CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Leadership Effectiveness: An Integrative Review

Martin M. Chemers

While there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are theorists of leadership, a widely accepted view is that leadership is "a process of social influence through which an individual enlists and mobilizes the aid of others in the attainment of a collective goal." Several elements are significant in this definition. The goal is "collective," and leadership is a collective process – that is, leadership exists as a response to collective need. Secondly, leadership is a process of "influence." Leadership is not a coercive process. Leadership involves obtaining and utilizing the assistance of other people. In all these ways, leadership is a *social* phenomenon. Its roots and its purposes are in the nature of group activity, and its full understanding is most possible when based in an understanding of social processes and their psychological underpinnings. Thus, it is very appropriate that the field of social psychology remains the conceptual home for leadership theory and research. In this chapter, I will review the dominant theoretical perspectives in the leadership literature and attempt to integrate them into a coherent whole. (Also see Lord, Brown, & Harvey, this volume, chapter 12.)

Functions of Leadership in Groups and Organizations

Organizational effectiveness and the successful leadership that makes productive effort possible are complex processes. It is helpful to approach the study of such processes by asking what are the key functions that leaders, groups, and organizations must accomplish to be successful, and what are the key elements of each of those functions.

Organizational functions

Organizations are complex systems of interpersonal relationships that exist within a dynamic environment. To be viable and effective, organizations must accomplish two basic functions – one concerned with internal integration and the other with external accommodation (Chemers, 1993; 1997; Schein, 1985).

Internal maintenance. The first vital function of any organization is to maintain the integrity and reliability of its internal systems. This function can be labeled internal maintenance. Every organization is confronted with innumerable routine and recurrent events. Organizations must develop reliable, predictable, and accountable systems for dealing with these stable events and for developing a basic integrity to organizational functioning. For example, a university must select and enroll students, assign classes, locate classes, assign faculty to teach, make payrolls, maintain buildings, and many more such activities. For the organization to be efficient, these recurrent events must be carried out in ways that are consistent over time and place (i.e., reliability), that allow others to anticipate those activities (i.e. predictability), and that allow for assessment of the success of those activities (i.e., accountability). In his classic analysis of social influence, Festinger (1950) argued that a key function of informal social communication is to allow members of a group to coordinate their efforts by developing a common goal and expected behaviors (norms) for acting in pursuit of those goals. This is even more true of large organizations which must establish internal maintenance to ensure efficient, goal-directed activity.

External adaptability. If the environments in which organizations functioned were completely stable and unchanging, the reliable and efficient systems of internal maintenance would be sufficient for organizational success. However, all organizations exist in environments that are, in some degree, dynamic, and many organizations must function in highly unstable and unpredictable circumstances. To deal with changing milieus, organizations must accomplish the function of external adaptability. Any living organism in a dynamic environment – and complex organizations certainly resemble living organisms – must develop methods for detecting changes in the environment (i.e., sensitivity), an ability to change internal systems in response to external change (i.e., flexibility), and a desire to accommodate organizational functioning to maximize adaptation to the environment (i.e., responsiveness). Thus, a competitive university at the beginning of the twenty-first century must be aware of changes in the environment with respect to student interest, research funding, community needs, governmental regulations, etc., and must modify its academic programs, research centers, accounting systems, public relations, community outreach programs, and a myriad of other activities to maximize the fit between internal and external environments.

The greatest challenge facing organizations is caused by the fact that internal maintenance and external adaptability are, to some degree, incompatible functions. Efforts to make an organization more reliable and predictable may impede its ability to be flexible and responsive. Accounting systems that maintain fiscal integrity cannot be modified

easily. Academic programs (e.g., general education requirements) that reflect basic values of the institution cannot respond, without careful consideration, to every shift in student interest. Balancing internal maintenance and external adaptability is crucial to organizational survival.

Leadership functions

Leadership is one of the major vehicles by which organizations achieve the functions described above (Chemers, 1997). Each of the organizational functions has a corollary leadership function at the level of the group or team. When groups are confronted with tasks that are stable, predictable, and well understood, the primary responsibilities of the leader are to motivate and guide subordinates. The leader must arouse in the followers a desire to contribute to group goal attainment, and then must provide appropriate levels of structure and guidance to allow followers to make such contributions. However, when the group's task is complex, dynamic, or unclear, the leader's responsibility shifts to that of accumulating and processing information to make decisions and solve problems to assist the group in orienting itself toward goal attainment.

Like the organizational functions, these two classes of leadership functions are also somewhat in contradiction. The strategies and behaviors that might be most effective in guiding and motivating followers – for example, articulating a clear goal, giving clear instructions – may not be possible when the leader is unclear about how to proceed. Alternatively, the participative atmosphere most appropriate to solving problems and enhancing follower intrinsic motivation could be wasteful when clear procedures already exist and efficiency is crucial to competitive success. Effective leadership involves balancing these functions in order to maintain a group that is cohesive, motivated, and directed. The objective of this chapter is to survey the empirical literature to identify and elaborate the critical elements that allow individuals to fulfill the daunting challenges of leadership effectiveness.

Elements of Effective Leadership

If we return to our definition of leadership as "a process of social influence in which an individual enlists and mobilizes the help of others in attaining a collective goal," we may infer some of the key elements of effective leadership.

First, leaders must enlist the aid of others. That is, they must act as credible sources of influence that encourage others to follow them, that is, they must establish legitimacy. Second, they must mobilize others. One aspect of this mobilization process entails motivating and focusing the energy of followers toward the collective intent. That is, leaders must establish a relationship with followers that encourages followers to apply their capabilities and efforts for the common purpose. This emphasis on the motivation of followers might be thought of as internal to the group process. However, another aspect of mobilization, directed more toward the external task environment, involves the application of

group members' knowledge, capabilities, energy, and material resources to the attainment of the group's goal. I label these three elements of effective leadership *image management*, *relationship development*, and *resource deployment*.

Image management

The decision to become a follower is an important one. It involves the loss of personal autonomy as one chooses to relinquish some independence of action and to expend one's efforts under the direction of another person. It also involves a degree of risk, as the follower has now placed some probability of personal goal attainment in the hands of another person. The decision to follow depends on the perception of the leader as credible and capable. The leader must be worthy of status and legitimacy. The would-be leader, must "look like a leader." The leader candidate must project an image that evokes a sense of trust and commitment in the follower. A considerable portion of leadership research over the last 40 years has been concerned with the question of how such an image is established and maintained.

Legitimacy. Some of the earliest of the modern work on leadership credibility (and still among the best work) was embodied in Hollander's (1958, 1993) "idiosyncrasy credit" model of leader legitimation and status bestowal. In a series of careful laboratory experiments, Hollander showed that leaders accumulate a virtual "bank account" of credibility (credits) that facilitates social influence and gives the individual latitude to introduce new ideas (idiosyncrasy) as they establish legitimacy. Legitimacy is, in turn, based on evidence that the leader is competent in the capacities needed to move the group toward its goal and is trustworthy, based on past adherence to group norms. Thus, through competence and conformity, the would-be leader establishes the legitimacy to influence others and introduce new ideas that may help the group to accomplish its goals. Kouzes and Posner's (1987) popular management treatise, *The Leadership Challenge*, reported a survey of 1,500 workers describing their best leader which found that honesty and competence were the two more important traits of outstanding leaders. How, then, do potential followers decide that a leader is competent and trustworthy.

Leader perception. Much of the early research on leadership involved work on the development of scales for measuring leader behavior. One of the most popular and enduring of these instruments is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Fleischman & Harris, 1962). The LBDQ was derived from factor analyses of extensive ratings of leader behavior in a variety of settings. The scale comprised two main factors. The first factor, *Initiation of Structure*, measured the degree to which a leader engaged in behaviors, such as work assignment, criticism of errors, emphasizing productivity, that are oriented toward providing task-relevant structure for goal achievement. The second factor, *Consideration*, measured leader behaviors, such as being friendly, making jokes, being considerate of followers' needs or feelings, that are oriented toward maintaining a positive climate and good morale in the group. Although early hopes that

one or the other of these factors would prove predictive of leadership effectiveness were not borne out (Korman, 1966), the measure remained a popular adjunct to leadership research. The widespread interest in leader behavior and the scales used to measure it led to the very interesting discovery that perceptions of leadership behavior were extremely prone to error.

Eden and Leviatan (1975) asked subjects to provide ratings of leader behavior after being given extremely limited information about a hypothetical production facility. Not only were the subjects willing and able to provide such ratings, but subsequent analyses revealed the same factor structure as that obtained when actual followers rated actual leaders' behavior. Staw (1975) showed subjects a videotape of a group working on a task. Although all subjects saw the same videotape, they were given false feedback about the group's performance with half told that the group had performed very well and half told the opposite. The performance feedback strongly affected the subjects' perceptions of the leader's behavior, that is, more active and positive leader behavior was rated in the "high performance" group than in the "low performance" group. A similar finding was reported by Rush, Thomas, and Lord (1977), who asked business school students to rate hypothetical leaders of high and low performing organizations. Clear differences indicated that the leaders of successful organizations were *assumed* to engage in high level of both task and morale-related behaviors.

Information-processing approaches. Lord and his associates (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982; Lord & Maher, 1990, 1991; see also Lord, Brown, & Harvey, this volume, chapter 12) developed an information-processing model of leader perception. They argued that followers form impressions of leaders in much the same way that other social perceptions are developed. Individuals process information in two modes (Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977); a *controlled* mode, which involves careful and rational attention; and an *automatic* mode, involving much less effortful and attentive processing. Automatic processing is guided by "knowledge structures" (Galambos, Abelson, & Black, 1986) such as scripts, categories, implicit theories, prototypes, etc. One powerful class of knowledge structures is prototypes (Cantor & Mischel, 1979; Rosch, 1978) which are category-based repositories of information about certain types of people, including typical traits, characteristics, and behaviors.

Lord, Foti, and Phillips (1982) demonstrated that people hold prototypes of leaders which include traits and behaviors. Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) had subjects read vignettes about leaders which varied in the number of prototypical behaviors that were ascribed to the leader. The degree of leadership prototypicality of the vignettes was strongly related to leadership perceptions of the subject. Furthermore, when prototypicality was sufficient to evoke a perception that the leader was effective, subjects added behaviors to their descriptions that were not in the vignette, but were prototypical of leaders in general.

Observers derive judgments of leadership from both direct and indirect information about the leader's behavior and about the success of the leader's organization, and those judgments influence their expectations and reactions to that leader. Once a person is seen as a leader, other perceptions are likely to be consistent with expectations for the leadership category prototype.

In an interesting extension of this approach, Hains, Hogg, and Duck (1997; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; also see Hogg, this volume, chapter 3) melded information-processing theory to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) to determine which aspects of a leader's image would be most important in giving a leader legitimacy. Hogg and associates presented politically active subjects with descriptions of leaders that included information about their competencies and their attitudes, to determine if followers would give greater credibility to the most competent individual or to one who best embodied the group-defining political attitudes and values. They found that all subjects gave higher ratings to potential leaders who were described as possessing leadership abilities, but subjects who strongly identified with the political group also gave higher ratings to the individuals who espoused the central group values. Hogg and associates found that for followers who were highly identified with their group, a potential leader's possession of normative values, attitudes, and orientations was as important as the possession of more universal leadership competencies. If we interpret these findings in light of Hollander's (1958, 1993) idiosyncrasy credit theory, information about prototypical leader traits provides information about competence, and information about espoused values and conformity to attitudinal norms provides information about trustworthiness.

Meindl (1990) has argued that leadership perceptions are so extensive and influential that they create a "romance of leadership." Not only do we hold prototypes of effective leadership which bias our judgments of leaders, but also our culture's belief in the positive effects of leadership is so ingrained that we attribute many organizational outcomes to the effects of leadership, even when we have no evidence to support such conclusions. For example, Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985) found that the number of leadership stories appearing in business-related newspapers and magazines increased when the stock market fell, and people ostensibly become more concerned about business success. Meindl and Ehrlich (1985) asked business school students to rate the importance of leadership (among other factors) to organizational functioning after reading vignettes describing organizational performance. The more extreme the performance (good or bad), the greater importance was attributed to organizational leadership.

Charisma. The centrality of leadership in our perceptions of group success and the complex relationship of autonomy and dependence between leader and follower may help to explain the basis for "charismatic" leadership. In his seminal work on organizations, Weber (1924/1947) identified the charismatic form of authority in which the leader's legitimacy depended on being chosen to fulfill some spiritual mission and/or being especially gifted in the sense that the leader has "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he (*sic*) is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities" (p. 358).

Several contemporary approaches to leadership emphasize charismatic or exceptional (i.e., transformational) qualities that contribute to a leader's credibility, legitimacy, and influence. Bass (1985) describes transformational leaders as having unusual competencies or expressing an organizational mission in idealized terms. House (1977) examined charismatic historical figures and concluded that they were characterized by the presentation of a compelling goal and the manifestation of extremely high levels of self-confidence.

Chemers, Watson, and May (in press) report that leaders with high "leadership efficacy," that is, those who describe themselves as having exceptionally good leadership skills and abilities, are given higher ratings on leadership potential by superiors and peers. Here again, we can see the compatibility of these findings with earlier work. Being chosen for an idealized or spiritual mission establishes the leader's credibility and trustworthiness, and high levels of projected self-confidence provide the basis for inferring competence.

Summary. In summary, the establishment and maintenance of a credible leadership image depends on projecting the characteristics of task-related competence combined with honesty and trustworthiness. Real or imagined behaviors consistent with the leadership prototype enhance the likelihood of such an image being established, and once established, contribute to further judgments that are consistent with and support that image.

Relationship development

The second major element of effective leadership concerns the leader's ability to establish a relationship with followers that motivates them to bring their full attention, energy, and commitment to the collective endeavor. In a goal-oriented group, the primary momentum for building that relationship is provided by the leader's *coaching and guidance*. Appropriate task-related mentoring helps the followers to feel empowered in their roles, to grow and develop intellectually as team members and as individuals, and to accomplish assigned tasks effectively. The leader's basic resource for providing the appropriate type and amount of structure and support is an accurate understanding of the followers' needs, with respect both to task-relevant skills and to personal or emotional needs. Accurate *attributions and judgments* form the basis for that understanding. Finally, the relationship must be built on *fair and equitable exchanges* between leader and follower.

Coaching and guidance. Effective motivation is based on a balance between an individual's desire for autonomy and need for structure. Theories of extrinsic motivation (e.g., expectancy theory [Vroom, 1964]) emphasize that individuals must believe that they have the relevant skills and knowledge to achieve performance levels associated with desired rewards. Intrinsic models (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 1980) highlight the importance of autonomy – but autonomy combined with performance feedback. Tasks that exceed a person's skills and knowledge undermine instrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Thus, strong intrinsic and extrinsic motivation will result from coaching that allows for a level of follower autonomy that is compatible with the follower's need and desire for structure.

A number of leadership models that focus on follower motivation recognize the importance of coaching that provides sufficient structure to guide the subordinate in accomplishing the task while allowing sufficient autonomy and room for intellectual growth to be intrinsically motivating. Building on the work of earlier theorists (Evans, 1970; Georgopoulos, Mahoney, & Jones, 1957), Robert House (1971; House & Mitchell, 1974) developed path-goal theory which combined an expectancy theory approach to motivation with an emphasis on leader behavior. Path-goal theories argued that leader

behaviors such as initiating structure would increase subordinate motivation by clarifying the path to the goal, thus making goal attainment appear more likely. House added the notion that the effects of a particular set of leader behaviors would be contingent on the nature of the subordinates' tasks and their relative need for structure. Path-goal theory hypothesized that structuring behavior would be most motivating when the subordinate's task was very complex or difficult, but would actually have a detrimental effect on clear or easy tasks where it would be seen as overly close monitoring. However, when a subordinate's task or work environment was boring or aversive, leader's consideration behavior should have a positive effect by buoying up morale and satisfaction.

Empirical research on path-goal theory has yielded mixed findings (Indvik, 1986). One methodological reason for only moderate support involves our earlier discussion of biases in ratings of leader behavior. General positive or negative reactions to a leader may elicit prototype-based perceptions of behavior – which may or may not accurately reflect actual leader behavior. In many of these studies measures of task characteristics, leader behavior, and subordinate motivation are all taken from one source – the subordinate, which is a very weak method. However, moderators of leader behavior effects that may be more important conceptually are those related to the nature of the subordinate's personality.

Although path-goal theorizing often mentions subordinate personality characteristics, few of the empirical studies actually measure such characteristics. In one study that did, Griffin (1981) measured the level of subordinate "growth need strength" (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), reflecting the individual's need for intellectual growth and development on the job. As hypothesized, Griffin found that growth need was a strong moderator of subordinate reactions. Followers high in growth need strength are less in need of structure regardless of task difficulty than are low growth need followers, but are more in need of comforting consideration when the task is routine or highly structured. This study illustrates the importance of considering follower personality, expectations, and needs when predicting the most useful type of coaching.

Although it has not been extensively empirically tested, situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977) also asserts that the degree of leader involvement in subordinate work activity (i.e., through coaching and direction) should be based on the subordinate's level of task-relevant knowledge and experience as well as on the subordinate's commitment to organizational goals. With increasing subordinate ability and commitment, the leader should gradually move away from direction toward participation and, eventually, delegation.

Bass's (1985, 1998) well-supported transformational leadership theory stresses that outstanding leadership involves providing the subordinate with assignments that are intellectually challenging and foster growth, development, and change. He argues further that the leader must treat the subordinate with "individualized consideration." In other words, it is not enough to be considerate of one's followers in some generic, well-meaning way. It is necessary that the leader approach each subordinate as an individual and provide support, encouragement, or direction that is tailored to that individual's needs and stage of development. In each of these theories of coaching, it is assumed that the leader can accurately assess the follower's needs and abilities. However, a significant question concerns factors that affect a leader's ability to accurately judge a follower's emotional needs or intellectual capabilities.

Attribution and judgment.   Leaders must rely on their observations of subordinate behavior and subordinate task performance to form judgments about their relative ability and commitment. Attempts to explain such judgments rely heavily on social psychological theories of attribution (Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967; Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rust, & Rosenbaum, 1972).

Green and Mitchell (1979) hypothesized that leaders' explanations for a subordinate's poor performance – a crucial judgment – would be guided by Kelley's (1967) factors of consistency (how frequent was the failure), distinctiveness (was the performance unique to a particular task), and consensus (how did other workers perform). They predicted that when subordinates were seen as failing consistently on a variety of tasks that other workers handled successfully, internal attributions to the subordinate's ability or effort would be more likely than explanations that involved factors outside of the subordinate's control (e.g., a difficult task or lack of organizational support). Such internal attributions were expected to lead to more punitive sanctions such as firing, rather than more benign interventions such as counseling or training. Experimental studies supported these hypotheses (Mitchell & Wood, 1980). Furthermore, Mitchell and Kalb (1982) found that when a subordinate's failure results in outcomes that are more severely negative for the organization, supervisors are more likely to make internal attributions and punitive interventions. The more severe reactions were seen even though the failure or improper procedure is exactly the same as that which results in less severe outcomes and less severe sanctions.

An analysis of leader attribution in group settings (Brown, 1984) explains why this might be so. Brown makes the powerful point that leadership involves "reciprocal causation." When a subordinate performs poorly, it reflects on the leader's performance as well. Poor performance might be the result of the subordinate's lack of ability or motivation, but it might also be the result of inattentive or poor leadership. As the severity of the outcomes increases, the evaluative implications for the leader also increase. Thus, added to the normal tendency to locate the causes of performance internally (Jones & Nisbett, 1971) is the leader's inclination to place blame elsewhere. Defensiveness may be a significant contributor to biased attributions by leaders.

Fiske (1993) notes that in relationships of unequal power, individuals with more power have a tendency to rely on stereotypes in the perception of subordinate partners. In part, this tendency arises from the fact that stereotypes require less effortful information processing for leaders who may be under heavy cognitive demand. A less benevolent explanation is related to the limiting and controlling effects of stereotypes on the less powerful partner. Goodwin and Fiske (1993) report that individuals with strong needs for power or personal dominance are even more likely to use stereotypes in judgments of others.

Another source of potential misjudgment is related to the very control the leader has in the situation. Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, and Mauch (1976) coined the term "the metamorphic effects of power" to describe the phenomenon that superiors who exercise strong methods of influence are more likely to see themselves as the source of the subordinate's compliance and subsequently devalue the subordinate as weak. Further, if the subordinate performs well, the leader is more inclined to take credit for that performance (Kipnis, Schmidt, Price, & Stitt, 1981). Pfeffer, Cialdini, Hanna, and Knopoff (in press) manipu-

lated student leaders' perceptions of the amount of involvement they had in a subordinate's task completion and found that the leaders' ratings of the quality of the task product was significantly correlated with the degree of self-perceived involvement.

In summary, leaders are naturally inclined to take credit for a subordinate's good performance, but likely to place the blame for failure on the subordinate. The more important the task or outcome, the more enhanced the tendency. Judgments lead to sanctions or corrective actions with profound implications for subsequent subordinate motivation, confidence, and commitment.

Fair exchanges. The relationship between the leader and follower is a form of transaction or exchange. The leader expects the subordinate to provide effort to attain the group's goals, and the follower, in turn, expects to be fairly compensated and treated respectfully.

Research on power and influence in leadership relationships (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1982; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990) provides a clear consensus. The most desirable and effective forms of leader power are referent power – rooted in the leader's attractiveness as a person and role model – and expert power – dependent on the leader's task-relevant knowledge. Similarly, the most well-accepted tactics of influence are rational appeals and consultation, both of which are predicated on the assumption that the subordinate is an intelligent and willing partner in the relationship.

The power of treating the subordinate as a partner is highlighted in the work of Graen and his associates (Graen, 1976; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Graen's vertical dyadic linkage model concerns the manner in which the leader and a subordinate negotiate the roles each will occupy in the relationship. After an initial period of acquaintance, the leader forms a judgment of the subordinate that leads toward a relationship in which the subordinate is treated either as a valued partner or a "hired hand." In high quality exchanges (i.e., partnerships), subordinates are given more interesting assignments and greater latitude in their accomplishment with the result that the subordinate becomes more committed to the relationship, the work, and the organization.

Summary. Relationship development is a critical element in effective leadership. In good relationships, followers become willing and committed partners, placing team and organizational success above their own interests. Feelings of partnership are dependent on the follower being treated with fairness and respect which entails providing an atmosphere of coaching and development for growth based on an accurate understanding of the follower's capabilities, personal style, and emotional needs and resources.

Resource deployment

The third important element of leadership is resource deployment. The potential effort, energy, and knowledge of a group of motivated followers represent the resource base for task accomplishment as do the skills, knowledge, and energy of the leader. These resources

must be deployed toward goal attainment, and that can happen in relatively more or less effective ways.

Self-deployment. The capabilities of effective leadership that we have described in the previous sections call on the leader to make the best possible use of his or her own resources. Good leaders must project an image of competence and trustworthiness. They must treat followers with sensitivity and respect, while challenging them to contribute to group goals. Finally, leaders must be astute observers of the group's environment and adjust internal maintenance processes to achieve successful external adaptation. What factors determine a leader's success in meeting this daunting set of demands?

Recent research suggests that confidence in one's ability to lead is a critical factor in effective self-deployment. Bennis and Nanus's (1985) popular book on leadership was based on interviews with 60 private sector and 30 public sector chief executive officers in outstandingly successful organizations. They concluded that these leaders were characterized by very high levels of self-confidence in their ability to lead and optimism about the results of their actions.

In a more controlled research approach, Chemers and his associates have reported that leaders high in leadership efficacy (i.e., the belief that one possesses the specific skills and general abilities necessary for leadership) are seen as more capable of leadership by peers, superiors, and subordinates and lead teams that perform more effectively. Chemers, Watson, and May (in press) obtained self-reports of leadership efficacy and optimism from a large group of ROTC cadets and later obtained ratings of the cadets' leadership performance from military science instructors at their universities and from peers, superiors, and evaluators of a leadership simulation at a summer Advanced Leadership Camp run by the U.S. Army. Leaders high in self-efficacy received higher ratings from every evaluative source than did less confident leaders.

In a study of men's and women's college basketball teams, Watson, Chemers, and Preiser (in press) measured the leadership efficacy of the teams' on-court leaders (e.g., team captains) and the collective performance efficacy of the entire team prior to the beginning of the season and then related those perceptions to each team's win and loss record for the season. After controlling for talent factors, such as previous season's record, number of returning players and starters, and coaches' overall assessment of talent, Watson et al. found leadership efficacy to be a strong and significant predictor of collective efficacy which, in turn, was a significant and strong predictor of team performance.

In these studies, leadership efficacy was treated as a dispositional variable (i.e., a relatively stable aspect of individual self-concept), but there is evidence that confidence is also affected by a leader's sense of fit with the environment. Eagley, Makhijani, and Klonsky (1992) report that some tasks are seen as more or less "congenial" or comfortable for male or female leaders. Regardless of sex, leaders who were in congenial tasks were more likely to act forcefully. Chemers, Ayman, Akimoto, and Sorod (1992) described a series of studies that indicated that leaders whose leadership style (i.e., task vs. relationship motivation) was matched to the degree of structure in the situation (according to the contingency model predictions [Fiedler, 1967; Fiedler & Chemers, 1984]) were more confident and positive about themselves and their groups than were mismatched leaders.

The ways in which one's mental state might influence the successful deployment of personal resources is illuminated by cognitive resource theory (CRT) (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987). Based on an extensive empirical base, CRT indicates that the usefulness of a leader's cognitive resources, that is, intelligence and experience-based knowledge, is drastically affected by the degree of stress the leader is experiencing. Leaders who are under heightened stress (e.g., from bosses, tasks, or other factors) become unable to use their intelligence in successful problem solving and decision making. They essentially become "nattering fools" (Fiedler, 1993). However, if experience has provided the leader with good knowledge on how to proceed (not requiring complex thought analysis), performance under stress can be excellent. The studies described above suggest that leadership confidence is a very important variable in self-deployment, and that confidence can result from either dispositional characteristics or from the fit between leadership style and the task environment.

The second aspect of resource deployment concerns the effective utilization of the followers' effort, knowledge, and commitment.

Team deployment.   The idea that some leadership styles or orientations are more suited to particular task environments is central to theorizing about how leaders maximize the fit between internal processes and environmental demands. One of the major breakthroughs in the study of leadership effectiveness occurred during the decade between 1965 and 1975 and was the recognition that different leadership situations might influence the relative effectiveness of various leadership styles or decision-making strategies.

In 1967, Fiedler published *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, which brought together an extensive set of research findings in the presentation of a theoretical approach labeled the contingency model. The model proposed that leaders approach group task situations with a strong orientation to maximize either interpersonal success or task accomplishment. Task-oriented leaders were generally more sensitive to task-related information and most likely to employ directive and structuring behavior. Relationship-oriented leaders were more attentive to interpersonal and morale-related issues and more likely to use participative decision making and considerate behavior.

Most remarkable was that Fiedler's data indicated that each of these leadership orientations was differentially effective based on the degree of predictability and control that the leadership situation provided to the leader. Predictability and control were determined by (1) the willingness of the followers to accept the leader's influence, (2) the degree of structure and clarity in the task, and (3) the amount of formal authority that the organization bestowed on the leader. These three variables were combined to yield a continuum of "situational control."

Task-oriented leaders were found to function most effectively in situations of very high or very low control. Both of these extremes make the use of directive strategies effective. In high control, the leader knows how to lead and the followers are prepared to follow. In low control, a firm hand on the rudder is necessary to keep the group from foundering. The relationship-oriented orientation with its use of subtler and more responsive tactics is better suited to the ambiguous and relatively less predictable middle zone characterized by an unstructured task or uncertain relationships. Although the subject of considerable controversy during the 1970s with respect to the validity of its findings, the

contingency model has been strongly supported by two meta-analyses done in the 1980s (Peters, Hartke, & Pohlmann, 1983; Strube & Garcia, 1981).

Approaching the problem from a different direction, but arriving at a similar conclusion, Vroom and his associates (Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Vroom & Jago, 1974) developed a contingency theory of small-group decision making called normative decision theory. Based on work in the decision-making and problem-solving literature (Maier, 1963), Vroom and Yetton deduced that the two crucial factors in decision making were how much information the leader had about the decision and how much support the leader was likely to have from followers in the implementation of any decision made. One can see that these two factors mirror the degree of clarity and structure in the group task and follower willingness to accept influence, which are the central variables in Fiedler's contingency model.

Normative decision theory identifies a continuum of leader decision styles that range from autocratic (the leader makes the decision alone) through consultative (the leader seeks advice from subordinates) to democratic or participative (the group makes the decision). When the leader has both the knowledge and structure to make a good decision and the expectation of willing support from followers in implementation, autocratic decision making is fastest and most efficient. As the leader's control over the situation deteriorates due to unclear information or a lack of support, more consultative or participative decision styles are likely to be more effective, because follower participation increases the likelihood that more information will be processed and that more support will develop. Although often seen as contradictory, the contingency model and normative decision theory are really complementary approaches. Each predict that more directive leadership approaches will be more effective in clear and predictable situations, and more participative approaches will be most successful in complex and ambiguous situations.

Summary. Successful leadership requires the effective deployment of internal resources to external demands. When a group is confronted with a complex and unpredictable environment, it will function most effectively if it employs flexible processes that involve many group members and much information in the decision. When situations are more structured and predictable, more regimented, time-efficient strategies can be successful. Good leaders must be able to recognize these features of the external environment to be able to adapt group processes. They must also have developed the kind of working relationships with followers that allow a group to function smoothly in various modes. A sense of personal efficacy leading to a calm and non-defensive posture seems to be the link between personal and team deployment.

Potential Moderators of Leadership: Culture and Gender

Most of the research that has been reviewed in this chapter was done in the United States or Western Europe and measured the behavior or performance primarily of White males. A very reasonable question is how much of what is concluded here remains valid if we consider leadership by women or people of other cultures.

Cultural factors

There is a reasonable, but not extensive literature on leadership in non-Western cultures. However, there is also a fairly well-developed literature on cultural differences in social processes, which while not directly about leadership, are quite relevant and applicable to leadership (also see Carnevale & Leung, this volume, chapter 20).

Cultural factors in social processes. One of the earliest and most important areas of social psychological consideration was the effect of values on social behavior (Znaniecki, 1918) – an interest also central to the study of cultural differences (Triandis & Brislin, 1980). A considerable body of research in organizational psychology has addressed the effects of value differences on work-related behavior in different societies.

Geert Hofstede (1980, 1984) has published some of the most influential work on values as related to organizational functioning. Hofstede (1980) adapted a number of value measures used in cross-cultural research on organizations into a comprehensive scale, which he then administered to a very large sample ($n > 50,000$) of middle managers from over 40 countries. Factor analyses resulted in four factors:

1   *Power distance*, referring to the degree of status differentiation accepted in social relations;
2   *Uncertainty avoidance*, reflecting people's comfort with risk and ambiguity in daily functioning;
3   *Individualism–Collectivism*, indicating the degree to which individuals in a society value individual, personal accomplishment as opposed to ingroup advancement and loyalty; and
4   *Masculinity–Femininity*, measuring the amount that members of the society valued "masculine" goals, such as achievement, competition, and material success as compared to "feminine" goals, such as nurture, concern for harmony, and quality of life.

Hofstede argued that cultural values help to determine organizational practices – for example, the extent to which leadership in goal-setting processes was relatively autocratic (e.g., France) or participative (e.g., Germany) as a result of differences in power distance; or the extent to which an organization had extensive sets of bureaucratic controls (e.g., Japan) or looser and more flexible systems (e.g., United States), reflecting different levels of uncertainty avoidance.

A number of social psychologists have zeroed in on the individualism–collectivism dimension as relevant to a range of social psychological processes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1990). Markus and Kitayama (1991) analyzed differences in construal of the self in individualistic societies (the independent self) and in collectivist societies (the interdependent self) – in terms of self-related cognitions, emotions, and motivation. Independents are most attentive to self-relevant information, are most emotionally affected by personal issues and are most motivated by outcomes related to individual goals and achievements. Interdependents, on the other hand, see themselves as deeply embedded

in a social context with the result that perception, thought, emotion, and motivation are most attuned to social roles and the achievement of harmonious relations and advancement of the group. It is reasonable to expect that differences in self-orientation like these might be related to both the image of what a good leader is and the expectations for what a fair, sensitive, and rewarding leader–follower relationship would involve.

In a cross-cultural taxonomy of relational orientations, Fiske (1991) details four common patterns in the exchange of valued resources. *Community sharing* refers to the pattern in which each group member gets what is needed, regardless of the level of their own contribution, and is based on generosity, concern for others, and avoidance of loneliness and isolation. *Authority ranking* involves unequal allocation based on status and power and entails the respect, deference, and obedience to superiors common in high power distance societies. *Equality matching* emphasizes social justice, reciprocity, and equal sharing of rewards, with the attendant diminishment of status differences. *Market pricing* means that resources are distributed based on "equity" or "fairness," implying that each person should be rewarded on the basis of merit and every individual seeks his or her own level. One might hypothesize that the nature of the leader–follower exchange and the type of behavior that would personify a good leader would vary considerably under these different systems.

Early (1997) integrates Hofstede's (1980) values difference and Fiske's (1991) resource exchange approaches in a model based on "face, harmony, and social structure." Early argues that the primary agenda in human social life is the determination of self-identity and position in a social structure. The two forms of face – one related to moral worthiness and the other to social prestige, status, and honor – are negotiated according to the particular values, norms, and exchange relationships in any social group. These negotiations ultimately are a major determinant of the form and functioning of organizations. For example, in collectivist societies, where trust between ingroup members is the basis of security and survival, moral worthiness is the most important form of face. In a society with strong status differentiation or authority matching exchanges, social prestige and standing are more important. When people in each society interact, their social interplay is a subtle attempt to establish, enhance, or protect their own face in a way that doesn't endanger future important interactions with the other party. For example, an American manager might seek to increase his social face by claiming responsibility for a successful project completion, but must be mindful not to reduce the face of other team members who also contributed to this project's success and might do so again in the future.

Cultural factors in leadership processes. The question of the cultural specificity of leadership processes is a complex and subtle one. The answer depends on the way in which the question is framed and on the level at which the analysis is aimed. Research on cultural factors in leadership behavior provides a case in point.

In 1969, Chemers reported that behavioral ratings of leaders by Iranian managers resulted in an unusual factor structure. Instead of structuring (task-focused) behavior and consideration (morale-focused) behavior appearing as independent factors, as they almost always do in the United States, the two factors collapsed into one general factor that was strongly related to subordinate ratings of satisfaction with the leader. In 1983, Ayman

and Chemers reported another similar factor structure in ratings of managerial behavior by Iranian subordinates. In the 1983 study, two new items that were added to the leader behavior scales ("my leader is a good leader" and "my leader is like a kind father to me") loaded heavily on this common factor, which again was strongly related to subordinate satisfaction with the leader. Ayman and Chemers concluded that this factor, labeled *Benevolent Paternalism*, represented the Iranian prototype of an effective leader. Sinha (1990) has reported similar ratings of leaders in India.

Based on these ratings, one might conclude that effective Iranian (or Indian) leaders behave differently (based on cultural values) than do American leaders. The problem with that conclusion is that although the leaders rated in the Ayman and Chemers (1983) study were Iranians, the leaders in the Chemers (1969) study were actually American leaders rated by Iranian followers. The more reasonable conclusion is that the differences in factor structure were more likely to have been caused by leadership prototypes held by the Iranian raters, rather than in the actual behavior of the leaders.

An extensive 25-year research program undertaken by Japanese psychologist, Jyuji Misumi (Misumi & Peterson, 1985) sheds more light on this question. Misumi's research on the performance–maintenance theory of leadership (Misumi, 1984; Misumi & Peterson, 1985; Misumi & Shirakashi, 1966; Misumi & Tasaki, 1976; Tasaki & Misumi, 1976) found that Japanese leaders who combined performance behavior (i.e., structuring, direction, and productivity emphasis) with maintenance behavior (i.e., support, consideration, and friendship) were more effective than those who emphasized only one of the behaviors. The effect was found both in field studies in which subordinates rated their managers and in laboratory experiments where trained leaders controlled the behavior they exhibited. The research by Misumi and by Chemers and Ayman leads to two questions. Are structuring and consideration behaviors universal categories, and why are they independent in some cultures and combined in others?

Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, and Bond (1989) administered an adapted Misumi's performance–maintenance survey to workers in the United States, Great Britain, Hong Kong, and Japan. In addition to general ratings of performance and maintenance, they added a number of very concrete and specific behaviors. They found that while the two factors were found in all four samples – perhaps reflecting the fact that leadership always involves a task and people – the specific behaviors that loaded on each factor were different in the different countries. The differences reflected the value differences already discussed. For example, American and British workers thought leaders were being considerate when they discussed work-related performance problems directly with them, while the Asian subordinates preferred that their superiors take an indirect approach of talking to their coworkers to protect against personal embarrassment (i.e., loss of face). Thus, at a general level, the two factors do seem to be widespread across culture, while the specific behaviors relevant to each factor are culturally specific.

As to why effective leaders in Iran, India, and Japan might be capable of combining structuring and considerate behavior while U.S. and other Western leaders seem to emphasize one or the other may also be dependent on values and expectations. Chemers (1997, 1998) argues that in individualistic and relatively low power distance societies (such as the United States, U.K., Australia, Israel), subordinates' need for growth and autonomy requires that considerate leadership behavior provide opportunities for subor-

dinate participation and development. Since high levels of directiveness and high levels of participation are contradictory, leadership in individualistic societies is likely to be more differentiated than in collectivist, high power distance cultures where a good leader (like a good father) can be both kind and directive.

Recently, Bass (1997) reported that studies of transformational leadership in several countries revealed that outstanding leadership was universal. Leaders associated with outstanding levels of task performance were rated highly on the behavioral factors of his transformational leadership model, that is, inspirational influence, idealized vision, individualized consideration, and intellectual challenge. What we don't know is whether outstanding leaders around the world all engage in the same behaviors, or if, no matter what the culture, good leaders are perceived as competent, trustworthy, and very concerned about their followers, even though the specific behaviors might be quite different.

Gender factors

Like culture, an analysis of gender differences in leadership requires considerable subtlety of analysis. Stereotypes have long existed about differences in the suitability of men and women for leadership roles. Bass, Krusell, and Alexander (1971) reported that in a survey of 176 male managers' attitudes toward women at work, the men thought that women lacked career orientation, dependability, and emotional stability. A series of studies on stereotypes of women in leadership reveal the remarkable staying power of these views. Schein (1973) asked male managers to describe the characteristics of men, women, and managers. The descriptions of men had a great deal in common with the descriptions of managers, while women's descriptions showed little overlap. More than 15 years after the Schein study, Heilman, Block, Martell, and Simon (1989) found that the stereotypes had changed little. Men were still more similar than women to managers and to "successful managers."

Is there any substance to these stereotypes? Do women have different leadership styles or capacities that make them less (or more) effective in leadership roles? After reviewing the available literature on the topic, Bass (1981) concluded that "the preponderance of the available evidence is that no consistently clear pattern of differences can be discerned in supervisory style of female as compared to male leaders" (p. 499). A very careful meta-analysis of research on gender differences in leader behavior (Eagly & Johnson, 1990) found very few differences between male and female leaders in terms of supervisory behavior or leadership style, and found only small differences in self-reported decision style. In a similar meta-analysis of research on the evaluation of male and female leaders, Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky (1992) found overall differences to be very slight and moderated by a number of factors, such as the nature of the followers and their attitudes toward women in leadership roles. Eagly et al. (1992) asked college students to rate the "congeniality" of various leadership roles for men and women, that is, how comfortable they thought a man or woman would be in the role. When they applied the congeniality analysis to their meta-analytic data, they found that all leaders – men and women – were described as more directive and forceful and were evaluated more positively when in a congenial role.

The effects of stereotypes and negative expectations for women leaders are not benign. Lord and Maher (1991) argue that the decision about who is a leader and subsequent attributions that flow from that judgment are heavily influenced by the leadership prototype held by the observer. If the prototype for leadership is exclusively masculine, women will have a hard time being perceived as a leader or being rated as an effective leader. In fact, another meta-analysis on leadership emergence (Eagly & Karau, 1991) does indicate that women are less likely to emerge as leaders in male-dominated tasks or organizations.

Belle Rose Ragins has conducted a series of studies examining the relationship of authority to women's leadership. In an exhaustive review of gender and power in organizations, Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) concluded that women have considerably more barriers than men in accumulating power in organizations, for a variety of reasons, including negative stereotypes and expectations. However, when men and women are matched for organizational level, no differences are found: (1) in the use of various forms of power (Ragins, 1989); (2) in subordinates' perceptions of the availability of various types of power (Ragins & Sundstrom, 1990); or (3) in the evaluations of men and women leaders (Ragins, 1991).

The conclusions in the area of gender and leadership are quite clear. Differences between men and women in leadership style or performance are so small as to be insignificant, but the negative stereotypes and expectations that surround women's leadership, while in the process of change, remain a serious impediment to the recognition of women's capabilities for success in leadership roles.

Some Conclusions

The leadership literature is far more coherent than it appears at first glance. Effective leaders project an image of competency and trustworthiness. The trustworthiness encourages followers to perceive the validity of the mission, and the competence creates the expectation that success is possible. Leadership involves a relationship in which leaders motivate followers to give their best, by providing challenges and support for growth and by rewarding people fairly – tangibly or psychologically – for their efforts. Finally, good leaders make effective use of the material and psychological resources of themselves and their teams by choosing strategies for task accomplishment that are adapted to the social and task environment.

A leader's ability to exhibit the capacities described here is greatly influenced by self-confidence. Leadership efficacy plays a role in the setting of high goals and expectations for self and followers and in creating a belief in the ability to achieve those goals. Confidence and positive expectations lead to calm and careful judgment, high effort, and perseverance in the face of difficulty. These attitudes provide the psychological basis for accomplishing the key elements of effective leadership, that is, image management, relationship development, and resource deployment.

In many ways, leadership is a universal process. Good leaders in every culture and at every time are wise and capable, sensitive to the needs and desires of followers, and fair.

These traits are manifested somewhat differently in response to cultural values and expectations. Gender differences, on the other hand, are even less significant in determining leadership effectiveness – being more the result of false stereotypes and biased expectations than the result of true differences in capacity.

How real are the effects of leadership? Is leadership effectiveness nothing more than an overrated social construction (Calder, 1977)? The evidence is quite clear that leadership has a real and significant effect on team and organizational outcomes. Some leaders are indeed more successful than others. However, the particular definition of success and the attributions that surround specific individuals in the leadership role are heavily influenced by expectations, prototypes, and social constructions. Like all social psychological phenomena, leadership researchers benefit from a combination of positivist and constructionist perspectives.

In fact, one promising area of future research might involve the melding of positivist and constructionist approaches in the study of leadership and organizational effectiveness. Given the importance of leader and follower confidence and optimism in team performance, an intriguing question concerns the tradeoff between accurate assessment of environmental contingencies versus perceptions and attributions that give rise to positive interpretations with resultant boosts to confidence.

When we move beyond the relationship between a single leader and single subordinate, the leadership context becomes more complex. Future research is likely to focus more on teams within organizations, and on organizations within society. Work relating leadership to intergroup relations (e.g., Hogg et al., 1998), power relationships (e.g., Fiske, 1993), and the broader cultural context (Chemers, 1997) offer potentially interesting new avenues of investigation.

What must be at the root of all of these approaches is the clear recognition that leadership and teamwork are social phenomena, and research guided by social psychological theory is most likely to allow for its best understanding.

References

Ayman, R., & Chemers, M. M. (1983). The relationship of supervisory behavior ratings to work group effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction among Iranian managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 338–341.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (2nd Ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*, 130–139.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., Krusell, J., & Alexander, R. A. (1971). Male managers' attitudes toward working women. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *15*, 221–236.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, K. A. (1984). Explaining group poor performance: An attributional analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 54–63.

Calder, B. J. (1977). An attribution theory of leadership. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior* (pp. 179–204). Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 12). New York: Academic Press.

Chemers, M. M. (1969). Cross-cultural training as a means for improving situational favorableness. *Human Relations, 22,* 531–546.

Chemers, M. M. (1993). An integrative theory of leadership. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership research and theory: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 293–320). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chemers, M. M. (1998). Culture and leadership. *Japanese Journal of Organizational Sciences, 31*(4).

Chemers, M. M., Ayman, R., Sorod, B., & Akimoto, S. (1991). *Self-monitoring as a moderator of leader-follower relationships.* Presented at the International Congress of Psychology, Brussels.

Chemers, M. M., Watson, C. R., & May, S. (in press). Dispositional affect and leadership performance: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.*

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 39–80). New York: Academic Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 233–256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 685–710.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 3–22.

Early, P. C. (1997). *Face, harmony, and social structure: An analysis of organizational behavior across cultures.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60,* 736–741.

Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the Path-Goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5,* 277–298.

Festinger, L. (1950). Informal social communication. *Psychological Review, 57,* 271–282.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E. (1993). The leadership situation and the Black Box in contingency theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 1–28). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1984). *Improving leadership effectiveness: The Leader Match concept* (2nd Ed.). New York: Wiley.

Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance.* New York: Wiley.

Fiske, A. P. (1991). *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations.* New York: Free Press.

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist, 48,* 621–628.

Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology, 15,* 43–54.

Galambos, J. A., Abelson, R. P., & Black, J. B. (1986). *Knowledge structures.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Georgopoulos, B. S., Mahoney, G. M., & Jones, N. W. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 41,* 345–353.

Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1993). Impression formation in asymmetrical power relationships: Does power corrupt absolutely? Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Graen, G. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1202–1245). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Graen, G., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 9*, 175–208.

Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader-member interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23*, 429–458.

Griffin, R. N. (1981). Relationships among individual, task design, and leader behavior variables. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*, 665–683.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250–279.

Hains, S. C., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1997). Self-categorization and leadership: Effects of group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1087–1099.

Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 935–942.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged edition). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1248–1263.

Hollander, E. P. (1958). Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credit. *Psychological Review, 65*, 117–127.

Hollander, E. P. (1993). Legitimacy, power, and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 29–48). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 321–338.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 3*, 81–98.

Indvik, J. (1986). Path-goal theory of leadership: A meta-analysis. *Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, 189–192.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 219–266). New York: Academic Press.

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). *The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kipnis, D. M., Castell, P. J., Gergen, M., & Mauch, D. (1976). Metamorphic effects of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61,* 127–135.

Kipnis, D. M., & Schmidt, S. M. (1982). *Profiles of organizational influence strategies (Form M)*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Kipnis, D. M., Schmidt, S. M., Price, K., & Stitt, C. (1981). Why do I like thee: Is it your performance or my orders? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66,* 324–328.

Korman, A. K. (1966). "Consideration," "Initiating Structure," and organizational criteria. *Personnel Psychology, 18,* 349–360.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & De Vader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34,* 343–378.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & Phillips, J. S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 104–121). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1990). Alternative information processing models and their implications for theory, research, and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 15,* 9–28.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Maier, N. R. F. (1963). *Problem solving discussion and conferences: Leadership methods and skills*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 98,* 224–253.

Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. A. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 159–203). New York: JAI Press.

Meindl, J. R., & Ehrlich, S. B. (1987). The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 30,* 91–109.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 91–109.

Misumi, J. (1984). *The behavioral science of leadership* (2nd Ed.). Tokyo: Yuhikaku Publishing.

Misumi, J., & Peterson, M. F. (1985). The Performance-Maintenance (PM) theory of leadership: Review of a Japanese research program. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 198–223.

Misumi, J., & Shirakashi, S. (1966). An experimental study of supervisory behavior on productivity and morale in a hierarchical organization. *Human Relations, 19,* 297–307.

Misumi, J., & Tasaki, J. (1965). A study on the effectiveness of supervisory patterns in a Japanese hierarchical organization. *Japanese Psychological Research, 7,* 151–162.

Mitchell, T. R., & Kalb, L. S. (1982). Effects of job experience on supervisor attributions for a subordinate's poor performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67,* 181–188.

Mitchell, T. R., & Wood, R. E. (1980). Supervisor's responses to subordinate poor performance: A test of an attribution model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25,* 123–138.

Peters, L. H., Hartke, D. D., & Pohlmann, J. T. (1983). Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership: An application of the meta-analysis procedure of Schmidt and Hunter. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 274–285.

Pfeffer, J., Cialdini, R. B., Hanna, B., & Knopoff, K. (in press). Faith in supervision and the self-enhancement bias: Two psychological reasons why managers don't empower workers. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 20*.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 387–411.

Ragins, B. R. (1989). Power and gender congruency effects in evaluations of male and female managers. *Journal of Management, 15*, 65–76.

Ragins, B. R. (1991). Gender effects in subordinate evaluations of leaders: Real or artifact? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*, 258–268.

Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 51–88.

Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1990). Gender and perceived power in manager-subordinate relations. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 273–287.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 20*, 93–110.

Schein, E. A. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship of sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*, 95–100.

Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. *Psychological Review, 84*, 127–190.

Sinha, J. B. P. (1990). The nurturant task style of leadership. In R. Ayman (Chair), *Establishing a global view of leadership: East meets West*. Symposium conducted at the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Kyoto, Japan.

Smith, P. B., Misumi, J., Tayeb, M., Peterson, M., & Bond, M. (1989). On the generality of leadership style measures across cultures. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62*, 97–109.

Staw, B. M. (1975). Attribution of the "causes" of performance: A general alternative interpretation of cross-sectional research on organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 414–432.

Strube, M. J., & Garcia, J. E. (1981). A meta-analytical investigation of Fiedler's Contingency Model of leadership effectiveness. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 307–321.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd Ed., pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Tasaki, T., & Misumi, J. (1976). A study of the effect of leadership behavior on group norms in the job situation of an industrial organization. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16*, 1–7.

Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989* (pp. 41–133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Triandis, H. C., & Brislin, R. W. (1980). *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social psychology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: Wiley.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1974). Decision-making as a social process: Normative and descriptive models of leader behavior. *Decision Sciences, 5*, 743–769.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Watson, C. R., Chemers, M. M., & Preiser, N. (in press). Collective efficacy and performance: A multilevel analysis.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.; T. Parsons, Ed.). New York: Free Press. (Originally published in 1924.)

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1972). Perceiving the causes of success and failure. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior* (pp. 95–120). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Yukl, G. A., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 132–140.

Znaniecki, F. (1918). Methodological note. In W. I. Thomas, & F. Znaniecki, (Eds.), *The Polish peasant in Europe and America.* Boston, MA: Bodger.