**Online Supplement A**

*Measures for Study Variables*

**Self-Identification (Study 1)**

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements:

1. I believe I have the characteristics of a leader
2. I see myself as a leader
3. Being a leader is very important to my sense of who I am
4. It is important to my sense of self that others see me as a leader

**Other-Identification (Coworker-rated, Study 1)**

Thinking of [Focal Employee’s Name], please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

1. I believe [Focal Employee’s Name] has the characteristics of a leader
2. I see [Focal Employee’s Name] as a leader
3. I believe that being a leader is very important to [Focal Employee’s Name]’s sense of who she/he is
4. I believe it is important to [Focal Employee’s Name]’s sense of self that others see him/her as a leader

**Hindrance Stress Appraisals (Studies 1 and 2)**

Study 1 prompt: In the past two weeks, I have felt that …

Study 2 prompt: Based on the information in the scenario, I feel that …

1. … being a leader at work thwarts my personal growth and well-being
2. … being a leader at work constrains my achievements of personal goals and development
3. … being a leader at work hinders my feelings of personal accomplishment

**Challenge Stress Appraisals (Studies 1 and 2)**

Study 1 prompt: In the past two weeks, I have felt that …

Study 2 prompt: Based on the information in the scenario, I feel that …

1. … being a leader at work helps to improve my personal growth and well-being
2. … being a leader at work challenges me to achieve personal goals and accomplishments
3. … being a leader at work promotes my feelings of personal accomplishment

**Individual Performance (Coworker-rated, Study 1)**

During the past two weeks, I would say that [Focal Employee’s Name] …

1. … was one of the best at what they do
2. … was very good at their daily job activities
3. … in general, was a good performer
4. … has been outstanding at their job
5. … has been an excellent worker compared to their peers

**Other-Identification (Dyadic, Study 2)**

Think about Taylor and how Taylor feels about you as a leader. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements based on the scenario above:

At work, Taylor would say that …

1. I believe I have the characteristics of a leader
2. I see myself as a leader
3. Being a leader is very important to my sense of who I am
4. It is important to my sense of self that others see me as a leader

**Other-Identification (Team, Study 2)**

Think about how your entire team feels about you as a leader. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements based on the scenario above:

At work, my entire team would say that …

1. I believe I have the characteristics of a leader
2. I see myself as a leader
3. Being a leader is very important to my sense of who I am
4. It is important to my sense of self that others see me as a leader

**Scenario Realism (Study 2)**

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements regarding the scenario that you just read:

1. It is realistic that I might experience a team like this
2. It is realistic that I might experience a situation like this
3. At some point in my career, I will probably encounter a scenario like the one described above

**Online Supplement B**

*Block Variable Approach for Indirect Effects for Study 1*

We also tested our hypothesized indirect effects using the block variable approach suggested by Edwards and Cable (2009). Specifically, we computed the joint effects of the five polynomial regression coefficients on each hypothesized mediator (otherwise referred to as block variables), and then regressed the mediators on the block variables to obtain an estimate of the overall effect of the polynomial coefficients on stress appraisals, which we used as the first stage coefficients in our indirect effect models. We tested the computed indirect effects for significance by using a Monte Carlo simulation (20,000 iterations) to construct 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals (Selig & Preacher, 2008). This approach allows us to consider the impact of (in)congruence on in-role performance through hindrance and challenge stress appraisals (Hypotheses 2a-b, respectively); however, it does not allow us to distinguish between the different types of incongruence and congruence necessary to test Hypotheses 4 and 6.

Hypotheses 2a and 4 propose that incongruence between self-and other-identification is negatively associated with in-role performance through increased hindrance stress appraisals (H2a) and this relationship is stronger for leader over-identification as opposed to leader under-identification (H4). Thus, we built on the polynomial regression results and examined the relationship between hindrance stress appraisals and in-role performance and used the block variable approach to test the indirect effect. The inverted U-shaped curve along the incongruence line (*O* = *S*) is positive and significant (curvature = .41, *SE* = .15, *p* ˂ .01), which demonstrates that hindrance appraisals are minimized when self-identification and other-identification are aligned and the negative, significant lateral shift quantity (LSQ = -3.81, CI [-7.27, -.36]; Atwater et al., 1998) suggests that an individual’s level of hindrance stress appraisal decreases as one moves along the incongruence line from low other-identification and high self-identification (i.e., leader over-identification) to high other-identification and low self-identification (i.e., leader under-identification). Next, we found a significant, negative relationship between hindrance stress appraisals and in-role performance (*ß* = -0.12, *SE* = .05, *p* = .03) and a negative indirect effect of congruence between self-identification and other-identification on in-role performance through hindrance stress appraisals (*IND* = -.11, *SE* = .05, 95% CI [-.22, -.01]) such that as incongruence increases, in-role performance decreases. These results offer further support for Hypothesis 2a.

Hypotheses 2b and 6 propose that congruence between self-and other-identification as a leader is positively associated with in-role performance through increased challenge stress appraisals (H2b) and this relationship is stronger for leader identity congruence as opposed to follower identity congruence (H6). The inverted U-shaped curve along the incongruence line (*O* = *S*) is negative and significant (curvature = -.32, *SE* = .13, *p* = .02), which demonstrates that challenge stress appraisals are maximized when self-identification and other-identification are aligned and the slope of the congruence line (*O* = *S*) was positive and statistically significant (slope = 2.25, *SE* = .47, *p* ˂ .01) suggesting that challenge stress appraisals are maximized for leader identity congruence as compared to follower identity congruence. We found a significant, positive relationship between challenge stress appraisals and in-role performance (*ß* = 0.25, *SE* = .08, *p* < .01) and, using the block variable approach we found a positive indirect effect between such congruence on in-role performance through increased challenge stress appraisals (*IND* = .25, *SE* = .08, 95% CI: [.09, .42]). Thus, Hypothesis 2b was also supported using the block variable approach.