Do organizations based in Poland need identity leadership? Polish adaptation of the short and full form of identity leadership inventory

Sylwiusz Retowski
Faculty of Psychology, SWPS University, Warszawa, Poland
Dorota Godlewska-Werner
Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Psychology, University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland, and
Rolf van Dick
Department of Social Psychology, Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany

Abstract

Purpose – The study aimed to test the validity and reliability of the Polish version of the identity leadership inventory (ILI) proposed by Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.* (2014) and to confirm the relationship between identity leadership and various job-related outcomes (i.e., trust in leaders, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intentions) among employees from Poland-based organizations. Identity leadership appears to be a universal construct (van Dick, Ciampa, & Liang, 2018) but no one has studied it in Poland so far.

Design/methodology/approach – The sample consisted of 1078 employees collected in two independent subsamples from different organizations located in Northern and Central Poland. We evaluated the ILI's factorial structure using confirmatory factor analysis.

Findings – The results confirm that the 15-item Polish version of the ILI has a four-dimensional structure with factors representing prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship. It showed satisfactory reliability. The identity leadership inventory-short form (four items) also showed a good fit with the data. As expected, the relationships between identity leadership and important work-related outcomes (general level of job satisfaction, work engagement, trust toward the leader and turnover intentions) were also significant.

Originality/value – Despite the cultural specifics of Polish organizations, the research results were generally very similar to those in other countries, confirming the universality of the ILI as shown in the Global Identity Leadership Development project (GILD, see van Dick, Ciampa, & Liang, 2018; van Dick *et al.*, 2021).

Keywords Identity leadership, Job satisfaction, Trust, Work engagement, Organizational culture

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Organizations aim to identify conditions that promote effectiveness. Scientific research that validates the importance of leadership in increasing employees' engagement and reducing burnout is helpful and supportive. Leaders are responsible for selecting, equipping, training

and influencing their followers and orienting them toward the organization's mission and goals (Winston & Patterson, 2006). Leaders trigger in their followers a willingness to undertake action. Winston and Patterson (2006) state that leaders guide followers to "willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy." Leaders use their critical thinking skills, insight, intuition and adequate persuasive communication and ensure that followers understand the ideas that the leader presents. Moreover, they act ethically and care about their followers' well-being, and support their development. In leader–follower interactions, both parties can achieve personal growth and renewal. Winston and Patterson (2006) identify a set of leader's attributes and behaviors including, trust-building, supporting the sense of self-worth and self-efficacy and focusing on the organization's goals. In management and organizational behavior research, the conceptualization of leadership has changed over time. Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, and Eagly (2017) identified three major waves in the understanding and conceptualization of leadership throughout the history of management and organizational behavior research through (1) behaviors and attitudes; (2) behaviors, cognitive schemes and contingencies and by (3) using transformational, social exchange, team and gender-focused perspectives. Today, scholars place more and more emphasis on leaders' social influence within the teams and organizations they lead.

Leaders' behaviors and leadership styles affect various variables concerning followers, such as relations within a team (see Conger & Kanungo, 1988), self-confidence and behaviors of proactive employees (see Coetzer, Bussin, & Geldenhuys, 2017), sense of tension and stress (see Bass & Bass, 2008) and trust in leaders (see Heyns & Rothmann, 2015). We can give several examples to show why it is crucial to define leadership as a process that influences employee attitudes and well-being, thereby impacting organizational effectiveness. New leadership concepts have emerged since the early 2010s. A key recent development is the social identity approach to leadership, which understands leadership as a process of social influence within a group (Haslam, Reicher, & Platow, 2020). We aimed to introduce the concept of social identity leadership within the context of Polish organizational culture and discuss validated research findings on methods to measure this leadership style. The Polish organizational culture is hierarchical and characterized by substantial power distance (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2002). It typically operates based on strict procedures, tends to be slow in responding to change, strives for excellence through discipline, prioritizes rationality over emotions and, thus demonstrates a sense of restraint. A hierarchical organizational culture means that leadership is less oriented toward personal relationships (Tran, 2021). In high-distance cultures, employees are more often in formal relations with their superiors which may result in their weaker identification with leaders. Considering these characteristics, we wanted to verify if Polish employees were less responsive to the influence of identity leadership. Specifically, we were interested in whether there was a relationship between identity. As we will describe below, there is strong evidence that identity leadership benefits organizations and teams. Therefore, we deemed it useful to present and test a Polish adaptation of the instruments for measuring it. Identity leadership appears to be a universal construct (van Dick, Ciampa, & Liang, 2018) but has not yet been established in Poland.

This article will begin with a theoretical overview of identity leadership and its components. Following this, it will outline the key effects of this leadership style, including trust in leaders, job satisfaction and work engagement. The final section of the theoretical introduction will depict the organizational culture of Polish organizations using Hofstede's dimensions. In the empirical section, we will outline the research procedure, describe the research methods and detail the data analysis strategy. Finally, we will present the results, discuss them, draw conclusions and describe the study's limitations.

Identity leadership

In the identity leadership concept, we perceive a leader in terms of the influence they exert on team members and their ability to build a collective identity. Identity leadership focuses on leaders as group members who represent, advance, create and embed followers rather than focusing primarily on developing the leader's own identity as a leader (Haslam, Gaffney, Hogg, Rast, & Steffens, 2022). Identity leadership increases team identification, job satisfaction, work engagement and perceived team support. It also increases the level of trust in a leader and improves performance (Steffens, Haslam, Kerschreiter, Schuh, & van Dick, 2014; Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014; van Dick *et al.*, 2018). A positive relationship between identity leadership and followers' innovative behaviors at work has also been reported (Bracht *et al.*, 2023). Social identity acts as a mediator between transformational leadership and organizational climate (Cheng, Bartram, Karimi, & Leggat, 2016). Moreover, van Dick, Ciampa, and Liang (2018) show that leaders who help their teams develop a sense of shared social identity protect them from the adverse effects of workplace stress, mainly burnout. The higher the level of identity leadership, the greater the team members' well-being. It benefits not only the workplace but also sports, where coaches' identity leadership predicts self-efficacy and goal achievement (Miller, Slater, & Turner, 2020).

Haslam *et al.* (2020) identified four key elements of identity leadership:

(1) Identity prototypicality – the leader is "one of us," embodies core attributes of the team and is an exemplary and model member.

(2) Identity advancement – the leader "does it for us," stands up for the group and is a champion of the group motivating the team and contributing to the fulfillment of group goals.

(3) Identity entrepreneurship – the leader "crafts a sense of us," makes people feel that they are part of the same group, increases cohesion and inclusiveness and clarifies understanding of core values, norms and ideals.

(4) Identity impresarioship – the leader "makes us matter," makes the team visible and promotes structures facilitating shared success (Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014).

By building on these four elements a leader strengthens team members' commitment to and identification with a group (Haslam *et al.*, 2020). Identification with the organization enhances employees' willingness to engage more in their work and help their co-workers (i.e. organizational citizenship behaviors, see van Dick, Grojean, Christ, & Wieseke, 2006) and reduces their intentions to voluntarily leave the organization (see van Dick *et al.*, 2004). A prototypical leader gains higher levels of trust from followers, receives better evaluations and forms efficient, cohesive teams that promote employee well-being (Barreto & Hogg, 2017; Steffens, Munt, van Knippenberg, Platow, & Haslam, 2021). A low level of identity advancement is a predictor of job burnout (van Dick *et al.*, 2018). Identity entrepreneurship correlates with the team members' well-being, lower burnout and lower sense of loneliness (Steffens, Haslam, Kerschreiter *et al.*, 2014; Krug, Haslam, Otto, & Steffens, 2021), as well as increases job-related positive affect and work engagement (Laguía, Moriano, Molero, García-Ael, & van Dick, 2021). It appears that being seen as a typical leader and advancing one's identity predict job satisfaction, whereas being seen as a typical leader, engaging in identity entrepreneurship and demonstrating identity impresarioship predict team identification (Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014). Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.* (2014) developed a short form of the identity leadership inventory comprising one item for each dimension that has demonstrated very good internal consistencies in previous research (e.g. Steffens, Haslam, Kerschreiter *et al.*, 2014, Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014; van Dick *et al.*, 2018). Thus, we predict that:

H1. The Polish version of ILI has a four-dimension structure (prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship) and the identified dimensions are of adequate reliability.

H2. The ILI short form has a one-dimensional structure and adequate reliability.

Possible consequences of identity leadership

Trust in leaders

We may understand trust in a leader as a belief in and loyalty to a leader (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). It is considered to be a key mediating factor between leadership with organizational effectiveness (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Moreover, it relates leadership to organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intentions, organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and is a mediator between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1990). It also mediates the negative relationship between identity leadership and burnout (Krug, Geibel, & Otto, 2021; van Dick *et al.*, 2021). In teams with higher trust, research found higher employee morale, greater willingness to share information and opinions and a creative development of ideas (Sonnenberg, 1994). Trust in a leader develops when employees see that the leader is self-assured, communicates openly, treats others fairly, is willing to support employees and is predictable (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009). Subordinates anticipate the future behaviors of their managers based on their past experiences. Trust appears to develop over time rather than based on a single event (Winston & Patterson, 2006). According to a recent meta-analysis by Steffens *et al.* (2021), respondents consistently linked leaders who embodied a typical identity to higher levels of trust among group members. Research in Chinese companies showed that trust enhanced the link between inclusive leadership and both psychological safety and work engagement (Siyal, 2023) as well as between inclusive leadership and task performance and psychological empowerment (Siyal *et al.*, 2023). Although inclusive leadership is slightly different from identity leadership due to the social nature of this type of leadership we hypothesized:

H3a. Identity leadership is positively related to the trust in the leader.

Job satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction is complex and multidimensional. We can consider it from a cognitive and an emotional perspective (e.g. Zalewska, 2003; Peplińska, Kawalec, Godlewska-Werner, & Połomski, 2020). Therefore, we understand it as an effect of thoughts, views, opinions or judgments about one's job, but also feelings and emotional states connected with the professional role. However, from a behavioral perspective, which describes job satisfaction as the attitude toward work manifested in by organizational behaviors and performance (Haffer, 2015). Job satisfaction is strongly correlated with work engagement (Mazzetti *et al.*, 2023) and affects work performance (Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, & Ilies, 2005).

Job satisfaction results from situational aspects such as work environment and job characteristics, dispositional and personal variables – for example, employee personality – and the interactions between situations and individual differences (Judge *et al.*, 2005). Emotional stability, internal locus of control, self-efficacy and self-esteem are examples of individual factors that influence job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001; Jasiński & Derbis, 2019). However, while job satisfaction remains stable according to dispositional theories, it can decrease when faced with situational changes (Judge & Larsen, 2001). Factors such as remuneration, development opportunities, quality of social relationships in the workplace

and the type and scope of tasks influence job satisfaction (Jurek & Olech, 2019). Other sources of job satisfaction are task diversity, identification with a job, organizational climate, psychological contract and empowerment strictly connected with leadership style (Jurek, 2017). Moreover, scholars also mention leadership, communication, trust, rewards, employee development, working conditions, the role of middle managers, maintaining high ethical standards, interpersonal relationships and talent management as the determinants of job satisfaction (Haffer, 2015).

The emphasis placed on relations and group actions is the essence of identity leadership. Thus, we hypothesized:

H3b. Identity leadership is positively related to job satisfaction.

Work engagement

Work engagement is one of the best-known indicators of workplace well-being. Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) define it as "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption." Vigor means having high energy at work, which helps in dealing with work-hindering obstacles better. Dedication to work arises when employees not only experience positive emotions at work but also strongly believe in its value and significance. Absorption in work is a state of intense focus that makes time spent at work pass quickly (Kulikowski, 2015). Some authors (e.g. Bakker, 2011) indicate that work engagement is a combination of the employee's ability to experience positive emotions at work, such as excitement, enthusiasm, satisfaction and a sense of energy. Work engagement is a key part of the job demands and resources theory (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2023). It explains how job demands and personal and organizational resources affect job performance through employee well-being, with work engagement as a positive indicator and job burnout as a negative one. Work engagement arises as a result of the interaction of many factors. Mazzetti *et al.* (2003) list four different types of resources as a predictor of work engagement: social, work, development and personal, and distinguish leadership as a separate predictor. For example, Breevaart *et al.* (2014) examined links between daily transactional and transformational leadership behaviors and daily employee engagement using a diary study. The results indicated significant effects of leadership on work engagement, which according to the JDR model, leads to improved job performance. Noteworthy, according to Breevaart *et al.* (2014), daily autonomy and daily social support mediate the daily effects of leadership on work engagement. Steffens, Haslam, Kerschreiter *et al.* (2014) have already investigated possible relations between identity leadership, especially the dimension of entrepreneurship and work engagement. Thus, we hypothesized:

H3c. Identity leadership is positively related to work engagement.

Turnover intentions

Branham (2010) lists seven key reasons for quitting a job. These are unfulfilled expectations, job incompatibility, poor coaching and feedback, little opportunity for development, feeling undervalued, stress and loss of trust in senior leaders. It turns out that leaders influence most employees as they shape working conditions and employee relationships. Those who decide to leave their job show higher levels of emotional tension and lower levels of job satisfaction (Swaen, Kant, van Amelsvoort, & Beurskens, 2002). Strong social identification has been shown to prevent employees from quitting (van Dick *et al.*, 2004; Cheng *et al.*, 2016), because a change may be perceived by them as losing a part of oneself and because they feel strongly connected to collective values and norms (van Knippenberg, van Dick, & Tavares, 2007). Thus, we hypothesized:

H3d. Identity leadership is negatively related to turnover intentions.

Specific organizational culture of organizations based in Poland on dimensions suggested by Hofstede

Cross-cultural differences cause differences in organizational cultures and attitudes to management. This results from culture-dependent mental programming that manifests itself in thinking, feeling and behavior patterns (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). Power distance, individualism versus collectivism, motivation toward achievement and success (former masculinity versus femininity), uncertainty avoidance and long-term and short-term orientation (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007) are well-known dimensions differentiating organizational cultures. We will describe these dimensions in general terms and then discuss where Polish organizations tend to sit on each of those dimensions.

Power distance: Power distance refers to the acceptance of power in others. In organizations with low power distance, we observe interdependency, equality in access to privileges and the expectation to be consulted (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). Employees have no problems with consulting managers and expressing different opinions, namely behaviors characteristic of democratic management style. In contrast, in organizations with high power distance, employees rely on supervisors. Employee-manager relations show emotional distance, inequality, hierarchy and a need to follow orders, typical of autocratic or paternalistic leadership. Trust between employees may be low in these organizations (Den Hartog & Dickson, 2018).

Uncertainty avoidance: Uncertainty avoidance refers to the tendency to employ specific rules and procedures to obtain specific results, and the level of danger and stress when faced with new and unfamiliar situations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). It closely relates to the need for predictability and ambiguity avoidance. Organizations and societies with high uncertainty avoidance often follow strict rules to control behaviors and increase the sense of safety. Employees attribute achievements to external circumstances or luck, although they do not feel happy themselves. They value expertise and believe that authorities' decisions are good. On the other hand, weak uncertainty avoidance means trust in general rules and common sense, as well as tolerance for chaos and different opinions. Den Hartog and Dickson (2018) suggest that a leader who focuses on ethical behavior can reduce uncertainty avoidance in teams that display the tendency to avoid new situations.

Long-term orientation: Long-term orientation is related to developing virtues that will be beneficial in the future (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). These include persistence, perseverance, systematicity, frugality and prevention. Learning opportunities, adaptability and integrity are valued. In organizations with a short-term orientation, we may observe the following characteristics: a strong respect for tradition, attention to the fulfillment of commitments/tasks, the expectation of quick results, values such as freedom, individual rights and achievement, and a belief in the value of knowledge and education. Short-term-oriented cultures value righteousness (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

Individualism vs collectivism: Individualism means loose relations between people and concentration on individual needs (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). In individualistic organizations, task performance, autonomy and personal fulfillment are more important than relations with others. In collective societies, a workplace is the source of group identification. Therefore, employees strive to achieve group goals and interests. Interpersonal relations and harmony orientation are more important here than the task itself. Hofstede and Hofstede (2007) notice that large power distance often co-occurs with collectivism and low power distance – with individualism.

Masculinity – femininity (Motivation toward achievement and success): Masculinity versus femininity is the dimension describing assertive and submissive behaviors. The most important goals in masculine organizations and societies are success, progress, constant growth and challenges, while in feminine – caring for others, cooperation, compromise and life quality. Masculinity vs femininity and individualism vs collectivism do not correlate with each other. This means that highly collectivistic/individualistic organizations are not necessarily more masculine or feminine, and vice versa.

According to Hofstede's results, the Polish organizational culture seems to have some unique characteristics compared with other countries. As Table 1 shows, uncertainty avoidance and individualism in Polish organizations are similar to Eastern European countries, while motivation to achievement scores are closer to Western European countries. Power distance in Poland is substantially higher than in Western countries, although not as high as in other Eastern countries. The long-term orientation score is the lowest among the neighboring countries. Scholars find power distance and uncertainty avoidance to be the most important dimensions when describing organizations (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2007). We may consider the unique characteristics of Polish organizational culture to be the effect of the long-term communist regime, challenging economic changes and the need to cope with a new economic situation (see Den Hartog, Koopman, Thierry, & Wilderom, 1997; Alaminos-Fernandez, Alaminos-Fernandez, & Alaminos, 2023). That is why a typical Polish organization struggles with bureaucracy and the need for order which both lead to uncertainty avoidance, subordination to authorities that reflects large power distance and intense work meant to bring profits in the future. At the same time, Sitko-Lutek's (2008) research shows that there is a significant dissonance between the existing ("culture as is") and the preferred national culture ("culture as should be"). Polish managers value low power distance, low achievement motivation (femininity) and people orientation, although long-term orientation and a high level of uncertainty avoidance are still expected. Research conducted by Wronka-Pośpiech and Frączkiewicz-Wronka (2016) demonstrates that changes toward the preferred organizational culture are occurring in Polish institutions. Polish institutions, especially public ones, can grow by fostering a flexible, innovative organizational culture that encourages experimentation.

The present research

The main goal of our research is to test the reliability and validity of the Polish version of ILI. Based on the previous research on ILI, we formulated hypotheses about construct and criterion validity. We hypothesized that the Polish version of ILI has a four-dimension structure (prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship) and the ILI short form has a one-dimension structure. We also expected that the Polish version of ILI is significantly related to job satisfaction, work engagement, trust in leaders and turnover intentions.

	Power distance	Individualism	Motivation towards achievement	Uncertainty avoidance	Long-term orientation	
Poland	68	47	64	93	49	
Germany	35	79	66	65	57	
Russia	93	46	36	95	58	
Ukraine	92	55	27	95	86	
UK	35	76	66	35	69	

Source(s): https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison-tool (2024)

Table 1.
Poland on key organizational culture dimensions against selected other countries

Method

Sample and procedure

Our sample consisted of two independent subsamples from different organizations located in Northern and Central Poland. Polish collaborators collected the data for subsample 1 consisting of 375 Polish employees in a cross-cultural research described by van Dick *et al.* (2021). The sample comprised participants from all age groups (9.9% 18–25; 34.4% 26–35; 34.4% 36–45; 20.0% 46–55; 1.3% over 55 years old). Women made up the majority of this subsample (72.8%). The collaborators collected the responses between November 2019 and September 2020. We recruited a convenience sample of 703 Polish employees (Subsample 2) via email and social media in several organizations across the country. The age in this subsample ranged from 17 to 65 years old, with a mean age of 33.05 years old (SD = 8.75). Roughly half of participants (56%) were female. We used Qualtrics to conduct the survey. We collected the responses between March and December 2020. Every fifth person from the examined sample, in addition to the ILI scale, completed additional scales measuring different organizational attitudes. We assumed that it is not necessary to examine the full sample to confirm the significance of the relationships between ILI and organizational attitudes. In this way, we tried to optimize the study. We aimed to recruit heterogeneous employee samples. We accomplished this aim in that the sample comprised participants from diverse age groups across different professions and industries and with varying degrees of work experience. Both surveys were anonymous. All participants took part voluntarily. We performed the correlation analyses used in the validity study on a smaller number of respondents. In each case, the tables contain full information about the number of subjects.

Measures

Identity leadership. We used the 15-item Polish version of ILI (van Dick *et al.*, 2021) that measures four dimensions of the phenomenon: prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship (Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014). To obtain the Polish version, we applied the standard procedure of translation, back-translation and resolving inconsistencies by discussion (Brislin, 1970). The participants used a seven-point scale where 1 indicated "disagree completely" and 7 – "agree completely." The participants were to think about their team and team leader (i.e. a direct supervisor/line manager) and assess to what extent the leader behaved in a particular way, e.g. "embodies what the team stands for" or "arranges events that help the team function effectively." Four items, one for each dimension, also can be used to compute ILI short-form scores (Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014). Appendix in English and Polish presents a full and short form of the scale.

Job satisfaction. The scale included six items (van Dick, Schnitger, Schwartzmann-Buchelt, & Wagner, 2001). It was used in the international research described by van Dick *et al.* (2021) (e.g. "Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job"). Participants used a seven-point scale, from 1 (does not apply) to 7 (applies fully). The scale reliability was 0.81.

Trust in the leader. The scale consisted of six items describing interpersonal trust, belief in the leader's intentions and loyalty to the leader (e.g. "I feel quite confident that my leader will always try to treat me fairly") (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1990). Participants used a seven-point scale, with 1 indicating "does not apply", and 7 – "applies fully". The scale reliability was 0.92.

Work engagement. We used the 17-item version of Schaufeli and Bakker's (2003) work engagement scale. Participants responded to all items (e.g. "At my work, I feel bursting with energy") on a seven-point scale from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). In this article, we used only the global work engagement index (0.94).

Turnover intentions. We used the scale developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1983). It included three items (e.g. "I often think about quitting."). The scale reliability

Analytic procedure
To test H1 and H2, we conducted CFA using Mplus version 8.5. We conducted basic descriptive and correlational analyses using the SPSS ver. 25 statistical software (IBM corp.). Drawing on Konarski (2010) and van Dick *et al.* (2018), we interpreted model fit using the Santorra–Bentler chi-square (S-B χ^2), the robust root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the robust comparative fit index (CFI), the robust Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and the robust standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). In the CFA, the root of mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is the most widely used assessment. Scholars consider the model to fit the data when the following values are obtained: RMSEA <0.08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1992), and TLI and CFI >0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995). Regarding SRMR, well-fitting models obtain values less than 0.05 (Byrne, 1998).

Results
Construct validity
In the first phase of the validation, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on two independent samples to check whether the factor structure fits the theoretical model. We tested both the 15-item version of ILI and the shortened, 4-item version. Similarly to van Dick *et al.* (2018) analyses, we tested the fit of data to four theoretical models: a four-correlated-factor model (Model A), one-factor model (Model B), a four-orthogonal-factor model (Model C) and four-factor model with second-order factor (Model D). Results indicate (Tables 2 and 3) that in both independent subsamples, all four models fit above the recommended value of 0.05 or less. Table 2 shows that Model A (the oblique model) and Model D (the higher-order factor model) fit the data relatively well. In both cases, RMSEA was around 0.07, CFI and TLI were above 0.95. The $\Delta\chi^2$ analyses showed a slight yet significant advantage of Model A over Model D. However, the qualitative analysis of other indices suggests that both models showed comparable fit to the data. Cross-cultural adaptation prepared by van Dick *et al.* (2018) indicated similar values of fit indices for Model A (four-correlated-factor model) and for Model D (four factors with higher-order factor model) for some countries (e.g. China and Israel). Results in Table 3 replicate results from Table 2, that is Model A (oblique model) and

Models	A	B	C	D
Satorra–Bentler χ^2	250.35	596.96	1537.16	279.99
Df	84	90	90	86
Scale correction	1.52	1.58	1.42	1.52
Robust RMSEA	0.073	0.123	0.207	0.078
Robust RMSEA CL	[0.061–0.083]	[0.113–0.132]	[0.198–0.216]	[0.068–0.088]
Robust CFI	0.964	0.891	0.736	0.958
Robust TLI	0.955	0.873	0.692	0.949
Robust SRMR	0.021	0.035	0.600	0.025
$\Delta S\text{-}B \chi^2$	–	232.51	90111.76	29.64
Δdf	–	6	6	2
p		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Note(s): A. Four-correlated-factor model, B. One factor model, C. Four-orthogonal-factor model, D. Four factor model with second-order factor
Source(s): Own elaboration

Table 2.
Fit indices for identity leadership inventory models in sample 1 ($N = 375$)

Models	A	B	C	D
Satorra–Bentler χ^2	364.12	943.17	1987.35	382,72
Df	84	90	90	86
Scale correction	1.82	1.89	1.81	1.82
Robust RMSEA	0.069	0.116	0.173	0.070
Robust RMSEA CL	[0.062–0.076]	[0.109–0.123]	[0.167–0.180]	[0.063–0.077]
Robust CFI	0.958	0.872	0.716	0.956
Robust TLI	0.948	0.851	0.669	0.946
Robust SRMR	0.025	0.041	0.568	0.028
ΔS-B χ^2	–	390.21	1757.13	18.60
Δdf	–	6	6	2
p		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Note(s): A. Four-correlated-factor model, B. One factor model, C. Four-orthogonal-factor model, D. Four factor model with second-order factor
Source(s): Own elaboration

Model D (the higher-order factor model) fit the data better than Model B and Model C. Results for both independent samples lead to the same conclusions. Thus, we conclude that fit indices for the Polish adaptation do not differ significantly from this reference point, and Model A and D represent an acceptable data fit, whereas Model B and C are not acceptable (for example in both cases RSMEA was above 0.10, CFI and TLI below 0.90).

Moreover, we conducted a CFA for the identity leadership inventory-short form in both independent subsamples. In the first subsample (n = 375), all fit indices indicated a good fit to the data (Satorra–Bentler χ^2 = 2.76, df = 2. Ns; Scale correction = 1,36; Robust CFI = 0.999; Robust TLI = 0.996). In the second sample (n = 703), the results were very similar (Satorra–Bentler χ^2 = 0.32, df = 2. Ns; Scale correction = 1,54; Robust CFI = 1.00; Robust TLI = 1,00). Thus, we conclude that fit indices for the Polish adaptation of the short form of ILI indicated a good fit.

Comparative data from Table 4 shows very good reliability indices in both samples and thus it supported hypotheses 1 and 2. The data resemble those obtained in three studies by Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.* (2014) and the international research by van Dick *et al.* (2021).

Criterion validity
Tables 5 and 6 present the intercorrelations among the ILI subscales, the short version of ILI and four outcomes (job satisfaction and, trust; work engagement and turnover intentions).

Independent variables	Number of items	Sample 1 (N = 375)	Sample 2 (N = 703)	Original version (2014, 2018)
Full version	15	0.98	0.97	0.98
Prototypicality ("Being one of us")	4	0.94	0.93	0.91–0.96
Advancement ("Doing it for us")	4	0.96	0.94	0.89–0.95
Entrepreneurship ("Crafting a sense of us")	4	0.96	0.95	0.88–0.95
Impresarioship ("Making us matter")	3	0.93	0.90	0.92–94
ILI short version	4	0.93	0.89	0.92

Source(s): Own elaboration

The collected data show that in line with Hypothesis 3, identity leadership positively correlates with trust (3a), job satisfaction (3b) and work engagement (3c), and negatively with the intentions to quit (3d). These relationships apply to each of the four facets of the ILI and the short form.

Discussion and conclusions

In line with other research, the 15-item Polish version of the Identity Leadership Inventory (ILI) showed a four-dimension structure justifying the differentiation into the four facets of prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship as suggested by Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.* (2014). However, the 15-item Polish version also allows for calculating an overall ILI score. Both the overall score and the four subscales showed good reliability. The identity leadership inventory-short form also showed a good fit to the data. This indicates its applicability in research conducted in Poland, allowing comparison with findings from other countries (e.g. van Dick *et al.*, 2021; Laguía *et al.*, 2021), reinforcing identity leadership as a universal construct (van Dick *et al.*, 2018). Organizations based in Poland benefit from identity leadership in a similar way to organizations in other countries because, as our results indicate, it correlates positively with trust in leaders, job satisfaction and work engagement, and negatively with turnover intentions. These variables are crucial in terms of organizational effectiveness (e.g. Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010; Breevaart & Zacher, 2019). Implementing the methods used in the present research in organizations, for example, as a part of an employee satisfaction survey or an assessment of managerial competence, can indicate areas of leadership that need to be developed to provide appropriate teamwork conditions. For example, preliminary data from Alex Haslam's *et al.* (2023) studies indicates that participants of the 5R Program reported large increases in identity leadership knowledge and significant positive effects in broadly defined team engagement and so-called "teamfulness." These results suggest that it is possible to make positive changes in the realm of identity leadership, and the validated methods outlined in this article enable the monitoring of these changes.

Positive effects of using identity leadership have been described in previous research that shows, among others, relationships between job satisfaction, work engagement and higher trust toward a leader (e.g. Steffens, Haslam, Kerschreiter *et al.*, 2014; Steffens, Haslam, Reicher *et al.*, 2014; van Dick *et al.*, 2018). The results of our study confirm such relationships also in the Polish samples. We can assume that it is a result of the fact that a leader inspires in his or her followers a sense of identity and identification with a team (Haslam *et al.*, 2020). It probably arises from the individuals' needs and not necessarily from the organizational culture in which they are involved.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ILI	4.34	1.72								
2. Prototypicality	4.34	1.74	0.95**							
3. Advancement	4.71	1.86	0.96**	0.89**						
4. Entrepreneurship	4.18	1.88	0.96**	0.87**	0.88**					
5. Impresarioship	4.05	1.79	0.92**	0.81**	0.83**	0.88**				
6. ILI short form	4.27	1.75	0.98**	0.93**	0.94**	0.94**	0.92**			
7. Job satisfaction	5.00	1.21	0.65**	0.62**	0.64**	0.61**	0.59**	0.63**		
8. Trust	4.62	1.64	0.84**	0.82**	0.81**	0.81**	0.73**	0.82**	0.69**	

Note(s): $^{**}p < 0.01$, (two-tailed)
Source(s): Own elaboration

Table 5.
Means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations between study variables ($N = 375$)

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ILI	4.57	1.63								
2. Prototypicality	4.45	1.70	0.90**							
3. Advancement	4.90	1.71	0.93**	0.79**						
4. Entrepreneurship	4.54	1.86	0.96**	0.81**	0.87**					
5. Impresarioship	4.37	1.74	0.92**	0.76**	0.79**	0.88**				
6. ILI short form	4.54	1.63	0.98**	0.89**	0.91**	0.94**	0.89**			
7. Work engagement	3.81	1.17	43**	0.33**	0.44**	0.42**	0.39**	0.41**		
8. Turnover intentions	3.89	2.06	−0.36*	−0.37*	−0.31*	−0.39*	−0.26*	−0.36*	−0.67*	

Note(s): **$p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, (two-tailed)
Source(s): Own elaboration

The differences between the preferred and existing Polish organizational culture indicate future directions of cultural change: from task orientation to people orientation, reduction of power distance, from masculine to feminine cultural patterns and moving away from a bureaucratic culture based on formal authority and hierarchy, lack of openness and participation in organizational processes and high power distance (Sitko-Lutek, 2008). All those changes require specific leadership. Identity leadership fosters unity through a "one of us" mentality, reducing power distance, promoting relationship building and strengthening team identification. Considering the results obtained by Chinese researchers (Guo, Zhu, & Zhang, 2022), we may presume that positive effects of identity leadership will occur in Polish organizations characterized by large power distance, because employees will feel a smaller distance to their leaders. Engaging in actions that benefit the collective ("doing something for us"), identity advancement assists in navigating situations characterized by uncertainty avoidance and managing changes effectively. Therefore, identity leadership may become an important factor reducing various negative consequences of uncertainty avoidance. In many organizations, it may be a key buffer that compensates for the lack of uncertainty tolerance. Most likely, by cultivating a collective identity, crafting a shared "sense of us" (identity entrepreneurship), ensuring that individuals feel valued and significant and "making us matter" (identity impresarioship) it encourages a long-term orientation and commitment to shared goals. In our opinion, there are strong indications that the propagation of this kind of leadership in Polish organizations may strengthen organization resources needed to cope with the consequences of excessive power distance, a strong tendency to avoid uncertainty and too short a time perspective.

Our study has some limitations. First of all, we acknowledge that the cross-sectional design does not allow for causal inference. Second, whilst our sample is relatively large, it is certainly not representative of the whole Polish (working) population. Moreover, the majority of the sample consisted of women who are stereotypically perceived as more people-oriented, which could have influenced our results in the context of social variables. Third, we collected data based solely on self-reports. Although we confirmed our hypotheses, it would be necessary that future validity research uses longitudinal designs to conclude about cause-and-effect relationships and to ensure greater gender heterogeneity. Fourth, the validity analyses were limited to correlations and did not use more detailed tools such as regressions or structural equations analysis. In the future, more research is needed using more advanced statistical methods. As identity leadership is a process of social influence (e.g. Haslam *et al.*, 2020) and an employee belongs to the work group, we cannot analyze them in isolation. Future research should focus on using a multi-level approach to assess entire teams and organizations, as scholars particularly emphasize the leaders' role in the multi-level approach (Bakker *et al.*, 2023). Through specific HR practices, organizations promote and support leaders who subsequently influence the demands and resources that the team members experience. Leaders influence team and individual employee well-being, impacting team and employee job performance. From the perspective of JD-R theory, leaders are key job resources. Therefore, future multi-level research should also involve defining relationships between identity leadership and other variables such as team identification, work engagement, job satisfaction and trust in leaders considering both the employee and the team levels. We suggest that future work in this area should consider other phenomena within the organization which include relations among employees such as silence in an organization, counterproductive behaviors and humor at work.

The study results confirmed that the 15-item Polish version of the identity leadership inventory (ILI) has a four-dimensional structure (prototypicality, advancement, entrepreneurship and impresarioship) and satisfactory reliability. The identity leadership inventory-short form (4 items) also showed a good fit with the data. As expected and in line with international research, the relations between identity leadership and important

work-related outcomes were significant, with positive relations between identity leadership and general job satisfaction, work engagement and trust in the leader and a negative relationship between identity leadership and turnover intentions.

References

Alaminos-Fernandez, P., Alaminos-Fernandez, A., & Alaminos, A. (2023). *Hofstede: The value structure in forty European societies. An exploratory approach based on Geert Hofstede's theory*. Alicante: Open Science Obets: University of Alicante.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 265–269. doi: 10.1177/0963721411414534.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *10*(1), 25–53. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933.

Barreto, N. B., & Hogg, M. A. (2017). Evaluation of and support for group prototypical leaders: A meta-analysis of twenty years of empirical research. *Social Influence*, *12*(1), 41–55. doi: 10.1080/15534510.2017.1316771.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and application*. New York: Free Press.

Bracht, E. M., Monzani, L., Boer, D., Haslam, S. A., Kerschreiter, R., Lemoine, J. E., . . . van Dick, R. (2023). Innovation across cultures: Connecting leadership, identification, and creative behavior in organizations. *Applied Psychology*, *72*(1), 348–388. doi: 10.1111/apps.12381.

Branham, L. (2010). *7 prawdziwych powodów odchodzenia z pracy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Studio EMKA.

Breevaart, K., & Zacher, H. (2019). Main and interactive effects of weekly transformational and laissez-faire leadership on followers' trust in the leader and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *92*(2), 384–409. doi: 10.1111/joop.12253.

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(1), 138–157. doi: 10.1111/joop.12041.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *1*(3), 185–216. doi: 10.1177/135910457000100301.

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *21*(2), 230–258. doi: 10.1177/0049124192021002005.

Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, G. D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. In S. E. Seashore, E. E. Lawler, P. H. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures, and practices* (pp. 71–138). Wiley-Interscience.

Cheng, C., Bartram, T., Karimi, L., & Leggat, S. (2016). Transformational leadership and social identity as predictors of team climate, perceived quality of care, burnout and turnover intention among nurses. *Personnel Review*, *45*(6), 1200–1216. doi: 10.1108/PR-05-2015-0118.

Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *15*(3), 227–240. doi: 10.1177/1548051808326596.

Coetzer, M., Bussin, M., & Geldenhuys, M. (2017). The functions of a servant leader. *Administrative Sciences*, *7*(1), 5. doi: 10.3390/admsci7010005.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, *13*(3), 471–482. doi: 10.2307/258093.

Demerouti, E., & Cropanzano, R. (2010). From thought to action: Employee work engagement and job performance. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 147–163). Psychology Press.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Dickson, M. W. (2018). Leadership, culture, and globalization. In J. Antonakis, & D. V. Day (Eds), *The nature of leadership* (3rd ed., pp. 327–353). Sage Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781506395029.n13.

Den Hartog, D., Koopman, P., Thierry, H., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (1997). Dutch and Polish perceptions of leadership and culture: The globe project. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *6*(4), 389–415.

Dirks, K., & Ferrin, D. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 611–628. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611.

Guo, Y., Zhu, Y., & Zhang, L. (2022). Inclusive leadership, leader identification and employee voice behavior: The moderating role of power distance. *Current Psychology*, *41*(3), 1301–1310. doi: 10.1007/s12144-020-00647-x.

Haffer, R. (2015). Determinanty i następstwa satysfakcji pracowników w świetle teorii pozytywnego zarządzania. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, *376*, 152–168. doi: 10.15611/pn.2015.376.11.

Haslam, S. A., Gaffney, A. M., Hogg, M. A., Rast, D. E., & Steffens, N. K. (2022). Reconciling identity leadership and leader identity: A dual-identity framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *33*(4), 101620. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101620.

Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Platow, M. J. (2020). *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence and power* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Haslam, S. A., Reutas, J., Bentley, S. V., McMillan, B., Lindfield, M., Luong, M., ... Steffens, N. K. (2023). Developing engaged and "teamful" leaders: A randomized controlled trial of the 5R identity leadership program. *PLoS One*, *18*(5), e0286263. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0286263.

Heyns, M., & Rothmann, S. (2015). Dimensionality of trust: An analysis of the relations between propensity, trustworthiness and trust. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *41*(1), 1–12. doi: 10.4102/sajip.v41i1.1263.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2007). *Kultury i organizacje. Zaprogramowanie umysłu*. Warszawa: PWE.

Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). Long- versus short-term orientation: New perspectives. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, *16*(4), 493–504. doi: 10.1080/13602381003637609.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues and application* (pp. 77–99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jasiński, A. M., & Derbis, R. (2019). Środowiskowe i osobowościowe uwarunkowania satysfakcji z pracy. *Problemy Higieny i Epidemiologii*, *100*(1), 10–17.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 80–92. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80.

Judge, T. A., & Larsen, R. J. (2001). Dispositional affect and job satisfaction: A review and theoretical extension. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *86*(1), 67–98. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2001.2973.

Judge, T. A., Parker, S. K., Colbert, A. E., Heller, D., & Ilies, R. (2005). Job satisfaction: A cross-cultural review. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, Ch. Viswesvaran (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*, Volume *2*, Organizational Psychology (s. 25–52). London: Sage Publication. doi: 10.4135/9781848608368.n3.

Jurek, P. (2017). Właściwości psychometryczne skali SAT-20 – nowego narzędzia do pomiaru satysfakcji z pracy. *Human Resource Management/Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, *115*(2), 104–126.

Jurek, P., & Olech, M. (2019). *KLIMAT4. Bateria diagnozy klimatu pracy*. Gdańsk: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych i Pedagogicznych.

Konarski, R. (2010). *Modele równań strukturalnych. Teoria i praktyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Krug, H., Geibel, H. V., & Otto, K. (2021). Identity leadership and well-being: Team identification and trust as underlying mechanisms. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *42*(1), 17–31. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-02-2020-0054.

Krug, H., Haslam, S. A., Otto, K., & Steffens, N. K. (2021). Identity leadership, social identity continuity, and well-being at work during COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 684475. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.684475.

Kulikowski, K. (2015). Zarządzanie zaangażowaniem w pracę w świetle teorii wymagań i zasobów pracy. *Nauki o Zarządzaniu*, *24*(3), 80–90. doi: 10.15611/noz.2015.3.07.

Laguía, A., Moriano, J. A., Molero, F., García-Ael, C., & van Dick, R. (2021). Identity leadership and work engagement in Spain: A cross-cultural adaptation of the identity leadership inventory. *Universitas Psychologica*, *20*, 1–13. doi: 10.11144/Javeriana.upsy20.ilwe.

Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(3), 434–451. doi: 10.1037/apl0000089.

Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. *Psychological Reports*, *126*(3), 1069–1107. doi: 10.1177/00332941211051988.

Miller, A. J., Slater, M. J., & Turner, M. J. (2020). Coach identity leadership behaviours are positively associated with athlete resource appraisals: The mediating roles of relational and group identification. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *51*, 101755. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101755.

Peplińska, A., Kawalec, K., Godlewska-Werner, D., & Połomski, P. (2020). Work engagement, organizational commitment and the work satisfaction of tax administration employees: The intermediary role of organizational climate and silence in the organizations. *Human Resource Management/Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, *134–135*(3-4), 127–144. doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.1678.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(2), 107–142. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7.

Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2003). UWES utrecht work engagement scale. Preliminary manual. Occupational Health Psychology Unit, (Version 1, November 2003).

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10–24). Psychology Press.

Sitko-Lutek, A. (2008). Kultura organizacyjna polskich przedsiębiorstw w świetle badań. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, *1*(6), 49–58.

Siyal, S. (2023). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Exploring the role of psychological safety and trust in leader in multiple organizational context. *Business Ethics, the Environment and Responsibility*, *32*(4), 1170–1184. doi: 10.1111/beer.12556.

Siyal, S., Liu, J., Ma, L., Kumari, K., Saeed, M., Xin, C., & Hussain, S. N. (2023). Does inclusive leadership influence task performance of hospitality industry employees? Role of psychological empowerment and trust in leader. *Heliyon*, *9*(5), e15507. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15507.

Sonnenberg, F. (1994). Trust me . trust me not (overcoming the cynicism of employees and customers). *Journal of Business Strategy*, *15*(1), 14–16. doi: 10.1108/eb039609.

Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Kerschreiter, R., Schuh, S. C., & van Dick, R. (2014). Leaders enhance group members' work engagement and reduce their burnout by crafting social identity. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung/German Journal of Research in Human Resource Management*, *28*(1-2), 173–194. doi: 10.1688/ZfP-2014-01-Steffens.

Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., Platow, M. J., Fransen, K., Yang, J., . . . Boen, F. (2014). Leadership as social identity management: Introducing the Identity Leadership Inventory (ILI) to assess and validate a four-dimensional model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(5), 1001–1024. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.05.002.

Steffens, N. K., Munt, K. A., van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M. J., & Haslam, S. A. (2021). Advancing the social identity theory of leadership: A meta-analytic review of leader group prototypicality. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *11*(1), 35–72. doi: 10.1177/2041386620962569.

Swaen, G., Kant, I., van Amelsvoort, L., & Beurskens, A. (2002). Job mobility, its determinants and its effects: Longitudinal data from the maastricht cohort study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *7*(2), 121–129. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.7.2.121.

Tran, Q. H. N. (2021). Organizational culture, leadership behaviour and job satisfaction in the Vietnam context. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *29*(1), 136–154. doi: 10.1108/IJOA-10-2019-1919.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, Ch. (2002). *Siedem wymiarów kultury*. Kraków: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.

van Dick, R., Christ, O., Stellmacher, J., Wagner, U., Ahlswede, O., Grubba, C., . . . Tissington, P. A. (2004). Should I stay or should I go? Explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job satisfaction. *British Journal of Management*, *15*(4), 351–360. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2004.00424.x.

van Dick, R., Ciampa, V., & Liang, S. (2018). Shared identity in organizational stress and change. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *23*, 20–25. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.11.005.

van Dick, R., Cordes, B. L., Lemoine, J. E., Steffens, N. K., Haslam, A., Akfirat, S. A., . . . Kerschreiter, R. (2021). Identity leadership, employee burnout and the mediating role of team identification: Evidence from the global identity leadership development project. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(22), 12081. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182212081.

van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O., & Wieseke, J. (2006). Identity and the extra-mile: Relationships between organizational identification and organizational citizenship behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, *17*(4), 283–301. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00520.x.

van Dick, R., Lemoine, J. E., Steffens, N. K., Kerschreiter, R., Akfirat, S. A., Avanzi, L., Dumont, K., Epitropaki, O., Fransen, K., Giessner, S., & González, R. (2018). Identity leadership going global: Validation of the Identity leadership inventory across 20 countries. *Journal of Occupational Organizational Psychology*, *91*(4), 697–728. doi: 10.1111/joop.12223.

van Dick, R., Schnitger, C., Schwartzmann-Buchelt, C., & Wagner, U. (2001). Der Job Diagnostic Survey im Bildungsbereich: Eine Überprüfung der Gültigkeit des Job Characteristics Model bei Lehrerinnen und Lehrern, Hochschulangehörigen und Erzieherinnen mit berufsspezifischen Weiterentwicklungen des JDS. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, *45*(2), 74–92. doi: 10.1026//0932-4089.45.2.74.

van Knippenberg, D., van Dick, R., & Tavares, S. (2007). Social identity and social exchange: Identification, support, and withdrawal from the job. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *37*(3), 457–477. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00168.x.

Winston, B., & Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*(2), 6–66.

Wronka-Pośpiech, M., & Frączkiewicz-Wronka, A. (2016). Strategic orientation and organizational culture in Polish public organizations: Insights from the miles and snow typology. *Management (1429–9321)*, *20*(1), 126–141. doi: 10.1515/manment-2015-0029.

Zalewska, A. (2003). Skala Satysfakcji z Pracy–pomiar poznawczego aspektu ogólnego zadowolenia z pracy. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia Psychologica*, *7*, 49–61.

Appendix
Identity leadership inventory (ILI); English version#
Identity prototypicality

    (1) This leader embodies what [the group] stands for.

    (2) This leader is representative of members of [the group].

    (3) This leader is a model member of [the group].*

    (4) This leader exemplifies what it means to be a member of [the group].

Identity advancement

    (5) This leader promotes the interests of members of [the group].

    (6) This leader acts as a champion for [the group]. *

    (7) This leader stands up for [the group].

    (8) When this leader acts he or she has [the group's] interests at heart.

Identity entrepreneurship

    (9) This leader makes people feel as if they are part of the same group.

    (10) This leader creates a sense of cohesion within [the group]. *

    (11) This leader develops an understanding of what it means to be a member of [the group].

    (12) This leader shapes members' perceptions of [the group's] values and ideals.

Identity impresarioship

    (13) This leader devises activities that bring [the group] together.

    (14) This leader arranges events that help [the group] function effectively.

    (15) This leader creates structures that are useful for [group members]. *

   *Items from Identity Leadership Inventory–Short Form (ILI–SF)
   Identity Leadership Inventory (ILI) - Polish version
   Kwestionariusz przywództwa tożsamościowego

Mój bezpośredni przełożony/Moja bezpośrednia przełożona…
Prototypowość

    (1) …uosabia to, co akceptuje grupa.

    (2) …reprezentuje członków grupy.

    (3) …jest uosobieniem grupy.*

    (4) …jest przykładem tego, co znaczy być członkiem grupy.

Wspieranie

(5) ...promuje interesy członków grupy.

(6) ...działa jak promotor grupy.*

(7) ...staje w obronie grupy.

(8) ...swoimi działaniami pokazuje, że interes grupy leży mu/jej na sercu.

Przedsiębiorczość

(9) ...sprawia, że ludzie mają poczucie, iż są częścią tej samej grupy.

(10) ...kreuje poczucie jedności w grupie.*

(11) ...rozwija zrozumienie tego, co znaczy być członkiem grupy.

(12) ...kształtuje u członków grupy sposób postrzegania wartości i ideałów grupy.

Impresaryjność

(13) ...wymyśla działania spajające grupę.

(14) ...aranżuje wydarzenia, które pomagają grupie skutecznie działać.

(15) ...tworzy struktury użyteczne dla członków grupy.*

*Pozycje ze skróconej wersji ILI (ILI–SF)

Corresponding author
Sylwiusz Retowski can be contacted at: sretowski@swps.edu.pl