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SUMMARY

Leaders responsible for overseeing multiple groups increase the likelihood of accomplishing organizational goals if they can successfully garner support and trust from all the groups they lead. However, when a leader emerges from one group, he or she may be viewed by others as having an inherit bias to his or her own group. How can a leader gain the support and trust of those in other groups without alienating him or herself from his or her base? This is a common, but understudied, intergroup leadership dilemma. In this dissertation, I aim to show that subtle identity performances directed at the outgroup (subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}), subtle appeals that are effectively invisible to those who are not familiar with the targeted outgroup’s norms, can be used by leaders to gain support and trust from their outgroup members, allowing them to maximize their potential following. Indeed, subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} are increasingly possible in today’s technological age; motivated leaders can access information that informs them of a targeted outgroup’s normative behavior and utilize this information to conduct subtle appeals to gain trust and support from their opposition. In my dissertation, I conduct three studies that introduce the construct subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} and test its effectiveness as a solution to a common problem of intergroup leadership. While the results of the studies ultimately do not support my primary hypotheses, that leaders can utilize subtle identity performances to gain trust and support from outgroup members, I offer suggestions for future research to help extend the body of work on subtle appeals.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Leaders are often nested within larger ecosystems; it is unlikely that a leader will be responsible for appealing to only his or her most loyal followers (DeChurch & Marks, 2006; Marks, DeChurch, Mathieu, Panzer, & Alonso, 2005; Rast, Hogg, & Van Knippenberg, 2018). Rather, it is often a leader’s job to reach across the aisle and secure support from an opposing group (Millward, & Timperley, 2010). In this situation, leaders must assume an intergroup leadership role, and concern themselves with both their base and with followers that hold attitudes and views which conflict with their own. For example, imagine a president, from the Democratic party, that is trying to assure he will be elected for another term in office. To accomplish this goal, the president will have to maintain the support of Democrat voters that elected him into office, while also peeling off some support from Republican and independent voters. This task is complex; a leader who attempts to appeal to an opposing group, or an outgroup, may be viewed as abandoning his or her own group, or ingroup, in the process. Therein lies the challenge for intergroup leaders: specifically, how do intergroup leaders garner support from outgroup members, without alienating themselves from their loyal ingroup members who already support their cause?

If this challenge for intergroup leaders was not already difficult enough, it is further complicated by the fact that leaders often emerge from within the system of teams which they lead (Mumford, Antes, Caughron, & Friedrich, 2008). Thus, these leaders originally, and often throughout their tenure as a leader, are viewed by their followers as holding membership with one specific group within the larger intergroup ecosystem. Returning to the example of politics provides an extremely salient example. If a member of the
Republican party wins an election for mayor of New York City, it does not mean that she abandons her membership as a Republican to embrace her new role as mayor. In fact, if anything, the opposite is true; according to research, followers in intergroup scenarios are well aware of which group their leader originally held membership. Indeed, individuals more often seek leadership from those who share a common group membership, (Platow, & van Knippenberg, 2001), thus making individuals inherently less likely to grant leadership to those who are attempting to lead across group boundaries.

Followers prefer to follow their own group members compared to other group members because they expect a fellow ingroup member to “have their back,” if for no other reason than their shared group membership (Hogg, 2001). Therefore, although the Republican mayor in our aforementioned example will likely garner support more easily from her fellow Republicans, she will have to work harder to demonstrate to other groups that she can be trusted to be a fair leader. Indeed, the Democrats and independents alike will want to make sure that their Republican mayor is not simply pushing the Republican agenda forward but, rather, has the best interest of all of her constituents.

In this political example, the Republican mayor may opt to show favoritism to another group, as this act would likely counter the expectation that a leader in an intergroup scenario would simply favor his or her own group over others (Duck & Fielding, 1999; Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012). Showing favor to an outgroup, or another component team in a multiteam system, has been shown to be effective in increasing leader support from outgroup followers (Ellmers, van Rijswijk, Bruins, & de Gilder, 1998). However, by favoring the outgroup, the leader risks alienating his or her base of ingroup members. Imagine how this strategy would play out in another example of an intergroup
leadership situation. Suppose after the merger between Amazon and Whole Foods, the Amazon director of the merger gave a speech to both Amazon and former Whole Foods employees suggesting that all of his employees should strive to care as much about their products as the former-Whole Foods employees do. Although this gesture is likely to help the intergroup leader gain support from outgroup followers (former-Whole Foods employees), it may also make his loyal ingroup supporters (Amazon workers) question if he is really “one-of-the-group.” So, it stands that intergroup leaders face a leadership challenge: how do intergroup leaders best gain the trust and support of outgroup followers without alienating themselves from their own base?

Researchers are beginning to outline suggestions for leaders who face this intergroup bind. For example, in their 2012 paper, Hogg and colleagues suggest that leaders can choose to promote a superordinate goal that binds the multiple, sometimes competing groups together under a common purpose (Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012). However, it is acknowledged that this suggestion may be difficult when the differences between groups are large (Brewer, 1999). Alternatively, Hogg and colleagues suggests that leaders may establish a relational identity between groups, thereby viewing interactions as a transaction rather than a competition (Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012). Although this may be useful for intergroup leaders in which transactions between teams are common and necessary, a newly established relational identity is unlikely to supersede one’s previously held identity with his or her work group. Indeed, people often spend the most time in their work group and this reinforces the work group identity as the primary and most central identity (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Thus, even if groups embrace a relational identity that emphasizes transactions between groups, these
transactions will still be viewed from the lens of the ingroup versus outgroup dichotomy (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Recent research points to the fact that both aforementioned solutions – promoting superordinate goals and establishing relational identity between groups -- do not work in all cases. In fact, in their 2018 paper, Rast and colleagues point to a key moderating variable, an identity threat, or competition between groups, as a determinate by which leaders can decide which strategy is best to employ (Rast, Hogg, Van Knippenberg, 2018). They show that when an identity threat is absent, promoting a superordinate goal is most beneficial; however, when an identity threat is present between groups, a leader should try to construct an intergroup relational identity. The problem with this finding and the proposed strategies are that intergroup relations are not static; these relationships swing from an emphasis on competition (i.e., high potential for an identity threat; best solved by a leader constructing a relational identity) to an emphasis on collaboration (i.e., low potential for an identity threat; best solved by leader constructing a superordinate goal) depending on the given tasks or goals at hand. Therefore, for intergroup leaders to be successful using this approach, they would have to continuously gauge and construe their followers’ identity and align this identity with the current goals and structures within the larger intergroup ecosystem. Even for the best leaders, this is an unrealistic expectation.

In this dissertation, I propose and test a new way that leaders can tackle the problem of leading across groups in intergroup leadership scenarios. Specifically, I suggest that leaders can utilize subtle identity performances directed at their outgroup (henceforth referred to as subtle identity performances^DAO), or subtle appeals to one’s outgroup, that are effectively invisible to those who are not familiar with the targeted outgroup’s norms.
I test to see if by embracing this technique, leaders can gain trust and support from their outgroup(s), without alienating their ingroup in the process.

I begin the first section of my dissertation by briefly reviewing and distinguishing between the terms “teams” and “groups.” Then, I outline, using social identity theory (SIT) as my guiding framework (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel, 1974), the role that groups play in humans’ lives and how an individual constructs a group identity. Next, I present the central concept of my dissertation by defining an identity performance (Klein, Spears, & Reicher, 2007), the acting out of one’s identity through expressive behaviors, word choices, or gestures. I explain how identity performances are used to reinforce trust and support from onlookers and differentiate how identity performances can be used either overtly or subtly. The remaining sections of the paper is aimed at answering the following four questions: What is the impact of subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}; why do subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} work; when are subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} most effective; and which types of subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} are most effective for leaders to employ?

1.1 Teams versus Groups

The most comprehensive definition of a team, put forth by Kozlowski and Ilgen (2006), states that a team is a unit in which “(a) two or more individuals who (b) socially interact; (c) possess one or more common goals; (d) are brought together to perform organizationally relevant tasks; (e) exhibit interdependencies to workflow, goals, and outcomes; (f) have different roles and responsibilities; and (g) are together embedded in an encompassing organizational system, with boundaries and linkages to the broader system context and task environment.” Importantly, the definition centrally emphasizes an
orientation towards a given task or goal. In this way, a team is a goal-directed entity that is assembled to accomplish a given objective.

Whereas this focus on achievement makes Kozlowski and Ilgen’s definition both unique and appropriate in organizational contexts, the definition also parallels many prominent social psychological definitions of a “group.” For example, Shaw (1976) defines a group as “two or more persons who are interacting with one another in such a manner that each person influences and is influenced by each other person” (pg.11). Notably, the conceptualizations of both team and group highlight the necessity for multiple members, social interaction, and complex interdependencies within the social structure. Importantly, whereas a team is often framed as a goal-first directed entity, groups often first emphasize social characteristics of the unit (e.g., norms and role relationships within said group; Turner, 1982).

Although there are acknowledged differences between the conceptualization of the terms team and group, the current paper will henceforth solely adopt the term “group” as the unit of analysis. This decision has been made to maintain consistency with the guiding theoretical framework for this paper, SIT. Specifically, the term ingroup will be used to refer to one’s own group whereas outgroup will be used to refer to the opposing group. Of note, in many cases throughout the paper, the given group will fit the above definition of a team.

1.2 Groups and Their Importance.

Individuals have long assembled into groups to accomplish tasks. To find an example, one can go as far back as our early ancestors who operated in groups of hunter-gatherers in order to maximize their chances of survival while seeking their next meal.
Individuals gain many benefits from assembling into groups. Just as in the hunter-gatherer example, groups often provide individuals a sense of agency that alone they would not have (Bandura, 2001). Often, this sense of agency is reflected in the group’s performance; in fact, many of the most novel innovations are the result of groups of individuals working together (Lee, Walsh, & Wang, 2015). For example, space exploration, one of the most daunting challenges of our time, is, in every way, accomplished through the collective group-work of many talented individuals. No matter how smart, gifted, or informed -- no one person would be capable of space travel alone.

Additionally, holding a group membership helps to fulfill the innate need for social interaction (Bales, 1950). For example, groups develop their own values, norms, and beliefs that help bond their members together and foster a sense of belonging (Hogg & Reid, 2006). Importantly, groups not only learn their own values, norms, and beliefs, but they become aware of these trademark characteristics of other groups. Once aware, individuals’ behaviors begin to serve as an indicator of group memberships. Individuals regularly adopt schemas for certain groups, and these schemas help them categorize others to reduce the stress of uncertainty (Hogg & Terry, 2000). Together, group memberships not only help fulfill our need to belong but also help us determine where others belong as well.

1.3 Group Identity

Social psychologists have long attempted to explain how people make sense of their many, often changing, roles in society (Feldman, 1984). One way this has been accomplished is by looking at how individuals identify with their group memberships. Scholars find that the importance of a given group membership often differs between
individuals (Mullen & Hogg, 1999). For example, a teacher who values her role as a mentor to younger students may hold her group membership as an educator in high-esteem, whereas a different teacher who views his job as a means to pay the bills is less likely to derive as much meaning from his educator group membership. Similarly, individuals often hold multiple group memberships and there are differences in how individuals balance the meaning of said memberships. (Cruwys, Steffens, Haslam, Haslam, Jetten, & Dingle, 2016; Jones & Jetten, 2011). Imagine in the previous example, the second teacher, the one who did not derive much meaning from his educator group membership, finds a great sense of meaning from his group membership in a recreational sports league that he regularly attends after work. In this example, the second teacher gains a stronger sense of identity from his recreational sports league membership than his educator group membership. The idea that individuals derive meaning from group memberships is conceptualized through the term group identification (Tajfel, 1982). To hold a group level identification, one must:
1) be cognitively aware of his/her membership, 2) evaluate that this membership is related to some value connotations, and 3) make an emotional investment in his/her awareness and evaluations (Bergami, & Bagozzi, 2000; Tajfel, 1982).

When individuals embrace a group-level identity, they become invested in the interests of their group (Brewer, & Gardner, 1996, Dasgupta, 2004; Garenter et al., 2012). This phenomenon is highlighted through individuals’ behavior in groups. Many studies have noted that individuals in groups quickly adopt and, subsequently, behave congruently with the norms, values, and beliefs of their respective groups. For example, a Red Cross group member may embrace the value of charitable behavior and give back to the
community on his or her own time in other ways. The Red Cross member is acting out the
group’s core tenants for others to recognize.

Over time, the emphasis on group normative behavior leads to the
depersonalization of the self. Individuals within a group are often viewed as group
members first, categorized by others as “one of us” or “one of them.” Through this process,
much of the variation between individuals within a group is lost. Instead, the emphasis
shifts to explain how one’s own group members, as a collective, are different from other
relevant, often competing, groups. According to SIT, the process of depersonalization
through group normative behavior serves as the catalyst for ingroup-outgroup comparisons
(Hormsey, 2008).

1.4 Performing Group Identity to Gain Trust and Support

Luckily for leaders, social identification is not just something you have, it is also
something you do. In fact, people “perform” their identities on a regular basis (Klein,
Spears, & Reicher, 2007; Ward, & Winstanley, 2005). For example, imagine a college
basketball coach who wears a pin of his team’s mascot. By wearing this pin, anyone who
sees the coach will know he is affiliated with the basketball team. Alternatively, consider
a mother who regularly posts parenting advice and tips on Facebook. In this example, the
mother is actively demonstrating her identity as a parent for others to see.

The public expression of group norms, symbols, and behaviors, like in the examples
above, is termed an identity performance, first coined by Klein and colleagues (2007).
Specifically, Klein and colleagues state that for such an expression to qualify as an identity
performance, the actor must identify with a social category, the social identity of said
category must be salient, the actor must believe him or herself to be visible to an audience, and the act of the identity performance must be purposeful.

Research suggests that identity performances are prevalent across cultures, geographic distances, and age ranges. One reason for their prevalence is that an identity performance proves to be a useful tool for group members to demonstrate their allegiance to their group (Efferson, Lalive, & Fehr, 2008). By repeatedly acting out group norms for others to see, one reiterates his or her position as a prototypical group member.

Importantly, being viewed as a prototypical group member is beneficial for a leader because prototypical group members are ascribed many positive qualities. Two prominent qualities that increase as one is seen as more prototypical are leader trust and leader support (Van Knippenberg, 2011). Prototypical leaders are trusted because they are perceived to have the group’s interests at their heart. Thus, prototypical leaders are expected to act in ways that will benefit the group in times of stress or disarray. Additionally, prototypical leaders are supported because they believe to give their group a platform to represent their ideals, values, and beliefs to larger audiences. A prototypical member most closely embodies what it means to be “one of the group,” therefore when prototypical members are in the spotlight, followers show support as a way to reinforce group standing (Duck & Fielding, 2003). Subtle identity performances, then, are a way that leaders can reinforce perceptions of prototypicality in order to garner trust and support.

1.5 Overt Versus Subtle Identity Performances

Overt identity performances are identity performances that can be recognized by most individuals, even if they do not hold membership in the leader’s group. (Klein, Spears, Reicher, 2007). A common example of an overt identity performance is ingroup favoritism,
or actively favoring one’s own group over other relevant outgroups (Mullen, Brown & Smith, 1999). In this way, ingroup favoritism, as well as other overt identity performances, demonstrates to onlookers that not only does the leader have the best interests of his or her own group at heart but that he or she will also show an uneven display of favor to his or her own group, if given the chance. Many studies have demonstrated that performing ingroup favoritism is one way to increase trust and support from ingroup followers (Duck & Fielding, 2003).

Importantly, overt identity performances directed at one’s own group, such as ingroup favoritism, are not without negative consequences. When a leader continually performs overt identity performances, ingroup members come to expect this behavior as the norm. Consequently, when the leader stops favoring his or her own group, even if it is only once, the effects can be dramatic (Platow & van Knippenberg 2001). Supporting this idea, Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) conducted a 3 by 3 design in which leader prototypicality (prototypical, outgroup bordering, or outlier) and leader behavior (ingroup favoritism, fair, or outgroup favoritism) were manipulated to test the effects on the ingroup followers’ endorsements of the leader. Indeed, out of the possible nine combinations, prototypical leaders (i.e., leaders who most often represent the best interests of their own group) who performed outgroup favoritism were the least likely to be endorsed.

The negative effects of overt ingroup identity performances are exacerbated in intergroup settings. When leading in intergroup settings, overt appeals made to bolster loyalist support simultaneously draw into question whether the leader will be fair to the other groups in the larger intergroup ecosystem. Outgroup followers are likely to feel that their perspectives are not represented by a leader who solely appeals to his base. At best,
overt ingroup identity performances may cause the outgroup to be wary of their leader, and at worst, outgroup followers may turn their support away from him or her all together (Hogg, van Knippenberg Rast, 2012). How can leaders utilize identity performances more effectively? According to recent research, one suggestion is to make their identity performances more subtle.

A subtle identity performance directed at one’s ingroup (termed for the first time for the purposes of this research project, subtle identity performance) is defined as “a subtle behavioral cue understood to be prototypical by ingroup members who are familiar with their own group’s norms,” but “effectively invisible to outgroup members who are not familiar with those norms” (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, & Dahling, 2018., p.3). One must look no further than our two past presidents to see subtle identity performances used in action. In 2008, Barack Obama gave a nod to his ingroup, young African American voters, by brushing off his shoulder during a campaign speech – something this ingroup could take to be a reference to the then hit song, “Dirt Off Your Shoulder” by rapper Jay-Z (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, & Dahling, 2018). Similarly, in 2001, George W. Bush, showed subtle favoritism to his fellow Christian followers by referencing the refrain of the Christian hymn “There is Power in the Blood” when giving a speech after 9/11 (Albertson, 2014). In both of these examples of presidents using subtle identity performance, outgroup members, whether it be the white, working class men and women in the case of Obama or non-Christian followers in the case of Bush, remained unaware of their leader’s subtle appeal to his own ingroup.

Subtle identity performances allow for a more nuanced approach to identity performances compared to overt identity performances. Instead of embracing a tactic like
ingroup favoritism and potentially alienating an outgroup, a leader may subtly perform his or her identity, reassuring his or her ingroup that he or she is still one of them without openly offending outgroup members who happen to be in the crowd.

In the first empirical study testing the efficacy of subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI}, I demonstrated that subtle identity performances \textsuperscript{DAI} allow leaders to maintain trust with their base, even while reaching across the aisle for support from the outgroup (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, Dahling, 2018). During the study, participants were broken into two groups and asked to complete a slogan-designing competition that was subsequently evaluated by a leader. The leader’s group membership was manipulated so that one group viewed the leader as an ingroup member and the other viewed the leader as an outgroup member. The leader’s favoritism (i.e., which group the leader chose to be superior) was manipulated such that the leader either showed favor to his own group, showed favor to the opposing group, or showed favor to the opposing group while utilizing a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAI} (in this study, a code word associated with the leader’s ingroup). Our findings indicate that subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI} buffer a leader’s perceived prototypicality, allowing him/her to overtly appeal to an outgroup without having to answer charges that he or she is not one of the group. Moreover, the results demonstrate that leaders who simultaneously apply a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAI} within their overt appeal to their outgroup increase their overall perceived trustworthiness in the intergroup context relative to if they appealed to their ingroup or outgroup alone – without the presence of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAI}.

This dissertation expands upon the concept of subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI} by investigating how subtle identity performances can be used to appeal directly to outgroups,
henceforth referred to as subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}. The aforementioned study (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato & Dahling, 2018) assumed that subtle identity performance can only be directed at the ingroup because such a deep understanding of the norms, values, and beliefs of a group must be understood to effectively execute such a subtle appeal. However, in this dissertation, I argue that subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} are becoming increasingly possible in today’s technologically advanced age. Motivated, intergroup leaders can access information that would inform them of normative behaviors that the targeted outgroups exhibit. Then, such leaders could utilize this information to perform a subtle appeal to their targeted outgroup. I argue that subtle identity performances will increase the follower’s trust and support of the leader, just as this tool does for ingroup members, but that this effect will be mediated by a different variable. Specifically, instead of increasing perceptions of prototypicality, as subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI} have been shown to do, a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} will increase leader trust and support by first increasing the leader’s perception of fairness. This argument is further described in the following section.

1.6 The Theory of Subtle Identity Performances\textsuperscript{DAO}

Subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} have the potential to be useful tools for leaders in intergroup contexts. Although subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI} allow leaders to buffer their prototypicality within their own group – something necessary to maintain support from loyalists, subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} address an alternative approach for an individual to succeed as a leader. Specifically, subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} allow leaders to directly garner outgroup follower trust and support without the leader’s ingroup being aware of his or her intentions.
When a leader enacts a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, a leader is counteracting the expectation that he or she will show bias toward his or her own group. Indeed, research has shown that outgroup followers’ first impressions of their leader are often negative because the leader is perceived to be an outsider (Duck & Fielding, 1999; Moy & Ng, 1996). Moreover, research has shown that outgroup followers are more likely to trust and support leaders that they perceive as fair, compared to leaders they perceive as being biased (Jones, Wiley, Dahling, LoPilato, 2018). When considering these findings together, it becomes essential that a leader finds a way to convince his or her outgroup followers that he or she will be a fair and equitable leader to all.

One way a leader can convince an opposing group that he or she is fair is to demonstrate in speeches and other, informal conversation that he or she is not only addressing his or her own group but that he or she has outgroup members in mind. Research has shown that when leaders perform outgroup favoritism, leaders increase their perceived fairness and, in turn, increase their trust and support (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Platow, Haslam, & Reicher; 2017). Importantly, performing the outgroup favoritism in a subtle manner should allow the leader to reap the benefits of outgroup favoritism without the fear of losing his or her ingroup supporters.

A subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} creates the perception of a fairer leader for two reasons. First, a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} demonstrates to outgroup followers that, despite a difference in group membership, he or she is aware and concerned with the opinions of outgroup followers. Second, a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} shows that a leader is invested in learning about the outgroup because he or she has already taken the time to learn enough nuances of the opposing group to be able to make a subtle appeal.
Together, the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} acts as a signal to outgroup members that the leader is fair and is worthy of their trust and support.

Importantly, as mentioned earlier, the benefit of the subtleness of a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} is that the act should not impact the ingroup’s perception of the leader. Indeed, the benefit of subtle identity performances as a whole is that they are effectively invisible to members outside of the targeted group (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, Dahling, 2018). Therefore, leaders who are able to utilize subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} in speeches given in intergroup contexts should maintain the support and trust of their base while garnering extra support and trust from the outgroup targeted in the appeal. Typically, generating increased support and trust from an outgroup comes at a cost of ingroup support and trust (Duck & Fielding, 1999). However, the subtlety of this type of appeal should lessen the concern of potential backlash from one’s ingroup.

\textit{H1: There will be a main effect of the utilization of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} such that H1a) leader trust and H1b) leader support will be higher when the leader’s speech utilizes a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}, compared to when the leader’s speech does not utilize a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}.}

\textit{H2: There will be an interaction between group membership and utilization of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}. For outgroup members, H2a) leader trust and H2b) leader support will be higher when the leader’s speech utilizes subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} compared to when the leader’s speech does not utilize subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}. For ingroup members, leader support and leader trust will not significantly differ between conditions.}
1.7 Why Subtle Identity Performances\textsuperscript{DAO} Work?

Leaders are responsible for establishing effective lines of communication, deciding procedures for day to day work, and determining reward structures for employees. In settings with multiple groups, the above tasks are complicated by the fact that, often, a leader’s natural tendency is to show favor to his or her own group rather than other groups with whom he or she does not hold membership (Horwitz, & Rabbie, 1982). Thus, while for ingroup members, concerns regarding leader fairness are not often central worries, they are paramount to the leader’s outgroup members (Hogg, 2015; Pittinsky, & Simon, 2007). Outgroup members must have evidence that their leader is considering all of his or her followers when making organizational decisions in order to put their trust in his or her leadership and support the leader’s proposed initiatives. I argue that the reason subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} increase leader trust and support is because these subtle appeals act as a signal to outgroup followers that the leader will be fair.

There are three components of fairness by which a follower may evaluate a leader (Skarlicki, & Folger, 1997). The first component is interactional justice, or the fairness the leader displays in social situations. Interactional justice has been related to the quality of leader-follower relationships, as leaders who are perceived to be more interactionally just have generally been shown to develop stronger relationships with their followers (He. Fehr, Yam, Long, & Hao, 2017). It should not be a surprise that ingroup members tend to view their leader as more interactionally just, as interactions within an ingroup are more frequent and comfortable than interactions with outgroups. The second component to a sense of fairness is procedural justice, or to the fairness of the organization’s procedures for handling internal manners (Skarlicki, & Folger, 1997). The third component to a sense of
fairness is distributive justice, or the perceived fairness of the given outcome (Skarlicki, & Folger, 1997). Whereas, typically, ingroup members can rest assured their leader is likely to have their own group’s back when designing group processes and distributing rewards, the same cannot be said of the leader’s outgroup members. Instead, outgroup members often desire to confirm that their leader is implementing fair procedures for evaluation and not simply rewarding performance based on group membership rather than merit (Platow, Haslam, Reicher, & Steffens, 2015). Therefore, an intergroup leader must actively fight against the charge of ingroup bias in all three components of fairness.

I argue that subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} help leaders fight against the charge of ingroup bias by increasing positive perceptions of the three aforementioned components of fairness to outgroup members. Subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} demonstrate to outgroup supporters that their leader is not biased towards his or her own group, but rather show concern for all groups in the larger ecosystem. A leader who learns the subtleties of an opposing group is investing time to become more knowledgeable about group memberships outside his or her own group. The effort it takes to understand such subtleties should signal to outgroup members that the leader is interested in incorporating and working for the entire ecosystem, not just the group with which he or she holds membership. Moreover, a leader enacting subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} is potentially risking support from his ingroup. Although with successful subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}, the ingroup should be unaware of the leader’s appeal to the given outgroup, a leader who utilizes this tool is still risking that his or her subtle appeal could somehow become exposed. For example, an ingroup member may overhear an outgroup member talking about a leader’s subtle appeal or a savvy ingroup observer may catch on to the subtle
reference to outgroup norms. In either case, the leader is exposing him or herself to potential backlash from his loyalist supporters in order to demonstrate that he cares about his outgroup followers – something, by definition, a leader with ingroup bias would never purposefully do. Together, I argue that subtle identity performances \( \text{DAO} \) act as a signal against ingroup bias, purposefully demonstrating that the intergroup leader is concerned about all of his followers and not just his own ingroup. Therefore, it is this increase in perceived fairness that explains why subtle identity performances \( \text{DAO} \) increase leader trust and support from outgroup followers.

\[ H3: \text{For outgroup members, the positive, direct effect of the utilization of outgroup subtle identity performances on H3a) leader trust and H3b) leader support will be partially mediated by the leader's perceived interactional justice.} \]

\[ H4: \text{For outgroup members, the positive, direct effect of the utilization of outgroup subtle identity performances on H4a) leader trust and H4b) leader support will be partially mediated by the leader's perceived procedural justice.} \]

\[ H5: \text{For outgroup members, the positive, direct effect of the utilization of outgroup subtle identity performances on H5a) leader trust and H5b) leader support will be partially mediated by the leader's perceived distributive justice.} \]

### 1.8 When are Subtle Identity Performances \( \text{DAO} \) Most Effective?

When one considers a subtle identity performance \( \text{DAO} \), he or she should be careful to also consider the authenticity of the leader’s appeal. The essence of a subtle identity performance \( \text{DAO} \) requires a leader to embrace a group with whom he or she would not naturally hold membership. Therefore, while leaders should do their best to make their appeals seem authentic to their outgroup supporters, they should also be wary of the
slippery slope that may come with appearing inauthentic during such an appeal. Therefore, succeeding in utilizing a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} may come easier to leaders who embrace an authentic leadership style.

According to Avolio and Gardner’s definition (2005), an authentic leadership style encompasses three core components: the first, authentic leaders are genuine; the second, authentic leaders lead based on their true values; and the third, authentic leaders hold values that are truly their own. Since this definition is so heavily focused on the identification with one’s true self, it should not come as a surprise that much of theoretical ground work stems from theories such as SIT. Additionally, authentic leadership has roots in positive psychology – embracing the perspective that the authentic values should be promoted in a confident, hopeful, resilient and optimistic way (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009). Authentic leadership helps leaders demonstrate to their followers that they value their role as an intergroup leader because authentic leaders are genuinely committed to their role as leader. Thus, to be seen as an authentic intergroup leader, one must represent not only their own ingroup, but other relevant outgroups as well.

Indeed, authentic intergroup leaders are likely to be able to enact authentic subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}. This is because they genuinely support the cause of both groups and therefore the subtle identity performance should come across to outgroup members as an honest, subtle appeal. However, inauthentic outgroup members will likely have a harder time crafting a subtle appeal because this will be going against their values of representing both groups in the larger intergroup ecosystem. The fact that an inauthentic leader may struggle crafting an appeal will only make his or her appeal appear less authentic. If a leader performs an inauthentic subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, the intended impact of gaining
outgroup support and trust may backfire. Instead, an inauthentic appeal may cause the leader to lose the trust and support of constituents who feel that their identities are being used as a tool for political gains.

\textit{H6: For outgroup members, there will be a main effect of the authenticity of the leader’s subtle identity performance such that mean scores for H6a) leader trust and H6b) leader support will be highest when the leader’s appeal is authentic, moderate when the leader does not utilize a subtle identity performance, and lowest when a subtle identity performance is inauthentic.}

1.9 The Many Forms of Subtle Identity Performances

The method of delivery for a subtle identity performance is something that has been unstudied. In the final section of my dissertation, I define three specific ways a subtle identity performance may be delivered: 1) verbally, 2) physically, or 3) in writing. I give an example of each type of subtle identity performance and theorize which method of delivery will be most effective for leaders.

Verbal subtle identity performances are subtle identity performances expressed to the audience orally. A verbal subtle identity performances could be implemented during a leader’s speech as a signal to an outgroup that he or she will be a fair leader. Written subtle identity performances are subtle identity performances expressed to the audience in text. Written subtle identity performances could be incorporated into PowerPoint presentations, included on signs, or written on handouts given to potential supporters. Finally, physical subtle identity performances are subtle identity performances expressed to the audience through the use of some material item. For example, during United States
presidential debates, candidates often wear color schemes that reflect their political party or their country as a whole.

Although each method of delivery for a subtle identity performance has value, I argue that to determine which method will generally be most valuable, one must consider how humans cognitively process information. Indeed, for a subtle identity performance to be effective, the audience member must process the appeal. Inherent in such an appeal is the subtle nature. Therefore, leaders should be careful to choose a method that does not further obscure the identity performance from the intended audience but rather makes the appeal obvious to the targeted group. The question becomes, which method – verbal, written, or physical – will most likely be recognized and processed consciously by the average outgroup member in the audience?

Research suggests that listeners in an audience are most likely to process information consciously, and not peripherally, if the information is unique or distinct from other relevant information that is being presented (Petty & Cacioppo, 2012). Thus, when leaders are giving speeches, simply adding a verbal subtle identity performance may not be distinct enough from the speech itself to catch the targeted outgroup members’ attention. Moreover, humans more easily process information that is straightforward compared to ambiguous (MacDonald, Just, Carpenter, 1992; Rust Stocker, 2010). Therefore, a physical subtle identity performance, such as wearing a certain color clothing, may not provide the audience member with enough concrete information to detect a leader’s intent of utilizing a subtle identity performance. The final option, a written subtle identity performance, is both distinct – as it can be presented separately on a screen as the leader gives a speech, and straightforward, as the message can be carefully constructed so that it is interpreted as
intended by the target audience. Therefore, I argue that written subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} will be more effective than their verbal and physical counterparts.

\textit{H7: There will be a main effect of outgroup subtle identity performance delivery such that H7a) leader trust and H7b) leader support will be higher when the leader’s outgroup subtle identity performance is delivered in writing, compared to verbally, physically, or not delivered at all.}

1.10 Summary

This dissertation introduces the term subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO}. Specifically, I highlight the benefit subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} can have for leaders in intergroup settings -- increased trust and support from one’s outgroup. Moreover, I propose that for outgroup members, the relationship between subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} and leader trust and support is mediated by the leader’s perceived fairness. I argue that when performing a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, leaders should take particular care to make sure their appeals are authentic, as inauthentic appeals may backfire and cause more harm than good. Finally, I present multiple methods of performing subtle identity\textsuperscript{DAO} and utilize cognitive psychological theories to hypothesize which method would be most effective for multigroup leaders to employ. In the following section, I will explain how I set out to test the aforementioned hypotheses.
CHAPTER 2. METHOD

I conducted a series of three studies to explore the impact of subtle identity performancesDAO on leader support and leader trust. The first study tested the impact subtle identity performancesDAO have in a simulated organization environment. Specifically, in this study, I attempted to 1) show that subtle identity performancesDAO can be used as tools for leaders to gain trust and support and 2) show that the reason they work is because they increase perceptions of trust among outgroup members. The second study manipulated the perceived authenticity of the subtle identity performanceDAO to determine if the authenticity of the subtle appeal had an impact on outgroup followers’ perceptions of leader trust and support. Finally, the third study investigated potential delivery methods of subtle identity performancesDAO and tested their subsequent impact on leader support and trust. Each study will be addressed in greater detail below.

2.1 General Participants Section – All Studies

Participants for all three studies were undergraduate students from a Southern public university in the United States. Demographic information of each participant was collected. The mean age for participants across all three studies was 19.52 with a standard deviation of 1.79. (Study 1: \( m = 19.45, sd = 1.94 \); Study 1: \( m = 19.42, sd = 1.76 \); Study 3: \( m = 19.62, sd = 1.74 \)). The majority of participants were male at 57 percent (Study 1: 57%; Study 2: 56%; Study 3: 58%). Additionally, participants’ race was collected. For Study 1, 46% of participants were White, 39% of participants were Asian, 7% of participants were Black, 7% of participants were Hispanic or Latino, and 1% of participants identified as “Other.” For Study 2, 46% of participants were White, 38% of participants were Asian,
7% of participants were Black, 7% of participants were Hispanic or Latino, and 2% of participants identified as “Other.” For Study 3, 43% of participants were White, 39% of participants were Asian, 8% of participants were Black, 6% of participants were Hispanic or Latino, and 4% of participants identified as “Other.” In the following sections, I will detail how I carried out each study. After describing all three studies, I will conclude with a general measures section that encompasses all the measures used in the three studies.

### 2.2 Study 1: Demonstrating the Impact of Subtle Identity Performances

This study was the first study to test whether leaders can use subtle identity performances to appeal not only to their ingroup members but also to outgroup members. Specifically, this study initially tested whether subtle identity performances increase leader support and trust within the leader’s outgroup without harming his or her standing within the ingroup.

#### 2.2.1 Study 1: Power Calculation.

Two different models were run for this study (Model 1: a multilevel linear regression and Model 2: a multilevel mediation model), so two separate power analyses were necessary. First, an a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) to determine the proper sample size for the multilevel linear regression. The analysis assumed a moderate effect size ($f = .315$; based on effect sizes of subtle identity performances on leader trust in Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, & Dahling, 2018) with three predictors (the main effect of subtle identity performance, the main effect of group, and the interaction effect), and two dependent variables (leader support and leader trust). In the power analysis, a total sample size of 114 participants was needed to reach a
desired power of 0.80 while maintaining an alpha of .05. Next, an a priori power analysis was conducted for the multilevel mediation model. Based on previous research, the same moderate effect size should be the lowest effect observed in the mediation analysis. Again, utilizing G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), a total sample size of 136 participants was needed to reach a desired power of 0.80 while maintaining an alpha of .05.

Thus, to satisfy Model 1 (the multilevel linear regression model) and Model 2 (the multilevel mediation analysis) of Study 1, I collected 141 participants. One participant was dropped due to incomplete data leaving in total 140 participants (69 ingroup members and 71 outgroup members).

2.2.2 Study 1: Procedure

Six participants and one confederate arrived at the researcher’s lab to complete a study titled “Investigating Teamwork and Collaboration.” Upon arrival, the researcher asked each participant to write down his or her name on a piece of paper and place it into a container. Participants were told as they wrote their names that, later, a participant would draw from the container to determine who would occupy the role of leader in the study. After all participants placed their names in the container, the researcher split the participants into two groups. The confederate was always be placed in the group of four, forming Group 1, and the remaining three participants made up Group 2. The researcher explained that all seven participants now worked for an organization titled “Healthy Choices.” They were told that, during their time in the organization, they would complete three tasks.

The first task was a team building activity, and each group completed this activity in separate rooms. For the team building activity, each team was assigned a code word and
instructed not to share their code word with the members of the other group. Groups generated as many sentences as possible in five minutes that utilized their code word. The confederate’s group, Group 1, was always assigned the code word “basically,” whereas Group 2 was always assigned the code word “actually.” An example sentence Group 1 could generate is “This study is basically enjoyable so far.” An example sentence Group 2 could generate is “I actually enjoy completing this study.” Importantly, the groups’ code words served as the only distinction between the two groups. Unbeknownst to the participants, the team building activity was designed to strengthen the association between their group membership and their code word.

After completing the team building activity, both groups joined the researcher in a common area. Groups sat on separate sides of the room and were asked not to speak to one another. The researcher explained that the leader would now be chosen for the organization. The researcher asked a participant to pull a name out of the container and the participant would then announce this person as leader. Unbeknownst to the participants, the container had been swapped with an identical one, and the participant pulled from a container that only included the name of the confederate. Thus, the apparent choice was forced, and the selected leader was always the confederate. The confederate leader was asked to join the researcher at a seat in the front of the common room. Importantly, the confederate leader was viewed as an ingroup member by his original three team members (Group 1), and an outgroup member by the opposing team with whom the leader shared no original membership (Group 2). Thus, this constituted the manipulation of group membership.

The researcher then began to describe the next tasks for the two remaining groups of three and the confederate leader. The groups were told they would be working together
to design a stress-reduction campaign for college students. Participants were told the campaign must include graphics, resources, and other ideas to support mental health awareness. The design of the campaign was completed in two parts – Task A and Task B. In the first part, Task A, Group 1 and Group 2 separately created a campaign proposal draft. The groups were told that, during this time, the leader was researching effective leadership strategies so that he or she can be a better leader in the final task, Task B.

Before the participants were released to start Task A, they were told that their campaign proposal drafts would be evaluated by the leader and a winner will be recognized. To help ease the sense of competition, the researcher informed the participants that in their later task (Task B), both work groups would come together to complete a final campaign draft. The information serves two purposes. First, it helped to create a sense of both competition and collaboration, elements that are present in intergroup work. Second, it served to make sure the participants were invested in the judgement of their leader.

After Task A was completed, the confederate leader came into each respective room and collected the campaign proposal drafts. When collecting his or her outgroup’s campaign proposal (Group 2), the design of the experiment was such that the confederate leader would see that the outgroup’s code word was “actually.” The confederate leader noted to Group 2 that he or she saw their code word and mentioned his or her own group’s code word. Importantly, the confederate leader now had the knowledge necessary to enact a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, because he or she now knew something intimate about the outgroup -- that their code word was “actually.”

Next, the researcher entered the independent work room of Group 1 and then Group 2 and explained to them that before their leader judges their work, he or she had been
instructed to work on drafting a leadership plan based on the research he or she completed during Task A. Participants were told that the leadership plan would help them complete Task B, and that the leader had ten minutes to complete the leadership plan. While the participants waited for their leader to write up the leadership plan, they took a short survey. This survey assessed variables related to group identity (see Appendix A).

After ten minutes, the leader’s leadership plan was distributed for each participant to read individually. Unbeknownst to the participants, the “leadership plan” was pre-drafted and served as the manipulation of the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}. Specifically, in the condition with the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} present, the leadership plan contained the outgroup’s code word “actually” five times in the write-up (see Appendix F). Alternatively, in the condition with the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} absent, the leader distributed the same write-up without the use of the word “actually” (see Appendix G). Therefore, the only difference between the two conditions was the use of the word “actually” in the leadership plan; this was the manipulation of the use of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}.

After the participants finished reading the leadership plan, the researcher informed them that, while their leader would be ostensibly judging which work group planned the better proposal, they would fill out a second survey that evaluated the leader (see Appendix B).

In reality, the leader never judged the proposals. Instead, after the second survey, the researcher called both groups into the common room with the confederate leader. The participants were expecting to hear which group had won the “best campaign proposal draft” and to find out more information about Task B. Instead, the study ended. The
researcher debriefed participants, explaining the true purpose of the study and highlighted that the leader was actually a confederate. For the complete researcher script, see Appendix E. For a visual depiction of Study 1, see Figure 1.

Figure 1. Visual depiction of Study 1.

2.3 Study 2: Authenticity and its impact on subtle identity performance outcomes

This study addressed the impact the authenticity of a subtle identity performance had on the tool’s effectiveness. Specifically, this study tested how the perceived
authenticity of the leader’s subtle appeal effected the outgroup’s perceptions of leader trust and leader support.

2.3.1 Study 2: Power Analysis.

An a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) to determine the proper sample size for a one-way ANCOVA. The analysis assumed a moderate effect size ($f = .315$) with three groups (authentic leader with subtle identity performance$^{DAO}$, inauthentic leader with subtle identity performance$^{DAO}$, and authentic leader with no subtle identity performance) and two dependent variables (leader support and leader trust). In the power analysis, a total sample size of 87 participants was needed to reach a desired power of 0.80 while maintaining an alpha of .05. To account for participant attrition, I collected data from 133 participants. Twelve participants were dropped after failing to correctly identify that the leader was an outgroup member, leaving in total, 121 participants.

2.3.2 Study 2: Procedure.

The researcher entered a classroom and asked participants for their help to complete two tasks on behalf of his psychology lab. In the first task, participants watched a video montage that highlighted their undergraduate university. After watching the video, participants were then given two minutes to write down what it meant to them to be a student at their university. Unknown to participants, the goal of this task was to heighten their identity salience with their university before they began the second task.

For the second task, participants watched a video of a student leader who was attempting to garner support for his project. Specifically, his project’s goal was to inspire
people to adopt pets from shelters rather than to buy pets from pet stores. The researcher showed participants a video of the aforementioned student-leader, and in the video clearly stated that he was a student from a different (outgroup) university. During the video, the outgroup student leader appealed to participants, asking for their support for his multi-university project to inspire those to adopt pets, and not shop for them. The subtle identity performance utilized by the leader was an appeal to the participants’ university’s superiority over their rival university. Specifically, at the participants’ university, a common phrase has been developed to recognize their university’s superiority over their rival university. The phrase is “To Hell with Georgia,” and it is printed on shirts sold at school bookstores, chanted at football games, and displayed on official school websites. However, those outside the participants’ university ingroup are generally unaware of the significance of this saying. Therefore, the leader spoke the phrase “To Hell with Georgia” as a subtle identity performance in his verbal appeal. The manipulation of the authenticity of the rival leader’s subtle identity performance occurred in the video. Specifically, to make the appeal more subtle, the leader utilized it in the following sentence: “I have learned that there are some laws in Georgia that make the adoption process difficult, but ‘to Hell with Georgia’, let’s adopt these dogs!”

There were three conditions in this experiment – in the first condition, the leader’s subtle identity performance$^{\text{DAO}}$ was authentic; in this condition, the leader clearly and confidently states the phrase “To Hell with Georgia” in his speech. In the second condition, the leader’s subtle identity performance$^{\text{DAO}}$ was inauthentic; in this condition, the leader messes up the phrase “To Hell with Georgia,” becomes flustered, and ultimately ends up looking down at his notes to finish performing the subtle identity performance. In the third
condition, the leader did not utilize a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}; this condition served as a control. (For all video scripts, see video script section in Appendix I\textsuperscript{1}). After the participants watched one of the three videos, they filled out a survey evaluating the leader (see survey in Appendix C). At the conclusion of this study, participants were debriefed. For the complete researcher script, see Appendix H.

2.4 Study 3: Written, Oral, or Physical: Which Subtle Identity Performance\textsuperscript{DAO} is Best?

This study addressed the three different methods of delivery for subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} and tested their effectiveness. Specifically, this study tested which type of subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} is most effective – a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} that is written, a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} that is verbalized or a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} that is a physical symbol?

2.4.1 Participants.

An a priori power analysis was conducted using G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) to determine the proper sample size for a one-way ANCOVA. As the effect of different subtle identity performance types is unknown, the analysis assumes a moderate effect size ($f = .25$) with four conditions (written subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, verbal subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, physical subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, and no subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}). In the power analysis, a total sample size of 128

\textsuperscript{1} In order to check the manipulation of the authenticity of the subtle identity performance, the researcher had classmates of the undergraduate research assistants watch one of the two potential conditions (authentic and inauthentic) and rate the authenticity of the subtle identity performance (See Appendix C). They were required to keep the information confidential. This data collection demonstrated that the performances differed in the intended fashion. Data can be found in the discussion.
participants was needed to reach a desired power of 0.80 while maintaining an alpha of .05. To account for participant attrition, I collected data from 183 participants. Ten participants were dropped after failing to correctly identify that the leader was an outgroup member, leaving in total, 173 participants.

2.4.2 Study 2: Procedure.

The researcher entered a classroom and asked participants for their help to complete two tasks on behalf of his psychology lab. In the first task, participants watched a video montage that highlighted their undergraduate university. After watching the video, participants were then given two minutes to write down what it meant to them to be a student at their university. Unknown to participants, the goal of this task was to heighten their identity salience with their university before they began the second task.

For the second task, participants watched a video of a student leader who was attempting to garner support for his project. Specifically, his project’s goal was to inspire people to adopt pets from shelters rather than to buy pets from pet stores. The researcher showed participants a video of the aforementioned student-leader, and in the video clearly stated that he was a student from a different (outgroup) university. During the video, the outgroup student leader appealed to participants, asking for their support for his multi-university project to inspire those to adopt pets, and not shop for them. The manipulation of the method of the leader’s subtle identity performance\(^{DAO}\) occurred during the video. Specifically, there were four conditions in this experiment – in the first condition, the leader’s subtle identity performance\(^{DAO}\) was written, in the second condition, the leader’s subtle identity performance\(^{DAO}\) was delivered verbally, in the third condition, the leader’s
subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} was delivered physically, and in the fourth condition, the leader did not utilize a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}.

In all conditions, the leader presented his appeal using a PowerPoint slide and nothing in the leader’s appeal changed expect the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} method unique to the specific condition (For all video scripts, see Appendix K). In all conditions, the leader utilized the “To Hell with Georgia” subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} from the Study 2. In the written condition the sentence “Some laws in Georgia make the adoption process difficult, but ‘to Hell with Georgia, lets adopt these dogs’!” was written on a PowerPoint slide. In the oral condition, the leader stated the aforementioned sentence verbally. In the physical condition, the leader included an image of a dog dressed in a University of Georgia shirt with the words “Sad dog” under the image. After the participants watched the video, they filled out a survey evaluating the leader (see survey in Appendix D). At the conclusion of this study, participants were debriefed. For the complete researcher script, see Appendix J.

2.5 Measures for All Three Studies

2.5.1 Leader Trust.

Leader trust was measured by six items adapted from a scale created by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) and a scale created by Adams & Satori, (2006). Leader trust was a dependent variable in all three studies. An example item assessing leader trust is: “I have complete faith in the integrity of my leader.” The scale was reliable, Study 1: $\alpha = 0.84$; Study 2: $\alpha = 0.87$; Study 3: $\alpha = 0.88$. 
2.5.2 Leader Support.

Leader support was measured by four items from a scale created by Duck & Fielding (2003). Leader support was a dependent variable in all three studies. Participants assessed leader support by rating how they felt about the leader on the four continua: unhappy – happy, unsatisfied – satisfied, unconcerned – concerned, uncomfortable – comfortable. I had doubts that the unconcerned– concerned item would be appropriate for the three studies as there was not much concerning information being presented by the leader. I decided to include the item in the scale and subsequently test, before analyzing the data, if the scale fit better with or without the item. As expected, the scale was much more reliable after the item was dropped, Study 1: $\alpha = 0.77$; Study 2: $\alpha = 0.86$; Study 3: $\alpha = 0.86$. Thus, the three-item scale was used to assess leader support.

2.5.3 Interactional Justice.

Interactional justice was measured by four items adapted from a scale created by Moorman (1991) and a scale created by Skarlicki and Folger (1997). Interactional justice was measured in study one as a mediating variable. An example item assessing interactional justice is: “The leader will treat members of my work group with respect.” The scale was reliable, Study 1: $\alpha = 0.86$.

2.5.4 Procedural Justice.

Procedural justice was measured by six items adapted from a scale created by Sweeney and McFarlin (1997). Procedural justice was measured in study one as a mediating variable. An example item assessing procedural justice is: “The procedures that
will be used to evaluate my work group’s performance are fair and objective.” The scale was reliable, Study 1: $\alpha = 0.78$

2.5.5 Distributive Justice.

Distributive justice was measured by five items adapted from a scale created by Sweeney and McFarlin (1997) and a scale created by Skarlicki and Folger (1997). Distributive justice was measured in Study 1 as a mediating variable. An example item assessing distributive justice is: “I believe that my work group will be rewarded fairly by this leader.” The scales reliability was a little lower than expected, Study 1: $\alpha = 0.66$.

2.5.6 Leader Authenticity.

Leader authenticity was measured by seven items adapted from a scale created by Gardner (2003). Appeal authenticity was measured in Study 1 as a control variable. For this scale, participants rated how certain adjectives described the leader’s appeal; the adjectives were as follows: honest, moral, deceptive (reverse-coded), trustworthy, dishonest (reverse-coded), ethical and manipulative (reverse-coded). The scale was reliable, $\alpha = 0.88$.

2.5.7 Group Identification.

Group identity was measured by six items adapted from a scale created by Henry, Arrow, and Carini (1999). Group identification was measured as a control variable in Study 1 and Study 2. An example item assessing group identification is: “When thinking about my work on this project, I see my work group membership as meaningful. The scale was reliable, Study 2: $\alpha = 0.71$; Study 3: $\alpha = 0.72$. 

37
CHAPTER 3. RESULTS

My primary contention for Study 1 was that the effects of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} on leader trust and leader support would depend on one’s group membership. Before I could run the analyses for Study 1, I first had to test 1) whether the data should be analyzed at the individual level or subgroup level and 2) whether the data necessitated a multilevel model.

The first question, at which level -- individual or subgroup -- should the data be analyzed, is important because individuals worked in subgroups to accomplish their tasks throughout the study. Therefore, it is possible that key variables, like their perceptions of leader trust, were explained more by their subgroup membership, than by their own individual opinions. For example, maybe there was a specific conversation in a subgroup that influenced all the members opinions on the leader. To test whether this was the case, and specifically, to see whether the data should be analyzed at the individual or subgroup level, I investigated the ICCs of all of my independent and dependent variables An ICC is a correlation coefficient that shows the amount of variance in a variable that is due to a grouping variable (in this case subgroup) over the total amount of variance in said variable. By looking at my ICCs, I found that the variance due to the subgroup level was low enough to justify running the data analysis at the individual level of analysis. For all variables, the highest amount of variance attributed to one’s subgroup was just 25%.
Although I then knew the data should be analyzed at the individual level, I still needed to investigate whether there was enough variance at both the subgroup level and the session level to justify a multilevel model. Just as sharing a subgroup could influence the individual to be similar about a leader, sharing a session (the six-person group for each study) could also influence individual opinions to be similar about a leader. There is a two-step process to determine whether the potential similarity (at both the subgroup and session level) justifies a multilevel model. The first step is to assess, again, the ICCs of key variables. I had already completed this for the subgroup, but now I did this same analysis using one’s session as the grouping variable. The second step, is to use the ICC for each key variable to calculate what is known as the design effect. The design effect is the ratio of actual sample size divided by the effective sample size. A design effect that is around 1.5 suggests that one should consider a multilevel model; a design effect greater than 2 suggests that one must use a multilevel model to accurately analyze the data (Hox, 2002). As seen in Table 1, not only is the multilevel model appropriate based on theoretical reasons, the design effects for subgroup and session on the dependent variables of leader trust and leader support are around 1.5; thus, the grouping variables of both subgroup and session should be added as random effects in the model. Consequently, this means that the design for Study 1 necessitated a three-level, multilevel model. Specifically, the first level of the multilevel model accounted for effects due to the individual. The second level of the

Table 1. Intraclass correlation coefficients for primary study variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subgroup ICC</th>
<th>Subgroup Design Effect</th>
<th>Session ICC</th>
<th>Session Design Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Trust</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Support</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Liking</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140; Data from Study 1.
multilevel model accounted for effects due to one’s subgroup, the three-person work group, that one completed tasks with in the study. Finally, the third level of the multilevel model accounted for effects due to one’s session, the 6-person group that included all participants in the given study timeslot.

3.1 Study 1

3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics.

Descriptive statistics and correlations among all study variables can be found in Table 2. All scales showed appropriate reliabilities. Notably, the correlations between interactive justice and procedural justice ($r = .26$), interactive justice and distributive justice ($r = .50$), and finally procedural justice and distributive justice ($r = .21$), are similar to findings in previous literature (Luo, 2007) and demonstrate that participants were successfully able to distinguish between each dimension of fairness. Table 3 separates the descriptive statistics by participant group membership and condition. Upon a cursory glance, for ingroup members, scores on leader trust and leader support do not seem to differ between conditions. Interestingly, for outgroup members, scores on leader trust and leader support are lower in the condition in which a subtle identity was present compared to when a subtle identity performance was absent. This unexpected finding encouraged a deeper dive into the data.
Table 2. Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and intercorrelations among primary Study 1 variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader Support</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interactive Justice</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leader Liking</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140; Data from Study 1.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations of primary study variables by condition and group membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subtle ID Absent</th>
<th>Subtle ID Present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inggroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>Inggroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Support</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Liking</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140; Data from Study 1.

3.1.2 Main Analyses.

The first hypothesis stated that there would be a main effect of leader speech type such that H1a) leader trust and H1b) leader support will be higher when the leader’s speech utilized a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}, compared to when the leader’s speech did not utilize a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}. Building on the first hypothesis, the second hypothesis stated that the relationship between leader speech type and H2a) leader trust and H2b) leader support would depend on group membership. For outgroup members, leader trust and leader support were hypothesized to be higher when the leader’s speech utilized a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} compared to when the leader’s speech did not
utilize a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO}. For ingroup members, leader support and leader trust were not expected to differ significantly between conditions.

To test the first two hypotheses, I ran the aforementioned three-level multilevel model in which person was nested in subgroup, which, all together, was nested in session. Specifically, I regressed a) leader trust and b) leader support on the interaction term of condition (subtle identity absent = 0, subtle identity present = 1) and group (ingroup = 0, outgroup = 1) and the corresponding main effects. Hypothesis 1a and 1b were not supported, see Table 4 and Table 5. Leaders were not evaluated differently due to the presence of a subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} on the dimensions of leader trust (\(\beta = 0.03, p > .05;\) see Figure 2) and leader support (\(\beta = -0.10, p > .05;\) see Figure 3). Additionally, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, see Table 4 and Table 5, suggesting that the effects of a subtle identity performance on leader trust (\(\beta = -0.21, p > .05;\) see Figure 4) and leader support (\(\beta = -0.01, p > .05;\) see Figure 5) did not depend on group membership.

![Figure 2](image.png)

Figure 2. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader trust (Hypothesis 1a).
Figure 3. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader trust (Hypothesis 1b).
Table 4. Multilevel coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 1a and 2a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Effects

\( \sigma^2 \) 0.39
\( \tau_{00} \) Subgroup 0.00
\( \tau_{00} \) Session 0.05
ICC Subgroup 0.00
ICC Session 0.11

Effect Sizes

Marginal R\(^2\) 0.06
Conditional R\(^2\) 0.16

Note. \( N = 140; \) Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session.

Table 5. Multilevel coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 1b and 2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Effects

\( \sigma^2 \) 0.29
\( \tau_{00} \) Subgroup 0.06
\( \tau_{00} \) Session 0.01
ICC Subgroup 0.17
ICC Session 0.02

Effect Sizes

Marginal R\(^2\) 0.09
Conditional R\(^2\) 0.26

Note. \( N = 140; \) Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session.
Figure 4. Bar graph demonstrating the interaction effect of condition by group on leader trust (Hypothesis 2a).

Figure 5. Bar graph demonstrating the interaction effect of condition by group on leader support (Hypothesis 2b).
Hypothesis 3 through Hypothesis 5 posited that the effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership on (a) leader trust and (b) leader support would be partially mediated by three different components of fairness. These three components were interactive justice (H3), procedural justice (H4) and distributive justice (H5). To test Hypotheses 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 5a, and 5b, I ran three separate 6-level, multilevel mediation models. In the following sections I describe the results from each of these models.

Hypothesis 3 theorized that the effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership on (a) leader trust and (b) leader support would be partially mediated by interactive justice. My results did not support this hypothesis. Specifically, the interaction of the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership did not predict interactive justice ($\beta = -0.29, p > .05$; see Table 6 and Table 7; Figure 6 and Figure 7). Since this first path of the mediation model (Path A) was not significant, there could not be an indirect effect to support H3a (DV of leader trust) or H3b (DV of leader support). Still, I analyzed the second path (Path B) to see if interactional justice predicted leader trust and leader support. I found support for this part of the hypothesis; interactional justice significantly predicted a) leader trust ($\beta = 0.58, p < .05$; see Table 6; Figure 6) and b) leader support ($\beta = 0.32, p < .05$; see Table 7; Figure 7). Still, as expected, the direct effect and indirect effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership on leader trust ($\beta = 0.01, p < .05$; $\beta = -0.17, p < .05$) and leader support ($\beta = -0.02, p < .05$; $\beta = -0.09, p < .05$) was not statistically significant.
Table 6. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 3a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Interactive Justice</th>
<th>Leader Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice C\text{Subgroup}</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice C\text{WSubgroup}</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Effects

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ subgroup</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ session</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ session</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect Sizes

Marginal $R^2$

Conditional $R^2$

Note. $N = 140$; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level = subgroup, level 3 = session. Absent effect size due to singularity.

Table 7. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 3b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Interactive Justice</th>
<th>Leader Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice C\text{Subgroup}</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Justice C\text{WSubgroup}</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Effects

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ subgroup</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ session</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_0$ session</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect Sizes

Marginal $R^2$

Conditional $R^2$

Note. $N = 140$; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level = subgroup, level 3 = session. Absent effect size due to singularity.
Figure 6. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 3a. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.

Figure 7. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 3b. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.
Hypothesis 4 theorized that the effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership on (a) leader trust and (b) leader support would be partially mediated by procedural justice. Again, results did not support this hypothesis. First, the interaction of the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership did not predict procedural justice ($\beta = -0.07, p > .05$; see Table 8 and Table 9; Figure 8 and Figure 9). Similar to Hypothesis 3, since this first path of the mediation model (Path A) was not significant, there could not be an indirect effect to support H4a (DV of leader trust) or H4b (DV of leader support). Still, I analyzed the second path (Path B) to see if procedural justice predicted leader trust and leader support. I found support for this part of the hypothesis; procedural justice significantly predicted a) leader trust ($\beta = 0.24, p < .05$; see Table 8; Figure 8) and b) leader support ($\beta = 0.16, p < .05$; see Table 9; Figure 9). Finally, as expected, the direct effect and indirect effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership was insignificant for both leader trust ($\beta = -0.20, p < .05$; $\beta = 0.09, p < .05$) and leader support ($\beta = -0.18, p < .05$; $\beta = -0.01, p < .05$).
Table 8. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 4a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Leader Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice CBsubgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice CWsubgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Effects**

| σ²        | 1.09 | 0.34 |
| τ₀₀       | 0.01  | Subgroup | 0.00  | Subgroup |
| ICC       | 0.01  | Subgroup | 0.00  | Subgroup |
|           | 0.01  | Session  | 0.13  | Session  |

**Effect Sizes**

| Marginal R² | 0.00 |
| Conditional R² | 0.02 |

Note. N = 140; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session. Absent effect size due to singularity.

Table 9. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 4b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Leader Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice CBsubgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice CWsubgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Effects**

| σ²        | 1.09 | 0.23 |
| τ₀₀       | 0.01  | Subgroup | 0.03  | Subgroup |
| ICC       | 0.01  | Subgroup | 0.10  | Subgroup |
|           | 0.01  | Session  | 0.17  | Session  |

**Effect Sizes**

| Marginal R² | 0.00 |
| Conditional R² | 0.02 |

Note. N = 140; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session.
Figure 8. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 4a. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.

Figure 9. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 4b. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.
Hypothesis 5 theorized that the effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership on (a) leader trust and (b) leader support would be partially mediated by distributive justice. The results did not support this hypothesis. Specifically, the interaction of the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership did not predict distributive justice ($\beta = 0.00, p > .05$; see Table 10 and Table 11; Figure 10 and Figure 11). Similar to above hypotheses, since this first path of the mediation model (Path A) was not significant, there could not be an indirect effect to support H5a (DV of leader trust) or H5b (DV of leader support). Still, I chose to again analyze the second path (Path B) to see if distributive justice predicted leader trust and leader support. I found support for this part of the hypothesis; distributive justice significantly predicted a) leader trust ($\beta = 0.48, p < .05$; see Table 10; Figure 10) and b) leader support ($\beta = 0.33, p < .05$; see Table 11; Figure 11). However, as in the earlier analyses, the direct effect and indirect effect of the interaction between the presence of a subtle identity performance and one’s group membership was insignificant for both leader trust ($\beta = -0.21, p < .05; \beta = -0.00, p < .05$) and leader support ($\beta = -0.19, p < .05; \beta = -0.00, p < .05$).
Table 10. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 5a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Leader Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice CBsubgroup</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice CWsubgroup</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>0.00 subgroup</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 Session</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>0.00 subgroup</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 Session</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect Sizes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal R²</th>
<th>Conditional R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 140$; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session. Absent effect size due to singularity.

Table 11. Multilevel meditation coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 5b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Leader Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Outgroup</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice CBsubgroup</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice CWsubgroup</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{00}$</td>
<td>0.00 subgroup</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 Session</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>0.00 subgroup</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 Session</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect Sizes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marginal R²</th>
<th>Conditional R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 140$; Data from study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level 2 = subgroup, level 3 = session. Absent effect size due to singularity.
Figure 10. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 5a. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.

Figure 11. Figure demonstrating the multilevel mediation for Hypotheses 5b. Unstandardized Beta weights are presented with Standard Errors in parentheses.
3.2 Study 2

3.2.1 Analysis Plan.

My primary contention for Study 2 was that the authenticity of a subtle identity performance^D_{AO} would impact outgroup perceptions of leader trust and leader support. The hypotheses for Study 2 were tested using a one-way ANCOVA, controlling for group identification.

3.2.2 Descriptive Statistics.

Descriptive statistics and correlations among all study variables can be found in Table 12. All scales showed appropriate reliabilities. Additionally, the correlation between the two dependent variables, leader trust and leader support ($r = 0.56$), was comparable to the correlation between these two variables in Study 1, ($r = 0.55$). The covariate, group identity correlated significantly with leader trust ($r = 0.22$) and leader support ($r = 0.19$). Table 13 separates the descriptive statistics by condition, specifically: the authentic subtle appeal, the inauthentic subtle appeal and the control condition. Upon a cursory glance, scores on leader trust and leader support do not seem to differ between conditions. Still, all hypotheses were tested.
### Table 12. Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and intercorrelations among primary variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader Support</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Identity</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 121; Data from Study 2.

### Table 13. Means and standard deviations of primary study variables by condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authentic Identity Performance (n = 41)</th>
<th>No Identity Performance (n = 43)</th>
<th>Inauthentic Identity Performance (n = 37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Support</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 121; Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, authentic identity = 2, inauthentic identity = 3; Data from Study 2.

#### 3.2.3 Main Analyses.

Regarding the main hypothesis for Study 2 (H6), I ran a one-way ANCOVA to investigate the potential main effect of the authenticity of the leader’s subtle identity performance \(^{DAO}\) on leader trust and leader support. Specifically, I hypothesized that the mean scores for leader trust and leader support would be highest when the leader’s appeal is perceived to be authentic and lowest when the leader’s appeal is perceived to be inauthentic. Furthermore, I hypothesized that the mean of the control condition, where the leader does not use a subtle identity performance \(^{DAO}\), would fall between the aforementioned conditions. The one-way ANCOVA did not support this hypothesis, failing to find a significant difference between conditions for both leader trust, \(F(2,117) = 0.58, p > .05;\) see Table 14; see Figure 12, and leader support, \(F(2,117) = 0.69, p > .05;\) see Table 15; see Figure 13.
Table 14. ANCOVA coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 6a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>partial eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2004.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2004.60</td>
<td>3397.62</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 121; Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, authentic identity = 2, inauthentic identity = 3; Data from Study 2.

Figure 12. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader trust (Hypothesis 6a).
Table 15. ANCOVA coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 6b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>partial eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1587.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1587.90</td>
<td>1707.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>108.62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 121; Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, authentic identity = 2, inauthentic identity = 3; Data from Study 2.

Figure 13. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader support (Hypothesis 6b).

3.3 Study 3

3.3.1 Analysis Plan.

My primary contention for Study 3 was that the method a leader chose to deliver his or her subtle identity performance\(^\text{DAO}\) would impact outgroup followers’ perceptions of leader trust and leader support. The hypotheses for Study 3 were tested using a one-way ANCOVA.
3.3.2 *Descriptive Statistics.*

Descriptive statistics and correlations among all Study 3 variables can be found in Table 16. All scales showed appropriate reliabilities. Additionally, the correlation between the two dependent variables, leader trust and leader support \((r = 0.58)\), was comparable to the correlation between these two variables in Study 1, \((r = 0.55)\) and Study 2. The covariate, group identity correlated significantly with leader trust \((r = 0.23)\) and leader support \((r = 0.16)\). Table 17 separates the descriptive statistics by condition: the written subtle appeal, the oral subtle appeal the physical subtle appeal, and the control condition. Similar to Study 2, upon a cursory glance, scores on leader trust and leader support do not seem to differ between conditions. Still, all hypotheses were tested.

**Table 16. Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and intercorrelations among primary Study 3 variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leader Support</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Identity</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 173\); Data from Study 3.

**Table 17. Means and standard deviations of primary study variables by condition for Study 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Identity Perf. ((n = 43))</th>
<th>Written Identity Perf. ((n = 43))</th>
<th>Oral Identity Perf. ((n = 37))</th>
<th>Physical Identity Perf. ((n = 50))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Trust</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Support</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(N = 173\); Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, written = 2 oral = 3; physical = 4; Data from Study 3.
3.3.3 Main Analyses.

Hypothesis 7 theorized that the outgroup’s perception of (a) leader trust and (b) leader fairness would be higher in the condition that included the written subtle identity performance was compared to the verbal, physical, or absent subtle identity performance conditions. To test this hypothesis, I ran a one-way ANCOVA, controlling for group identity. The model did not support the hypothesis; in fact, none of the four conditions produced mean scores of leader trust, $F(3,168) = 2.19, p > .05$; see Table 18; see Figure 14, and leader support, $F(3,168) = 0.70, p > .05$; see Table 19; see Figure 15, that were significantly different from each other.

Table 18. ANCOVA coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 7a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>partial eta$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2992.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2992.10</td>
<td>4986.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100.63</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 173$; Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, written = 2 oral = 3; physical = 4; Data from Study 3.
Figure 14. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader trust (Hypothesis 7a).

Table 19. ANCOVA coefficient estimates for Hypothesis 7b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>partial eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2205.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2205.30</td>
<td>2722.59</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identity</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>136.60</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 173; Condition coded as follows: no identity = 1, written = 2 oral = 3; physical = 4; Data from Study 3.
Figure 15. Bar graph demonstrating the main effect of condition on leader support (Hypothesis 7b).
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION

The aim of this dissertation was to investigate whether subtle identity performances serve as an effective tool to help leaders address the challenges of intergroup leadership. Specifically, Study 1 tested the efficacy of subtle identity performances as a strategy to gain outgroup members’ trust and support. Study 2 investigated how the authenticity of the subtle identity performance impacted the outcomes of trust and support. Finally, Study 3 attempted to demonstrate the most effective method of delivering a subtle identity performance by evaluating the format of the appeal – either with a written, oral, or physical delivery. Together, this dissertation represents the first efforts in understanding how leaders can capitalize on subtle appeals to opposing groups to bolster their standing with outgroup members without alienating themselves from their loyal supporters.

I hypothesized that the effect of a subtle identity performance would depend on the audience’s group membership. Specifically, I theorized that outgroup members would respond positively to a subtle identity performance directed at them, increasing their perceptions of leader trust and leader support, whereas ingroup members would not register the subtle nature of the appeal and, thus, not show meaningful changes in leader trust or support compared to a control condition without an appeal (H1 and H2). I tested these hypotheses in Study 1, however, they were not supported.

Additionally, I wanted to understand the mechanisms by which subtle identity performances operated to increase leader trust and support from outgroup audiences. To this end, I tested a mediation model, theorizing that subtle identity performances increased leader trust and leader support by first increasing perceptions of leader fairness.
I hypothesized that subtle identity performances would increase the perception that the leader would interact positively with outgroup members (H3: interactive justice), enact fair procedures to evaluate outgroup members, and finally, (H4: procedural justice) distribute rewards evenly to all of his or her followers (H5: distributive justice). Ultimately, the test for the mediation model was unable to be conducted due to issues of singularity that compromised the ability to analyze the model.

Still, because I remained interested in the effects of a subtle identity performance on interactive, procedural and distributive justice, I decided to investigate this relationship, post-hoc, by simply looking at how the presence of subtle identity performances changed perceptions of the three fairness outcomes (Path A in the mediation model), instead of evaluating this relationship in the larger mediation model. By taking this approach, I was then able to remove the random effect in each model that was causing the aforementioned issue of singularity in the mediation model (i.e., the level 2, nesting variable subgroup for interactive and distributive justice and the level 3, session nesting variable for procedural justice). After doing this, I regressed each term of interest (interactive justice, procedural justice, and distributive justice) on the condition by group interaction. I did not find a significant relationship between the condition by group interaction and any of the three justice components (interactive justice: $\beta = -0.30, p > .05$; procedural justice: $\beta = -0.08, p > .05$; distributive justice: $\beta = -0.01, p > .05$), which provides more evidence that the indirect effect of the original meditation model would likely have been insignificant.

The question of how the authenticity of the subtle identity performance impacted leader trust and support was tested in Study 2. I hypothesized that outgroup members would evaluate a leader better if he or she authentically performed a subtle identity performance
rather than inauthentically performing a subtle identity performance or not performing one at all. The pre-test determined that I did effectively manipulate the authenticity of the subtle identity performance $t(44) = -3.13, p < .05$, however I did not find a significant relationship between said authenticity and the main outcomes of leader trust and leader support, failing to support the aforementioned hypothesis (H6).

Finally, I hypothesized that the method of delivery of a subtle identity performance would impact the subtle identity performance’s effectiveness. Specifically, I theorized that a written subtle identity performance would elicit more trust and support in the leader compared to an oral or physical subtle identity performance. I tested this hypothesis in Study 3, but it was not supported (H7). There was no significant difference in trust or support between the written, oral, physical, or control condition.

Overall, the current exploration of subtle identity performance $^{DAO}$ did not prove to be very fruitful. Due to the lack of evidence of their effectiveness, it may simply be that subtle identity performances do not work when a leader directs them at an opposing group. After all, my previous work has shown that subtle identity performances do increase leader trust when directed at their own group (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, and Dahling, 2018). There are theoretical reasons to believe that subtle identity performances $^{DAO}$ may not be an effective tool compared to subtle identity performances $^{DAI}$. Specifically, extending the logic of the Social Identity Theory of Leadership (Van Knippenberg, 2011), ingroup leaders are likely to be perceived as leaders that are attempting to benefit their own group, even in ambiguous situations. Therefore, an ingroup leader that performs a subtle identity performance will be more likely to have this act attributed to an appeal at his or her own
group, compared to an outgroup leader that utilizes the same appeal as an attempt to reach across the aisle.

Although the aforementioned arguments suggest the null effect may represent the actual state of the world, I believe it is too early to conclude definitively that a subtle identity performance cannot be used to gain support from outgroup followers. In the following sections of my dissertation, I will outline both theoretical and methodological concerns that may have potentially contributed to the lack of findings in this dissertation. I will describe how these concerns should be addressed in future studies on subtle identity performances. Finally, I will suggest a direction for future research that I believe will lead us to a deeper understanding of both the tool of subtle identity performances and the processes which underlie their effectiveness.

4.1 Methodological Concerns

In this section, I will highlight potential methodological concerns that may have contributed to why I did not find my hypothesized results. Specifically, I will detail each concern, explain how I tried to initially account for the concern but show how the concern still may have affected the results. Finally, I will propose potential remedies to each methodological concern. The concerns I will highlight specifically revolve around the

4.1.1 Lack of Incentive for Participants.

The first methodological concern applies to the first study only but is particularly consequential. Specifically, the concern is that participants did not have an incentive to care about the leader’s ultimate decision as to which group was better, Group 1 or Group 2, in the task that they were completing. Therefore, if the participants did not care whether
they felt like the leader supported them or the opposing group, the effect of the subtle identity performance, or lack thereof, would be significantly harder to find. Indeed, the purpose of a subtle identity performance^{DAO} is to increase the perception of fairness and, ultimately, trust and support in the outgroup leader. If the participants did not feel that the leader had any significant power over meaningful decisions, then it is likely that they were not concerned about the leader or his or her actions. In fact, I did not find a main effect of group membership on leader trust ($\beta = -0.19, p > .05$; see Table 4) or leader support ($\beta = -0.28, p > .05$; see Table 5); this suggests that participants did not care whether their leader was an ingroup member or outgroup member. If this is the case, it becomes even less likely that they would care if the leader used a subtle appeal to their group.

Unfortunately, this concern was something that I had thought deeply about before conducting the study. I had tried to see if I could reward extra SONA credits (credits to participants that were needed to complete research hours) to the winning group. However, the use of a reward was against school policy. Additionally, I checked to see if I could enter the winning group into a lottery system to give incentive to the groups so that the leader’s choice of the “winner” had real life implications (i.e., they could win money). Unfortunately, my IRB does not allow lottery type prizes to be awarded due to state laws. Therefore, instead of using these tactics, I tried to convey to participants that the competition was of extreme importance and that they should take it very seriously. Also, it was mentioned multiple times, throughout the study, that the campaign design task was a contest to see which group was better.

Ultimately, it appears that emphasizing competition without a reward is not enough to engender incentive in participants to care about a leader’s judgement in a lab setting. If
I were to do this study again, I would find a way to offer some type of incentive to the winning group. Indeed, it was what I intended to do in this study but was stymied by the regulations and laws already in place in my school and state.

4.1.2 Lack of Meaningful Identity Developed in Lab.

The second methodological concern is that all three studies took place in a laboratory setting as opposed to a real-life environment. A lab setting was chosen because I believed it was necessary to maximize internal validity since this was the first set of studies investigating the impact of subtle identity performances\(^{DAO}\). However, the artificial nature of a lab setting may have sacrificed necessary external validity (Dipboye, & Flanagan, 1979), which ultimately could have led to my null findings.

One prominent concern of conducting this study in a lab environment is that it relied on participants quickly identifying with a group membership that they potentially did not view as meaningful. This was especially true in Study 1, in which participants formed teams with strangers. Although minimal group paradigm research has demonstrated that simply separating individuals into groups is enough for individuals to begin to identify as a collective with their fellow group members (Diehl, 1990), the level of identity necessary for a subtle appeal to produce the desired effects may not have been reached in such a design. I was aware of this concern and took many steps to help foster the relevant group identities in my methods. For example, in Study 1, each group sat in separate rooms, completed a team building activity, were referred to only by their group names, and were told that they would be competing with the participants in the opposing group. In Study 2 and Study 3, participants watched a “Welcome to Georgia Tech” video that was designed to make them think about their identity as a Georgia Tech student. All of the
aforementioned strategies that were employed have been identified by prior research as ways to foster and increase salience of an identity (Brewer, 1999; Marin, Ruiz, & Rubio, 2009; Tajfel, 1982). Furthermore, I measured group identity and identity salience in each study to assess whether participants did form an identification with the relevant group membership as intended. Based on mean identification levels from Study 1 ($M = 4.69; SD = 0.54$) Study 2, ($M = 4.48$ out of $6; SD = 0.65$), and Study 3 ($M = 4.49$ out of $6, SD = 0.72$), it appears that people did identify with their own group.

Still, if I did this study again, I would capitalize on already fostered identities that people share. Ideally, this would be done by studying real life work teams that have relevant outgroups from which a leader could be pulled from to utilize a subtle identity performance. Furthermore, when assessing group identity, I could bolster my current manipulation check to include how they feel about other group identities that they hold (e.g., school identity, family identity, etc.) to compare whether the current identity is truly meaningful to them in a larger multifaceted picture which encompasses the multiple shared identities that each participant holds. The additional context of this group identity measure would give me better insight into the true “meaningfulness” of the group membership being assessed in the current study.

4.1.3 Salience of Subtle Identity Performances.

The third methodological concern was that the chosen subtle identity performances were not salient enough to illicit the hypothesized response from the outgroup audience. In Study 1, the subtle identity performance was the use of the outgroup’s code word “actually.” This code word was known only to outgroup members and was utilized in a team-building task that required the outgroup to write as many sentences as they could including their code
word: “actually.” Indeed, the entire purpose of the team-building task was to heighten the salience of the outgroup’s code word, “actually.” I chose this word and this method of manipulation, because, in my prior study that looked at subtle identity performances directed at the ingroup, this manipulation produced the desired effects – increasing the ingroup’s perception of trust in the leader without harming the outgroup’s perceptions of leader (Jones, Wiley, LoPilato, & Dahling, 2018). Since the study of subtle identity performances is a new topic in the literature related to SIT, I chose to utilize methods that had worked before. However, utilizing a methodology that increases the salience of subtle identity performances even more would be beneficial.

One way to increase the salience of subtle identity performances in a lab setting is to utilize an existing identity that all participants share and pull from that identity a slogan, phrase, or saying that members recognize, but others may not. This was the strategy I employed when deciding on the subtle identity performance for Study 2 and Study 3. Since my participants were attendees of a single university, I decided to crowd-source potential subtle identity performances from undergraduates who attended this university. I discussed with undergraduate research assistants many possibilities and ultimately decided that the phrase “To Hell with Georgia” best represented a subtle identity appeal that held a special meaning to their own university students compared to others without the university affiliation. The “To Hell with Georgia” subtle appeal did not go unnoticed. In Study 2, 93% of participants said they recognized the “To Hell with Georgia” phrase and in Study 3, 77% of participants recognized the phrase. Importantly, this represents the percentage of participants that explicitly processed the appeal, though it is very plausible that even more participants implicitly processed the appeal (Rameson, Satpute, Liberman; 2010). Still, in
Study 2 and Study 3, the subtle appeal occurred at the end of a two-minute speech from the leader. It is possible that the participants already made their judgements of the leader before the subtle appeal. Conversely, if I had chosen to place the appeal at the beginning of the speech, it is possible the participants would have forgotten the subtle identity performance by the end of the speech.

A major methodological challenge of studying subtle identity performances is determining how to create a scenario in which the speaker’s appeal remains 1) subtle enough to be undetectable by audience members who are outside of the targeted group, while 2) also being salient enough for the targeted group to recognize the performance as a significant “nod” of support in their direction. Inherently, subtle identity performances are likely to produce small effects since, by their very nature, they must be subtle. Therefore, researchers must think carefully about all aspects of their design to heighten the chance that the effect of a subtle identity performance will be observable in their data.

4.2 Theoretical Concerns

In this section, I will highlight theoretical concerns that may have contributed to why I did not find my hypothesized results. As in the prior section, I will detail each concern, explain how I tried to initially account for the concern, but show how the concern still may have affected the results. Finally, I will propose potential remedies to each theoretical concern.

4.2.1 Defining a Subtle Identity Performance.

One reason a subtle identity performance may not be seen as salient by the targeted group in a laboratory setting is that the subtle identity performance is developed by the
researchers – not the group members themselves. The construction of subtle identity performances in the truest form, should represent a purposeful display of identity that signifies an allegiance to a shared group membership (Klein, Spears & Riecher, 2007). How subtle identity performances grow to be shared as common knowledge within a group’s identity is something that is currently not understood. We know from SIT literature that through shared time and experiences, individuals develop similar understandings and opinions (Hogg & Reid, 2006) and this may help foster a fertile ground for subtle identity performance development. Understanding how subtle identity performances initially develop will help researchers better understand how to choose an effective subtle identity performance to utilize during their research. In my dissertation, this knowledge would have helped me be even more deliberate in my selection of my subtle identity performances.

Not only is it crucial to understand how subtle identity performances develop, it is also of equal importance to understand who develops them. Adopting a social identity theory perspective, one may argue that prototypical group members are the most likely to initiate the use of subtle identity performances as a means to further consolidate their position as representative of the group (Klein, Spears, & Riecher, 2007). Further, prototypical group members are most likely to have the necessary requisite knowledge about the group to develop a subtle identity performance that is effective (Van Knippenberg, 2011). For example, as described earlier, when creating my subtle identity performance to appeal to participants at my university, I went to university students to ask them ideas of meaningful phrases that could be utilized as a subtle appeal. University students were able to provide a better subtle appeal than I could have created on my own.
because they had a deeper knowledge of the norms, values, and beliefs that come with being a member of said university. As we begin to understand more about how subtle identity performances develop and who are the driving forces behind their development, we will be able to greatly improve our ability to conduct meaningful research on this type of subtle appeal.

4.2.2 Competition Versus Collaboration.

Subtle identity performances are used in intergroup contexts, a situation that includes two or more present groups. However, the intergroup context may appear very different depending on whether the groups are competing or collaborating on a given task (Brown & Abrams, 1986). When an outgroup leader performs a subtle identity performance, he or she will, therefore, likely get a much different response from outgroups that are viewed as collaborators compared to outgroups that are viewed as competitors. The dynamic of competition versus collaboration was present in my dissertation, although it was admittedly unintended. In Study 1, groups were competing to design the best one-week mental health campaign to implement on a college campus. This task pitted ingroup members against outgroup members. In Study 2 and Study 3, the outgroup was asked to work with the ingroup to support a common cause: the promotion of the adoption of dogs. Despite not finding significant effects in subtle identity performance in either the competitive or collaborative tasks in the current study, determining how collaboration versus competition impacts a leader’s ability to perform subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} is still something that should be investigated.

One reason collaboration compared to competition may impact subtle identity performances is the distinction’s effect on perceptions of group identity. When multiple
groups are collaborating, group members have an ability to form a larger shared identity that emphasizes the shared goals between the two groups. For example, the shared identity of two businesses working through a transaction could be derived from the shared involvement in the transaction (Rast, Hogg, & van Knippenberg, 2018). This sense of shared identity may allow followers to view their outgroup leader as one of their own, if they perceive the two groups as part of a larger, co-existing identity. Alternatively, in competitive tasks, followers are likely to be even more wary of a leader’s subtle identity performance. An outgroup follower might ask: “What is the leader really trying to accomplish with this subtle appeal?” The inherit skepticism of opposing group members is something observed in research on groups in competitive environments (Duck & Fielding, 1999), and this skepticism could ultimately undermine a leader’s ability to genuinely make an appeal to an opposing group. Future research that directly manipulates the task from a collaborative to a competitive environment will help shed light on how these two factors influence subtle identity performances.

4.2.3 Authenticity of Leader.

In the current dissertation, I evaluated whether the authenticity of the subtle identity performance impacted how the subtle identity performance was perceived by outgroup members. Although, for Study 2, I successfully manipulated the authenticity of the subtle appeal, \( t(44) = -3.13, p < .05 \), I found that the authenticity of the leader’s subtle appeal had no effect on how the appeal was perceived by outgroup followers. Still, I believe it makes theoretical sense that authenticity is an important variable to consider when discussing identity performances, especially identity performances directed at outgroup. The null finding could be explained by the fact that followers do not judge the authenticity
of their leader’s specific appeals but rather hold a general view of their leader’s authenticity. Depending on if a leader is viewed as generally authentic or inauthentic, the impact of their subtle identity performance towards an outgroup may differ.

I ran post-hoc analyses to investigate whether general perceptions of authenticity impacted the effect of subtle identity performances on the perception of the leader. Specifically, I ran a multilevel model that regressed leader liking (how much a participant liked their leader) on the three-way interaction term of leader group by subtle identity performance condition by leader authenticity. I was most interested in investigating how leader liking changed when an authentic outgroup leader performed a subtle identity performance compared to when an inauthentic outgroup leader performed a subtle identity performance. The three-way interaction was significant. When outgroup leaders performed a subtle identity performance, they were liked more when they were viewed as inauthentic compared to when they were viewed as authentic, $\beta = -1.00, p < .05$; see Table 20; see Figure 16.
Table 20. Multilevel coefficient estimates for three-way interaction of group by condition by leader authenticity on leader liking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup by Subtle Identity Present</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup by Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Identity Present by Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup by Subtle Identity Present by Leader Authenticity</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>σ²</th>
<th>0.35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τ0 Group</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ0 Session</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Group</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Session</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginal R²</th>
<th>0.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional R²</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 140; Data from Study 1. Model ran as a three-level multilevel model where: level 1 = person, level = subgroup, level 3 = session.

Figure 16. Post-hoc line graph demonstrating the three-way interaction of group by condition by leader authenticity on leader liking.

Importantly, this is a post-hoc finding so any interpretation of this finding should be considered with caution. However, providing a potential explanation of post-hoc
findings is a useful exercise to extend ideas for potential future research. At first the aforementioned post-hoc finding may appear counter-intuitive – why would outgroup members like a leader more if he/she appeared inauthentic compared to authentic? However, one must remember that these leaders are performing a subtle identity performance directed at their outgroup, something that by nature is likely to be viewed as inauthentic by the targeted outgroup.

From a social identity theory perspective, authentic leaders are leaders who most embody their groups norms, values and believes. Inauthentic leaders, then, would be leaders who flip flop between groups’ beliefs and do not seem to hold consistent values or standings on any given issue. Thus, when an inauthentic leader makes a subtle appeal to his or her outgroup, he or she is operating consistently with expectations. From the outgroup’s mind, their leader was never viewed as the authentic type and thus an appeal to a group membership with which he or she does not belong does not seem out of the ordinary. In other words, the appeal is something that the leader would be expected to do. Humans appreciate this sense of consistency (Festinger, 1957). However, when an authentic leader makes a subtle appeal to an outgroup, outgroup members are likely to question why the leader is appealing to them in such a way. For authentic leaders, reaching across the aisle to an opposing group is more likely to 1) stand out, 2) appear more disingenuous, and 3) raise concerns regarding the potential ulterior motives. Being that these are explanations for a post-hoc finding, future research should attempt to replicate these findings with a study that is specifically designed to manipulate a leader’s perceived authenticity. Understanding the relationship between leader authenticity and subtle identity
performances\textsuperscript{DAO} will help leaders understand when it is of value to utilize subtle identity performances as a tool to gain favor from their outgroup followers.

4.3 Future Directions: A Qualitative Investigation into Subtle Identity Performances

One could argue that there are two approaches to studying a new construct or phenomenon. The first approach consists of exploring the construct in a heavily controlled setting that allows one to clearly manipulate and test antecedents and outcomes related to the construct. Thus far, this is the approach that I have taken to investigate the tool of subtle identity performances. The second approach consists of exploring the construct in a “real-world” setting. Although the later approach, compared to the former, lacks internal validity, it allows researchers to better understand the construct that they are trying to replicate in the lab. For any new construct, research that tackles both approaches are essential (Dipboye, & Flanagan, 1979). In this section, I will outline a plan for qualitative research and provide questions that would be of interest when investigating subtle identity performances in the “real-world.”

Qualitative research on subtle identity performances can be easily conducted in environments where there exist long-standing groups that operate in a setting requiring intergroup relationships. For example, a research team could sit in on a Democratic campaign team and observe the intergroup relationship between the Democrat campaign and the rival Republican campaign. By being in a setting in which meaningful identities are being developed, researches will be able to observe how subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAI} are created and develop over time. A researcher should note some specific questions of interest: When do subtle identity performances develop within a
group? Once developed, how are subtle identity performances utilized? Who within the group utilizes subtle identity performances as a tool? What is the intended purpose of the utilization of the subtle identity performance? Does the utilization of the subtle identity performance have the intended effect?

After understanding how subtle identity performances$^{DAI}$ are utilized within one’s own group, qualitative research should also examine if leaders ever utilize subtle identity performances to reach across the aisle (i.e. subtle identity performances$^{DAO}$). Important questions relating to subtle identity performances$^{DAO}$ that can be answered by qualitative research include: How do outgroup leaders determine the subtle identity performance they will use to appeal to a group that is not their own? Do subtle identity performances$^{DAO}$ have the intended effect on outgroup members or is their potential for this type of appeal to hurt the leader’s standing? What happens if the leader’s ingroup discovers that their leader has been subtly appealing to an opposing group?

The open-ended questions mentioned in the previous two paragraphs will benefit from being explored in a context in which 1) meaningful group identities are held, and 2) these identities can be explored over a long period of time. The topic lends itself well to a qualitative research approach and thus should be examined this way in the future. The potential for a robust theory to develop will be greatly enhanced as we begin to better understand the antecedents, mediators, and outcomes of subtle identity performances. This theory, then, could be extended to help make evidence-based suggestions to practitioners who seek to utilize subtle identity performances as a practical tool to gain support in intergroup settings.
4.4 Conclusion

This dissertation is the first set of studies to test how leaders can utilize subtle identity performances to gain support from an opposing group. Specifically, I investigated how the use of a subtle identity performances\textsuperscript{DAO} changes outgroup perceptions of leader trust and leader support, tested the mechanisms behind this relationship, determined if the authenticity of the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} impacted the tool’s efficacy, and finally, examined if the method in which the subtle identity performance\textsuperscript{DAO} was delivered impacted the perceptions of the leader. While the hypotheses in this dissertation were not supported, in my discussion of the null findings, I propose many areas to pursue for those seeking to further research in the area of subtle identity performances. I intend to continue my research in this area of subtle identity performances, and I hope to find evidence to support their use as a viable tool for leaders in intergroup scenarios.
Appendix A Measures for Study One – Survey 1

All measures were answered on a Likert-type scale unless otherwise noted, where:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree.

Demographics
1. I identify as:
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. My age is ___ (open ended)

3. My year in school is:
   a. 1st Year
   b. 2nd Year
   c. 3rd Year
   d. 4th Year
   e. 5th Year
   f. 6th Year or More

4. My ethnicity is __
   a. White
   b. Hispanic or Latino
   c. Black or African American
   d. Native American or American Indian
   e. Asian / Pacific Islander
   f. Other

My ID Number is: (Open Ended)

Group ID
1. I belong to:
   a. Group 1
   b. Group 2

Work Group Identity Salience
Statement adapted from Randel, 2002
1. If people asked me about this study, I initially think of describing myself in terms of my work group.
2. When I think of the people in this study, what comes to mind initially are the people in my work group, and then the other people not in my work group.
3. I think one’s work group is one of the most prominent characteristics of my peers in this study.
Work Group Identification

*Statements adapted from Henry, Arrow, and Carini, 1999*

1. I would prefer to be part of a different work group.
2. Members of this work group like one another
3. I enjoy interacting with this work group
4. I do not like many of the people in this work group
5. When thinking my work on this project, I see my work group membership as meaningful.
6. I see myself as quite different from other members of this work group.

MTS Identity Salience

*Statement adapted from Randel, 2002*

1. If someone asked me about the Healthy Choices organization, I initially would think of describing all members in Healthy Choices organization compared to my specific work group team.
2. When I think of the Healthy Choices organization, what comes to mind initially is the goals of the organization as a whole, rather than my work team goals.
3. I think of the smaller three-person, work group one belongs to in the Healthy Choices organization is one of the most prominent characteristics of my fellow co-workers in the Healthy Choices organization (R).

MTS Identification

*Statements adapted from Henry, Arrow, and Carini, 1999*

1. I would prefer to be part of a different organization.
2. Members of the Healthy Choices organization like one another.
3. I enjoy interacting with members of the Healthy Choices organization.
4. I do not like many of the people in the Healthy Choices organization.
5. When thinking my work on this project, I see my Healthy Choices organization membership as meaningful.
6. I see myself as quite different from other members of the Healthy Choices organization.
Appendix B

Measures for Study One – Survey 2

All measures were answered on a Likert-type scale, where:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree.

My ID Number is: (Open Ended)

Group ID
1. I belong to:
   a. Group 1
   b. Group 2

Leader Trust

Statements adapted from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990

1. I feel quite confident that my leader will always try to treat my work group fairly.
2. My leader would never try to gain an advantage by deceiving my work group.
3. I have complete faith in the integrity of my leader.
4. I feel a strong loyalty to my leader.
5. I trust that my leader will make the best decisions for all the followers in the Healthy Choices organization.
6. When making decisions, the leader will have the best interests of the whole Healthy Choices organization in mind.

Leader Support

Statements adapted from Duck & Fielding, 2003

Please rate how you feel about the leader on the following items.

1. Unhappy - Happy
2. Unsatisfied - Satisfied
3. Unconcerned - Concerned
4. Uncomfortable - Comfortable

Interactive Justice

Statements adapted from Moorman, 1991

1. The leader will be equally considerate and kind to all employees in the Healthy Choices organization.
2. The leader will deal with all employees in the Healthy Choices organization in a truthful manner.
3. The leader will provide explanation for his decisions.
4. The leader will treat members of my work group with respect.

**Procedural Justice**

*Statements adapted from Sweeny and McFarlin, 1997*

1. I believe the leader would be willing to reconsider my work group’s performance grade if we asked him or her to review it again.
2. I understand the performance appraisal system the leader is using to judge our project.
3. When decisions are made in this project, my work group usually loses out in the end.
4. I am not afraid to ‘blow the whistle’ on the other work group to the leader if I believe they are doing something wrong.
5. The procedures that will be used to evaluate my performance are fair and objective.
6. I am aware of what standards have been used to evaluate my performance.

**Distributive Justice**

*Statements from Sweeny and McFarlin, 1997*

1. The rewards that will be given to work groups will depend on how well a work group performs their job.
2. With the current leader, I believe rewards will be seldom related to actual performance.
3. The leader will likely evaluate my work group’s performance on things not related to the specific assignment for my work group.
4. The leader’s judgement of my work group’s performance will likely represent a fair and accurate picture of my work group’s actual performance.
5. I believe that my work group will be rewarded fairly by this leader.

**Authentic Appeal**

*Scales adapted from Gardner, 2003*

The leader’s appeal was:

1. Honest
2. Moral
3. Deceptive (reverse)
4. Trustworthy
5. Dishonest
6. Ethical
7. Manipulative (reverse)
Source credibility

Scale adapted from Wu and Shaffer, 1987

1. How knowledgeable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?
   a. (seven-point scale not knowledgeable to knowledgeable)
2. To what extent is the person who wrote this message an expert on the message topic?
   a. (seven-point scale not expert to expert)
3. How trustworthy is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?
   a. (seven-point not-trustworthy to trustworthy)
4. How reliable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?
   a. (seven-point not-reliable to reliable)

Argument Quality

Scale adapted from Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point incomplete to complete)
   b. (seven-point inconsistent to consistent)
   c. (seven-point inaccurate to accurate)

Usefulness of Information

Scale adapted from Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point worthless to valuable)
   b. (seven-point unininformative to informative)
   c. (seven-point unhelpful to helpful)

Liking of Leader

Statements adapted from Rubin, 1970

1. The leader seems unusually well-adjusted.
2. I would highly recommend the leader for a responsible job.
3. In my opinion, the leader appears to be an exceptionally mature person.
4. I have great confidence in the leader’s good judgement.
5. Most people would react very favorably to the leader after a brief acquaintance.
6. I think that the leader and I are quite similar to each other.
7. I would vote for the leader in a class or group election
8. I think that the leader is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
9. I feel that the leader is an extremely intelligent person.
10. The leader is very likeable.
11. It seems to me that it is very easy for the leader to gain admiration.
12. I would like this leader to be a TA for my class.

**Manipulation Checks**

*Created for this Study*

1. Did you notice the leader’s use of the word “actually” in the leadership plan? “?”
   (Yes/No Answer)
Appendix C

Measures for Study Two

All measures were answered on a Likert-type scale, where:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree.

Demographics

1. I identify as:
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. My age is ___ (open ended)

3. My year in school is:
   a. 1st Year
   b. 2nd Year
   c. 3rd Year
   d. 4th Year
   e. 5th Year
   f. 6th Year or More

4. My ethnicity is __
   a. White
   b. Hispanic or Latino
   c. Black or African American
   d. Native American or American Indian
   e. Asian / Pacific Islander
   f. Other

Leader Trust

Statements 1-5 adapted from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990

Statement 6 adapted from Adams & Satori, 2006

1. I feel quite confident that the leader will always try to treat Georgia Tech student volunteers fairly.
2. The leader would never try to gain an advantage by deceiving Georgia Tech student volunteers.
3. I have complete faith in the integrity of the leader.
4. I feel a strong loyalty to the leader.
5. I trust that the leader will make the best decisions for all his followers, regardless of what school they go attend.
6. When making decisions, the leader will have the best interests of all his followers in mind.
Leader Support

Statements adapted from Duck & Fielding, 2003

Please rate how you feel about the leader on the following items.

1. Unhappy - Happy
2. Unsatisfied - Satisfied
3. Unconcerned - Concerned
4. Uncomfortable - Comfortable

Work Group Identity Salience

Statement adapted from Randel, 2002

1. When people ask me about who I am, I initially think of describing myself in terms of the school I go to (e.g., I am a Georgia Tech student).
2. It is not intentional, but when I think of my friends, what comes to mind initially is the names of Georgia Tech students and then the names of non-Georgia Tech students (or the names of non-Georgia Tech students and then the names of Georgia Tech students).
3. Even though I don’t mean to, I think of the school one attends as one of the most prominent characteristics of my peers.

Work Group Identification

Statements adapted from Henry, Arrow, and Carini

1. I would prefer to go to another university that is not Georgia Tech.
2. Students of Georgia Tech like one another.
3. I enjoy interacting with students at Georgia Tech.
4. I do not like many of the people at Georgia Tech.
5. Being Georgia Tech Student is meaningful to me.
6. I see myself as quite different from other students at Georgia Tech.

Authenticity of Appeal

Scales adapted from Gardner, 2003

The leader’s appeal was:

1. Honest
2. Moral
3. Deceptive (reverse)
4. Trustworthy
5. Dishonest
6. Ethical
7. Manipulative (reverse)

Source Credibility

Scale adapted from Wu and Shaffer, 1987
Items (Competence-Based 1 & 2, Trustworthiness Based 3 & 4):

1. How knowledgeable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?
   a. (seven-point scale not knowledgeable to knowledgeable)
2. To what extent is the person who wrote this message an expert on the message topic?
   a. (seven-point scale not expert to expert)
3. How trustworthy is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?
   a. (seven-point not-trustworthy to trustworthy)
4. How reliable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message? 1
   a. (seven-point not-reliable to reliable)

**Argument Quality**

*Scale adapted from* Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point incomplete to complete)
   b. (seven-point inconsistent to consistent)
   c. (seven-point inaccurate to accurate)

**Usefulness of Information**

*Scale adapted from* Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point worthless to valuable)
   b. (seven-point uninformative to informative)
   c. (seven-point unhelpful to helpful)

**Information Adoption**

*Scale adapted from* Bailey and Pearson, 1983

1. Would you join this specific leader’s cause to promote the adoption of dogs?
   a. (seven-point unlikely to likely)
2. How motivated are you to join this specific leader’s cause to promote the adoption of dogs?
   a. (seven-point unmotivated to motivated)
3. To what extent do you agree with the action’s suggested in the leader’s message?
   a. (seven-point strongly disagree to strongly agree)
Involvement

*Scale adapted from* Stamm and Dube; 1994

**Items**

1. Imagine you are supporting this leader’s cause; how involved would you in the cause?
   a. (seven-point not a lot to a lot)
2. Imagine you are supporting this leader’s cause; how much would his appeal be on your mind in a typical day?
   a. (seven-point not a lot to a lot)

Liking of Leader

*Statements adapted from* Rubin, 1970

1. The leader seems unusually well-adjusted.
2. I would highly recommend the leader for a responsible job.
3. In my opinion, the leader appears to be an exceptionally mature person.
4. I have great confidence in the leader’s good judgement.
5. Most people would react very favorably to the leader after a brief acquaintance.
6. I think that the leader and I are quite similar to each other.
7. I would vote for the leader in a class or group election.
8. I think that the leader is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
9. I feel that the leader is an extremely intelligent person.
10. The leader is very likeable.
11. It seems to me that it is very easy for the leader to gain admiration.
12. I would like this leader to be a TA for my class.

Manipulation Checks

*Created for this Study*

1. What school did the leader in the video attend? (Open Ended Answer)
2. Did you notice the leader state “To Hell with Georgia” in his appeal? (Yes/No Answer)
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Measures for Study Three

All measures were answered on a Likert-type scale, where:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree.

Demographics

1. I identify as:
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. My age is ___ (open ended)

3. My year in school is:
   a. 1st Year
   b. 2nd Year
   c. 3rd Year
   d. 4th Year
   e. 5th Year
   f. 6th Year or More

4. My ethnicity is __
   a. White
   b. Hispanic or Latino
   c. Black or African American
   d. Native American or American Indian
   e. Asian / Pacific Islander
   f. Other

Leader Trust

Statements 1-5 adapted from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990

Statement 6 adapted from Adams & Satori, 2006

1. I feel quite confident that the leader will always try to treat Georgia Tech student volunteers fairly.
2. The leader would never try to gain an advantage by deceiving Georgia Tech student volunteers.
3. I have complete faith in the integrity of the leader.
4. I feel a strong loyalty to the leader.
5. I trust that the leader will make the best decisions for all his followers, regardless of what school they go attend.
6. When making decisions, the leader will have the best interests of all his followers in mind.
Leader Support

*Statements adapted from Duck & Fielding, 2003; \( \alpha = .89 \).*

Please rate how you feel about the leader on the following items.

1. Unhappy - Happy
2. Unsatisfied - Satisfied
3. Unconcerned - Concerned
4. Uncomfortable - Comfortable

Work Group Identity Salience

*Statement adapted from Randel, 2002*

1. When people ask me about who I am, I initially think of describing myself in terms of the school I go to (e.g., I am a Georgia Tech student).
2. It is not intentional, but when I think of my friends, what comes to mind initially is the names of Georgia Tech students and then the names of non-Georgia Tech students (or the names of non-Georgia Tech students and then the names of Georgia Tech students).
3. Even though I don’t mean to, I think of the school one attends as one of the most prominent characteristics of my peers.

Work Group Identification

*Statements adapted from Henry, Arrow, and Carini, 1999*

1. I would prefer to go to another university that is not Georgia Tech.
2. Students of Georgia Tech like one another.
3. I enjoy interacting with students at Georgia Tech.
4. I do not like many of the people at Georgia Tech.
5. Being Georgia Tech Student is meaningful to me.
6. I see myself as quite different from other students at Georgia Tech.

Source credibility

*Scale adapted from Wu and Shaffer, 1987*

Items (Competence-Based 1 & 2, Trustworthiness Based 1 & 2):

1. How knowledgeable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?  
   a. (seven-point scale not knowledgeable to knowledgeable)
2. To what extent is the person who wrote this message an expert on the message topic?  
   a. (seven-point scale not expert to expert)
3. How trustworthy is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message?  
   a. (seven-point not-trustworthy to trustworthy)
4. How reliable is the person who wrote this message, on the topic of the message? 1
   a. (seven-point not-reliable to reliable)

Involvement

*Scale adapted from* Stamm and Dube; 1994

**Items**

1. Imagine you are supporting this leader’s cause; how involved would you in the cause?
   a. (seven-point not a lot to a lot)
2. Imagine you are supporting this leader’s cause; how much would his appeal be on your mind in a typical day?
   a. (seven-point not a lot to a lot)

Argument Quality

*Scale adapted from* Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point incomplete to complete)
   b. (seven-point inconsistent to consistent)
   c. (seven-point inaccurate to accurate)

Usefulness of Information

*Scale adapted from* Bailey and Pearson, 1983

Please rate the content of the leader’s appeal on the following scales, as in

1. “The information in the leader’s appeal is …”
   a. (seven-point worthless to valuable)
   b. (seven-point uninformative to informative)
   c. (seven-point unhelpful to helpful)

Information Adoption

*Scale adapted from* Sussman and Seigel, 2003

1. Would you join this specific leader’s cause to promote the adoption of dogs?
   a. (seven-point unlikely to likely)
2. How motivated are you to join this specific leader’s cause to promote the adoption of dogs?
   a. (seven-point unmotivated to motivated)
3. To what extent do you agree with the action’s suggested in the leader’s message?
   a. (seven-point strongly disagree to strongly agree)
Liking of Leader

*Statements adapted from Rubin, 1970*

1. The leader seems unusually well-adjusted.
2. I would highly recommend the leader for a responsible job.
3. In my opinion, the leader appears to be an exceptionally mature person.
4. I have great confidence in the leader’s good judgement
5. Most people would react very favorably to the leader after a brief acquaintance.
6. I think that the leader and I are quite similar to each other.
7. I would vote for the leader in a class or group election
8. I think that the leader is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
9. I feel that the leader is an extremely intelligent person.
10. The leader is very likeable.
11. It seems to me that it is very easy for the leader to gain admiration.
12. I would like this leader to be a TA for my class.

Manipulation Checks

*Created for this Study*

1. What school did the leader in the video attend? (Open Ended Answer)
2. Did you notice the leader state “To Hell with Georgia” in his appeal?
3. Did you notice the sad dog wearing a University of Georgia shirt?
4. The subtle appeal to Georgia Tech students over UGA students was distinct from the rest of the leader’s appeal.
5. The subtle appeal to Georgia Tech students over UGA students was clear; it was not easy to miss.
Appendix E
Study 1 – Researcher Script

Hi, are you here for the study Teamwork in Organizations? Great, welcome to the study. Please sign in and write your name down on a slip of paper. Then, place the paper into this container. At a later point in the study, we will draw from this container to determine who will be leader of our mock organization. For now, after you sign in, you can have a seat in the back room.

[Repeat for all participants, including the confederate, then enter back room]

Hi, again, everyone. Thank you all for agreeing to be part of the Teamwork in Organizations study. Today, we are going to set up a mock organization that will consist of two teams and complete a few tasks together. Does anyone have any general questions before we begin?

Great, the first thing we will do is split you into your two teams. I am going to read off the names of the people placed into Group 1 and ask that you move your stuff to sit together on this side of the room.

[Gesture to one side of the room and read off names of Group 1]

The remaining people are part of Group 2 and can sit over here.

[Gesture to other side of the room]

Although you are in separate groups, it is important that I emphasize you will be working together for the same overarching organization titled “Work Smart”. The organization’s goal is to promote mental health and wellness in college students, and you will see, later, that this is what most tasks you complete will be about. During your time here, you will also take a few surveys about your experience. Any questions, thus far?

Okay, I am now going to explain the first task. This task is actually a team building activity. It is meant to be fun and help you get to know each other before we start the real activities. Each group will be assigned a code word. The code words are in your independent rooms, which I will direct you to shortly. You will have seven (7) minutes to make up as many sentences as you can using your code word. For example, if my code word was “disgusting”, I could write a sentence like “It is disgusting when people pick their nose.” In your independent room, along with your code word, you will find paper and a pencil. Make sure that one person is writing down all the sentences that you create. Finally, and this is important, you should not tell the other group your code word. Thus, only members of your group must know the word. Does everyone understand? Okay, I will direct you to your rooms and we can begin the team building activity.

[Direct each group to appropriate room and set timer for 7 minutes. When 7 minutes are finished, gather both groups into the common area, making sure the groups sit separately from one and other, as they were before they left to do the task.]
Alright, hopefully that team building activity helped you feel a little more comfortable with your teammates and was a little fun. Now that you have been talking, I want to introduce the two main tasks we will do today. However, before we do this, we must choose a leader for our organization. The leader will have a different set of responsibilities, which I will explain, mostly related to coordinating and making sure the groups work together effectively. To choose the leader, can someone volunteer to pick a name out of this container and read it out loud?

[Make sure the container has been swapped with the original container and that the current container only contains the confederates name on each slip of paper; thus, the confederate’s name will be read aloud as the person chosen to be the leader.]

Great, so who is (confederate’s name)? Awesome, are you willing to act as leader for the rest of this experiment? [Confederate answers, “Yes.”]

Okay, then please come sit up here with me. I will now explain what each group, and the leader will be doing for the remaining two tasks. As I mentioned, the goal of this organization is to promote healthy lifestyles for college students. Thus, the ultimate product of your two tasks will be to produce a stress-reduction campaign for college students. As I already mentioned, the design of the campaign will be completed in two parts – Task A and Task B. In the first part, Task A, Group 1 and Group 2 will separately create a campaign proposal draft. You will find the instructions and supplies in your room and you are to outline your proposal on a sheet of paper. This is a very open-ended assignment; however, your campaign can include graphics, resources, and other tools to support mental health awareness. You will have fifteen (15) minutes to work on this draft. During this time the leader [look to the leader], will be researching effective leadership strategies so that you can be a better leader in the final task, Task B. You will be doing this research on the computer provided.

Okay, before you go back to your independent rooms to start Task A, there is one last thing you should know and you should know (looking at the leader). The leader will be responsible for evaluating your campaign proposal drafts once you finish and then choosing which proposal is better[Ask for cheers]. However, just like in any organization, there will be rewards for good collaboration as well. For Task B, both work groups will come together to complete a final campaign draft, and all participants will have a chance to be recognized as the best MTS out of all the sessions we run. Does anyone have any final questions before we break into groups again? . . . Good. When you get into your rooms, you will find the instructions for this task written out so that you can refer back to them if you have any questions.

[Break into groups, start timer for fifteen (15) minutes. At the end of the fifteen (15) minutes, the leader comes in and collects the work from each of the two groups.]

Leader to Group 2 when collecting their work: Hi guys, the researcher told me to come in here and collect your work. Oh wait -- was your code word “actually”?! Ha, that is funny. Our code word was “ironically.” I bet you all were able to make
better sentences. Oh, I think I was not supposed to know your word but, oh well, it can be our secret. [Collects work from Group 2.]

Leader to Group 1: Hi guys, the researcher told me to come in here and collect your work. [Collects work from Group 1.] Thanks.

[Researcher talks to leader in hallway explaining next task. The others remain in their separate rooms, waiting.]

[Researcher enters Group 1’s room and then Group 2’s room and explains the following to each, separately.]

Hi guys, I just told the leader but wanted to tell you, too, that before he (she) judges your work, he (she) has been instructed to draft a leadership plan based on the research he (she) completed while you were working on Task A. He (she) has ten (10) minutes to do this, and the goal is that this plan will help you all complete Task B. The leader is writing the plan up on a Google Doc, and when the 10 minutes are up, I am going to ask both groups to read the plan so that everyone is on the same page. Does anyone have any questions about where we are at now? Great! So we are not wasting time, while the leader is working, I will ask that you all to fill out this short survey. Please do so independently and just raise your hand if you have any questions.

[After the 10 minutes are up, researcher joins Group 1 and then Group 2 and opens up the Google Doc with the leadership plan.]

Okay, did everyone finish their surveys? No problems? Awesome. Well, here is the leader’s leadership plan. Right now, the leader is working on judging your campaign draft proposals to see which group will be the winner and get the extra credit. While he (she) is doing that, I ask that everyone read his (her) plan to yourselves quietly and then, again, I have another survey for you to complete. It is important, again, that I emphasize that I would like you to do this part individually, therefore, read the plan and fill out the survey on your own. After everyone finishes, we will meet back in the common room to complete Task B, the final task in our organization. Any questions?

[All participants all called in to enter the common room and debriefing begins.]

I know everyone is expecting to find out who the leader chose as the winner and also to start Task B, however I have to admit to you there was some deception in this study. Now, you might be wondering what is going on and what is the purpose of this study? The first deception we must acknowledge is that the leader was a confederate and the leadership plan was pre-drafted. In fact, the purpose of this study was to assess how you would evaluate the leader based on the leadership plan presented to you. There are two conditions in this study, in one condition, the leader simply has a “normal” leadership plan, however in the other condition, the leader’s leadership plan includes Group 2’s code word 5 times.

[Present the two scripts on a slide for participants to see with the Group 2’s code word “actually” highlighted 5 times.] What we are testing to see is if this “subtle identity performance directed at the leader’s outgroup” will increase positive perceptions of the
leader for outgroup members, without harming ingroup member’s feelings towards their leader. Does anyone have any questions about anything that happened in this study?
Appendix F
Study 1 – Leadership Plan with Subtle Identity Performance^{DAO}

The researcher told me to look up leadership strategies that are actually used in real life. I found a few. One thing I learned is that although we are supposed to be an organization made up of two small groups, when we work together, we should actually try to think of ourselves as one large team. The research I looked at said that there are actually differences in results depending on how one views themselves in an organization (either as a group member or part of a larger collective). After this, I am going to try to not get involved in group discussions. Instead, I will actually just be there to help if needed. Lastly, I learned that the best leaders are good communicators. And communicating involves not only speaking but also actually listening to the person talking to you. So, I will try to listen and only then put in my opinions.
Appendix G
Study 1 – Leadership Plan without Subtle Identity Performance

The researcher told me to look up leadership strategies that are used in real life. I found a few. One thing I learned is that although we are supposed to be an organization made up of two small groups, when we work together, we should try to think of ourselves as one large team. The research I looked at said that there are differences in results depending on how one views themselves in an organization (either as a group member or part of a larger collective). After this, I am going to try to not get involved in group discussions. Instead, I will just be there to help if needed. Lastly, I learned that the best leaders are good communicators. And communicating involves not only speaking but also listening to the person talking to you. So, I will try to listen and only then put in my opinions.
Appendix H
Study 2 – Researcher Script

[Hand out a piece of yellow paper to each student in the class.]

Hi Class! Thank you for allowing me to have a few minutes of your time. I am working on a couple of projects for my psychology lab and could use your thoughts on two separate topics. The first topic is about Georgia Tech. For this activity, I am going to put on a short video about Georgia Tech, and I ask that you all watch. After the video, you will each complete a short writing assignment.

[Play on Georgia Tech video]

[After video ends]

Alright, now, I ask that everyone take the yellow paper that was handed out to each of you and right down what it means to you to be a Georgia Tech student. This can be in paragraph form, you can do lists, whatever you like! As long as you are writing continuously. I am going to ask that you do this for three minutes. Any questions?

[After three minutes end, stops the writing and collects the yellow paper responses.]

Okay, thanks for helping me with these thoughts on what means to be a member of your institution.

The second topic is about a service project; I would like to share some information on behalf of a student at Georgia State University (emphasize outgroup status with tone). He is starting a campaign to increase the adoption of pets from local shelters rather than the purchase of pets from pet stores. We are conducting a survey to see how likely he would be to receive support from students at other institutions. I am going to put on the video. I ask that you watch this video very carefully because, afterwards, I will ask you to fill out a survey regarding your impressions of the student leader, and your willingness to support him, among other things. Does anyone have any questions?

[Play Outgroup Leader Video Here - the text for each condition of the video is at the end of the script]

Alright, finally, I would like you to take a short survey, as I mentioned before. You will need your computers, the link to the survey is written on the board. Please do not talk to anyone while completing this survey and, when you finish, you can close your computer.

[When all students are done, debrief students.]
Hi Class! My name is ___, and I am a student at Georgia State University. I am working on a program to help promote the adoption of companion animals – like cats, dogs, and even hamsters -- rather than the buying of a pet companion from a pet store. Let me explain to you why I am promoting this cause. Pet store animals are sold for profit, and the animals produced for pet stores are often mass produced in animal-mills that ignore an animal’s basic needs. These mills do this to cut costs. Essentially, the market for buying pets is much like any other cooperation, the bottom line is profit.

Alternatively, one could choose to adopt a pet from a local adoption shelter. In these shelters, you will find animals that are unwanted, stray, or even abandoned by previous owners. Unlike pet stores, while in the shelter’s care, animals are generally well cared for. They provide every animal with his or her basic needs, like food or water, as well as any veterinarian care an animal may require. While the goal of pet stores is to make a profit, the goal of an animal shelter is to find an animal who has often had a hard life a loving home.

So, I am reaching out to ask you for help. We need students who can help us grow and promote this program. My program is just starting. However, if we can build a sustainable base of supporters and find creative ways to reach out to new audiences – like maybe posting flyers around campuses that highlight local shelters, I feel this project could grow to be very successful.

Before I go, I want to explain to you why this cause is so important to me on a personal level. I learned about the cruel treatment of animals in breeding shelters and started to think about how the animals cannot advocate for themselves. Essentially, only we have the power to decide the quality of these animals’ lives. After realizing this, I have personally adopted a dog – Baily, and I regularly volunteer at the local animal shelter in my neighborhood. This is something that is extremely close to my heart, and I hope that you can see that through this appeal. Based on the information I provided, I really hope you support this effort. (Fill in text here based on condition. See below.) Thank you for listening.

**Authentic** – “I have learned that there are some laws in Georgia that make the adoption process difficult, but to hell with Georgia, let's adopt these dogs!”

**Control** – “”

**Inauthentic** - “I have learned that there are some laws in Georgia that make the adoption process difficult, but THWg – wait, [looks down at notes] to hell with [stumbles] Georgia, lets adopt these dogs [less enthusiastic].”
Appendix J
Study 3 – Researcher Script

[Hand out a piece of yellow paper to each student in the class.]

Hi Class! Thank you for allowing me to have a few minutes of your time. I am working on a couple of projects for my psychology lab and could use your thoughts on two separate topics. The first topic is about Georgia Tech. For this activity, I am going to put on a short video about Georgia Tech, and I ask that you all watch. After the video, you will each complete a short writing assignment.

[Play on Georgia Tech video]

[After video ends]

Alright, now, I ask that everyone take the yellow paper that was handed out to each of you and right down what it means to you to be a Georgia Tech student. This can be in paragraph form, you can do lists, whatever you like! As long as you are writing continuously. I am going to ask that you do this for three minutes. Any questions?

[After three minutes end, stops the writing and collects the yellow paper responses.]

Okay, thanks for helping me with these thoughts on what means to be a member of your institution.

The second topic is about a service project; I would like to share some information on behalf of a student at Georgia State University (emphasize outgroup status with tone). He is starting a campaign to increase the adoption of pets from local shelters rather than the purchase of pets from pet stores. We are conducting a survey to see how likely he would be to receive support from students at other institutions. I am going to put on the video. I ask that you watch this video very carefully because, afterwards, I will ask you to fill out a survey regarding your impressions of the student leader, and your willingness to support him, among other things. Does anyone have any questions?

[Play Outgroup Leader Video Here - the text for each condition of the video is at the end of the script]

Alright, finally, I would like you to take a short survey, as I mentioned before. You will need your computers, the link to the survey is written on the board. Please do not talk to anyone while completing this survey and, when you finish, you can close your computer.

[When all students are done, debrief students.]
Appendix K
Video Script/Slide for Written Condition

Hi Class! My name is Corey, and I am a student at Georgia State University. I am working on a program to help promote the adoption of companion animals – like cats, dogs, and even hamsters -- rather than the buying of a pet companion from a pet store. Let me explain to you why I am promoting this cause. Pet store animals are sold for profit, and the animals produced for pet stores are often mass produced in animal-mills that ignore an animal’s basic needs. These mills do this to cut costs. Essentially, the market for buying pets is much like any other cooperation, the bottom line is profit.

Alternatively, one could choose to adopt a pet from a local adoption shelter. In these shelters, you will find animals that are unwanted, stray, or even abandoned by previous owners. Unlike pet stores, while in the shelter’s care, animals are generally well cared for. They provide every animal with his or her basic needs, like food or water, as well as any veterinarian care an animal may require. While the goal of pet stores is to make a profit, the goal of an animal shelter is to find an animal who has often had a hard life a loving home.

So, I am reaching out to ask you for help. We need students who can help us grow and promote this program. My program is just starting. However, if we can build a sustainable base of supporters and find creative ways to reach out to new audiences – like maybe posting flyers around campuses that highlight local shelters, I feel this project could grow to be very successful.

Before I go, I want to explain to you why this cause is so important to me on a personal level. I learned about the cruel treatment of animals in breeding shelters and started to think about how the animals cannot advocate for themselves. Essentially, only we have the power to decide the quality of these animals’ lives. After realizing this, I have personally adopted three dogs – Baily, Boxer, and Riley, and I regularly volunteer at the local animal shelter in my neighborhood. This is something that is extremely close to my heart, and I hope that you can see that through this appeal. Based on the information I provided, I really hope you support this effort. Thank you for listening.
Hi Class! My name is Corey, and I am a student at Georgia State University. I am working on a program to help promote the adoption of companion animals – like cats, dogs, and even hamsters -- rather than the buying of a pet companion from a pet store. Let me explain to you why I am promoting this cause. Pet store animals are sold for profit, and the animals produced for pet stores are often mass produced in animal-mills that ignore an animal’s basic needs. These mills do this to cut costs. Essentially, the market for buying pets is much like any other cooperation, the bottom line is profit.

Alternatively, one could choose to adopt a pet from a local adoption shelter. In these shelters, you will find animals that are unwanted, stray, or even abandoned by previous owners. Unlike pet stores, while in the shelter’s care, animals are generally well cared for. They provide every animal with his or her basic needs, like food or water, as well as any veterinarian care an animal may require. While the goal of pet stores is to make a profit, the goal of an animal shelter is to find an animal who has often had a hard life a loving home.

So, I am reaching out to ask you for help. We need students who can help us grow and promote this program. My program is just starting. However, if we can build a sustainable base of supporters and find creative ways to reach out to new audiences – like maybe posting flyers around campuses that highlight local shelters, I feel this project could grow to be very successful.

Before I go, I want to explain to you why this cause is so important to me on a personal level. I learned about the cruel treatment of animals in breeding shelters and started to think about how the animals cannot advocate for themselves. Essentially, only we have the power to decide the quality of these animals’ lives. After realizing this, I have personally adopted three dogs – Baily, Boxer, and Riley, and I regularly volunteer at the local animal shelter in my neighborhood. This is something that is extremely close to my heart, and I hope that you can see that through this appeal. Based on the information I provided, I really hope you support this effort. I have learned that there are some laws in Georgia that make the adoption process difficult, but to hell with Georgia, lets adopt these dogs! Thank you for listening.
Appendix K (Cont.)
Video Script/Slide for Verbal Condition

Hi Class! My name is Corey, and I am a student at Georgia State University. I am working on a program to help promote the adoption of companion animals – like cats, dogs, and even hamsters -- rather than the buying of a pet companion from a pet store. Let me explain to you why I am promoting this cause. Pet store animals are sold for profit, and the animals produced for pet stores are often mass produced in animal-mills that ignore an animal’s basic needs. These mills do this to cut costs. Essentially, the market for buying pets is much like any other cooperation, the bottom line is profit.

Alternatively, one could choose to adopt a pet from a local adoption shelter. In these shelters, you will find animals that are unwanted, stray, or even abandoned by previous owners. Unlike pet stores, while in the shelter’s care, animals are generally well cared for. They provide every animal with his or her basic needs, like food or water, as well as any veterinarian care an animal may require. While the goal of pet stores is to make a profit, the goal of an animal shelter is to find an animal who has often had a hard life a loving home.

So, I am reaching out to ask you for help. We need students who can help us grow and promote this program. My program is just starting. However, if we can build a sustainable base of supporters and find creative ways to reach out to new audiences – like maybe posting flyers around campuses that highlight local shelters, I feel this project could grow to be very successful.

Before I go, I want to explain to you why this cause is so important to me on a personal level. I learned about the cruel treatment of animals in breeding shelters and started to think about how the animals cannot advocate for themselves. Essentially, only we have the power to decide the quality of these animals’ lives. After realizing this, I have personally adopted three dogs – Baily, Boxer, and Riley, and I regularly volunteer at the local animal shelter in my neighborhood. This is something that is extremely close to my heart, and I hope that you can see that through this appeal. Based on the information I provided, I really hope you support this effort. Thank you for listening.

---

**Adopt Don’t Shop**

- Some laws in Georgia make the adoption process difficult, but let’s work around it and adopt these dogs!

  ![Sad Dog](image1.png)

  ![After Adoption](image2.png)

  ![Happy Dog](image3.png)
Hi Class! My name is Corey, and I am a student at Georgia State University. I am working on a program to help promote the adoption of companion animals – like cats, dogs, and even hamsters -- rather than the buying of a pet companion from a pet store. Let me explain to you why I am promoting this cause. Pet store animals are sold for profit, and the animals produced for pet stores are often mass produced in animal-mills that ignore an animal’s basic needs. These mills do this to cut costs. Essentially, the market for buying pets is much like any other cooperation, the bottom line is profit.

Alternatively, one could choose to adopt a pet from a local adoption shelter. In these shelters, you will find animals that are unwanted, stray, or even abandoned by previous owners. Unlike pet stores, while in the shelter’s care, animals are generally well cared for. They provide every animal with his or her basic needs, like food or water, as well as any veterinarian care an animal may require. While the goal of pet stores is to make a profit, the goal of an animal shelter is to find an animal who has often had a hard life a loving home.

So, I am reaching out to ask you for help. We need students who can help us grow and promote this program. My program is just starting. However, if we can build a sustainable base of supporters and find creative ways to reach out to new audiences – like maybe posting flyers around campuses that highlight local shelters, I feel this project could grow to be very successful.

Before I go, I want to explain to you why this cause is so important to me on a personal level. I learned about the cruel treatment of animals in breeding shelters and started to think about how the animals cannot advocate for themselves. Essentially, only we have the power to decide the quality of these animals’ lives. After realizing this, I have personally adopted three dogs – Baily, Boxer, and Riley, and I regularly volunteer at the local animal shelter in my neighborhood. This is something that is extremely close to my heart, and I hope that you can see that through this appeal. Based on the information I provided, I really hope you support this effort. Thank you for listening.
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