CHAPTER 6

HOW AND WHEN LEADER BEHAVIOR AFFECTS INTERGROUP LIKING: AFFECT, APPROVAL, AND ALLOPHILIA

Todd L. Pittinsky, R. Matthew Montoya, Linda R. Tropp and Anna Chen

ABSTRACT

We report on research that investigated the emotional mediation of leader behavior on observers' affinity for the members of a leader's group. Participants (N=181) read a vignette describing the positive, negative, or neutral behaviors of a national leader, and the approval or disapproval of that leader's followers for that behavior. Results revealed that liking (i.e., alophilia) for the leader's followers decreased when the group leader behaved negatively and group members expressed approval for their leader. These changes in alophilia were mediated by the amount of anger experienced by the participant. Implications of these findings for future work on leadership and intergroup relations are discussed.

Relations between groups are often characterized by conflict. Indeed, intergroup conflict is ubiquitous. Examples of large-scale intergroup
conflict can be seen in the ethnic cleansing or genocide that occurred in the former Yugoslavia between 1991 and 2001 and more recently in the Darfur region of western Sudan. Intergroup conflict is a common, almost endemic feature of social organization (Brewer, 1999; Sumner, 1906). Integral to the understanding of intergroup conflict are intergroup attitudes — how members of one group evaluate the members of another group.

Negative intergroup attitudes inhibit cooperation and often stoke intergroup conflict (Allport, 1954/1979). The degree to which members of one group dislike the members of another group can quickly become both cause and consequence of intergroup conflict, creating a downward, self-reinforcing cycle (for a discussion, see Brewer, 1999; Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner, 2005; Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998). Although intergroup attitudes can range from dislike to neutrality to affinity, the typical approach of social scientists is to study intergroup liking as shades of dislike, i.e., prejudice. A complementary approach is the emphasis and examination of shades of liking — positive attitudes beyond neutrality, i.e., allophilia (Pittinsky, 2005).

**ALLOPHILIA IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS**

Allport (1954/1979, p. 25) observed early on that although much attention is paid to negative stereotypes and negative prejudice, scant attention is paid to positive stereotypes and positive prejudices. When researchers do study intergroup affinity, they all too often use standard measures of prejudice, which measure factors of dislike and report on changes in relative degrees of intergroup dislike. Alternatively, allophilia is a global measure of intergroup liking that taps cognitive, affective, and behavioral evaluations. Allophilia is conceptually and empirically distinct from the constructs used by prominent models of intergroup relations and has distinct predictive ability vis-à-vis prejudice measures for positive intergroup behaviors (Pittinsky, Rosenthal, & Montoya, 2007).

Allophilia is also distinct from one of the few positive-prejudice constructs discussed in the literature: ambivalent sexism, or sexism comprised of both benevolent sexism and hostile sexism (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996). Ambivalent sexism is a particular form of an ambivalent attitude (Hass, Katz, & Rizzo, 1991; Petty, Fleming, & Priester. 2001; Priester & Petty, 1996) that refers to the “set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles but are subjectively positive in feeling tone (for the perceiver)” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491). Allophilia differs from benevolent sexism in two principal
ways. First, alophilia measures global positive feelings toward members of a racial, ethnic, or national identity group. Benevolent sexism, in contrast, is restricted to the measurement of women. Second, alophilia – but not benevolent sexism – measures attitudes that both an observer and the individual holding the attitude are likely to agree are positive. Ambivalent sexism expects variability on the degree of agreement or disagreement between the actor and the target (or the actor and an observer) on whether or not the gender attitude is positive. An example illustrates the difference. A male coworker might feel and even remark to a female coworker that he finds her “cute”: an oft-cited example of benevolent sexism. The actor may experience that attitude and act as positive. It is not, however, likely to be experienced as benevolent or positive by many targets (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Recognizing that affinity between groups can be distinct from the absence of dislike, and that liking is deserving of study, an important question emerges: what influences whether members of one group like the members of another group? Research on antecedents of intergroup attitudes has focused on social categorization (e.g., Brewer, 1979; Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Kramer & Brewer, 1984; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Tajfel, 1982; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), the salience of group membership (Brewer & Gaertner, 2001; Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999), group competitiveness (Kelley & Stahelski, 1970; Rabbie & Bekkers, 1978), and intergroup contact (Allport, 1954/1979; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), among others.

Although scholars have considered these and other causes of intergroup attitudes, the popular media provide suggestive evidence of another possible determinant of intergroup attitudes: leader behavior. The argument usually suggests that the actions of a leader directly impact how his or her followers are regarded. Media accounts of the presidency of George W. Bush, for example, suggest that popular opinion of the American people rests heavily on actions taken by the American government: “The American people will be held directly responsible for accelerating global instability and jeopardizing the security of Americans and the world for generations if Bush is elected” (Young, 2004); “... (T)here is undeniably a rise in enmity toward the American government – and maybe, by association, the American people – across the world” (Kennard, 2005); “The fact of the matter is that people hate America and Americans because of the nature and modus operandi of America’s foreign policy” (Nantambu, 2003). These examples stress that the actions of a leader – to one degree or another – may influence how his or her followers are perceived. Thus, though not typically
studied by intergroup relations researchers, the behaviors of group leaders are a possible determinant of intergroup attitudes.

LEADER BEHAVIOR AND INTERGROUP ATTITUDES

The media examples cited above illustrate that there are contrasting views on whether leader behaviors affect intergroup attitudes. Although a growing body of research has investigated leadership in the context of intragroup processes (see Hogg, 2001; Reicher, Haslam, & Hopkins, 2005), researchers have not, to our knowledge, directly tested the relationship between leader behavior and intergroup attitudes. The media examples cited above are also noteworthy for a second reason: they point out that observers often have emotional responses to leader behaviors. Research and theory on emotions suggest that the experience of emotions in response to leader behaviors may influence changes in intergroup attitudes, which would then only perpetuate the influence of a leader’s behavior on intergroup attitudes.

*Anger in Intergroup Evaluations*

Emotions can be especially strong predictors of a group’s evaluations of another group (e.g., Bodenhausen & Moreno, 2000; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Maio, Esses, & Bell, 1994; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991; Wilder & Simon, 2001). More specifically, anger is a particularly potent intergroup emotion, as it can be easily provoked in intergroup contexts (Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004; Mackie & Smith, 1998; Bodenhausen, 1993) and has been shown to mediate intergroup hostilities (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Wilder & Simon, 2001).

Our work examines whether a leader’s behavior can change the level of anger experienced by observers, and in turn influence observers’ attitudes toward the leader’s followers. Research has demonstrated that, in general, aversive stimuli will generate anger (Berkowitz, 1990), and how we appraise events is key to how we feel about them (Arnold, 1960; de Rivera, 1977; Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1984; Weiner, 1982). Anger results from an appraisal that one’s group may be harmed (Smith, 1993, 1999). An anger response to the threat or occurrence of harm may not be restricted to the cases common to appraisal theories of emotions – cases in which emotions follow events that are personal or self-relevant (Frijda, 1986; Roseman, 1984; Scherer, 1988; Smith & Ellsworth, 1985), or are generated by collective aspects of the
Table 1. Predictions of Anger Response in Bystanders by Group Leader Behavior and Group Members’ Approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follower Approval</th>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Highest anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>High anger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self (as in Intergroup Emotion Theory; Mackie et al., 2000). Extending past work leads to the prediction that observing a leader who is harming other groups may trigger an anger response in observers. More generally, real, threatened, or even observed pain (via empathy) can amplify the perception of injustice, which can also stoke anger (Harter & Whitesell, 1989; Fischer, Shaver, & Carnochan, 1988).

Research and theory predict that negative leader behaviors perceived to be unjust are particularly likely to stoke anger in observers. Perceived injustice plays a critical role in the elicitation of negative emotions (Mikula, Scherer, & Athenstaedt, 1998). Mikula and colleagues found that injustice was important for several negative emotions, especially anger (also see Clayton, 1992; Sprecher, 1992). In a study of consumers’ reactions to service failures, for example, emotions were first triggered by the failure of service but subsequent assessments of the justice or injustice of the failure were associated with more anger (McColl-Kennedy, Daus, & Sparks, 2003). In another study linking negative emotions to perceptions of injustice, anger-producing events were found to be those that were also perceived as unfair (Mikula et al., 1998).

**Follower Support**

Whereas the experience of anger may mediate leader behavior effects on intergroup attitudes, there may be boundary conditions to the general effect. Follower support for a leader’s negative behaviors is one likely moderator in the relationship among leader behavior, anger responses in observers, and changes in attitudes for the leader’s followers. Table 1 illustrates the potential relationship between leader behavior and follower support.

Responses of anger may be stronger when followers approve of their leader’s negative behaviors. This may be in part because the injustice may be perceived to be greater and, as a result, associated with a greater anger response. Because both the leader and the followers—who might have the
ability to stop the leader (or at least express their outrage to the government) - support the negative action, the experience of injustice should increase. Moreover, past research has shown that the perception of injustice is greatest when harm is caused, but ownership for the harm is not made (Miller, 2001). In instances in which group members approve of the negative act of a leader, ownership for that act is more diffuse and as a result, anger should increase. Alternatively, a group disapproving of a leader’s negative behavior provides an observer with greater validation that the negative act was, in fact, wrong. For these reasons, it is hypothesized that follower support will moderate the influence of leader behavior on intergroup attitudes.

A study was designed to examine whether leader behavior would affect attitudes toward the leader’s followers, the possible role of anger as a mediator of these effects, and whether or not follower support moderates the effects.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The central question of the research is whether emotions mediate the effects that leader’s behaviors have on observers’ attitudes for the members of the leader’s group (the followers). We conducted research to test a model in which a group leader’s behaviors (positive, negative, or neutral) interact with group members’ approval (approval or disapproval) to influence allophilia (i.e., intergroup affinity). We hypothesized that anger should mediate the relationship, and explain the increase or decrease in allophilia.

Although the goal of the research was to examine possible affective mediation of leader behavior effects on allophilia, several intergroup factors might also explain the hypothesized effects. For example, the prototypicality of the country might mediate the hypothesized effects (Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003; Hains, Hogg, & Duck, 1997; Hogg, Cooper-Shaw, & Holzworth, 1993; Hogg & Hardie, 1992). Prototypicality is derived from self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987), and refers to the degree to which a particular case illustrates the typical qualities of a group. Country prototypicality refers to the degree to which the country from which the target leader and his or followers come is representative of the countries of the United Nations. A second intergroup factor that might mediate a leader’s behavior effects on intergroup attitudes is entitativity (e.g., Campbell, 1958; Gaertner & Schopler, 1998). Entitativity refers to the extent to which a group is perceived to be a bounded whole rather than a
loosely associated aggregate (Yzerbyt & Rogier, 2001), that is, the extent to which the members of a group are perceived to have the quality of a unit (Gaertner & Schopler, 1998; Welbourne, 1999). A third intergroup factor that might mediate a leader behavior’s influence on intergroup attitudes is group homogeneity, i.e., how similar to each other group members are perceived to be. Although our research focused on collecting evidence for affect-based mediation of intergroup attitudes, our method allowed us to examine whether our data suggested potential concurrent, or alternative, mediation by these intergroup factors.

METHOD

Participants

One hundred and sixty-eight participants were recruited. Participants were United States residents between the ages of 18 and 64 years ($M = 37.81$). The gender breakdown of the sample was 47.6% male and 52.4% female. The majority of participants were United States citizens (94.2%). Prospective participants were recruited through e-mail advertisements that they had signed up to receive through an online survey sampling service. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the six conditions of a 3 (leader behavior: negative vs. neutral vs. positive) $\times$ 2 (follower response: approval vs. disapproval) between-subjects factorial design.

Procedure

Participants completed the survey online, completing the intergroup affinity questionnaire first (see section “Measures”). Next, participants read a vignette about a possible negative world event in the future, the French leader’s response to the event, and the reactions of the French people to their leader’s behavior. All participants learned of the event, by reading this passage:

In the last month, severe earthquakes devastated areas of Southern Asia. Even three weeks after the major quakes, mudslides and aftershocks have kept many communities out of reach of emergency personnel. Current estimates number the victims of this disaster between 250,000 and 300,000. In leading financial relief efforts, international humanitarian organizations have been seeking aid from all sources.
The study’s two independent variables – group leader behavior and group members’ approval – were manipulated in the event. For the leader behavior variable, the French leader was described as providing assistance (positive), refusing assistance (negative), or preparing to make a decision for the victims of the natural disaster (neutral). For half of the participants the leader described was male, and for half of the participants the leader described was female. In the positive leader behavior condition, participants read:

In response to the pressing nature of this need, the French Prime Minister spoke ardently and voted in support of a U.N. resolution to create an earthquake fund. Moreover, he (she) proposed an initiative to substantially increase government spending on international humanitarian aid. These decisions were based on the Prime Minister’s belief that countries should find a way to care for each other and help each other become independent.

In the negative leader behavior condition, participants read:

In spite of the pressing nature of this need, the French Prime Minister spoke out and voted against a U.N. resolution to create an earthquake fund. Moreover, he (she) proposed an initiative to cut government spending on international humanitarian aid. These decisions were based on the Prime Minister’s belief that international aid organizations are corrupt, and that countries should learn to care for themselves and not be dependent on other countries.

In the neutral leader behavior condition, participants read:

Similar in response to other world leaders, the French Prime Minister proposed to look into the situation. A decision on how to respond to the disaster in Southern Asia would be made within the week.

The final passage participants read was a description of the degree of group members’ approval for their leader’s behavior: approval or disapproval. Participants in the group member approval condition read:

The French people responded overwhelmingly positively to the news, some even flooding the streets in praise of the Prime Minister. Public opinion polls administered in France shortly after the announcement revealed that roughly 75% of the French people supported the Prime Minister and his (her) statement. Interviews with French citizens as well as government officials confirmed that there had been a general consensus of approval of their leader.

Participants in the group member disapproval conditions read:

The French people were outraged when they heard the news, some even mobbing the streets in overwhelming opposition to the Prime Minister. Public opinion polls administered in France shortly after the announcement revealed that roughly 75% of
the French people opposed the Prime Minister and his (her) statement. Interviews with French citizens as well as government officials confirmed that there had been a general consensus of opposition to their leader.

After reading the vignette, we first collected information regarding the participants' affective state; second, participants completed the Allophilia Scale to assess intergroup liking. Next, we asked the participants two manipulation check questions. The first assessed the nature of the French leader's impact on the victims of the natural disaster, and the second assessed the extent to which the French people approved or disapproved of their leader's behavior. After completing the manipulation check questions, participants were then debriefed.

Measures

Allophilia
Intergroup affinity was assessed using the affective evaluation subscale of the Allophilia Scale developed by Pittinsky et al. (2007), adapted for attitudes toward the French. Five items were included: I have positive feelings about the French; I care about the well-being of the French; I feel warmly about the French; For the most part, I like French culture; and Overall, I like the French. The subscale was reliable, $a = .87$. Item responses were scored on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Anger
We used the 3-item anger subscale from the 30-item Differential Emotion Scale (DES; Izard, 1972). Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they were experiencing a particular emotion at that moment, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

Country Prototypicality
Country prototypicality was measured using attributes that were generated by participants as being distinctive for each group compared to their own group and a baseline group (Waldzus et al., 2003). First, participants were asked to generate four attributes that were characteristic of the French people in comparison to other member countries of the United Nations. Participants then generated four attributes that were characteristic of the American people. Participants were asked to rate the self-generated attributes of the French and Americans in terms of their applicability to
other citizens of the United Nations on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (does not apply at all) to 5 (applies very much). The mean applicability score of each group’s attributes was the indicator of the typicality of the respective country in general.

Entitativity
Participants rated the perceived entitativity of the French people by using the group entitativity measure (GEM; Gaertner & Schopler, 1998) in which participants view a series of six diagrams that illustrate circles that surround a center circle at various distances. Participants were told that the circles represent the French people. The diagrams were numbered 1–6, with each successive diagram illustrating more proximal circles, each representative of greater entitativity.

Homogeneity
Perceived homogeneity for the United States was measured by asking to what extent participants thought the people in the United States differed from each other. The perceived homogeneity for France was measured by asking to what extent the people of France differ from each other (both on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 [not at all] to 7 [very much]). The homogeneity rating for the United States (ingroup) was subtracted from the homogeneity rating for France (outgroup). A negative score indicates that participants perceive the outgroup as more homogeneous than the ingroup, whereas a positive score indicates that the ingroup is perceived to be more homogeneous than the outgroup.

RESULTS
We assessed the participant’s gender and we also manipulated the gender of the French leader. There were no significant gender differences for allophilia. Moreover, there were no significant interactive effects of gender and any other independent variable; therefore, we do not discuss gender further.

Manipulation Checks

Follower Approval
The degree to which participants thought the followers approved of their leader’s behavior was entered into a 2 (follower approval: approval,
disapproval) \times 3 \text{ (leader behavior: positive, negative, neutral) ANOVA. There was a significant main effect for follower approval, } F(1, 162) = 153.10, \ p < .05. \text{ such that participants perceived more approval in the approve condition } (M = 5.97, SD = 1.16) \text{ than in the disapprove condition } (M = 2.81, SD = 2.02). \text{ The main effect for leader behavior was also significant. } F(2, 162) = 13.75, \ p < .05. \text{ but leader behavior did not interact significantly with follower approval. } F(2, 162) = 2.76, \ p = \text{n.s.} \text{ Leader Behavior} \\

The degree to which participants evaluated the impact of leader's behavior as positive or negative was entered into a 2 \text{ (follower approval: approval, disapproval) \times 3 \text{ (leader behavior: positive, negative, neutral) ANOVA. There was a significant main effect for leader behavior, } F(1, 161) = 85.84, \ p < .05. \text{ Two non-orthogonal contrasts probed this effect: the first contrast compared the positive and neutral conditions, and the second contrast compared the neutral and negative conditions. The first contrast revealed that the impact of the positive leader behavior } (M = 5.63, SD = 1.15) \text{ was more positive than the impact of the neutral leader behavior } (M = 4.17, SD = 1.74), \ t(166) = 5.38, \ p < .05. \text{ The second contrast indicated that participants evaluated the behavior in the neutral leader behavior condition as more positive than the impact of the negative leader behavior condition } (M = 2.09, SD = 1.14), \ t(166) = 7.30, \ p < .05. \text{ The main effect for follower approval was also significant. } F(2, 161) = 7.89, \ p < .05, \text{ but follower support did not significantly interact with leader behavior. } F(2, 161) = .72, \ p = .48. \\

\text{Overall Model} \\

Table 2 displays the means for post-test allopophilia as a function of leader behavior and follower approval. We entered allopophilia into a 3 \text{ (leader behavior: positive, negative, neutral) \times 2 \text{ (follower approval: approve, disapprove) ANOVA with pre-test affective allopophilia entered as a covariate. As expected, pre-test allopophilia was a significant covariate, } F(1, 161) = 258.96, \ p < .05. \text{ such that higher pre-test allopophilia scores corresponded with higher post-test allopilia scores. Important to our predictions, although neither the main effect for leader behavior nor follower approval was significant. } F(2, 161) = 2.32, \ p = .10. \text{ and } F(1, 161) = .79, \ p = .70, \text{ the critical Leader Behavior \times Follower Approval interaction was significant. } F(2, 161) = 3.16, \ p < .05 \text{ (Fig. 1).}
Table 2. Mean Ratings of Affective Allophilia and Anger by Leader Behavior and Follower Approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follower Approval</th>
<th>Leader Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective allophilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 173. Allophilia ratings ranged between 1 and 7 with higher values indicating greater allophilia. Anger ratings ranged between 1 and 5, with higher values indicating more attraction or anger. Means for affective allophilia adjusted (pre-test scores covaried out). Means for anger are actual.

![Bar chart showing mean ratings of affective allophilia by leader behavior and follower approval]

Fig. 1. Adjusted Mean Ratings of Affective Allophilia by Leader Behavior and Follower Approval.

We examined the Leader Behavior × Follower Approval interaction by comparing the effect of follower response at different levels of leader behavior. The first comparison of scores on allophilia for participants in the neutral-disapprove and the neutral-approve conditions was not significant, \( t(167) = .10, p = .90 \). The second comparison revealed that allophilia was
lower among participants in the negative-disapprove condition compared with those in the negative-approve condition, \( t(167) = 1.99, p < .05 \). The third contrast revealed that there were higher allophilia scores among participants in the positive-approve condition (\( M = 4.18 \)) than among those in the positive-disapprove condition (\( M = 3.91 \)), yet the effect was not statistically significant, \( t(167) = 1.39, p = .16 \). Thus, lower allophilia scores were observed only when both the leader behavior was negative and the followers approved of the negative behavior.

**Mediated Moderation of Allophilia**

The potential mediation of allophilia by anger was assessed using MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, and Sheets’s (2002) modification of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) procedure. According to MacKinnon et al., mediation is established when (a) the independent variable significantly influences the mediating variable, (b) the influence of the proposed mediator is significant when including the proposed mediator and the independent variable as predictors of the dependent variable, and (c) the indirect effect of the mediating variable is significant.

An initial analysis tested for heterogeneity of regression. With allophilia as the dependent variable, we entered anger along with leader behavior and follower approval as predictors. There was no evidence of heterogeneity of regression for anger, Anger × Follower Approval × Leader Behavior, \( F(1, 155) = .70, p = .49 \).

As indicated above, the Leader Behavior × Follower Approval interaction was significant for allophilia, \( F(2, 161) = 3.16, p < .05 \), and for anger, \( F(1, 167) = 4.43, p < .05 \). Observers experienced the greatest degree of anger when a leader behaved negatively and his or her group members approved, and observers experienced the least anger when a leader acted positively and group members approved.

Further analyses indicated that the predictive power of anger on allophilia was significant when follower response, leader behavior, and interaction terms were included in the model, \( B = .14, SE = .05, p < .05 \). Using MacKinnon et al.’s (2002) empirically derived critical values for the assessment of indirect effects (critical values for \( z \) of .05 and .01 are .97 and 1.1, respectively), the indirect effect of the Follower Approval × Leader Behavior interaction on allophilia via anger was significant, \( z = 1.72, p < .05 \). The interactive effect of leader behavior and follower approval on allophilia was no longer significant when the assessment of anger was included in the model, \( B = .55, SE = .29 \).
$p = .35$. These results are consistent with total mediation of the moderating effect of leader behavior on follower approval by anger.\textsuperscript{1,2}

**Intergroup Factors**

We further tested three potential intergroup mediators: perceived homogeneity, entitativity, and prototypicality. For none of the variables was the Group Leader × Group Approval interaction significant, nor did any of the variables produce a significant indirect effect for the Group Leader × Group Approval interaction on allophilia.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

This study examined the attitudes observers hold for a group, and how observers respond emotionally to the actions of that group's leader in the context of his or her followers' approval or disapproval for those actions. Specifically, we demonstrated that affinity for a leader's followers was significantly reduced only when the leader acted negatively and the followers approved of the negative behavior. The data suggest that the effects of a leader's behavior must be interpreted in relation to the perceived approval/disapproval of the leader's followers for the behavior. Importantly, observers' emotional responses of anger mediated the effects of leader behavior and followers' approval on liking for the French people. Though our study was not directly designed to rule out mediation by other intergroup processes, we failed to find significant effects for any other potential mediator.

One important implication of the current work is the particular impact of group member approval. Liking for the group members was primarily influenced by the follower's approval of positive leader acts – rather than follower's disapproval of negative leader acts. Consider the previously discussed cases involving citizens of one country learning about the actions of the leaders of other countries. Our data suggest that when one learns about the actions of the leaders of another country, the degree to which the followers of that leader approve or disapprove of their leaders' actions will influence attitudes toward the followers. However, our findings suggest that only discovering that the followers approve of their leader's negative actions will change evaluation of the followers.
Through our study, we found evidence that anger mediated changes in liking. Interestingly, participants who were neither members of the leader’s group nor members of the group affected by the leader’s behaviors became angry as a result of observing a negative act toward a group. This occurrence of emotional responses in observers of intergroup relations is significant, and has practical implications. We often learn information about groups that experience injustices at the hands of other groups when we are not members of the perpetrating group or the victim group, but rather are members of an observing group. Our data suggest that even observers are capable of experiencing strong emotional responses to negative, unjust acts by leaders, even when they are not directly involved as perpetrators or victims.

Though our results met theoretical expectations, there are some limitations of the present work that should be considered in future work. First, we would want to see how the domain in which the leader is behaving positively or negatively affects the interaction and experience of anger by observers. Additional work should also measure emotional responses using multiple methods. Interestingly, we were able to pick up emotional effects in the present research using a fairly blunt measure, suggesting that other measures of emotional responses may show even stronger effects. It should also be noted that the assessment of anger in this study was of a general emotional state; future work should also specify more closely the target of observer anger (e.g., whether anger was directed toward the leader, toward the outgroup in general, or toward other entities). Further research could also usefully examine the impact of group members’ approval or disapproval in a broader range of contexts, such as when the leader is presumed to be democratically elected (as in the case reported in this chapter) and when the leader is not democratically elected by the group. Finally, the model we tested predicted attitudes toward an outgroup whose leader behaved positively, neutrally, or negatively toward a third group. A more complete model, developed over time with additional data, might predict behaviors toward the members of a third group -- the beneficiaries or victims of the leader’s behaviors. Finally, future work might examine the effects of leader behavior on participant behavior toward members of the leader’s group. Anger has implications not only for attitudes, but also for action and behaviors, and there is evidence to suggest that attitude-behavior connections can be stronger in context of emotion (e.g., Talaska, Fiske, & Chaiken, in press).

Nonetheless, findings from the present research offer preliminary insights regarding how observers’ perceptions of the relationships between leader’s
behaviors and followers' responses contribute to observers' experiences of anger, and how these factors together contribute to the formation of intergroup attitudes.

NOTES

1. The anger response measured may be directed at the group leader, group members, or both. The likelihood that the anger is directed at the group members is perhaps most consistent with our data. If anger was directed solely at the leader, then the experienced anger would have been exceedingly high in both the negative leader behavior conditions. However, we found that anger was highest when the leader did something negative and the group members approved, and was lower when the leader did something negative and the group members disapproved. This suggests that what is important to predicting anger is not based solely on what the leader does, anger is also dependent on what the group members do.

2. Although we were primarily interested in anger, we also assessed the other emotions measured by the DES (i.e., interest, enjoyment, surprise, distress, disgust, contempt, fear, shame, and guilt). The other emotions, however, did not produce a significant Group Leader \times Group Approval interaction, nor did they mediate the effect of the interaction on affective allophilia, so we do not discuss or report them further.
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