrowing from social impact theory, loyal employees experience minimal social distance between them and the team member. This minimal social distance maybe accrue from the quality of the leader-member exchange between the leader and the employee (Erdogan & Bauer, 2014; Shalini Sarin Jaina, 2018) Studies on the effect of status distance on team member job outcomes alludes that both low and high status distance influence the quality of leader -team member relationship.

The mediating role of status threats

People involved in a different range of goal-directed events to be able to their status, supported by many "cognitive, behavioral, and affective" processes (C. Anderson et al., 2015). At the same time, status encourages people with its pros, such as support and recognition from others (Cameron Anderson, Srivastava, Beer, Spataro, & Chatman, 2006) positive influence (J. Berger, S. J. Rosenholtz, & M. J. A. r. o. s. Zelditch Jr, 1980) and psychological wellbeing (Adler, Epel, Castellazzo, & Ickovics, 2000). On the other hand, forfeiture of status accelerate adverse sentiments (Kemper, 1991) and weak performances (Marr & Thau, 2014). According to the literature, envy arises when leader compare themselves with their team member and consequently feel a threat to their status (Cohen-Charash & Mueller, 2007; M. K. Duffy, K. L. Scott, J. D. Shaw, B. J. Tepper, & K. Aquino, 2012a). In response,

team member may strive to interruption the employee's status through "social undermining", hoping to improve their own status and alleviate the envious feeling (Duffy et al., 2012a; Tai, Narayanan, & McAllister, 2012). A study by Zhang (2018) attempted to suggest "the effect of status threat on ethical leadership". The status threat was acquired from the "self-reports of leaders", which are likely to be influenced by "individual sensibility", "tolerance and capability" to determination status threat. According to Miller (2001), vehement responses are possible at a disrespectful behavior, and it is an offense which is obvious in public. This confirms that such an act is more towards status threat (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, & Schwarz, 1996). Felson (1978) to confirms that vehement reactions are obvious in public circumstances rather than secluded. According to Reh (2017), it has been established that emotions to offer that a predicted future status threat can in the same way rise team member to feel "envy toward", and subsequently "undermine", their workfellow. Moreover, Eugene Kim (2014) has been the focus on envy as an illustrative mediator of the persecution of high performers from fellow group members. In conclusion, therefore, neither one-sided low-status distance nor one-sided high-status distance can yield favorable results in a given organizational setup.

According to Sarah P. Doyle (2014) discussed optimistic actions that might support the performance of other team members close in status should be repressed as well, as "in order to avoid this threat to self-evaluation". "the closer the other the less help one would expect the other to be given" (Tesser, 1988). While not essentially being a direct threat to one's status (as were those close in status), there are other costs associated with helping those further away in the status distance which may explain the reduced possibility to help these individuals relative to those moderately distant in status (Reh, 2017). Further, explore the positive side of the status threats. Imposing status threat on leaders will increase their obvious direction in the status relationship system, which in turn "encourages conformity to ethical norms and directs their attention to formulating good relationships" with others (M. K. Duffy, K. L. Scott, J. D. Shaw, B. J. Tepper, & K. J. A. o. M. J. Aquino, 2012b). With their study significantly contributed to a new path in the field of status distance provide individuals with the modify others' thoughts, feelings, and behavior. Nevertheless, the scholars did not come across observed research, which describes how a leader to support the performance of team member when the status distance is lower. But they simultaneously opened a new possibility for future research aimed at exploring factors that mediator consequence of status threat on the relationship between low-status distance and team member job performance. Hence

H 1: There is a negative relationship between leader-member status distance and leader perceived status threats.

H 2: Leader status threats mediate the relationship between leader-member status distance and team member job performance

The moderating role of task interdependence

Task interdependence is defined as the extent to which employees depend on other members of an organization to perform their work efficiently (Claus W Langfred, 2007; Vidyarthi, Anand, & Liden, 2014). Task interdependence cannot work without the spirit of teamwork in an organization. It is a functional way to plan structured how information, materials, and expertise will be shared between team members tasks and elaborating roles for people involved in the work (Hertel et al., 2004; Pearce & Gregersen, 1991). Task completion is achieved through the differentiation of activity into tasks which are assigned to individuals who work in teams to deliver the final product. The quality of the final product will depend on the quality of interdependency among them. There are three kinds of interdependence in organizational team members: goal interdependence (related to goals), task interdependence (task behavior), and behavior interdependence (evaluation of behavior outcomes). Proper goal setting will lead to task interdependence and structure which will ultimately result in high instrumentality in working teams. High task instrumentality will increase employee task-driven interactions which increase their self-efficacy and motivation (Hen et al., 2017; Shalini Sarin Jaina, 2018)

Many researchers have discovered that, team members will be more prospective to cooperate, communicate share knowledge with others when a teams have a high level of task interdependence subsequently display more citizenship behavior hence higher employee performance (Bachrach, Powell, Bendoly, & Richey, 2006). They proved that high levels of task interdependence encourages cooperation among team members and facilitate team self-management (Bachrach, Powell, Collins, & Richey, 2006; Claus W Langfred, 2007). Task interdependence will also facilitate information exchange because interdependent working tasks require employees to exchange information and communicate on work issues (C. K. De Dreu, 2007; Pangil & Moi Chan, 2014; Rego & Simpson, 2018). Since task interdependence promotes a sense of oneness, openness, and teamwork in the realization of task goals, Han, Lalwani, and Duhachek (2017), argues that such an experience of empowerment and consultative engagements in the task interdependence teams will attenuate the effect of high or low-status distance on the performance of the tasks. Therefore, since higher task, leader-employee interdependence involves more complex and ambiguous tasks necessitating greater coordination among group members (C. K. J. J. o. a. p. De Dreu, 2007; Wang & Howell, 2010), Leader have to devote extra attention to promote cooperation, create opportunities to learn roles, develop a suitable teamwork synergy framework, and help employees acquire the knowledge and interact well in working teams.

Employee task interdependence, on the other hand, has been cited to have a huge effect on the relationship between the leader and team member job performance. The task interdependence can either be between the team members or among team member and their immediate leader Khatri (2009), brought forth four cultural dimensions that became the most popular references in cross-cultural studies. This will consider task interdependence to moderated levels may relate positively with job performance, but this relationship consequently, it can be inferred that up to a certain threshold level of status distance (Jain & Jain, 2018). However, status distance effects will greatly influence the perceptions that team member will have towards their role in the achievement of tasks in groups.

that task interdependence is straightly related to leader perception. Addition to that employees may start to feel the leader's close monitoring under high task interdependence and high task contacts. Thus, high task interdependence groups are frequently more intricate and need a high magnitude of different elements across manifold members (Liden et al., 2006; Saavedra, Earley, & Van Dyne, 1993). We persuade that low task interdependence in workgroup emphasizes the negative consequence of leaders' status distance on leader team member relationship. Then leader became threats and a leader is not giving much generous, magnify circumspection and independence frequently. Such a leader does not lead to affect and trust in the team member and people whose status is threatened tend to engage in antisocial behavior to purposely harm others through actions such as criticizing and acting unkindly Aquino, Douglas, and Processes (2003) however, there is no clear combination of the literature on the despite the importance of the relationship between leaders and member task interdependence and leader status distance how to effective job performance. nevertheless, we, therefore, expect high task interdependence motives to weaken the negative relationship between status distance and team member job performance. Therefore, offer the following prediction

H 3: When task interdependence of the team is higher, the leader-member status distance will be less related to leader status threats.

H 4: The indirect relationship between leader-member status distance and team member job performance through leader status threats is conditional on task interdependence, such that higher task interdependence tends to weaken the relationship

The moderating role of employee loyalty

The effect of status distance on employee work behaviors may also be influenced by the level of loyalty of employees (Zhou, 1983). Cheng (1993) pronounced loyalty to the leader as accepting the leader's goals, being authentic, eager to apply additional stimulate, and signifying fulsome enthusiasm. Further clarification that loyalty to leader gives the impression to be more significant than organizational commitment in process for employee's in-role and extra-role performance (Chen, Tsui, Farh, & psychology, 2002) These findings are also quite previous research accomplishing Western samples (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Gregersen, 1993) it found that employee performance was more strongly effected with loyalty to leader . According to Loveman (1998) revealed that employee loyalty is certainly interrelated with service superiority. (Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 2008). Loyal workers enthusiastically engage in their organization's purposes, act in accordance with their organization's long-term well-being, and do not question or insubordinate the organization hierarchy and authority (Ibrahim & Al Falasi, 2014; Shalini Sarin Jaina, 2018) However, findings from employee loyalty studies indicate that loyal employees enjoy a mutual relationship with their leader whose premise is on mutual reciprocity and trust among them and the leader irrespective of the nature of the status distance culture of the organization. Following (Linz, Good, & Busch, 2015) focused on commitment to the leader Identification occurs when the employee admires certain attributes of the leader, such as the leader's attitudes and behavior, personality or achievements. They may feel proud to be accompanied by the leader who has these esteemed characteristics (Weng, 2014). Employees who were loyal to the leader have a tendency to be decreasing and unwilling to comply with the leader's decision and were not accepting the leader's goals/values, being faithfully, normally hesitated to respect to the leader, then naturally leaders and team member relationship are concerned with managing and resolving conflict. Thus, leader fears that changes and the relationship became a diminish among the leader and team member, Moreover the leader's became threats also unkindly attitudes and criticizing behaviors are improperly affected to the employee's value systems. As a result of this situation team member performance transformation to be lower(Ibrahim & Al Falasi, 2014).

To address these critical issues, we provide a comprehensive approach of the extant on status distance and employee loyalty through the lens of the status threats. Although many studies have examined the effect of employee loyalty on some aspect of status distance, conversely there is currently no compilation of research that provides an explicit considerate of when, why, and how leaders engage in status threats if team member disloyalty to their leader and as a result especially how it could be influence for the team member job performance . Therefore, we offered the following prediction.

H5: When team member loyalty to the leader is higher, the leader-member status distance will be less related to leader status threats.

H 6: The indirect relationship between leader- Team member status distance and team member job performance through leader status threats is conditional on team member loyalty, such that higher loyalty tends to weaken the relationship.

From a theoretical perspective, employee loyalty and task interdependence can be a relevant moderator of validity and that the relationship between status distance and job performance is often implicit to be negative. The current research contests this assumption theoretically and empirically and tests a relation between status distance and job performance. Therefore, the goal of this study was to establish the inspiration of employee loyalty and task interdependence on the moderator effect of superior lower status distance on team member job performance.

Theoretical background

Many theoretical perspectives shape the effect of status distance on employee job behaviors. The Power Distance Theory (PDT) asserts that "the smaller the distance from the more powerful person, the stronger the tendency to reduce it" and as per the Power Distance theory this can be done through cognition and manifestation of new employee behaviors (Gomez, Kirkman, & Shapiro, 1999; Hofstade, 2001) On a behavioral level, the PDT alludes of the possibility of actual acquisition of the position of a person having more power Mulder (1976). Additionally through various experiments on organizational social structures, (Mulder, 1976) revealed

that there was an emotional distance separating subordinates from their bosses. (Mulder, 1976) further found out that this distance was because of the power differences between them and was responsible for the creation of organizational ‘social systems’ and ‘supervisor-subordinate’ dyadic relationships. In his first description of Power Distance Theory, Mulder (1976) asserted that “use of power gives satisfaction and that the desire for power that is assumed to result from this satisfaction leads to a downward and an upward power tendency”. The downward tendency implies the power tend to keep less powerful others at a distance, while upward power tendency refers to the power tendency that tends to reduce the difference in power between oneself and a more powerful other. This study will focus on the downward power tendency which results to the status distance between the subordinates and their superiors (Bruins & Wilke, 1993; Khatri, 2009; Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009). Increasing status distance is attained through better handling of employees in areas like fairness, good rewards, enthusiastic job conditions, and the general employee welfare is embraced more by employees hence high job performance.

The second theory of organizational bureaucracy (Bruins & Wilke, 1993; Hofstade, 2001) concerns itself with upward power distance. The theory of bureaucracy asserts that power is vested in positions or ranks occupied by individuals with a given authority. In case such positions fall vacant, they will immediately be filled with the person next in command in the organization hierarchy. Thus, subjects immediately below the top position will have a stronger feeling of being eligible to take over the highest position than others who are in lower positions. Based on this, facts many studies that have attempted unfold the effect of status distance on the superior-subordinate dyadic relationship and employee job outcomes have pointed on an existence of a complex web of the relationship among various power-related constructs (Y.-t. Lee & Antonakis, 2014; Linz et al., 2015).

Leader-member exchange (LMX) is well-interpret as the degree to which an employee feels a sense of belonging and that he /she has a quality relationship with the leaders the management of the organization (D. J. Henderson, S. J. Wayne, L. M. Shore, W. H. Bommer, & L. E. Tetrick, 2008a). It is that feeling where the member feels that he/she is accepted by his/her leader. Leader trust in members gives them an upper hand in accessing information in an organization and this gives them a certain form of autonomy (D. J. Henderson, S. J. Wayne, L. M. Shore, W. H. Bommer, & L. E. J. J. o. a. p. Tetrick, 2008b). Studies have exposed that employees are selected to be a part of managerial in-groups based on supervisors’ assessments of employees’ skills, motivation, and the level of trust that the manager feels the member deserves. According to Henderson et al. (2008a), once LMX has begun to be established, the leader will representative more responsibility to the team member, which is associated with an increase in team member empowerment and thus high member performance. The argument component in LMX is essential because it allows for the concept of mutual trust and respect, which inspires information exchange. In this respect, trust and LMX are intertwined, acting as both source and product of the other. When a employee is accepted into a manager’s in-group, it can be perceived as a reward because it is typically the result of good job-performance and self-actualization of the psychological contract on behalf of the employee (Henderson et al., 2008a)

Conceptual framework

Figure 1: Theoretical model

Research and Methodology

Population and sample description

The target population will be selected employees from different departments in a state-owned College of Education in Sri-Lanka. The choice of the study area is that the principle of authority and subordination is common in public institutions where bureaucracy is common. This design enables the researcher to have an equal proportion of selected elements from a unit of interest to the study.

In this case, respondents will be picked from each department on a given proportion depending on the size of the department. A sample of 240 respondents will be selected from the 06 public College of Education in Sri-Lanka.

Instrumentation and measures

Constructs have been measured both at individual and group level using Mplus version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Mplus is a statistical modeling program that makes available researchers with a flexible tool to analyze their data. The Within and Between parts of the figure indicate the multilevel model by using Mplus (Appendix A). The measures of the five constructs of the study namely: status distance, status threats, employee loyalty, task interdependence, and employee Job performance were as follows. The rating of performance was done using (Patrick D. Lynch, 1999) scale of superior-subordinate rating. Superiors rated the performance of those employees who rated themselves on their level of task performance. The questionnaire items were elicited on a seven-Likert scale. Sample of the questioner item included "This employee performs tasks that are expected of him/her" and "This employee exhibits punctuality at his work". Loyalty to the supervisor (LS) was measured by the 17-item scale with five dimensions developed by Chen, Tsui, and Farh (2002). The items were elicited on a seven-item Likert scale 7. The sample of the items included: "When someone speaks ill of my supervisor, I will defend him/her immediately". Task interdependency was measured in line with the items of Claus W. Langfred (2016) Though Claus W. Langfred (2016) used two levels of task interdependence: Task interdependence being the extent to which a team member is affected by the work of other members. We used a seven-point Likert scale. Sample items for generalized task interdependence included: 'Most of my work activities are affected by the activities of other people on the team', and, 'My work cannot be done unless other people do their work'. Status threats measured by using four items. We used a seven-point Likert scale. I felt some employees could challenge my status in the firm". "I felt my dominance in work was threatened by other employees". "Some employees competed with me to increase their influence in the firm". "I felt some employees did not agree with the relative value of my contribution to the firm". Developed by Zhang (2018). Status distance was measured in line with the guidelines of Informal status of self-assessment, a dimension of influence, prestige and centrality combination of Spreitzer (1995); Andrews (1993) We used a seven-point Likert scale evaluating accurate or inaccurate of the following statements: "When I want to influence an important decision, I can give my own opinion"; "I have great control over what happens in a department or organization". The employees should feel free to discuss it with the supervisor; "I can feel the importance of the organization to me"; "How well I do my job in this position will affect many people". These items were combined to form a single status -distance scale to be generated as a composite variable.

Control items Based on previous studies, data were also collected to assess the results as a function of the duration of the relationship between leader and team member (dyad tenure), leader support and self-report of the performance. The number of years of experience in the present job, the, and the respondent's age and gender, education qualification, profession.

Results

The study's research model which was established within the framework of antecedent literature and theoretical perceptions proposed that the level of status distance of a supervisor would be producing desired on subordinate's or employee's job performance. In this context, it was expected that the level of status threats as the mediating variable (mediator) would describe the relationship between status distance and job performance. Standardized Mplus factor loading output for the five-factor model. First, the hypothesized five-factor model has been tested. The result suggests that the theoretical measurement constructs revealed the internal consistency with good psychometric properties for the data. Total effect (β_c) could be tested separately both as the direct effect (β_c') of the independent variable (status distance) on the dependent variable (job performance), and indirect effect ($\beta_a.\beta_b$) which was the effect that defined over loyalty to the supervisor, task interdependence and status threats. The standardized loading estimates of all five variables are shown in (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Basic model testing

Table 1: Reliability and validity

	Cronbach's Alpha	Rho-A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Employee Loyalty	0.817	0.827	0.865	0.518
Employee Performance	0.824	0.913	0.866	0.523
Status Distances	0.797	0.870	0.850	0.523
Status Threats	0.533	0.533	0.811	0.682
Task Interdependence	0.856	0.865	0.886	0.529

The Cronbach's alpha values were considered to test the reliability of measurement scales Nunnally (1978) and Kline (1999) recommended that a measurement scales are reliable if the Cronbach's alpha value is greater than 0.7. However, the status threat was lower than Cronbach's Alpha value (0.7). Fornell and Larcker (1981) by considering the measurement model of the study reported the required validity of AVE must be over 0.50. Under certain circumstances, all variables scale (AVE) values well exceed the value of 0.50. It bears a resemblance to the high internal conformity of measurement scales which were used in the study.

Table 2: Path coefficient

		Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Employee Loyalty Threats	→ Status	-0.126	-0.130	0.066	1.916	0.056
Status Distance Loyalty	→ Employee	0.442	0.451	0.053	8.336	0.000
Status Distance	→ Status Threats	0.047	0.050	0.076	0.621	0.535
Status Distance Interdependence	→ Task	-0.190	-0.197	0.066	2.897	0.004
Status Threats performance	→ Employee	-0.372	-0.391	0.049	7.640	0.000
Task Interdependence Threats	→ Status	-0.336	-0.352	0.052	6.440	0.000

According to table 02 produced each variable's, standard deviation was higher than ($p > .05$) except the status threat and Job performance relationship ($0.049 < .05$). Conversely, it was nearly 0.05. Therefore, it provides there is a sufficient linear relationship between the variables. The researcher followed the recommendations to examine the significant if the direct effect of leader-member status distance and job performance. Employee loyalty ($\beta = -0.126, p < 0.05$) had a significant impact on leaders' threats but it was a negative impact. As a result, it was not accepted. Status distance had a significant impact on employee loyalty ($\beta = 0.442, p < 0.05$). Status distance had no significant impact on the status threat ($\beta = 0.047, p < 0.05$) but according to the (Appendix B) in the total effect of status distance has a significant impact on status threats ($\beta = 0.055, p < 0.05$). Also, status distance significantly impacts on task interdependence ($\beta = -0.190, p < 0.05$), status threat significantly impacts on employee performance ($\beta = -0.372, p < 0.05$), task interdependence significantly impacts on status threats ($\beta = -0.336, p < 0.05$) but most of the relationship were not indicate high internal consistency in measurement.

Table 3: Specific indirect effects

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Status Distance → Employee Loyalty → Status Threat → Employee Performance	0.021	0.023	0.012	1.735	0.083
Status Distance → Status Threat → Employee Performance	-0.017	-0.019	0.030	0.582	0.561
Status Distance → Task Interdependence → Status Threat → Employee Performance	-0.024	-0.027	0.011	2.168	0.031
Status Distance → Employee Loyalty → Status Threat	-0.056	-0.058	0.030	1.859	0.064
Status Distance → Task Interdependence → Status Threat	0.064	0.069	0.024	2.673	0.008

The researcher followed the recommendation of Hayes (2017). In order to evaluate the significance of the indirect effect of status distance, employee loyalty and status threats link to the employee performance. Meanwhile, status distance, task interdependence, and status threats link to employee performance. As mentioned in the conceptual framework, the hypothesis is related to the moderation mediated effect. As shown in table 03 indicate the status distance, Employee loyalty, status threats had a significant and positive indirect effect on employee performance. ($\beta=0.021$, $t(456)=1.735$, $p<.01$). As well as status distance, task interdependence had a positive and significant effect on status threats ($\beta=0.064$, $t(456)=2.673$, $p<.01$). According to Hayes (2017), if the lower and upper level of the confidence intervals does not reach zero, the moderation effect is supported to the study. As a result, the employee loyalty and task interdependence provide the basic indirect effect for the study. Subsequently, referred that, the indirect effect is greater than the direct effect which means it has perfect mediation for the study.

Implications

Status is gaining as a contemporary job design among professional employees those who engage in creativity requisite jobs. How status influences on the inspiration of professional employees in remained unanswered in the existing literature. To effectuate this gap the researcher intended to understand the link between status distance and employee job performance. I was conducted to get an initial understanding of status distance and employee job performance based on quantity approach in the National College of education in Srilanka. In this regard surveyed the consequence of leader status distance on the two dimensions of employee loyalty and task interdependence testing the model-based followed by existing theories and literature. The present study strides a step beyond the literature and identified two mechanisms through which low-status distance impact on employee job performance is based on power distance, bureaucracy and leader-member exchange theory. A previous conceptualization suggested that low-status distance can alter the leading to better outcomes (Triguero-Sánchez et al., 2013). The present study confirmed and extended this view by empirically testing the low-status distance on condition that status threats through the alteration of team member job performance.

Status threats as the mediating variable while the employee loyalty and task interdependence were considered as moderators. The data has been obtained by conducting a survey that collected data to evident the proposed hypothetical framework of the Moderation Effects of Employee Loyalty and Task Interdependence on the Relationship between leader Status Distance and member Job Performance. Employee loyalty generates automatically with being leader status distance and it is not given many perceptions for status threats. Task interdependence is a distinctive dimension of the status distance and that can enhance the negative relationship with status threats. The employee loyalty and task interdependence have positively correlated each other and interact which support directly to the relationship with status distance and job performance. Employee loyalty, task interdependence, and low-status distance are complementary and the combination of them lead to organizational success and the development not only beneficial for the organization it can bring better psychological well-being of individuals.

Employees have achieved their targets in a challenging environment because they believe their skills and competencies. They get the opportunity to self-learning, learning from others and sharing knowledge with others. They develop themselves by occupying this knowledge field of business in spite of winning. Therefore low-status distance is positively associated with employee loyalty and task interdependence which shows great contribution across organizational types as firm take status while they engage in the working environment (Hen et al., 2017; Rego & Simpson, 2018). The surrounding environment creates value in the low-status distance that setting up a flexible work environment. The leader positive thinking was enhanced by the easiness in sharing knowledge, better close with employee created an easy platform for employee job performance. Specifically revealed that job performance context enhances leader personal perception. personal identity has been found more related to employee creativity performance.

The outcome of the study showed that the agreeableness extraversion and self-consciousness has a substantial relationship with the leader and team member capacity of emotional stability. The finding provides useful insights to reconcile the paradoxical views exist about leader and team member link.

Low-status distance is a helpful option to generate novel ideas since it allows working relatively independent and relaxed environment. However, a status threat is not a good option for generating useful ideas with the diminished perspectives discussion and knowledge sharing in the organization contexts (Tai et al., 2012; Zhang, 2018). The outcome of this study highlights the importance of understanding different personalities which drive better leader who leads or commands a group in the organization. This implies to think new approaches in the relationship between leader -team member as well as the organization set policies for reducing mistakes. Most of the research on status distance mainly focus on the general development of leadership without considering leaders status threats. The finding of this study provides insights into why leaders are different and what leaders need to build as skills and what personalities are required to be successful leaders. This helps develop organization culture targeting generated business development. This study also provides inputs on what leader's lack and why they feel emotionally unstable in activities. Therefore, this study provides a platform for the organization to build up productive solutions in developing a successful organization. The finding of this study helps policymakers and other stakeholders to set policies and prepare suitable programs extending from conventional approaches to developing the leader employee relationship.

Conclusions

The study concludes that the leader's status threats influence of team member job performance in the organization. emotionally stability as one of the personality traits identified under the leader status distance ability to change and adaption team member job performance. Perhaps the reasons could be some environmental factors identified in the study. The business growth intention enhances the individual influences of the leader's conscientious agreeableness experience to the member job performance in the organization. Thus, leader perception and team member job performance are interrelated and important constructs in the organization. Accordingly, these findings support the argument that experimental innovators make a great contribution to organizational success. The researcher hopes that the findings will contribute to a new chapter beginning of status distance in the organization. Low-status distance context as a job design of working associated with positive outcomes of job satisfaction and job performance. It enhances the generation of novel ideas professional leaders. Leader and team member good relationship reduced disturbances improves persons original unique thinking which is important for the organization. This finding emphasizes the importance of working in a collocated context in order enhance the idea exchange, knowledge sharing, team member representation in the organization that will, in turn, helps in the development of the useful idea of the professional leader and team member.

By considering this study's great contributions to how low-status distance may relate to the employee job performance. This study used primary data collected from the national college of education in Srilanka. National Colleges of Education is the main teacher training institutions in teacher development. Therefore, business environment factors have not been evaluated in this study. Then the study only looks for the link of leader status distance and how to affect the employee job performance. Hence future studies can consider business environment factors are adding to the extension of low-status distance and job performance. The future research can apply these findings in other various contexts like developed and developing contexts is warranted. The researcher encourages future researchers especially to extend this study in a business organization where a leader has a significant contribution to economic development. The questionnaire is a generally used and valuable tool for amassing survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to administer without the presence of the researcher, and often being comparatively forthright to analyze. Accordingly, findings of the present research imply the importance of maintaining the balance between both working at collocated context with face to face contacts to get the maximum results in terms of creating job performance. Notwithstanding the contributions, this study has some limitations to be acknowledged first, the positive impact of low-status distance on the novelty aspect of creativity will be diminished if the employee has an extrovert personality as he/she does not prefer to work in a socially isolated environment. The survey with the participants revealed that their personality, values and thinking styles in their view on an employee as a function of individual difference and it perceived to the make a relationship on leader and employee. However, our model does not capture those interactions.

References

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. J. H. p. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *19*(6), 586. doi:https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586
- Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychol Bull*, *141*(3), 574-601. doi:10.1037/a0038781
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., Kring, A. M. J. J. o. p., & psychology, s. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *81*(1), 116. doi:DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.1.116
- Anderson, C., Srivastava, S., Beer, J. S., Spataro, S. E., Chatman, J. A. J. J. o. p., & psychology, s. (2006). Knowing your place: self-perceptions of status in face-to-face groups. *91*(6), 1094. doi:DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1094
- Andrews, H. I. a. S. B. (1993). Power, Social Influence, and Sense Making: Effects of Network Centrality and Proximity on Employee Perceptions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, No. 2 pp. 277-303.
- Aquino, K., Douglas, S. J. O. B., & Processes, H. D. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchical status. *90*(1), 195-208. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00517-4
- Bachrach, D. G., Powell, B. C., Bendoly, E., & Richey, R. G. J. J. o. A. P. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance evaluations: Exploring the impact of task interdependence. *91*(1), 193. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.193
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(2), 464-482. doi:DOI: 10.2307/256788
- Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch Jr, M. J. A. r. o. s. (1980). Status organizing processes. *6*(1), 479-508. doi:https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.06.080180.002403
- Blau, P. M. (1977). A macrosociological theory of social structure. *American journal of sociology*, *83*(1), 26-54.
- Bruins, J. J., & Wilke, H. A. (1993). Upward power tendencies in a hierarchy: Power distance theory versus bureaucratic rule. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *23*(3), 239-254.
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). The attraction paradigm. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=Oye3AAAAIAAJ>

- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., Farh, J. L. J. o. o., & psychology, o. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. 75(3), 339-356. doi:https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369749
- Cheng, B. (1993). The effects of organizational value on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job performance: a comparison of different weighting model and discrepancy model. *Chinese journal of Psychology*, 35(1), 43-58.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Mueller, J. S. (2007). Does perceived unfairness exacerbate or mitigate interpersonal counterproductive work behaviors related to envy? *J Appl Psychol*, 92(3), 666-680. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.666
- De Dreu, C. K. J. J. o. a. p. (2007). Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: a motivated information processing perspective. 92(3), 628. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.628
- DesJardins, N. M. L., Srivastava, S., Küfner, A. C. P., & Back, M. D. (2015). Who Attains Status? Similarities and Differences Across Social Contexts. 6(6), 692-700. doi:10.1177/1948550615580171
- Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., Shaw, J. D., Tepper, B. J., & Aquino, K. J. A. o. M. J. (2012b). A social context model of envy and social undermining. 55(3), 643-666. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.0804
- Erdogan, B., & Bauer, T. N. (2014). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory: The Relational Approach to. *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations*, 407.
- Eugene Kim, T. M. G. (2014). Victimization of High Performers:The Roles of Envy and Work Group Identification. *Journal of Applied Psychology Vol. 99*, No. 4, 619–634. doi:DOI: 10.1037/a0035789
- Felson, R. B. (1978). Aggression as impression management. *Social Psychology*, 41(3), 205-213. doi:10.2307/3033557
- Flynn, F. J., & Amanatullah, E. T. (2012). Psyched Up or Psyched Out? The Influence of Coactor Status on Individual Performance. *Organization Science*, 23(2), 402-415. doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0552
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. In: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Gomez, C., Kirkman, B., & Shapiro, D. (1999). *The impact of power distance on the relationship between participation and organizational commitment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the academy of management.
- Grant, A. M., Gino, F., & Hofmann, D. A. J. A. o. M. J. (2011). Reversing the extraverted leadership advantage: The role of employee proactivity. 54(3), 528-550. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.61968043
- Gregersen, H. B. (1993). Multiple commitments at work and extrarole behavior during three stages of organizational tenure. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Han, D., Lalwani, A. K., & Duhachek, A. J. J. o. C. R. (2017). Power distance belief, power, and charitable giving. 44(1), 182-195. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucw084
- Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*: Guilford Publications.
- Henderson, D. J., Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. J. J. o. a. p. (2008b). Leader--member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination. 93(6), 1208. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012678
- Hertel, G., Konradt, U., & Orlikowski, B. (2004). Managing distance by interdependence: Goal setting, task interdependence, and team-based rewards in virtual teams. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 13(1), 1-28.
- Heskett, J., Jones, T., Loveman, G., Sasser, E., & Schlesinger, L. (2008). Putting the Service-Profit Chain to Work. *Harvard Business Review, July-August*, 118-129. doi:citeulike-article-id:9676656
- Hofstade, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. 2. In: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ibrahim, M., & Al Falasi, S. (2014). Employee loyalty and engagement in UAE public sector. *Employee Relations*, 36(5), 562-582.
- Jain, S. S., & Jain, S. P. (2018). Power distance belief and preference for transparency. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 135-142.
- James R. Meindl, S. B. E. a. J. M. D. (1985). The Romance of Leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 1 ()*, pp. 78-102.
- Kemper, T. D. (1991). Predicting emotions from social relations. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 330-342.
- Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organisations. *Vision*, 13(1), 1-9.
- Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744-764.
- Kline, T. (1999). *Remaking teams: The revolutionary research-based guide that puts theory into practice*: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer San Francisco.
- Langfred, C. W. (2007). The downside of self-management: A longitudinal study of the effects of conflict on trust, autonomy, and task interdependence in self-managing teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 885-900.
- Langfred, C. W. (2016). Autonomy and Performance in Teams: The Multilevel Moderating Effect of Task Interdependence. *Journal of Management*, 31(4), 513-529. doi:10.1177/0149206304272190
- Leary, M. R., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., & Diebels, K. J. (2014). The pursuit of status: A self-presentational perspective on the quest for social value. In *The psychology of social status* (pp. 159-178): Springer.

- Lee, M. (1992). An explanation of the significance, influencing factors, and the results of behaviors of loyalty to organization: A case of middle and small enterprises in Taiwanese. *unpublished Master's thesis, Institute of Applied Psychology, Fu Ren University, Taiwan (in Chinese)*.
- Lee, Y.-t., & Antonakis, J. (2014). When preference is not satisfied but the individual is: How power distance moderates person–job fit. *Journal of Management*, 40(3), 641-675.
- Liden, R. C., Erdogan, B., Wayne, S. J., Sparrowe, R. (2006), Occupational, Psychology, O., & Behavior.. Leader-member exchange, differentiation, and task interdependence: implications for individual and group performance. 27(6), 723-746.
- Linz, S., Good, L. K., & Busch, M. (2015). Promoting worker loyalty: an empirical analysis. *International Journal of Manpower*, 36(2), 169-191. doi:10.1108/ijm-06-2013-0129
- Loveman, G. W. (1998). Employee satisfaction, customer loyalty, and financial performance: an empirical examination of the service profit chain in retail banking. *Journal of service research*, 1(1), 18-31.
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). 8 social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management annals*, 2(1), 351-398.
- Marr, J. C., & Thau, S. (2014). Falling from great (and not-so-great) heights: How initial status position influences performance after status loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1), 223-248.
- Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of injustice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 527-553. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.527
- Mulder, M. (1976). Reduction of power differences in practice: The power distance reduction theory and its applications. *European contributions to organization theory*, 79, 94.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2012). MPlus: statistical analysis with latent variables--User's guide.
- Netemeyer, R. G. (2010). Store Manager Performance and Satisfaction: Effects on Store Employee Performance and Satisfaction, Store Customer Satisfaction, and Store Customer Spending Growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. doi:10.1037/a0017630
- Neuberg, S. L., & Cottrell, C. A. (2008). Managing the threats and opportunities afforded by human sociality. *Group dynamics: theory, research, and practice*, 12(1), 63.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric methods. In: New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pangil, F., & Moi Chan, J. (2014). The mediating effect of knowledge sharing on the relationship between trust and virtual team effectiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(1), 92-106.
- Patrick D. Lynch, R. E., and Stephen Armeli. (1999). Perceived Organizational Support: Inferior Versus Superior Performance by Wary Employees. *American psychological association*.
- Pearce, J. L., & Gregersen, H. B. (1991). Task interdependence and extrarole behavior: A test of the mediating effects of felt responsibility. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 76(6), 838.
- Phillips, K. W., Rothbard, N. P., & Dumas, T. L. (2009). To disclose or not to disclose? Status distance and self-disclosure in diverse environments. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 34, No. 4, , 710–732.
- Popper, M. J. T. L. Q. (2013). Leaders perceived as distant and close. Some implications for psychological theory on leadership. 24(1), 1-8.
- Rego, A., & Simpson, A. V. (2018). The perceived impact of leaders' humility on team effectiveness: an empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(1), 205-218.
- Reh, S. (2017). Keeping (Future) Rivals Down: Temporal Social Comparison Predicts Coworker Social Undermining via Future Status Threat and Envy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. doi:10.1037/apl0000281
- Ren, Y., Harper, F. M., Drenner, S., Terveen, L., Kiesler, S., Riedl, J., & Kraut, R. E. (2012). Building member attachment in online communities: Applying theories of group identity and interpersonal bonds. *Mis Quarterly*, 841-864.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698
- Ridgeway, C. L. (1984). Dominance, performance, and status in groups: A theoretical analysis. *Advances in group processes*, 1, 59-93.
- Saavedra, R., Earley, P. C., & Van Dyne, L. J. J. o. a. p. (1993). Complex interdependence in task-performing groups. 78(1), 61.
- Sarah P. Doyle, R. B. L., Jr., Steffanie L. Wilk. (2014). Helping Others Most When They're Not Too Close: Status Distance as a Determinant of Interpersonal Helping in Organizations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*.
- Shalini Sarin Jaina, Shailendra Pratap Jainb. (2018). Power distance belief and preference for transparency. *Journal of Business Research*. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.04.016
- Smith-Lovin, J. M. M. a. L. (1987). <Homophily in Voluntary Organizations Status Distance and the Composition of Face-to-Face.pdf>.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Pshlogical empowerment in the work place dimentions measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Stürmer, S., Snyder, M., Kropp, A., & Siem, B. (2006). Empathy-motivated helping: The moderating role of group membership. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(7), 943-956. doi: 10.1177/0146167206287363
- Tai, K., Narayanan, J., & McAllister, D. J. (2012). Envy as pain: Rethinking the nature of envy and its implications for employees and organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 107-129.

- Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 181-227): Elsevier.
- Triguero-Sánchez, R., C. Peña-Vinces, J., & Sánchez-Apellániz, M. (2013). Hierarchical distance as a moderator of HRM practices on organizational performance. *International Journal of Manpower*, 34(7), 794-812. doi:10.1108/ijm-03-2012-0046
- Vidyardhi, P. R., Anand, S., & Liden, R. C. (2014). Do emotionally perceptive leaders motivate higher employee performance? The moderating role of task interdependence and power distance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 232-244.
- Wang, X.-H. F., & Howell, J. M. (2010). Exploring the dual-level effects of transformational leadership on followers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1134.
- Weng, L.-C. (2014). Improving Employee Job Performance through Ethical Leadership and 'Guanxi': The Moderation Effects of Supervisor-subordinate guanxi differentiation. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 19(3), 321.
- Zhang, G. (2018). Status Threat and Ethical Leadership: A Power-Dependence Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10551-018-3972-5
- Zhou, Y. (1983). The relationship between Chinese value system and managerial behaviors in large enterprises in Taiwan. *Unpublished PhD dissertation, Institute of Business and Management, National Chengchi University, Taiwan (in Chinese)*.

Appendix

Appendix A

Appendix B

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Employee Loyalty -> Employee Performance	0.047	0.051	0.026	1.793	0.074
Employee Loyalty -> Status Threat	-0.126	-0.130	0.066	1.916	0.056
Status Distance -> Employee Loyalty	0.442	0.451	0.053	8.336	0.000
Status Distance -> Employee Performance	-0.021	-0.024	0.031	0.670	0.503
Status Distance -> Status Threat	0.055	0.060	0.076	0.729	0.466
Status Distance -> Task Interdependence	-0.190	-0.197	0.066	2.897	0.004
Status Threat -> Employee Performance	-0.372	-0.391	0.049	7.640	0.000
Task Interdependence -> Employee Performance	0.125	0.139	0.034	3.689	0.000
Task Interdependence -> Status Threat	-0.336	-0.352	0.052	6.440	0.000