I want It that Way: The Influence of Leadership Styles on Self-Regulation Strategies Assessment and Locomotion

Cleo Vasilda

S3792323

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3E-BT15: Bachelor Thesis

Group number 23

Supervisor: (prof.) (dr(s).) Ben Gutzkow

Second evaluator: (prof.) (dr(s).) Yasin Koc

In collaboration with: R. Pezhgorska, I. Pickman, L. Pliaukštaite, and L. Van der Kolk.

Month 01, 2022

A thesis is an aptitude test for students. The approval of the thesis is proof that the student has sufficient research and reporting skills to graduate, but does not guarantee the quality of the research and the results of the research as such, and the thesis is therefore not necessarily suitable to be used as an academic source to refer to. If you would like to know more about the research discussed in this thesis and any publications based on it, to which you could refer, please contact the supervisor mentioned.

Abstract

Types of leadership styles can influence the experience of a regulatory fit, depending on the self-regulation strategies of an individual. Previous studies show that aspects of selfregulation can interact with leadership styles. This research investigates whether locomotors feel more comfortable with a directive leadership style, whereas assessors would feel more comfortable with an advisory leadership style. Leaders have influence on the goal pursuit of individuals on a daily basis, which oftentimes makes it harder for an individual to choose their own strategies. This research focuses on the influence of advisory and directive leadership styles on locomotion and assessment, by looking into a possible regulatory fit. Accordingly, the influence of having choices on level of satisfaction within locomotors and assessors is investigated. For this research, we used a between-subjects design (N = 100), namely two conditions for the type of leadership (directive vs. advisory) and two orientations (locomotion vs. assessment). We found no support for the preferences of leadership styles of locomotors or assessors. No difference in satisfactory level was found based on having or not having choices. Consequently, we conclude that we have found no support for the preference of advisory or directive leadership on locomotion or assessment, and found no preference for the presence or absence of choice.

Keywords: locomotion, assessment, self-regulation, regulatory-fit, leadership

Locomotion and Assessment: Preferred Leadership Styles

People set goals for themselves all the time, which is why it is important to know what motivates a person to get to a desired outcome (i.e. the goal; Kruglanski et al., 2002). When there is a correspondence between a self-regulation orientation of a goal and the manner of getting to the goal, it is called a regulatory fit (Higgins, 2005), and as such can also be influenced by a leader in, for example, a work setting (Johnson, Lin, Kark, Van Dijk, King & Esformes, 2017). Self-regulation is described as the actions taken to pursue a goal, which includes making decisions, planning and assessing what actions are best to be taken (Fujita, 2011). Self-regulation strategies can interact with environmental aspects, such as decisions made by somebody else or the type of leadership style that is used. A leader can, for example, influence the manner of goal pursuit of an employee, and thereby facilitate or hinder the regulatory fit, depending on the employee's individual self-regulatory preferences (Higgins, Idson, Freites, Spiegel & Molden, 2003). If the strategy chosen by the leader is in line with the preferred strategy of the employee, a regulatory fit can be produced (Higgins, 2005).

Experiencing a regulatory fit comes with higher levels of satisfaction. When the choice of goal pursuit is in line with the preferred goal pursuit of an employee, the employee will feel more satisfied (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007). This means that a regulatory fit will be experienced by the employee.

In this research we investigate whether two aspects of self-regulation, namely locomotion and assessment, influence experiencing a regulatory fit, depending on receiving either an advisory or a directive leadership style. Higgins and his colleagues describe two types of self-regulation orientations: locomotion and assessment (Higgins, Kurglanski & Pierro, 2003). Locomotion concerns getting to a goal for the sake of getting to the goal. This can also mean moving from one desired end-state to another. Locomotion often concerns quicker decisions and less cognitive activity (Pierro et al., 2008). Assessment means taking into account multiple ways and possible outcomes to get to the best possible goal. Assessors in general spend more time making comparisons and evaluate more different components to get to their desired end-state. Even though locomotors and assessors have a preference when it comes to the process of making a decision, this process can be influenced by environmental aspects. So it might be that a person who prefers making considerate and careful choices suddenly has to make quick decisions when this is commissioned by a boss. These types of self-regulation strategies play a part in possibly experiencing a regulatory fit or non-fit.

A chosen leadership style is an environmental aspect that can be of influence on experiencing a regulatory fit. This is due to the fact that leaders, depending on their type of leadership style and the strictness of the work environment, often influence chosen ways of goal pursuit for an employee (Higgins, Idson, Freites, Spiegel & Molden, 2003). In this research we look at two styles: advisory leadership and directive leadership. Whereas advisory leadership is a softer style, associated with democracy, consultation and participation (Bass, 1990), directive leadership is often experienced with stronger input from a leader, and comes with more authority, coercion and being directive (Bass, 1990).

In this research, we would partly like to replicate the study of Kruglanski, Pierro and Higgins from 2007. We would like to research if different leadership styles facilitate or interfere with an individual's preferences for certain regulatory modes/strategies, such as locomotion and assessment. In addition, we will look at the satisfactory level to see if a regulatory fit or non-fit is experienced, along with the possibility that the factor of choice contributes to this satisfactory level. Therefore, we investigate the influence of advisory and directive leadership on the self-regulatory orientations in the context of locomotion and assessment.

Locomotion and Assessment

Self-regulation strategies influence experiencing a regulatory fit. Higgins and Kruglanski made a distinction in self-regulation strategies (1995), as they distinguished the two strategies: locomotion and assessment. Locomotion is reaching the desired end-state in a moving way. This form of self-regulation motivates people to move from state to state, while including psychological resources to maintain this movement (Higgins, Pierro & Kruglanski, 2003). This is a straight-forward way of reaching a goal, because the goal is to get to the goal itself. People who would rather reach their desired end-state this way are called locomotors. For example, their goal is getting a parking spot, so their solution is taking the first one that is free.

Assessment ,on the other, hand means taking into account the possible utilities and possible desired end-states more critically. Assessors generally look for a way in which they get to the best end-state possible, using the best options to get there. They take into account more factors and compare more possibilities. For example, when assessors are looking for a parking spot, they might take into account how close it is to the store, what position the car should be in while parking and so on, instead of going for the first parking spot they see.

An assessment orientation may further be associated with increased cognitive activity, especially compared to locomotion. Researchers provided a study that looked at locomotion and assessment on counterfactual thinking and regret (Pierro, Leder, Mannetti, Higgins, Kruglanski & Aiello, 2008). Participants had to fill in their thoughts and feelings on a given negative scenario and on a negative experience they had had themselves. The study finds that locomotors did not have as many counterfactual thoughts or regret as assessors did. This suggests that assessors think more critically about things that happened and feel more regret after experiencing a negative outcome because they take in to account more possibilities. Previously stated finding thus suggest that the self-regulation orientation has effect on the

amount of counterfactual thinking and the amount of regret. Being looked at from a more general point, this states that assessors are associated with more cognitive activity. Assessors generally want to make the careful choice, which explains the presence of counterfactual thinking later on. They evaluate the outcome and the way the outcome was pursued, which is in line with Kunda's ideas about accuracy goals (1990). This idea states that people that desire to be accurate spend more cognitive effort on reasoning, focus more on significant information and use more complicated processing strategies (Kunda, 1990). On the contrary, locomotors experienced less counterfactual thinking and regret, as they in general like to move on rather than evaluate previous experiences critically. This in itself suggests that might locomotors like the absence of choice, so they can move on quickly and freely without having to think about decisions or possible outcomes. These types of preferences that are part of self-regulation strategies, like choice and decision making, might by interfered with by environmental aspects. Therefore, it is important to know what influence such aspects have on self-regulation strategies, like locomotion and assessment.

Leadership styles

Leadership, being an environmental aspect, can influence the experience of a regulatory fit according to the regulatory modes theory (Higgins, Kruglanski & Pierro, 2003). Lewin and Lipit made a distinction between autocratic and democratic leadership in 1938. The leadership styles are part of a continuum that goes from wholly autocratic to wholly democratic (Bass, 1990). Autocratic leadership is seen as leadership with stronger input from the leader. This style also comes with authority, being directive and coercion. Democratic leadership comes with softer types of styles, like democracy, consultation and participation (Bass, 1990). With democratic leadership, the input from the leader is seen more as an advice than as an obligation. More recent papers refer differently to autocratic and democratic leadership styles, to avoid possible affiliation with politics (e.g., Kruglanski, Pierro &

Higgins, 2007). To avoid those affiliations here as well, the democratic leadership style will from now on be referred to as advisory leadership style. The autocratic leadership style will be referred to as directive leadership style. Previous research states that participants who score high on locomotion prefer the presence of a directive leader. On the other hand, participants who score high on assessment are more satisfied with an advisory leader (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007). This suggests that directive leadership and locomotion in combination produces a regulatory fit. The same goes for advisory leadership in combination with assessment. Because leadership styles can or cannot be in line with self-regulation preferences of an individual, both advisory and directive leadership can influence the regulatory fit of people to whom these types of leadership styles are being applied.

Self-regulation

The self-regulation strategy a person chooses or prefers may not always be in line with the strategy that is chosen by external sources (Higgins, Idson, Freites, Spiegel & Molden, 2003). Self-regulation includes the actions taken to pursue a goal, including decision making, assessing and planning what and what not to do (Fujita, 2011). For example, it is possible that a boss chooses a different way of goal pursuit than that is preferred by an employee. When the two strategies are not in line, creating a regulatory non-fit, people tend to be less satisfied with the result because they value the accomplished results less than they would if the strategies would align (Avnet & Higgins, 2003).

Locomotion and assessment are dimensions of self-regulation (Higgins & Kruglanski, 2000). There are different self-regulation strategies, which help a person to pursue a goal in a successful way (Inzlicht, Werner, Briskin & Roberts, 2021). The self-regulation strategy in this research is the comparing and selecting of different means to get to a desired end-state. These end-states can be explained as being a desired behaviour, attitude, emotional state, or can be referred to as a goal (Gross, 2015).

Regulatory fit

Motivation plays a big part in the process of making of decisions. Motivation is said to work at many levels that interact with each other. This interaction has influence on a person's behaviour (Cooper, Worthy & Maddox 2015). The dynamic movement between behaviour and motivation can be explained by the regulatory fit. Namely, a regulatory fit happens when there is a correspondence between a self-regulation orientation of a goal and the manner of getting to that goal (Higgins, 2005). Experiencing a regulatory fit has positive effects on an individual. Freitas and Higgins found that participants who experienced a regulatory fit enjoyed an activity more than participants who did not experience a fit (2002). Research suggests that regulatory fit increases the perceived value of a decision. People tend not to necessarily feel more satisfied with the decision itself, but they do feel better about it in a way that the decision feels right, which increases the perceived value of it (Camacho, Higgins & Luger, 2003). Furthermore, Higgins (2005) found that employees, when experiencing a regulatory fit, feel right about what they are doing at their work and have higher levels of motivation for both their work and keeping relationships with others.

In a study of Avnet and Higgins (2003), participants were asked to determine the value of a chosen brand of light, compared to other brands. There were two conditions: a locomotion mode condition and an assessment mode condition. In the locomotion mode condition participants were asked to determine the value through a progressive elimination strategy. This strategy reduces the number of comparisons after every time the participant made a choice between two brands, leaving one option to choose in the end. In the assessment mode condition, participants were asked to compare each brand to all other given brands. The participants had to choose the best brand according to their own comparisons. The research states that participants with a locomotion orientation had a better fit with the progressive elimination strategy, while assessment orientation had a better fit with the full evaluation strategy. They also found that participants who experienced a higher regulatory fit were willing to pay more for their chosen brand than participants that experienced a lower regulatory fit. This, more generally looked at, states that locomotors prefer less options to choose from. Additionally, assessors prefer to have more options to compare, so they can make the best choice.

Previous research suggests that types of leadership styles and certain self-regulation strategies combined can produce a regulatory fit (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007). This study states that participants who score high on assessment tend to be more satisfied with the presence of advisory leadership. On the other hand, participants who score high on locomotion tend to prefer directive leadership.

The current study

We, based on previously mentioned research, expect locomotors to be more satisfied with a directive leader and assessors to feel more comfortable with an advisory leader, because in both situations a regulatory fit would be experienced, which makes people feel better about their choices. For this purpose, we created two different leadership conditions in which the leader manipulated the participants. In the advisory condition of this research the leader stuck to an advisory script, clearly letting the participants know they could make their own choices. The participants could choose their own room and additionally they could also make a (fake) choice between easier or more difficult anagrams. They were told that the difficult anagrams would give them 2 points per correct answer, while the easier ones would give them one point. In reality no points were given and the easy and hard anagrams were the same.

In the directive condition, the leader made the choices for the participants. There was no (fake) choice between difficulties for the participants. On top of that participants were told there were different versions of the anagrams, which the leader chose for the participant. They were also told the anagrams built up in difficulty. The leader told them that each correct answer would credit them with points. All of these statements were false, as there were no different versions, points or differences in difficulty. Both advisory and directive conditions were falsely told they would receive 0.3 more credits if they would be among the top performers. We expect that locomotors will be more comfortable in the directive condition, partly because they would not have to make a choice in this condition. This is expected to contribute to the regulatory fit. On the contrary, assessors generally prefer to make choices, so we expect them to be more comfortable in the advisory conditions. In this condition they are able to make most of the choices themselves, contributing to the regulatory fit.

Hypothesis 1. Locomotors are more satisfied with advisory leadership styles, while assessors are more satisfied a directive leadership style.

Hypothesis 2. Locomotors feel more positive with the absence of choices, while assessors feel more positive when they have choices.

Method

Participants

We recruited 99 (female = 79; male = 19; non-binary = 1) international students of the University of Groningen. The participants were first-year psychology students and were between 18 and 33 years old (M=19.82; SD= 2.33). The only prerequisite for participating was that people were asked to show up awake and alert. Participating was voluntary and in exchange for 0.5 course credits.

Procedure

We invited the participants to come to the laboratory for psychological research at the faculty of Psychology in Groningen. The participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions – directive leader condition or advisory leader condition. There were 49

participants in condition 1 and 51 participants in condition 2. The research was administered by four different researchers (all female, aged 21-22). The one present at the laboratory at a given time played the role of both the directive and advisory leader in the specific condition and handled every participant on an individual basis. The difference between the two conditions is characterized by either making choices yourself or choices that are being made for you. To create this distinction in reality there were multiple steps to the manipulation in both conditions.

Our study was an experimental study, manipulating the conditions assigned to the participants. We used a between-subjects design, namely two conditions for the type of leadership (directive vs. advisory) and two orientations (locomotion vs. assessment). The independent variables were the types of leadership condition and the orientations. The dependent variables were the level of satisfaction and effectiveness of the participants.

We used a laboratory with five rooms, each of them had a computer. Two rooms on the left were meant for condition 1 and two rooms on the right - for condition 2. The middle room was used by the researcher. Scripts for different condition manipulations were created based on keywords that guided the leaders for instructing the participants about the task. (see appendix). The leaders were four females between the ages of 21 and 22 who are fluent in English and are researchers of this study as well.

In condition 1, the menu for the choice of the type of anagram was still open when the researcher walked in with the participant. The participant was then shown which type of anagram test was chosen by the researcher. This was not the case in condition 2. In this condition the choice was made on forehand, being anagram test number 2. The participant would walk in to the room and immediately see the screen with the explanation of the test.

Condition 1 was the directive condition. The leader followed the directive script. In this condition there were multiple components to the manipulation. The first component was

the leader choosing the room the participant was going to be in. The second component was choosing the condition for the participant on the computer, while the participant watched the leader make the choice for them. The leader chose between the numbers 1,3,4,5 and 6. The numbers represented a different version of the task. In reality, all those numbers led to the same task, the participant only thought they were getting a certain version. The leader told the participants about their task and told them they could receive points for each correct answer, and if they ended among our top performers they would receive extra course credits. They were also told that the items varied in difficulty. Both statements were untrue and part of the manipulation. Encouragement of keeping the time in mind was expressed.

Condition 2 was the democratic condition. The leader, in this condition, used the democratic script. First, the leader on the forehand chose task number 2, so the participant would not see that a choice was made for them when entering the room. The participants in this condition were also allowed to choose their room themselves after the leader told them so. The next component is another choice: the leader explained the task, telling them that they could make a choice between hard or easy anagrams. The easy anagrams would give them 1 point per correct answer while the hard anagrams would give them two. In truth, there was no difference between the easy or hard choice. They were also told they would receive extra course credits if they made it to the top performers, which was also a manipulation. Encouragement of choosing wisely was expressed.

The goal of both conditions was for the participants to complete a word anagram task. The word anagram task consists of six items in total. After this task, the participant completed a short questionnaire about their feelings of satisfaction, effectiveness, enjoyment, the difficulty of the task, an evaluation of the leader and their personal importance of a good performance. Finally, the participants filled in the Regulatory Mode Questionnaire (RMQ; Kruglanski et al. ,2000) to assess individual differences in locomotion and assessment orientations. On average, the participants spent 17,9 minutes in the room to complete the whole study.

Results

Preliminary analysis

The assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were assessed. Concerning the assumption of normality, we examined the variables of locomotion, assessment and log time average. The log time average variable is the average time spent on the task. A logarithmic transformation is used because time has a value of 0 as reference point, which means the time values are skewed if no log transformation is used.

Using the Shapiro Wilk test, we found out that locomotion scores were not normally distributed with W(99)=0.973, p=0.041. Additionally, the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that assessment scores were normally distributed (W(99)=0.986, p=0.40). Nevertheless, we reported evidence of non-normality for the "LogTimeAverage" scores (W(99)=0.932, p < 0.001). We also examined the assumption of homoscedasticity by using the Levene's test. For the Assessment scores (F = 0.062, p = 0.804, $\alpha = 0.703$) and the Locomotion scores (F = 0.160, p = 0.690, $\alpha = 0.745$) we concluded that the homoscedasticity assumption was met. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was met both for the assessment and locomotion variables (p > 0.5), as well as the linearity assumption which was checked with the Q-Q plots (figure 1 and 2). Correlations are shown in Table 1. Interactions are shown in figure 4 and 5.

Our dependent variables involved the level of satisfaction, effectiveness, enjoyment and importance regarding the task. These represent indicators of regulatory fit. Cronbach's alpha was high enough to summarize the measures as one 'regulatory fit' variable ($\alpha = 0.759$). One important point is that for all the results found, we controlled the variables for gender and condition (directive or advisory). In the hypothesis testing section we look into more details of our data set and additional findings. Indeed, we manipulated the variable "condition" (advisory vs. directive) and found that this manipulation had an influence on the participants, although the effects that we found were unintended. We examined the conditions of the participants and the locomotion and assessment scores. An initial data check in the correlation table (Table 1) showed a difference in assessment scores. Participants assigned to the directive condition scored significantly lower on assessment scores compared to locomotion scores, whereas participants allocated to the advisory condition scored significantly higher on assessment scores (F(1) = 6.975, p < 0.05). Figure 3 illustrates this. It can be said that being assigned to the advisory condition might have elicited an assessment orientation. Therefore, any results regarding assessment should be interpreted with caution. The caution is necessary because the condition may have had influence on the preferred or chosen self-regulation orientation of a participant, during the task. This possibly influences the results regarding assessment oriented findings in a way that not the participants regulatory orientation, but the condition there were put in are cause of the current findings.

Hypothesis testing

The first hypothesis was that locomotors would be more satisfied with the directive leadership style whereas assessors would feel more satisfied with the advisory leadership style. In other words, if these hypotheses are found in the results, there is a regulatory fit.

The second hypothesis was that locomotors would feel more positive when not having choices, when on the contrary, assessors would feel more positive when they have choices. This means that participants would experience a higher regulatory fit when higher levels of satisfaction, effectiveness, enjoyment and happiness are measured within the two conditions.

Concerning the first hypothesis, no significant results were discovered. Indeed, we speculated that participants categorized as assessors would feel more satisfied with a

democratic leader. The results suggest that no difference exists between the level of satisfaction of an assessor in condition 1 or 2 (F(1) = 2.110, p = 0.150). Additionally, we found the same result regarding the variable locomotor (F(1) = 0.024, p = 0.876). It was not statistically significant, thus there exists no statistical difference between the level of satisfaction of a participant who is locomotor in the advisory or the directive condition. We conclude that taking into account these regulatory fit scores, no difference was found between the regulatory orientations of participants and the leadership style.

For the second hypothesis, no significant results were found. This suggests that the absence or presence of choices does not affect experiencing a regulatory fit. The scores on the experience of regulatory fit were not distinct (F(1) = 0.361, p = 0.549). There are no significant differences found between assessor satisfaction and an advisory or directive leadership style (F(1) = -2,110, p = 0.150). There are no significant differences found between locomotor satisfaction and an advisory or directive leadership style (F(1) = 0.024, p = 0.876), which means the absence or presence of choice does not affect the regulatory fit.

We further looked at the condition of the participants and the time spent on the word anagram task. Interestingly, participants assigned to the "directive" condition spent significantly less time on the task (M = 4.25, SD = 0.253) compared to participants assigned to the "advisory" condition (M = 4.54, SD = 0.244). In other words, the difference between the two conditions is significant regarding the average time spent (F(1) = 4.427, p < 0.05).

The data further suggests that there exists no evidence of a difference between locomotors and assessors in terms of the amount of time they spent on a task. However, we observed something different. Indeed, when we focused on the variable "LogTimeAvg" and identified that when this variable increases, the scores on Regulatory Fit increases as well. The results were significant (F(1) = 4.121, p < 0.05). This data thus suggest that the

participants that better enjoyed the task , spent more time on the task. Data is shown in Table 2.

One other interesting finding emerged: we found evidence that a higher score on variable locomotion increased the variable of Regulatory Fit significantly (F(1) = 7.306, p < 0.05). Thus, this correlation explains that the task in general may have been more suited for people who scored higher on locomotion, independent of the condition of the task. Data is shown in Table 2.

Discussion

This study aimed to look at the influence of an advisory or directive leadership style on the self-regulatory strategies locomotion and assessment. In line with research on the regulatory fit (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007), it was expected that locomotors would feel more satisfied with a directive leadership style, while assessors were expected to feel more satisfied with an advisory leadership style, which was our first hypothesis. According to the literature, people who score high on locomotion tend to prefer to have less choices when making a decision. Assessors, on the other hand, prefer to choose from more options to compare and make the best possible choice (Avnet and Higgins, 2003). The second hypothesis derived from this research. Locomotors were expected to feel more positive with the absence of choices, while assessors were expected to feel more positive when choices were present.

For the hypothesis researched in this study, no evidence was found. Hypothesis 1 was not supported. No evidence was found for the effect of leadership styles on the self-regulation strategies locomotion and assessment, which means there was no difference in regulatory fit between the two conditions. Hypothesis 2 was also not supported. Assessors and locomotors did not score differently on regulatory fit in the two conditions, which means the presence or absence of choice did not influence the regulatory fit. One interesting finding is that participants who were assigned to the advisory condition scored higher on assessment than participants in the directive condition. Therefore it could be argued that being assigned to the advisory condition elicited an assessment orientation.

Limitations and Further Research

A limitation of our research is that the manipulation of the leaders might not have been strong enough. This might be because the leaders were four students, roughly the same age as the participants in the study. Therefore, it is possible that the gap between leader and participant was not strong or serious enough, leading to a less strong manipulation. Future research could consider using older leaders to create a more real distance between the leader and the participant to create a more realistic effect. Also, it would be interesting to see if there is a difference between the influence of male and female leaders, because in this study only female leaders were present.

It might also be possible that the manipulation in this research was not necessarily not strong enough, but had unintended effects. The data suggests that the advisory condition elicited an assessment orientation, which shows that the manipulation does have effect, but in an unexpected way. It might be interesting for future research to look into this more deeply.

Another limitation of this research are the scripts that the leaders used to explain the task to the participants. The scripts differed for the advisory and directive condition of course, but in some ways the scripts might have been too leading. For example, in the directive script, the participants were explicitly told to watch their time. The results show that participants in the directive condition spent significantly less time on the task compared to the advisory condition, in which no time related suggestion had been made. This demonstrates that the participants listened well, but it influences the manipulation in a way that it makes it harder to conclude findings. The same applies to the advisory script. In this condition participants were told to choose their task wisely. This in itself may have influenced the self-regulation

orientation chosen by the participants, because in this condition the scores on assessment were significantly higher. This idea is in line with a study of Duncan and colleagues (2008). Their research suggests that participants take verbal instructions into account when performing a task, because the instructions are incorporated in active task sets of the participants, which influences their behaviour. For further research it would be wise to be more considerate about the phrases used in the scripts. Researchers should try to suggest as little as possible about how the participants should do their task. They should focus on the differences in advisory and directive leading only, for example by not mentioning time or warn to make careful choices.

The previously mentioned scripts could arguably also be a strength in this research. The script was very well listened to according to the results, which means that the leaders conducted the study in a reliable way.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Concerning the theoretical implications, our findings for once challenge the theory that a leadership style has influence on a regulatory fit, for it may be that ways of presenting instructions for a task is of more influence than the type of leadership that is presented. This in itself suggests that either locomotion or assessment might be primed by certain instructions, instead of being the self-regulation strategy of the person who follows these instructions (Duncan et al., 2008).

This research adds discussion to the consisting theories (see Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007; Avnet & Higgins, 2003) about the influence of leadership styles on experiencing a regulatory fit, and the preference of presence or absence of choice depending on locomotion or assessment. Our research does not support the previous findings of the original studies.

Our research also challenges the idea that locomotors prefer the absence of choice, while assessors prefer the presence of choice (Kruglanski, Pierro & Higgins, 2007). This might be due to the fact that the choice given in the advisory condition was really only a choice between level of difficulty, while the task after that was the same. The study Avnet and Higgins conducted in 2013 had many choices for their participants to be made. It could be argued that the choice may have been of less importance because the choice itself might not have been hard and there were only two options to choose from, which makes it small in number of choice. For locomotors, who would prefer the absence of choice, this idea suggests that the choice might still have been easy and quick to make, which explains why there is no difference is preference of absence or presence of choice.

Looking at the practical implications, the previous findings may be of interest to people who fulfill a leading role in an organization or institution, or have a leading job in general. The finding that the way of presenting instructions might affect the way a task is being performed can be of great value when a leader wants to achieve a certain outcome.

Conclusion

In conclusion, previous findings did not provide support for the idea that the selfregulation strategies locomotion and assessment, in combination with an advisory or directive leadership style create a regulatory fit. Support was found for the idea that the way of presenting instructions might affect the way a task is being performed.

References

- Avnet, T., & Higgins, E. T. (2003). Locomotion, assessment, and regulatory fit: Value transfer from "how" to "what." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(5), 525–530. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00027-1
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press
- Camacho, C. J., Higgins, E. T., & Luger, L. (2003). Moral value transfer from regulatory fit: What feels right is right and what feels wrong is wrong. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84(3), 498–510. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1037/0022-3514.84.3.498
- Duncan, J., Parr, A., Woolgar, A., Thompson, R., Bright, P., Cox, S., & Nimmo-Smith, I.
 (2008). Goal neglect and Spearman's g: Competing parts of a complex task. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 137(1), 131–148. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.137.1.131
- Freitas, A. L., & Higgins, E. T. (2002). Enjoying goal-directed action: The role of regulatory fit. Psychological Science, 13, 1–6
- Fujita K. (2011). On conceptualizing self-control as more than the effortful inhibition of impulses. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 15(4):352–66
- Gross, J.J. (2015). Emotion regulation: current status and future prospects. *Psychol. Inq.* 26(1):1–26
- Higgins, E. T. (2005). Value from Regulatory Fit. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14(4), 209–213. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00366.x
- Higgins, E. T., Idson, L. C., Freitas, A. L., Spiegel, S., & Molden, D. C. (2003). Transfer of value from fit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1140–1153.

- Higgins, E. T., Kruglanski, A. W., & Pierro, A. (2003). Regulatory Mode: Locomotion and Assessment as Distinct Orientations. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 35.* (pp. 293–344). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doiorg.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1016/S0065-2601(03)01005-0
- Inzlicht, M., Werner, K. M., Briskin, J. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2021). Integrating models of self-regulation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 319–345. https://doi-org.proxyub.rug.nl/10.1146/annurev-psych-061020-105721
- Johnson, R. E., Lin, S. H. J., Kark, R., Van Dijk, D., King, D. D., & Esformes E. (2017). Consequences of regulatory fit for leader–follower relationship quality and commitment. J. Occup. Organ. Psychol. 90(3):379–406
- Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., & Higgins, E. T. (2007). Regulatory mode and preferred leadership styles: How fit increases job satisfaction. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(2), 137–149. https://doi-org.proxyub.rug.nl/10.1080/01973530701331700
- Kruglanski, A. W., Shah, J. Y., Fishbach, A., Friedman, R., Chun, W. Y., & Sleeth-Keppler,
 D. (2002). A theory of goal systems. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 34(2), 331-378.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Thompson, E. P., Higgins, E. T., Atash, M. N., Pierro, A., Shah, J. Y., & Spiegel, S. (2000). To "do the right thing" or to "just do it": Locomotion and assessment as distinct self-regulatory imperatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 793–815. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.793
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*(3), 480–498. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

Lewin, K., & Lippit, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Sociometry*, 1, 292–300.

Pierro, A., Leder, S., Mannetti, L., Tory Higgins, E., Kruglanski, A. W., & Aiello, A. (2008).
Regulatory mode effects on counterfactual thinking and regret. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(2), 321–329. https://doi-org.proxyub.rug.nl/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.06.002

Tables and Figures

Table 1Pearson's Correlations

Variable		LocScore	AsScore	Condition	LogTimeAvg	sex
1. LocScore	Pearson's r	_				
	p-value	_				
2. AsScore	Pearson's r	0.199	—			
	p-value	0.049				
3. Condition	Pearson's r	0.072	0.258			
	p-value	0.482	0.010			
4. LogTimeAvg	Pearson's r	-0.061	0.092	0.219		
	p-value	0.547	0.364	0.029		
5. sex	Pearson's r	-0.036	0.041	0.008	0.072	
	p-value	0.723	0.690	0.934	0.480	

Table 2ANOVA Omnibus Tests

	SS	df	F	р	η²p
Model	228.7713	10	2.65059	0.007	0.231
LogTimeAvg	51.5427	1	4.12054	0.045	0.046
AsScore	30.0912	1	2.40561	0.124	0.054
LocScore	91.3874	1	7.30589	0.008	0.075
CONDITION	-4.55e-13	0	NaN	NaN	0.002
Gender	28.6726	1	2.29221	0.134	0.080
AsScore * CONDITION	26.3971	1	2.11029	0.150	0.024
LocScore * CONDITION	0.3065	1	0.02450	0.876	0.000

AsScore * LocScore	0.0158	1	0.00126	0.972	0.000
CONDITION * Gender	0.3581	1	0.02863	0.866	0.000
Residuals	1100.7681	88			
Total	1329.5394	96			

Note. Cronbach's alpha Locomotion = (α = 0.745); Cronbach's alpha Assessment = (α = 0.703)



Figure 1. Assessment linearity QQ plot.



Figure 2. Locomotion linearity QQ-plot.



Figure 3. Assessment score difference between directive and advisory conditions *Note.* Condition 6 represents directive condition, condition 2 represents advisory condition.



Figure 4. Locomotion score difference between directive and advisory conditions *Note:* Condition 6 represents directive condition, condition 2 represents advisory condition.



Figure 5. Interaction between RegFit and Assessment Scores *Note:* RegFit represents the variable regulatory fit, condition 6 represents directive condition, condition 2 represents advisory condition.



Figure 6. Interaction between RegFit and Locomotion Scores. *Note:* RegFit represents the variable regulatory fit, condition 6 represents directive condition, condition 2 represents advisory condition

Appendix A

Scripts leaders

Advisory:

"Welcome!

Thanks for participating in this study. You will get a seat in one of the rooms here.

Your goal is to complete a word anagram task. You may choose between two different tasks: 1) an easier one that earns one point for every correct solution and 2) a harder one that earns two points for every correct solution. You will receive a bonus of 0.3 additional SONA credits if you are among the top performers, so choose your task wisely.

Finally, when you are done with the tasks, two more questionnaires will follow on the screen. After that, you are done and you can call me.

Good luck!"

Directive script:

"Welcome!

Thanks for participating in this study. I would want you to take place in this room.

Your goal is to complete a word anagram from a list of different versions. I am going to choose your version when we enter the room. For every correct solution you find, you will receive one point. The items vary in difficulty - you will start with easier ones and then move on to more difficult ones. You will receive a bonus of 0.3 additional SONA credits if you are among the top performers, so don't forget about the time limit you have.

Finally, when you are done with the tasks, two more questionnaires will follow on the screen. After that, you are done and you can call me.

After the time limit runs out:

"I will tabulate your results and let you know later whether you met the goal and earned the bonus..."

Good luck!"