



HAL
open science

Followers' Satisfaction From Working With Group-Prototypic Leaders: Promotion Focus as Moderator

Antonio Pierro, Lavinia Cicero, E. Tory Higgins

► **To cite this version:**

Antonio Pierro, Lavinia Cicero, E. Tory Higgins. Followers' Satisfaction From Working With Group-Prototypic Leaders: Promotion Focus as Moderator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2009, 45 (5), pp.1105. 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.020 . hal-00713413

HAL Id: hal-00713413

<https://hal.science/hal-00713413>

Submitted on 1 Jul 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Accepted Manuscript

Followers' Satisfaction From Working With Group-Prototypic Leaders: Promotion Focus as Moderator

Antonio Pierro, Lavinia Cicero, E. Tory Higgins

PII: S0022-1031(09)00173-5
DOI: [10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.020)
Reference: YJESP 2308

To appear in: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*

Received Date: 10 March 2008
Revised Date: 12 May 2009
Accepted Date: 24 June 2009

Please cite this article as: Pierro, A., Cicero, L., Higgins, E.T., Followers' Satisfaction From Working With Group-Prototypic Leaders: Promotion Focus as Moderator, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* (2009), doi: [10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.020)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Running head: PROMOTION FOCUS AND LEADERS' GROUP PROTOTYPICALITY

Followers' Satisfaction From Working With Group-Prototypic Leaders:

Promotion Focus as Moderator

Antonio Pierro and Lavinia Cicero

"Sapienza" University of Rome, Italy

E. Tory Higgins

Columbia University, USA

Address correspondence to:

Antonio Pierro, Dipartimento di Psicologia dei Processi di Sviluppo e Socializzazione,
University of Rome "La Sapienza", Via dei Marsi 78, 00185, Rome, Italy; fax: +39-06-49917652;
e-mail: antonio.pierro@uniroma1.it.

Abstract

What is the effect of followers' promotion focus on their satisfaction from working with a leader who is prototypic of their group? We propose that high (*vs.* low) promotion-focused followers will respond more positively to a group-prototypic leader as a way to advance the in-group ("promote us"), which would increase their satisfaction from working with that leader. Results from an organizational survey and a scenario experiment supported the predicted two-way interaction between promotion focus and leaders' group prototypicality: the positive relation between leaders' group prototypicality and followers' satisfaction from working with their leader was significantly greater for high than low promotion-focused employees. No such interactive effect was found for employees' level of prevention focus. We discuss how these findings extend social identity theory's analysis of leadership.

Keywords: Social identity model of organizational leadership, leader prototypicality, Regulatory focus, Promotion focus, Job satisfaction, Leadership satisfaction.

A central question in the area of leadership is the extent to which effective leadership is associated with follower well-being and satisfaction (cf. Yukl, 2001). In the present contribution, we take into account the analysis of leadership provided by social identity theory (for a review, see Haslam, 2004; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). Leaders' group prototypicality— the extent to which leaders are representative of the identity of their group or organization (Hogg, 2001)— has been found to be an important factor underlying leadership effectiveness and work outcomes (Hogg, 2001; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Several factors that moderate the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and their leadership effectiveness have already been discovered: followers' salient identification with their group or organization (e. g. Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998), leaders' group-oriented behavior (i.e., leaders' behaviors aimed at pursuing their group's best interests; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), and followers' desire to reach closure and reduce uncertainty (Pierro, et al., 2005). The purpose of the present research was to extend social identity theory's analysis of leadership by considering how followers' level of promotion focus (Higgins, 1997) could moderate the relation between a leader's group prototypicality and the followers' satisfaction from working with that leader.

Social Identity Theory's Analysis of Leadership Effectiveness

Recently, a growing number of studies have applied social identity theory analyses to group and organizational processes (for overviews, see Haslam, van Knippenberg, Platow, & Ellemers, 2003). Social identity theory outlines how group membership contributes to self-definition. People define themselves not only in terms of their idiosyncratic personal attributes and interpersonal relationships, but also in terms of the collective attributes of the group to which they belong (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Self-conception in terms of group membership involves a psychological "merge" of self and group, in which self-conception is

contingent on *group prototypes*– the fuzzy set of attributes that capture the essence of the group (Rosch, 1978). Accordingly, the more that people define themselves in terms of their group identity, the more their beliefs, attitudes and behavior will be governed by their group membership.

Group members also differ in the extent to which they are prototypical of their group. Just like some traits, attitudes or behavioral dispositions are more prototypical of the group than others, some members of a group are more prototypical of the group than other members; that is, their personal characteristics more closely match the group's prototypical characteristics. The more a member of a group is prototypical of their group, the more he or she represents the group's standards, values and norms. Prototypical group members exemplify group normative behavior and reflect what members of the group have in common and what sets them apart from other groups (Hogg, 2001).

Moreover, the social identity theory analysis of leadership (Hogg, 2001) proposes that group members treat the group prototype as a source of information about social reality, and, because of this, group members are more open to the influence of group-prototypic leaders (cf. van Knippenberg, Lossie, & Wilke, 1994). In addition, as representatives of the shared identity, group-prototypic leaders are more likely to be trusted by other group members who perceive them as having the group's best interests at heart (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Given all this, group-prototypic leaders are more likely to be endorsed by other group members and are more likely to be effective. These general predictions have been supported by the results of a variety of lab and field studies (e.g., Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Hogg et al., 1998; Pierro et al., 2005; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

There are several factors that moderate the impact of leaders' group prototypicality on their effectiveness (see Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). For example, the more that followers identify with their group or organization, the more leaders' group prototypicality increases their effectiveness (Hogg, 2001). Also, because the endorsement of prototypical leaders derives in part from followers' trust in their leaders' group-orientedness (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003), leaders'

display of group-oriented behavior can in part "substitute" for their group prototypicality (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). More recently, individual differences in the need to reduce uncertainty (e. g., need for closure; Webster & Kruglanski, 1994) have been found to moderate the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and their effectiveness (Pierro et al., 2005).

These previous studies have demonstrated that factors relating to followers' identification with the group, followers' trust in their leader's commitment to the group, and followers' needs that are satisfied by social identity and self-categorization (e.g., the need for self-esteem, see Abrams & Hogg, 1988; the need to reduce uncertainty, see Hogg, 2001, 2007) can moderate the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and their effectiveness. The present research considered how another factor—followers' promotion focus—could moderate this relation through its influence on followers' attraction to a group-prototypic leader (see Hogg, 2001, for a discussion of followers' attraction to a group-prototypic leader). Specifically, we test the proposal that followers who have stronger promotion focus concerns with aspirations, advancement and accomplishment (see Higgins, 1997) will respond more positively to a group-prototypic leader as a way to advance the in-group ("promote us"). This, in turn, would make the followers more satisfied from working with that leader. In the next sections, we describe how the regulatory focus distinction between promotion and prevention focus relates to in-group favoritism, and then discuss how the promotion form of in-group favoritism could influence the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and follower satisfaction working with a leader.

Regulatory Focus and Distinct Forms of In-Group Favoritism

Regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997) proposes that there are two distinct self-regulatory systems that are associated with the different survival needs of nurturance and growth versus security and safety—promotion and prevention, respectively. These two systems have different types of self-regulatory concerns and prefer to use different strategic means. A promotion focus involves a concern with accomplishments, advancement, and aspirations (ideals), a sensitivity to the

presence or absence of gains, and a preference for eager approach-related strategies of goal pursuit. A prevention focus involves a concern with security, duties and obligations (oughts), a sensitivity to the presence or absence of losses, and a preference for vigilant avoidant-related strategies of goal pursuit. There is evidence that individuals with a promotion focus are concerned with potential advancements (i.e., gains) in moving toward a desired goal, whereas individuals with a prevention focus are concerned with potential setbacks (i.e., losses) in moving toward a desired goal (e.g., Forster, Higgins, & Idson, 1998; Higgins, Roney, Crowe, & Hymes, 1994; Shah, Higgins, & Friedman, 1998). Having a promotion versus a prevention focus also relates to having distinct emotional experiences. For individuals with a promotion focus, positive and negative outcomes are experienced along the cheerful-dejection (e.g., happy-sad) dimension. In contrast, for individuals with a prevention focus, positive and negative outcomes are experienced along the quiescence-agitation (e.g., calm-nervous) dimension (e.g., Higgins, 1987, 1996; Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Shah & Higgins, 2001).

Most germane to the general objective of the present studies, there is recent research relating promotion versus prevention focus to *different forms of in-group favoritism*. In-group favoritism can take the form of either responding more positively to in-group than out-group members or responding more negatively to out-group than in-group members. For example, in-group favoritism can be revealed by in-group members taking action to get closer to or rewarding more the members of their in-group than the members of an out-group—a positive response form of in-group favoritism. Alternatively, in-group favoritism can be revealed by in-group members taking action to get away from or punish more the members of an out-group than the members of their in-group—a negative response form of in-group favoritism.

There is evidence from studies involving both chronic and situationally-induced regulatory focus that individuals with a strong promotion focus show the positive response form of in-group favoritism, i.e., “promote us”, whereas individuals with a strong prevention focus show the negative response form of in-group favoritism, i.e., “prevent them” (see Sassenberg, Kessler, &

Mummendey, 2003; Shah, Brazy, & Higgins, 2004). Shah et al. (2003), for example, found that an intergroup bias for promotion-focused individuals was reflected in their approaching and feeling more cheerful toward in-groups than out-groups ("promoting us"). In contrast, an intergroup bias for prevention-focused individuals was reflected in their avoiding outgroups and feeling less relaxed toward them ("preventing them"). Behavioral and emotional reactions toward in-groups were more positive for promotion-focused individuals (with no effect for prevention-focused individuals), whereas behavioral and emotional reactions to out-groups were more negative for prevention-focused individuals (with no effect for promotion-focused individuals). In studies of resource allocation, Sassenberg et al. (2003) found that promotion-focused individuals distributed more positive outcomes (gains or rewards) to in-group than out-group members, but did not distinguish between in-group and out-group members when distributing negative outcomes (losses or punishments). In contrast, prevention-focused individuals distributed more negative outcomes to out-group than in-group members, but did not distinguish between in-group and out-group members when distributing positive outcomes.

Promotion Form of In-Group Favoritism and Responding Positively to a Group-Prototypic Leader

The results from the studies by Sassenberg et al. (2003) and Shah et al. (2004) suggest that regulatory focus may play a role in group membership processes as they relate to how in-group favoritism is carried out. Specifically, these results suggest that when groups have a leader with promotion-focused followers, the promotion-focused followers could respond positively to the in-group, i.e., "promote us", by responding positively to the leader who is prototypic of the in-group. That is, for the in-group, one way to "promote us" is to promote what is prototypical of us. A group leader who has high group prototypicality embodies what is typical of the group members, and thus responding positively to a group-prototypic leader is one way to respond positively to the in-group. The more prototypic the leader, the more responding positively to the leader would be a way of "promoting us". This mechanism would increase the promotion-focused followers' attraction to the group-prototypic leader, which in turn should increase leader effectiveness (see Hogg, 2001). In

particular, this mechanism should increase promotion-focused followers' satisfaction from working with a prototypic leader endowed with attractive qualities. The purpose of our studies was to test this hypothesis.

In sum, our studies attempt to extend social identity theory's analysis of leadership. We propose that a stronger promotion focus, because of its association with the positive form of in-group favoritism, will moderate the influence of leaders' group prototypicality on followers' satisfaction from working with their leader. Our studies use different procedures—both field and experimental methods. Study 1 was a cross-sectional survey, carried out in different working settings. Study 2 was an experimental study involving a hypothetical organizational context and it manipulated leader prototypicality.

Study 1

Method

Participants

296 employees (110 men and 186 women) drawn from four different Italian organizations—a large energy research department (N=51); an aerospace research and project company (N=50); a national research institution (N=54); and a public administration service (N=141)—participated in the study on a voluntary basis. Their mean age was 44 years ($SD = 9.13$), with an average seniority of about 16.41 years ($SD = 9.95$). There were no effects of organization, gender, age, or seniority on our DV, and thus these variables will be omitted from further consideration.

Procedure

The participants filled out the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ), which is described below. They then responded to a number of scales, including scales on leader's group prototypicality and satisfaction from working with the leader (described below). The instructions for these scales asked respondents to refer always to the leader of the same unit and to their daily work experience.

Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ). Like the original RFQ developed by Higgins and colleagues (Higgins, Friedman, Harlow, Idson, Ayduk, & Taylor, 2001), its Italian version constitutes an 11-item instrument designed to measure individual differences in the tendency toward promotion pride (6 items; item example, “How often have you accomplished things that got you 'psyched' to work even harder”) and prevention pride (5 items; item example, “Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times” [reverse scored]). Ratings are made on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or seldom) to 5 (very often). A composite score for each dimension was computed by averaging across responses to each item. The reliability and validity of this instrument has been established by several studies (see Grant & Higgins, 2003; Higgins et al., 2001).

Leader's Group Prototypicality. Participants were asked to respond to the following four items derived by Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) and van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005) which refer to the participants' daily work and team leader: “This team leader is a good example of the kind of people that are members of my team”; “This team leader has very much in common with the members of my team”; “This team leader represents what is characteristic about the team”; “This team leader is very similar to the members of my team”. Participants responses are recorded on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). A composite leader group prototypicality score was computed by averaging the responses to each item (Cronbach's alpha = .92).

Satisfaction from working with the leader. Participants' satisfaction from working with their leader was assessed with the following two items: “I receive great satisfaction from my job” (cf. Wanous, Reichers & Hudy, 1997), and “I am very satisfied with the interpersonal relationship with my team leader”. Participants responses were recorded on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Because these items were highly correlated ($r = .51, p < .001$), a composite satisfaction from working with the leader score was computed by averaging the responses to each item (Cronbach's alpha = .67).

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations between variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

The prediction for the effect on “satisfaction from working with the leader” from the interaction between leader’s group prototypicality and regulatory focus was tested by means of a moderated multiple regression analysis (using the product variable approach suggested by Baron & Kenny, 1986). The main effects of leader’s group prototypicality and regulatory focus, and the interaction between these variables, were entered in the analysis. Following Aiken and West (1991), predictor variables were centered (i.e., by subtracting the mean from each score), and the interaction terms were based on these centered scores. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

As can be seen in Table 2, the results revealed a significant main effect of leader’s group prototypicality on satisfaction from working with the leader ($\beta = .32; p < .001$). The results also show a significant main effect of promotion focus on satisfaction from working with the leader ($\beta = .12; p < .05$), which is consistent with previous findings of a positive relation between successful promotion and feelings of satisfaction (see Higgins, 1997). Most germane to the purpose of this study, the hypothesized 2-way interaction between leader group prototypicality and promotion focus on satisfaction from working with the leader was found to be significant ($\beta = .17; p < .01$). No such significant 2-way interaction effect was found for prevention focus ($p > .76$). The positive sign of the 2-way interaction effect suggests that, as predicted, the relation between the followers’ perception of their leader’s group prototypicality and their satisfaction from working with the leader was stronger for high than low promotion-focused participants.

To further illustrate the nature of this interaction effect, simple slopes analyses were performed, following Aiken and West (1991). This analysis revealed that the relation between perception of leader group prototypicality and satisfaction from working with the leader was

significant within each of the two levels of promotion focus (low 1 *SD* below and high 1 *SD* above mean), but the effect was much stronger for the high promotion-focused participants ($\beta = .48$; $p < .001$) than for the low promotion-focused participants ($\beta = .16$; $p < .05$).

Discussion

The results of Study 1 support our hypothesis that perceived leader group prototypicality would affect followers' satisfaction from working with the leader especially for individuals with a strong promotion focus. Though these results are encouraging, Study 1 has some possible limitations. Since these data derived from a cross-sectional survey, they could be subject to common method/source biases. It should be noted, however, that while common method/source biases may inflate relations between variables, it actually leads to an underestimation of interaction effects (Evans, 1985; McClelland & Judd, 1993). Thus, the interaction effect that is central to the present research cannot be attributed to such biases. A somewhat related point is that the correlational nature of these data, by its nature, does not allow for a clear causal inference. For instance, might satisfaction from working with the leader affect leader prototypicality perception differently for strong (vs. weak) promotion-focused followers? Not likely, we believe, but still something we wished to address in another study. Study 2 was designed in order to address this, using the technique of experimental scenarios to manipulate the perceived prototypicality of the group leader.

Study 2

Method

Participants

89 undergraduate students (82% women), with the average age of 22.74 ($SD = 3.49$), currently enrolled in a psychology course at the "Sapienza" University of Rome, participated voluntarily in the study. They were randomly assigned to the experimental conditions (high vs. low perceived prototypicality of the group leader).

Procedure and Instrument

During a course in social psychology, participants were invited to take part in a study on the general theme of leadership. All participants filled out the same 11-item questionnaire (RFQ) used in Study 1 which measures promotion and prevention regulatory focus. Then two short business scenarios, inspired by previous research (Cicero, Bonaiuto, Pierro, & van Knippenberg, 2008; van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg, 2005, Study 2), were randomly distributed. Participants were told to envision that, after they graduated, they went to work for an internationally-oriented consulting agency with a very good reputation and that they were part of a team.

In the *high* “team leader prototypicality” condition, the team leader was described as being very representative of the kinds of persons in the team and very similar to the other team members, and as being someone who had a similar background, similar interests and similar attitudes towards life and work. It seemed that he/she felt perfectly at home as a member of the team. It really seemed that he/she enjoyed working in close collaboration with the team members.

In the *low* “team leader prototypicality” condition, the team leader was described as an “outsider” in the team, someone who was very different from the other team members and who had a different background, different interests and different attitudes towards life and work. It seemed that he/she did not feel quite at home as a member of the team. It really seemed that he/she would have preferred working separately from the team.

Manipulation check measure

As a check of the manipulation of the team leader's group prototypicality, participants responded to the same 4-item scale used in Study 1 on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Cronbach's alpha = .96).

Dependent variable

In order to measure “satisfaction from working with the leader”, participants responded to the following five items modelled on prior studies (similar to those used in Study 1): “I would receive great satisfaction from my job”; “I would be really satisfied with the relationship with this leader”;

"I would be happy to work with this leader" (e.g., Wanous, Reichers & Hudy, 1997); "It would be really enjoyable to do this job"; "This job would be really interesting for me". Responses were recorded on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A composite "satisfaction from working with the leader" score was computed by averaging responses to each item (Cronbach's alpha = .77).

Results

Manipulation Check On Perceived Prototypicality of the Group Leader

An ANOVA on the manipulation check for perceived prototypicality of the group leader indicated that participants in the *high* leader prototypicality condition perceived the leader as more prototypical ($M = 3.72$) than those in the *low* leader prototypicality condition ($M = 1.81$) ($F_{1, 88} = 129.67$; $p < 0.001$). Thus, the manipulation was successful. To further explore the effects of our independent variables on the manipulation check items, we performed a moderated multiple regression analysis where the main effects of manipulated leader prototypicality (dummy variable), regulatory focus, and the interaction between these variables were entered. Results showed only a significant main effect of leader prototypicality ($\beta = .78$; $p < .001$).

Satisfaction from Working with the Leader as a function of Promotion Focus and Perceived Prototypicality of the Group Leader

Descriptive statistics and correlations between variables are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 about here

Our main hypothesis was tested by means of a moderated multiple regression analysis (using the same product variable approach of Study 1) where the main effects of manipulated prototypicality of the group leader (dummy variable), regulatory focus, and the interaction between these variables were entered.

As can be seen in Table 4, there was a significant and positive main effect of leader prototypicality ($\beta = .25$; $p < .05$), and, most relevant to the goal of the study, a significant and

positive interaction effect of promotion focus x leader prototypicality on subjects' satisfaction from working with the leader ($\beta = .22$; $p < .05$). The prevention focus x leader prototypicality interaction was not significant ($p > .10$).

Table 4 about here

To further explore the nature of the promotion focus x leader prototypicality interaction effect, simple slopes analyses were performed. Results revealed, consistent with our hypothesis, that the relation between leader prototypicality and satisfaction from working with the leader was significant and strong for employees high in promotion focus (1 SD above the mean; $\beta = .47$; $p < .01$), but was non-significant and weak for individuals relatively low in promotion focus (1 SD below the mean; $\beta = .02$; *n.s.*). These results not only replicate previous research showing the importance of leader prototypicality for followers' work outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction), but also support the novel proposal that this relation is especially strong for followers with a high promotion focus.

General Discussion and Conclusions

We proposed that differences in the strength of individuals' promotion focus moderate the relation between followers' perception of their leader's group prototypicality and their satisfaction from working with their leader, with group-prototypic leaders having more satisfied followers when those followers have a strong promotion focus. Study 1, a cross-sectional study with a sample of workers from different types of organizations, replicated previous studies (e.g., Pierro et al., 2005) in finding a significant positive relation between followers' perceiving their leader as having high group prototypicality and their having high satisfaction from working with their leader. But most important for the purpose of our research, Study 1 also found the predicted 2-way interaction, which reflected the fact that this positive relation was stronger for high (*vs.* low) promotion-focused participants. This moderating effect of promotion focus on the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and followers' satisfaction from working with their leader was replicated in Study 2,

which experimentally manipulated the leader's group prototypicality. Together, using a multi-method approach, the results of these studies indicate that strength of promotion focus moderates the relation between followers' perceiving their leader as being group-prototypic and being satisfied from working with their leader.

Our studies extend previous research relating regulatory focus to leadership effectiveness. Previous research (e.g., Moss et al., 2006) has shown that the effectiveness of a leader's leadership style decreases when there is a non-fit with followers' regulatory focus (e.g., passive, laissez-faire leadership style with a promotion-focused follower). The present research concerns a different kind of regulatory focus effect on responses to leadership—how followers' stronger promotion focus increases the relation between perceiving their leader as being group prototypic and being satisfied from working with their leader. We propose that this moderation effect occurs because the form of in-group favoritism that occurs when individuals have a strong promotion focus (*vs.* a strong prevention focus) involves increasing positive responses toward in-group members, i.e., “promoting us”, as reflected in assigning in-group (*vs.* out-group) members more positive outcomes and taking action to get closer to them (see Sassenberg et al., 2003; Shah et al., 2004). For an in-group with a leader and followers, increasing attraction toward a group-prototypic leader would be another way for followers to increase positive responses toward their in-group. And this way of “promoting us” would naturally increase followers' satisfaction from working with that leader.

Our results not only extend regulatory focus theory to a new area concerning leadership effectiveness. They also provide additional support for the proposed significance of *social attraction* in applying social identity theory to the analysis of leadership (see Hogg, 2001). If social attraction is, indeed, an important variable that relates leaders' group prototypicality to leadership effectiveness, then a factor that increases social attraction toward a group-prototypic leader should strengthen the relation between leaders' group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. This is precisely what our studies found for the factor of followers having a strong promotion focus and leadership effectiveness being reflected in followers' satisfaction from working with the leader. Our

results also support the suggestion of van Knippenberg and colleagues (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004) that it is important to take into account followers' characteristics as a motivational moderator underlying leaders' effectiveness from their group prototypicality.

Studies on self-categorization, self-construal, and social identity describe how the self may be defined not only in terms of unique, individuating characteristics that distinguish an individual from other individuals (the personal self) but can also extend to in-group membership (e.g., Hogg, 2003; Sedikides & Brewer, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Our research shows how the in-group membership of promotion-focused followers, especially, can enhance the quality of their life by increasing their satisfaction from working with group-prototypic leaders. This is another benefit of in-group membership in addition to the benefits from increasing self-esteem or reducing uncertainty. If this is a distinct benefit of in-group membership for followers who have a strong promotion focus, what might be the distinct benefit of in-group membership for followers who have a strong prevention focus? Perhaps they derive satisfaction from perceiving the out-group prototypic leader as being a poor leader—a kind of downward comparison benefit? Future research needs to explore this and other potential benefits for both prevention-focused and promotion-focused followers.

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M.A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and inter-group discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*, 317-334.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G., (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173-82.
- Cicero, L., Bonaiuto, M., Pierro, A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). Employees' work effort as a function of leader group prototypicality: the moderating role of team identification. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, *58*, 117-124.
- Evans, M.G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *36*, 305-323.
- Fielding, K. S., & Hogg, M. A. (1997). Social identity, self-categorization, and leadership: A field study of small interactive groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *1*, 39-51.
- Forster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Idson, C. L. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength as a function of regulatory focus: revisiting the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 1115-1131.
- Grant, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2003). Optimism, promotion pride, and prevention pride as predictors of quality of life. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 1521-1532.
- Haslam, S. A., (2004). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Haslam, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M., & Ellemers, N. (Eds.) (2003). *Social Identity at Work: Developing Theory for Organizational Practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*, 319-340.

- Higgins, E. T. (1996). Emotional experiences: the pains and pleasures of distinct regulatory systems. In R. Kavanaugh, B. Zimmerberg, & S. Fein (Eds.), *Emotions: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 203-241). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23.
- Higgins, E. T., Roney, C., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predictions for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 515-525.
- Higgins, E. T., Shah, J. Y., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 515 – 525.
- Higgins, E. T., & Silberman, I. (1998) Development of regulatory focus: Promotion and prevention as ways of living. In J. Heckhausen and C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulation across the life span* (pp. 78-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: a motivational theory of social identity processes. In W. Stroebe and M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 11; pp. 223-255).
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- Hogg, M. A. (2003). Social identity. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 462–479). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Hogg, M. A. (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 69-126). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. London: Routledge.
- Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1248-1263.
- Hogg, M. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social Identity and Leadership Processes in Groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 35; pp. 1-52). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McClelland, G.H., & Judd, C.M. (1993). Statistical difficulties of detecting interactions and moderator effects. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 376-390.
- Moss, S., Ritossa, D., & Ngu, S. (2006). The effect of follower regulatory focus and extraversion on leadership behavior. The role of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 27, 93 – 107.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., Bonaiuto, M., van Knippenberg, D., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2005). Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness: the moderator role of need for cognitive closure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 503-516.
- Platow, M. J., & van Knippenberg, D. (2001). A social identity analysis of leadership endorsement: The effects of leader ingroup Prototypicality and distributive intergroup fairness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1508-1519.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch, & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and Categorization*. Hillsdale (NJ): Erlbaum.
- Sassenberg, K., Kessler, T., & Mummendey, A. (2003). Less negative = more positive? Social discrimination as avoidance or approach. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 48–58.
- Sedikides, C., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). *Individual self, relational self, collective self*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

- Shah, J. Y., Brazy, P. C., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). Promoting us or preventing them: regulatory focus and manifestations of intergroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 433-446.
- Shah, J. Y., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Regulatory concerns and appraisal efficiency: the general impact of promotion and prevention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 285-293.
- Shah, J. Y., Higgins, E. T., & Friedman, R. (1998). Performance incentives and means: how regulatory focus influences goal attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 285-293.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-categorization Theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: the moderator role of leadership prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 25-37.
- van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A Social Identity Model of Leadership Effectiveness in Organizations. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Kramer (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol 25, pp. 245-297). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- van Knippenberg, D., Lossie, N., & Wilke, H. (1994). In-group prototypicality and persuasion: determinants of heuristic and systematic message processing. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 289-300.
- van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 825-856.
- Yukl, G. (2001). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 247-252.

Webster, D.M., & Kruglanski, A.W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 1049-1062.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and relations between variables (Study 1; N = 296)

| Variables | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------|------|--------|---|
| 1. Promotion focus | 3.73 | .57 | - | | | |
| 2. Preventive focus | 3.52 | .65 | .10 | - | | |
| 3. Leader's Group Prototypicality | 3.64 | 1.32 | .04 | .13* | - | |
| 4. Satisfaction from work with leader | 4.15 | 1.34 | .15** | .05 | .34*** | - |

Note : * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$;

Table 2

Satisfaction from work with leader, as a function of Leader's Group Prototypicality (LGP) and Regulatory Focus: Results of moderated multiple regression analysis (Study 1)

| | Satisfaction from work with leader |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Predictors</i> | β |
| Leader's Group Prototypicality | .32*** |
| Promotion focus | .12* |
| Preventive focus | -.01 |
| GLP X Promotion focus | .17** |
| GLP X Preventive focus | -.02 |

Note : * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics and relations between variables (Study 2, N = 89)

| Variables | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|------|------|------|---|
| 1. Promotion focus | 3.68 | .48 | - | | | |
| 2. Preventive focus | 3.05 | .74 | .06 | - | | |
| 3. Leader's Group Prototypicality | - | - | -.01 | -.08 | - | |
| 4. Satisfaction from work with leader | 3.11 | .60 | .04 | -.04 | .24* | - |

Note : * $p < .05$.

Table 4

Satisfaction from work with leader, as a function of Leader's Group Prototypicality (LGP) and Regulatory Focus: Results of moderated multiple regression analysis (Study 2)

| | Satisfaction from work with leader |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Predictors</i> | β |
| Leader's Group Prototypicality | .25* |
| Promotion focus | .11 |
| Preventive focus | .02 |
| GLP X Promotion focus | .22* |
| GLP X Preventive focus | .17 |

Note : * $p < .05$.