Critical Leadership Studies

Chapter · January 2011

1 author:

David L Collinson
Lancaster University

173 PUBLICATIONS **7,955** CITATIONS

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Men and Masculinities in Contemporary Organizations View project

Critical Leadership Studies View project

13

Critical Leadership Studies

David Collinson

INTRODUCTION

This chapter considers the emergence of a comparatively new approach to studying leadership. It explores the growing impact of 'critical leadership studies' (CLS). This term is used here to denote the broad, diverse and heterogeneous perspectives that share a concern to critique the power relations and identity constructions through which leadership dynamics are often reproduced, frequently rationalized, sometimes resisted and occasionally transformed (e.g., Gabriel, 1997; Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Fairhurst, 2007; Sinclair, 2007; Banks, 2008; Nye, 2008). Critical studies challenge hegemonic perspectives in the mainstream literature that tend both to underestimate the complexity of leadership dynamics and to take for granted that leaders are the people in charge who make decisions, and that followers are those who merely carry out orders from 'above'.

From the outset, it is important to acknowledge that CLS comprise a variety of approaches informed by an eclectic set of premises, frameworks and ideas (e.g., Calas and Smircich, 1991; Gronn, 2002; Gordon, 2002; Tourish and Vatcha, 2005; Ospina and Su, 2009). Although they share a concern to examine leadership power dynamics, critical studies do not constitute a unified set of ideas, perspectives or a single community of practice. They often draw on the more established field of critical management studies (CMS) which, in seeking to open up new ways of thinking and alternative forms of management and organization, focus on the critique of rhetoric, tradition, authority and objectivity (Mingers, 2000). Questioning traditional orthodoxies, CMS exponents draw on a plurality of theoretical perspectives, ontologies and epistemologies, from

structuralism, labour process theory and critical realism, to feminism, post-structuralism, deconstructionism, literary criticism, postcolonial theory, cultural studies, environmentalism and psychoanalysis. Although these diverse perspectives are often depicted as part of an inclusive 'critical' movement (e.g. Alvesson and Willmott, 2003), they can also be in tension with one another (e.g. Ackroyd, 2004). Fournier and Grey (2000) define CMS in terms of this plurality of conflicting intellectual traditions, arguing that such internal differences are much less significant when critical approaches are contrasted with mainstream, managerialist perspectives.

CLS draw on similar intellectual traditions. They too share a common view, in this case about what is neglected, absent or deficient in mainstream leadership research. Indeed, it could be argued that critical studies emerge directly from that which is underexplored or missing in the mainstream orthodoxy. Whilst all these perspectives critically examine and prioritize power relations and the ways they are reproduced in particular structures, relationships and practices, CLS contrast with many CMS perspectives in a number of ways. In particular, CLS explicitly recognize that, for good and/or ill, leaders and leadership dynamics (defined here as the shifting, asymmetrical interrelations between leaders, followers and contexts) also exercise significant power and influence over contemporary organizational and societal processes. Despite their espoused concern to critique the exercise of power and control, many CMS writers ignore the study of leadership, focusing more narrowly on management and organization. CLS emphasize that leadership and management are often interwoven forms of organizational power and identity that are

not as easily separable as CMS sometimes seem to assume. CLS examine the complex dynamics between leaders and managers, as well as those between leaders, managers and followers. Relatedly, CLS also recognize that whereas leadership and power are often associated with those in positions of formal authority, this is not always the case. Critical studies emphasize that leadership dynamics can emerge informally in more subordinated and dispersed relationships, positions and locations, as well as in oppositional forms of organization such as trade unions (Knowles, 2007) and revolutionary movements (Rejai, 1979). Emphasizing the importance of power asymmetries, CLS also highlight the significance of follower agency and their potential for dissent and resistance.

This chapter explores current developments in this emergent field. It suggests that by raising under-researched questions, CLS have the potential to broaden understanding of leadership dynamics, developing new forms of analysis, as well as opening up innovative lines of enquiry. After considering the weaknesses and absences within mainstream perspectives, as highlighted by various critical writers, the chapter outlines some of the key themes and concepts that inform more critical approaches. It concludes by considering the CLS challenge to contemporary leadership studies.

ESSENTIALISM, ROMANTICISM AND DUALISM

A burgeoning literature now exists exploring the theory and practice of leadership. The vast majority of studies can be located within a 'mainstream paradigm', an umbrella term that, like 'critical studies', draws together a diverse and heterogeneous set of theories, approaches and findings. Within the mainstream paradigm there are significant differences between theories such as the following: trait, situational/contingency; path–goal; leader–member exchange; impression management and social identity; emotional intelligence; and charismatic/transformational leadership. These perspectives have tended to focus on the primary question of what makes an effective leader. Although this literature has produced useful insights regarding leaders' competencies and behaviours, definitive answers about effectiveness have proved elusive, and findings have been inconclusive.

Concentrating primarily on individual leaders and their qualities, mainstream studies have been criticized for being leader-centric (Jackson and

Parry, 2008). Many critical theorists have argued that mainstream studies portray leaders as proactive agents and followers as those who passively respond (e.g. Gronn, 2002). Leader-centric perspectives are most evident in trait theory which, in addressing the attributes needed for leader effectiveness, has recently undergone a resurgence of interest (e.g. Zaccaro, 2007). Similarly, situational theory suggests that effective leaders should communicate by deploying a mix of directive and supportive behaviours compatible with followers' 'developmental levels' (e.g. Hersey and Blanchard, 1996). Path–goal theory holds that leaders must choose styles best suited to followers' experience, needs and skills (e.g. House, 1971). Leader–member exchange theory describes how leaders tend to be open and trusting with 'in-group' followers, but distant with 'out-group' members (e.g. Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Recent interest in 'emotional intelligence' indicates that effective leaders need to develop greater awareness of the emotional dynamics of leadership processes (e.g. Goleman et al., 2002).

Social identity theorists argue that effective leaders are typically perceived as 'prototypical' of the group's identity (van Knippenberg and Hogg, 2003). They predict that followers are likely to endorse leaders who quintessentially embody the values of the group (Hogg, 2001). Identity construction is also central to Gardner and Avolio's (1998) focus on leaders' influence tactics through impression management (framing, scripting, staging and performing). Suggesting that leaders' own life histories might be a significant source of influence over followers, Shamir et al. (2005) illustrate how leaders often strategically construct their biographies to convey predefined messages. Transformational studies assert that leaders can inspire followers to greater commitment by satisfying their needs, values and motivations (e.g. Burns, 1978). They also suggest that effective and charismatic leaders should validate and transform followers' identities (Lord and Brown, 2003) by, for example, acting as role models and encouraging followers' psychological identification and value internalization (Shamir et al., 1993).

These perspectives tend to define leadership primarily as a top-down influence process through which leaders change the ways followers envision themselves. Accordingly, they consider followers only in relation to their susceptibility to certain leader behaviours or styles. Seeking to render leadership a predictable practice and leadership studies a prescriptive endeavour, mainstream approaches tend to portray followers as 'an empty vessel waiting to be led, or even transformed, by the leader' (Goffee and Jones, 2001, p. 148). For example, situational leadership views followers through the rather static and objectified categories of

'enthusiastic beginners', 'disillusioned learners', 'reluctant contributors' and 'peak performers'. Path–goal theory treats leadership as 'a one way event – the leader affects the subordinate' (Northouse, 2004, p. 113). Leader–member exchange theory says little about the ways followers may influence the leader–member relationship or about the group and organizational dimensions of these relationships (Howell and Shamir, 2005). Transformational studies typically draw on highly gendered, heroic images of the 'great man', viewing leaders as dynamic agents of change and followers as passive and compliant.

Critical writers question this recurrent tendency to privilege leaders and neglect followers, frequently pointing to three main (sometimes interrelated) weaknesses in mainstream leadership studies namely, essentialism, romanticism and dualism. These are now briefly discussed in turn.

Critical writers propose that we rethink leadership as socially and discursively constructed and in so doing reject the essentialism that lies at the heart of the psychological, positivist method which underpins the mainstream paradigm (Lakomski, 2005). Psychology focuses primarily on individuals and on their internal (psychological) dynamics, giving much less attention to the socially and discursively constructed nature of leadership dynamics (Fairhurst, 2007, and Fairhurst, Chapter 36, this volume). Positivism tends to rely on quantitative analyses in which standard questionnaires are administered to large samples. By contrast, critical perspectives are more focused on the socially constructed and multiple discourses and meanings that tend to characterize leadership dynamics (Fairhurst and Grant, 2010). Accordingly, they frequently draw on qualitative, interpretive and case study research methods that address the shifting possible constructions of leadership located within their complex (and often asymmetrical) conditions, processes and consequences (see also Bryman, Chapter 2, this volume).

Arguing that leadership needs to be understood as socially constructed, Grint (1997) questions the essentialism underpinning trait, situational and contingency theories which seek to identify the one best way to lead. Such essentialist perspectives assume that it is possible to discover an 'essence' to leaders and their contexts. Grint argues that this search for the universal 'essence' of leadership denies the socially constructed nature of both 'leading' and 'context'. He criticizes the positivist assumption underpinning much leadership research that it is possible for researchers to produce an 'objective' view of either individual leaders or of the specific situations in which they act. All accounts (of leadership) are derived, he contends, from linguistic reconstructions, which

have to be interpreted and are therefore potentially contestable.

Ospina and Sorenson (2007, p. 189) view leadership as a dynamic, collective and community-based achievement. Arguing that leadership is 'intrinsically relational' and 'rooted in context or place', they emphasize that a constructivist lens provides an opportunity to reveal 'the multiple sources of leadership, the multiple forms leadership may take, and the multiple places where it can be found' (2007, p. 200). Accordingly, constructionist perspectives also highlight the importance of context and its multiple (socially constructed) forms (Osborne et al., 2002; Porter and McLaughlin, 2006). Indeed, contexts are important for leadership not only in practice but also in theory. The majority of leadership studies are North American in origin and much research (unconsciously) articulates (positivist) US values (Hartog and Dickson, 2004). Alongside this often acknowledged US-centrism is an assumption that North American cultural values can be transposed to leadership theory, development and practice in quite different contexts (Jackson and Parry, 2008). Yet, it is increasingly evident that leadership and followership dynamics take very different forms in different societies (Bjerke, 1999).

The multiple identities, values and cultures of leaders and followers in various diverse regions, societies and continents are likely to have a significant impact on the possibilities and limits of leadership practices (see also Guthey and Jackson, Chapter 12, this volume). Whereas Western and North American societies typically subscribe to meritocratic principles based on individual achievement, Asian and Eastern societies adhere to more collectivist and ascriptive values that privilege, for example, kinship and age. Cultures in developing countries tend to share certain characteristics such as strong family bonds, a sense of fatalism, deference and an expectation that organizations will take care of their workers; values which often reflect and reinforce highly paternalistic leadership styles (Dickson et al., 2003). Highlighting the importance of geographic, cultural, administrative and economic proximity for effective global leadership, Ghemawat (2005) argues that regions continue to be important, but often neglected units of analysis for cross-border, 'macro' leadership strategies.

In his cross-cultural analysis of leadership development programmes in the USA, Europe and China, Jones (2006) points to the disproportionate influence of US values. He argues that US leader development is informed by its own cultural history of mythical heroes, from the hunter-trapper to the Indian fighter, from the John Wayne cowboy figure to the charismatic business entrepreneur. This mythological view of heroic leaders has been

heavily criticized. Mintzberg (2006) questions the obsession with heroic leaders within leadership studies and its underlying 'syndrome of individuality' which, he believes, is undermining organizations and communities. Meindl et al. (1985) were early critics of this tendency to 'romanticize leadership', where leaders are either credited for high organizational performance or, conversely, held personally responsible for workplace failures. Arguing that we have developed overly heroic and exaggerated views of what leaders are able to achieve, they suggested that leaders' contribution to a collective enterprise is inevitably somewhat constrained and closely tied to external factors outside a leader's control, such as those affecting whole industries.

This critique of leadership romanticism has informed a growing interest in 'post-heroic leadership', an approach that emphasizes its social, relational and collective nature. Post-heroic perspectives highlight the effectiveness of distributed (Gronn, 2002), shared (Pearce and Conger, 2003), servant (Hale and Fields, 2007), quiet (Collins, 2001), collaborative (Jameson, 2007) and community leadership (Ricketts and Ladewig, 2008), as well as co-leadership (Alvarez and Svejenova, 2005). This approach often argues that digital technologies and intensified globalized competition are creating more flexible, team-based and informal leadership practices that are less hierarchical and more focused on shared power and responsibility.

Post-heroic perspectives also reflect and reinforce greater interest in followership (e.g. Riggio et al., 2008; Shamir et al., 2007; Bligh, Chapter 31, this volume). Some have argued that 'exemplary', 'courageous' and 'star' followers are a precondition for high-performing organizations (e.g. Chaleff, 2009: Kellerman, 2007; Kelley, 2004) and for enhancing charismatic leadership (Howell and Shamir, 2005). Viewing 'effective followership' as particularly important in the contemporary context of flatter hierarchies and greater team working (Raelin, 2003), some writers have simply added a concern with followers to produce a less leader-centric version of leadership. In so doing they tend to remain confined within a mainstream managerial focus on followers' contribution to organizational performance.

However, it is also possible to develop a more critical approach to understanding followership by exploring the importance of asymmetrical power relations and insecurities in leader-led dynamics (Collinson, 2006, 2008). This approach treats oppositional practices and identities as important phenomena worthy of analysis, rather than as dysfunctional elements of a system. It recognizes the significance of asymmetrical power relations for understanding followers as well as, and in relation

to, leaders. In so doing, critical approaches also question the reliance in mainstream studies on the artificial and excessive separation between leadership and followership (e.g. Gronn, 2002; Gronn, Chapter 32, this volume).

Various studies question the tendency in orthodox approaches to separate and privilege leaders while neglecting followers, leaders' relations with 'followers' and the wider economic, social, political, cultural and technological contexts. Gordon (2002; Gordon, Chapter 14, this volume) suggests that the historical constitution of the differential in power (and status) between leaders and followers has resulted in mainstream theorists viewing leaders' apparent superiority as 'natural' and unproblematic. Fairhurst (2001) highlights the 'primary dualism' in leadership research as that between the individual and the collective, arguing that studies typically concentrate either on leaders, in ways that overlook the dynamics of the collective, or on the latter, thereby neglecting the former's basis for action. By contrast, she advocates dialectical approaches to leadership which explore the dynamic tension and interplay between seemingly oppositional binaries. Relatedly, critical writers also question the broader reliance in mainstream leadership research on seemingly oppositional binaries or 'dualisms' such as transactional/transformational, organic/mechanistic and participative/autocratic leadership (Collinson, 2005; Grint, 2005).

Debates about dualism(s) and dialectics have a long history in social and philosophical theory (e.g. the work of Hegel, Marx, Sartre, Adorno and Derrida) and more recently have become increasingly influential in organization studies (Knights, 1997; Mumby and Stohl, 1991; Reed, 1997) and communication studies (Baxter and Montgomery, 1996). Giddens' structuration theory (1984, 1987) seeks to overcome the individual/society dualism in social theory by rethinking the 'dialectics of power relations'. Emphasizing an intrinsic dialectical relationship between agency and power within all social relations, Giddens argues that human beings are knowledgeable social agents who, acting within historically specific (unacknowledged) conditions and (unintended) consequences, always retain a capacity to 'make a difference'. His notion of the 'dialectic of control' holds that, no matter how asymmetrical, power relations are always two-way, contingent and to some degree interdependent. An important implication of the dialectic of control is that leader–follower relations are likely to be characterized by shifting interdependencies and power asymmetries. Since power relations are always two-way, leaders will remain dependent to some extent on the led, while followers retain a degree of autonomy and discretion. If we rethink followers as knowledgeable

agents, we can begin to see them as proactive, self-aware and knowing subjects who have at their disposal a repertoire of possible agencies within the workplace. Accordingly, power relations between leaders and followers are likely to be interdependent as well as asymmetrical, typically ambiguous, frequently shifting, potentially contradictory and often contested.

Influenced by Giddens' ideas, critical writers from various perspectives argue that dialectical perspectives can facilitate new ways of thinking about the complex dynamics of leadership. Dialectical approaches to leadership power relations reveal that seemingly opposing categories are interconnected and frequently mutually reinforcing. So, for example, the dialectic of control in the context of leadership dynamics focuses on the simultaneous interdependencies and asymmetries between leaders and followers as well as their ambiguous, shifting and potentially contradictory conditions, processes and consequences. This chapter now explores three interrelated dialectics frequently evident in leadership dynamics: control/resistance; consent/dissent; and men/women. Although these are by no means exhaustive, they illustrate the kinds of dialectical processes through which leader–follower dynamics are frequently enacted and reproduced.

CONTROL/RESISTANCE

Mainstream leader-centred approaches share a tendency to underestimate questions of power and control (Ray et al., 2004). Assuming that the interests of leaders and followers automatically coalesce, orthodox studies view power and control as unproblematic forms of organizational authority while treating resistance as abnormal or irrational. Typically, mainstream studies define leadership in terms of 'influence' (positive), and distinguish this from power (negative). In so doing, they fail to appreciate that the former may be one aspect of the latter. Burns (1978) distinguished between good 'leaders', who mobilize followers to achieve a collective purpose, and 'power holders'. Often viewed as 'the father figure of modern leadership studies' (Jackson and Parry, 2008: p. 11), Burns argued that power wielders should not be considered to be leaders at all. Burns' distinction, which tends to relegate questions of power to a minor concern, has been very influential in leadership studies.

By contrast, CLS explicitly contend that the exercise and experience of power is central to all leadership dynamics. Informed by various perspectives (from labour process theory to radical psychology and post-structuralism), critical leadership writers recognize that leaders' control is very important and can take multiple economic, political, ideological and psychological forms. They show how control is not so much a 'dependent variable' as a deeply embedded and inescapable feature of leadership structures, cultures and practices. Gordon (2002 and Chapter 14, this volume) observes that assumptions about a leader's right to power and dominance are embedded at a deep structural level in most, if not all, organizations.

Leaders can exercise power, control and influence in many ways: for example, by constructing strategies and visions, shaping structures and cultures, intensifying and monitoring work, providing rewards and applying sanctions, and through hiring and firing. They can also exercise power by 'managing meaning', and defining situations in ways that suit their purposes (Smircich and Morgan, 1982). CLS argue that power is intimately connected to knowledge and subjectivity. Influenced by Foucault's (1977, 1979) ideas, critical writers examine the ways that 'power/knowledge' regimes are inscribed on subjectivities. Foucault explored the 'disciplinary power' of surveillance that produces detailed information about individuals, rendering them visible, calculable and self-disciplining selves. He suggested that by shaping identity formation, power is enabling and productive as well as subordinating. As Alvesson and Willmott (2002) observed, 'identity regulation' is now a central feature of organizational control in post-bureaucratic organizations.

The disciplinary nature of power is revealed by a number of studies that explore follower conformity, compliance and consent. Although conformity tends to be viewed positively in mainstream studies, frequently treated as an expression of commitment and loyalty, critical writers highlight its potentially detrimental consequences in certain circumstances. They point to the Nazi extermination of six million Jews and the explanation from those involved that they were 'just obeying orders' as a stark reminder about its potential dangers. Milgram's (1963) experiments highlighted peoples' willingness to obey authority. Fromm (1977) pointed to 'the fear of freedom' where individuals try to shelter in the perceived security of being told what to do and what to think, viewing this as a less-threatening alternative to the responsibility of making decisions for themselves. Similarly, Bratton et al. (2004) highlighted the negative organizational effects of 'destructive consent' and the potentially positive consequences of 'constructive dissent'.

Various writers reveal how followers often attribute exceptional qualities to charismatic leaders through processes such as transference

(Maccoby, 2007), fantasy (Gabriel, 1997), idealization (Shamir, 1999), projection (Shamir, 2007), seduction (Calas and Smirich, 1991) and reification (Gemmill and Oakley, 1992). Lipmen-Blumen (2005) extends these arguments in analysing the 'allure of toxic leaders', where she contends that followers frequently seem to be fascinated by toxic leaders despite, and possibly even because of, the latter's dysfunctional personal characteristics such as lack of integrity, insatiable ambition, enormous egos, arrogance, reckless disregard for the effects of their actions on others and cowardice. From a critical perspective, the destructive and coercive practices of 'toxic', 'dictatorial' and/ or 'bad' leaders are rather extreme forms of leadership power and control. CLS suggest that power and control can also be exercised and experienced in more subtle ways within everyday leadership practices. Suffice it to say here that the production of follower conformity is certainly one possible outcome of leadership dynamics, but is this inevitable?

Some critical writers draw on the arguments of Giddens and Foucault to highlight the dialectic between power and resistance. Foucault asserted that 'resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power' (1979, p. 95). Even in the most totalitarian of power regimes, cleavages and contradictions arise that provide opportunities for resistance, especially in the form of localized acts of defiance. As Foucault argued, 'Where there is power, there is resistance' (1979, p. 95). Accordingly, some critical researchers assert that power/resistance are mutually implicated, co-constructed and interdependent processes that have multiple, ambiguous and contradictory conditions, meanings and consequences (Mumby, 2005). Viewing control and resistance as discursive and dialectical practices, they argue that the meanings of such practices are to some extent open-ended, precarious, shifting and contingent. From this perspective, power is seen as both disciplinary and enabling, while practices of control and resistance are viewed as mutually reinforcing and simultaneously linked, often in contradictory ways (Collinson, 2003).

In leadership studies, issues of dissent have only recently been addressed (Banks, 2008). By contrast, in CMS there is a considerable literature demonstrating that forms of control frequently produce employee resistance (e.g. Fleming and Spicer, 2007). Studies suggest that followers are frequently more knowledgeable and oppositional than has typically been acknowledged in the mainstream leadership literature (Jermier et al., 1994). Some researchers draw on Hirschman's (1970) ideas to argue that resistance enables subordinates to 'voice' dissent (e.g. Graham, 1986). Hirschman argued that in conditions of

organizational decline individuals are likely either to resign (exit) or try to change (voice) products or processes they find objectionable. He suggested that voice is less likely where exit is possible and more likely where loyalty is present and when exit opportunities are limited.

Critical researchers reveal that oppositional practices can take numerous forms (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999), including strikes, 'working to rule', output restriction, 'working the system', 'whistleblowing' and sabotage (Edwards et al., 1995). In exceptional cases, subordinates may even (seek to) depose leaders (Mole, 2004). Even in the military, there is a long history of outright rebellion, mutiny and spontaneous acts of 'follower' dissent (Prince, 1998). Through oppositional discursive practices followers can express discontent, exercise a degree of control over work processes and/or construct alternative, more positive identities to those prescribed by organizations. This focus on the power/resistance dialectic does not imply that followers will invariably engage in resistance (in a mechanical or predetermined way), or that their opposition is necessarily effective. Control may produce compliance and even conformity, while resistance can also have unintended and contradictory consequences. Not all follower dissent is aimed specifically at leaders, and followers do not invariably seek to resist those in leadership positions. In many everyday workplace settings, employees are concerned with performing well and meeting expectations about their job performance.

Some critical writers argue that employee resistance is more likely to emerge when followers believe that leaders are exercising control in unfair, dictatorial, coercive, nepotistic and/or narcissistic ways (see also Kets De Vries and Balazs, Chapter 28, this volume). Equally, followers are more likely to resist when they feel that their views have not been considered, when they perceive leaders to be 'out of touch' and when they detect discrepancies between leaders' policies and practices. Where followers perceive such inconsistencies, they can become increasingly cynical about leaders. Fleming's (2005) research in an Australian call centre found that, in the face of a corporate culture which treated workers like children, employees constructed oppositional identities expressed in cynicism. Employees in a US Subaru Isuzu plant detected inconsistencies between the company's teamworking ideal and work intensification. Consequently, they refused to participate in corporate rituals, sent highly critical anonymous letters to the company and used humour to make light of the company's teamworking and continuous improvement philosophies (Graham, 1995).

Similarly, research in a UK truck manufacturer demonstrated that a corporate culture campaign introduced by the new US senior management team to improve communication and establish trust with the workforce had the opposite effect (Collinson, 1992, 2000). Shop-floor workers dismissed senior management's definition of the company as a team and pointed to recurrent discrepancies between leaders' words and actions. Fuelled by their perceptions of leaders' distance and lack of understanding about production, managers' routine disregard for workers' views, and manual workers' own sense of job insecurity, employees resisted by 'distancing' themselves, restricting output and effort, creating a counterculture and by treating work purely as a means of economic compensation. The company's leaders and managers remained unaware of how their strategies produced contrary effects on the shop-floor. This study showed how control and resistance can be embedded within a mutually reinforcing vicious circle. It also demonstrates that if leaders' claims to authenticity are to be accepted by followers, the former's discourses and practices need to be seen to be consistent (see also Caza and Jackson, Chapter 26, this volume). When followers perceive discrepancies within and between leaders' words and their actions, they are likely to view them as yet another attempt to manipulate the workforce.

Some critical studies suggest that follower dissent may be even more diverse than previously recognized, being aimed at multiple audiences, such as the media (Real and Putnam, 2005) and customers (Leidner, 1993). Those working outside organizations can also express dissent. The campaign against Shell's plans to dispose of the obsolete Brent Spar platform by sinking it in the Atlantic Ocean illustrates how (external) resistance can change leaders' practices. After a Europe-wide boycott of their petrol stations, Shell eventually dismantled the platform on land in Norway. Klein (2000) has explored global protests against the leadership of the World Bank, the IMF and the World Trade Organization as well as more specific campaigns against companies like Nike, Reebok, McDonald's and Pepsi.

DISSENT/CONSENT

Followers' oppositional discursive practices may also blur the boundaries between dissent and consent. In particular, where followers are employed and might therefore be particularly concerned to avoid sanctions, they may resist in disguised and partial ways. While (employed) followers might

be highly critical of leaders' practices, they may decide to censor their views and camouflage their actions through a kind of resistance that 'covers its own tracks' (Scott, 1985). One important reason why opposition may be disguised and limited is because those who resist anticipate the disciplinary sanctions their actions may provoke and shape their actions accordingly. As Heifetz and Laurie (1997, p. 129) observe in their study of leadership, 'whistle-blowers, creative deviants and other such original voices routinely get smashed and silenced in organizational life'. Subtle and routine subversions such as absenteeism (Edwards and Scullion, 1982), 'foot dragging' (Scott, 1990), 'disengagement' (Prasad and Prasad, 1998) and even irony and satire (Collinson, 2002, 2010) can be disguised and ambiguous, making them difficult for leaders to detect. Employees may even undermine leaders' change initiatives simply by doing nothing. Such inertia can result in leaders making all sorts of errors (Grint, 2005). Indeed in certain cases, even worker accommodation with managerial objectives can enable them to conceal resistance within the appearance of consent.

Disguised dissent is also particularly likely to occur where surveillance has become increasingly pervasive: for example, where hierarchical control is reconfigured through performance targets (Collinson, 2003). As a consequence of their increased awareness of being monitored, followers may engage in ambiguous oppositional practices that embody elements of both dissent and consent. In particular, they may conceal and massage knowledge and information. Under the gaze of authority, individuals are increasingly aware of themselves as visible objects and, as a consequence, they can become increasingly skilled choreographers of self and information, learning to disguise their response to 'the gaze'. This dramaturgical notion of self applies Goffman's (1959) ideas of impression management to surveillance processes. Goffman argued that interaction is like an information game in which individuals strategically disclose, exaggerate, or deliberately downplay information according to what they see as their strategic purpose.

A critical analysis of safety practices on North Sea oil installations found that despite extensive leadership commitment to safety, many offshore workers were either not reporting accidents and 'near misses' or else they sought to downplay the seriousness of particular incidents (Collinson, 1999). While company leaders talked proudly about the organization's 'learning culture', offshore workers complained about a 'blame culture' on the platforms. Believing that disclosure of accident-related information would have a detrimental impact on their annual appraisal, pay

and employment security, offshore workers felt compelled to conceal or downplay information about accidents, injuries and near misses. Precisely because such practices constituted a firing offence, these workers also disguised their under-reporting. Hence, while the mainstream leadership literature tends to assume that it is primarily leaders who use impression management, followers may also disguise dissent. Critical perspectives suggest that such dramaturgical practices can take primarily conformist (e.g. telling leaders what they want to hear) or more oppositional forms (e.g. knowledge and output restriction). They may also embody elements of both conformity and resistance. Accordingly, workplace power asymmetries can generate subtle forms of disguised dissent. Rather than being polarized dichotomies, dissent and consent may be inextricably linked within the same practices.

In an important contribution to the critical analysis of organizations, Kondo (1990, p. 224) criticizes the tendency to separate artificially conformity or resistance into 'crisply distinct categories'. She contends that there is no such thing as an entirely 'authentic' or 'pristine space of resistance' or of a 'true resister'. Observing that people 'consent, cope, and resist at different levels of consciousness at a single point in time', Kondo questions the meaning of the term 'resistance' and warns about the dangers of romanticizing followers' oppositional practices. Her arguments have important implications for CLS. Whereas mainstream writers may romanticize leaders and overstate consensus, more critical studies can romanticize followers and exaggerate their opposition. Researchers may also romanticize distributed and more collective forms of leadership (Leonard, 2009). Kondo cautions against the tendency of critical researchers to impute a subversive or emancipatory motive or outcome to resistance. Her analysis also highlights the importance of gender for understanding the control/resistance and consent/dissent dialectics of leadership.

MEN/WOMEN

Gender is a very important and frequently neglected feature of leadership dynamics (Fletcher, 2004). Critical feminist writers have critiqued the tendency of male researchers to view leadership through stereotyped perspectives that simultaneously underestimate the importance of gender (Calas and Smircich, 1991). In the study of gender generally, and women in leadership more particularly, issues of essentialism, romanticism and dualism frequently emerge. The mainstream gender

and leadership literature tends to focus on whether women and men adopt similar or different, and/or better or worse leadership styles (e.g. Rosener, 1990). As Carli and Eagly outline in more detail (Chapter 8, this volume), researchers have argued, for example, that women are more relationship-oriented and men more task-oriented. Questioning the biological essentialism that can underpin such debates, critical feminist studies explore the gendered nature of leadership, management and organization (Martin, 1990), focusing in particular on *both* the similarities and differences between men and women (Bacchi, 1990), and also between women *and* between men.

Recognizing that people are inherently gendered beings in socially constructed ways, critical feminists suggest that the dialectics between men and women, masculinity and femininity, as well as between paid employment and domestic work are inescapable features of gender and leadership dynamics (Bligh and Kohles, 2008). Whereas power and gender are sometimes assumed to be separate, critical studies also argue that they are inextricably linked. Bowring (2004) emphasizes that the binary opposition between leaders and followers is reinforced by a gender dualism in which men are viewed as the universal, neutral subject and women as 'the other'. She argues that we need to move towards greater fluidity in leadership research by recognizing that people have multiple, interrelated and shifting identities.

Critical feminist studies reveal that romanticized notions of the heroic, 'tough' leader are often saturated with masculinity, that women continue to be largely excluded from senior positions (Sinclair, 1998, 2007) and that they can experience considerable hostility in male-dominated managerial cultures (Marshall, 1995). Critical studies of men reveal the dominance of masculine assumptions in organizational cultures and practices generally, and in shaping the models, styles, language, cultures, identities and processes of leadership and management more particularly (Collinson and Hearn, 1996). Critical feminist studies of management and organization illustrate how certain gendered, ethnic and class-based voices are routinely privileged in the workplace, whereas others are marginalized (Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004).

In relation to critical feminist studies of the workplace, research highlights how the control of leaders and managers is often sustained through the gendered segregation of jobs and the subordination of domestic labour. The paid workplace (as well as the domestic sphere) is an important site for the reproduction of men's masculine power and status. Studies suggest that masculinity can be embedded in formal organizational practices (e.g. recruitment), through to more informal dynamics (e.g. joking relationships). Central to

men's valorization of 'work' is a close identification with machinery and technology (Cockburn, 1983). Masculine cultures at work can also be reproduced through men's sexuality and the sexual harassment of women (Collinson and Collinson, 1996).

Critical feminist organizational research demonstrates that resistance practices can also take gendered forms (e.g. Trethewey, 1997). Various studies reveal, for example, how male-dominated shop-floor counter-cultures are frequently characterized by highly masculine breadwinner identities, aggressive and profane forms of humour, ridicule and sarcasm and the elevation of 'practical', manual work as confirmation of working-class manhood (e.g. Collinson, 1992, 2000). Cockburn (1983) illustrates how male-dominated shop-floor counter-cultures and exclusionary trade union practices in the printing industry elevated men and masculinity while subordinating and segregating women. Research in female-dominated factories and offices suggests that women workers often engage in (feminine) counter-cultures characterized by similarly aggressive, joking and sexualized practices of resistance (e.g. Westwood, 1984).

A small number of recent critical feminist studies suggest that it is not only followers but also those (broadly) defined as occupying leadership positions who may engage in resistance when seeking to promote change (Ospina and Su, 2009; Zoller and Fairhust, 2007). Sinclair (2007) focuses on the 'subversive leadership' of two Australian leaders, a woman Chief Commissioner of Police and an aboriginal school principal, who achieved radical change in moribund systems. Meyerson (2001) shows how senior managers can attempt to effect (gender) change while working within the organization. 'Tempered radicals' are frequently women in senior positions who are committed to their organization but also to a cause that is fundamentally at odds with the dominant workplace culture. Seeking to maintain a delicate balance between pursuing change, while also avoiding marginalization, tempered radicals have to cope with various tensions between potentially opposing 'personal' and 'professional' identities.

Critical feminist studies also address the contradictory processes and outcomes of workplace resistance. For example, Willis (1977) describes how working-class 'lads' creatively constructed a counter-culture that celebrated masculinity and the so-called freedom and independence of manual work. Yet, this counter-culture facilitated the lads' smooth transition into precisely the kind of shop-floor work that then subordinated them, possibly for the rest of their working lives. Ashcraft (2005) reveals how airline captains engaged in subversive practices, but in this case their intentions were to undermine a change programme and to preserve their power and identity. Viewing the corporate enactment of a 'crew empowerment system' as a threat to their masculine authority and identity, pilots utilized numerous strategies to resist their loss of control, while also giving the appearance of supporting the change programme. These predominantly white professional men resisted the erosion of their authority by apparently consenting while actually resisting. Ashcraft illustrates how resistance can symbolically invert dominant values, but in ways that cut across emancipatory agendas, reinforcing the status quo.

Hence, some critical studies de-romanticize resistance by pointing to its potentially paradoxical processes and outcomes. They suggest that apparently oppositional practices may actually reinforce the very conditions of excessive control that stimulated resistance in the first place. Reflecting Kondo's arguments, their focus on the consequences of employee resistance avoids overly romanticized interpretations that celebrate, rather than critically examine, follower opposition. These arguments in turn raise important questions about the meaning of resistance, about who resists, how, why and when they do so, what strategies inform their practices, and what outcomes ensue. Critical feminist studies also raise important questions about how to theorize the multiple, simultaneous and potentially intersecting nature of leadership power dialectics. Differences and inequalities can take multiple forms (e.g. gender, ethnicity, class, age, disability, faith, sexual orientation, national origin, etc.) and different aspects of power, inequality and identity may be reproduced by those in leadership positions in ways that may perpetuate disadvantage.

Recently there has been growing interest within critical studies in exploring the simultaneity of gender, race and class (Calas et al., 2010). Demonstrating that the category 'women' is by no means a universal, Holvino (2010) explores the critique of white liberal feminism by women of colour. Developing an intersectional analysis, she argues that the emphasis in the mainstream gender literature on women managers (and leaders) concentrates on achieving individual rights for white women in ways that privilege gender over race, class, ethnicity and other dimensions of difference. Whereas white middle-class women are often found in managerial and higher-paid work, women of colour typically predominate in lower-paid positions. Holvino argues that gender needs to be studied in relation to other social processes such as race, ethnicity, class, sexuality and nation. Similarly, critical studies of men highlight the importance of 'multiple masculinities' and

how these are frequently shaped by class, race, ethnicity, etc.(Collinson and Hearn, 1994, 2009). These critical studies raise important questions for the development of CLS, highlighting the significance of gender and other aspects of diversity and inequality in leadership dynamics, as well as the conceptual value of intersectionality, simultaneity and asymmetry. In addition to the theoretical challenges they pose for CLS, these arguments highlight the need to develop more inclusive and integrated leadership practices that value multiplicity, diversity, simultaneity and difference.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has explored the emergent field of critical leadership studies. Focusing particularly on the situated and shifting power relations between leaders, managers and followers, CLS suggest that dialectical perspectives can facilitate new ways of thinking about their complex, ambiguous and potentially contradictory inter relations. The three dialectics discussed above are frequently interconnected and mutually reinforcing. However, they are by no means exhaustive of the numerous dialectics that characterize leadership dynamics. Rather than try to produce a definitive list of such dialectics, it is argued here that dialectical analysis is better seen as a way of thinking and understanding leadership dynamics.

Critical perspectives raise a number of underexplored issues about power in leadership dynamics and about what it may mean to be 'a leader', 'a manager' and a 'follower' in contemporary organizations and societies. They question the prevailing mainstream view that leader-led relations are inherently consensual. Indeed, the legacy of orthodox studies is a rather uncontested notion of leadership. CLS recognize that leaders exercise considerable control, and that their power can have contradictory and ambiguous outcomes that leaders either do not always understand or of which they are unaware. Critical perspectives view control and resistance as mutually reinforcing, ambiguous and potentially contradictory processes. Although control can stimulate resistance, it may also discipline, shape and restrict the very opposition it sometimes provokes.

Critical perspectives suggest that in leader–follower relations there is always the potential for conflict and dissent. Leaders (and leadership researchers) cannot simply assume the obedience or loyalty of followers. Given the asymmetrical nature of workplace power, it is hardly surprising that followers often conform (or give the outward appearance of compliance), but from a leadership point of view we need to know a lot more about the conditions and consequences of such practices. For example, leaders can surround themselves with sycophants, thereby stifling dialogue, new ideas and innovation (Bratton et al., 2004). Critical perspectives reveal that followers may not only express opposition in numerous ways but also may seek to protect themselves from sanctions. Disguised dissent incorporates self-protective, ambiguous practices that may blur the boundaries between resistance and consent.

Critical feminist and diversity analyses highlight how these (and other) dialectics of leader/follower, power/resistance and consent/dissent are shaped by gender, class, race, age, etc. They demonstrate that leadership dynamics are inescapably situated within, and reproduced through multiple, intersecting and simultaneous differences and inequalities. Indeed, there remains a significant challenge for CLS to examine the interrelations between multiple inequalities and to show how these intersect and/or contradict.

This in turn raises complex questions about how to theorize the interrelations between multiple dialectics within particular practices and contexts. It is quite possible for researchers to question one dualism but to do so in ways that reproduce others. Just as workplace resistance may paradoxically reproduce the very conditions of control that give rise to opposition, critical writers may question specific dualisms, but simultaneously reinforce others. For example, although some critical researchers may challenge the leader/follower dualism, they might simultaneously neglect important relations between control and resistance or between men and women and so on. Accordingly, a pressing challenge for CSL is to find ways to theorize the interrelations between multiple, simultaneous, ambiguous and contradictory dialectics.

Relatedly, there is a need to develop more nuanced accounts of the diverse economic, social, political and cultural contexts in which leadership dynamics are typically located (Gibney et al., 2009; Jepson, 2009). For example, technological advances in communications and transportation increase the potential for cross-cultural interactions in all types of organizations. Globalization may facilitate trade and global capital flows and more integrated financial markets, and reduce transportation costs. In the search for lower production and distribution costs, transnational corporations can transfer parts of their processes to other parts of the globe. These shifting regional, national and global contexts and their local impacts require more detailed analysis.

Critical approaches also raise questions about leaders' and followers' identities. The notions of 'the leader' and 'the follower' are deeply embedded

identities, especially in Western societies (Sinclair, 2007). Yet, there is a growing recognition that such traditional identities no longer adequately characterize leadership power relations, which are increasingly seen as blurred, fluid and contradictory (Gordon, 2002). For example, whereas distributed leadership encourages followers to act as 'informal leaders' (Raelin, 2003), leaders in many contemporary organizations are subject to intensified pressures of accountability that can render them 'calculable followers' (Collinson and Collinson, 2009). In many organizational settings, individuals are expected to act as both leaders and followers, either simultaneously or at different times and circumstances. Accordingly, there is a need for more critical research to examine these multiple, shifting and often paradoxical identities of 'leaders' and 'followers' in particular contexts. Exploring how these ambiguous subjectivities are negotiated in practice should not only enhance our understanding of leadership dialectics in various contexts but also emphasize the value of critical studies for analysing situated leadership and followership dynamics.

The implications of CLS for leadership studies are potentially far-reaching. By critically exploring power relations and identity constructions, CLS encourage researchers to rethink leaders, followers and contexts as well as their dialectical interrelations. They reveal the problems in mainstream studies associated with essentialism, romanticism and dualism, while also challenging CMS in a number of ways. In particular, they emphasize the power and impact of leadership, for good or ill, in contemporary organizations and societies. Recognizing the related significance of followers, they warn against the tendency to romanticize dissent and opposition. Equally, they highlight the importance of gender and other aspects of diversity and inequality for understanding the conditions, processes and consequences of leadership dynamics. CLS also challenge both mainstream and critical researchers to be more reflexively aware of their underlying (and often implicit) theoretical assumptions and how these can shape leadership theory, research, development and practice. In sum, by raising under-researched questions, particularly about power and identity, the emergent field of CLS has the potential to broaden understanding of leadership dynamics, develop new forms of analysis and open up innovative lines of enquiry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Ackroyd, S. (2004) 'Less bourgeois than thou: a critical review of studying management critically', *Ephemera*, 4(2): 165–170.

Ackroyd, S. and Thompson, P. (1999) *Organizational Misbehaviour.* London: Sage.

Alvarez, J. L. and Svejenova, S. (2005) *Sharing Executive Power. Cambridge, UK:* Cambridge University Press.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (2002) 'Producing the appropriate individual: identity regulation as organizational control', *Journal of Management Studies,* 39(5): 619–644.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (eds) (2003) *Studying Management Critically.* London: Sage.

Ashcraft, K. L. (2005) 'Resistance through consent?' *Management Communication Quarterly,* 19(1): 67–90.

Ashcraft, K. L. and Mumby, D. K. (2004) *Reworking Gender: A Feminist Communicology of Organization.* London: Sage.

Bacchi, C. L. (1990) *Same Difference: Feminism and Sexual Difference.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Banks, S. (ed.) (2008) *Dissent and the Failure of Leadership.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Baxter, L. A. and Montgomery, B. M. (1996) *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics.* New York: Guilford Press.

Bjerke, B. (1999) *Business Leadership and Culture.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Bligh, M. and Kohles, J. (2008) 'The romance lives on: contemporary issues surrounding the romance of leadership', *Leadership,* 3(3): 343–360.

Bowring, M. A. (2004) 'Resistance is not futile: liberating Captain Janeway from the masculine–feminine dualism of leadership', *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(4): 381–405.

Bratton, J., Grint, K., and Nelson, D. (2004) *Organizational Leadership.* Mason, OH: South Western/Thomson.

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership.* New York: Harper and Row.

Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1991) 'Voicing seduction to silence leadership', *Organization Studies*, 12(4): 567–602.

Calas, M., Smircich, L., Tienari, J., and Ellehave, C. F. (2010) 'Editorial: observing globalized capitalism: gender and ethnicity as entry point', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 17(3): 243–247.

Chaleff, I. (2009) *The Courageous Follower.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler. (1st edn, 1995.)

Cockburn, C. (1983) *Brothers.* London: Pluto.

Collins, J. (2001) *Good to Great.* London: Random House.

Collinson, D. (1992) *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Collinson, D. (1999) 'Surviving the rigs: safety and surveillance on North Sea oil installations', *Organization Studies,* 20(4): 579–600.

Collinson, D. (2000) 'Strategies of resistance: power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace'. In K. Grint (ed.), *Work and Society: A Reader.* Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 163–198. Originally published in J. Jermier, D. Knights, and W. Nord (eds), (1994) *Resistance and Power in Organizations.* London: Routledge, pp. 25–68.

Collinson, D. (2002) 'Managing humour', *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(2): 269–288.

Collinson, D. (2003) 'Identities and insecurities: selves at work', *Organization*, 10(3): 527–547.

Collinson, D. L. (2005) 'Dialectics of leadership', *Human Relations,* 8(11): 1419–1442.

Collinson, D. L. (2006) 'Rethinking followership: a post-structuralist analysis of follower identities', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2): 179–189.

Collinson, D. (2008) 'Conformist, resistant and disguised selves: a post-structuralist approach to identity and workplace followership'. In R. Riggio, I. Chaleff, and J. Lipmen-Blumen (eds), *The Art of Followership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp. 309–324.

Collinson, D. (2010) 'Leadership, humor, and satire'. In R. A. Couto (ed.), *Political and Civic Leadership: A Reference Handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. (1994) 'Naming Men as Men: Implications for Work, Organization and Management' Gender, *Work and Organization,* 1(1): 2–22.

Collinson, M. and Collinson, D. L. (1996) 'It's only Dick: the sexual harassment of women managers in insurance sales', *Work, Employment and Society*, 10(1): 29–56.

Collinson, D. L. and Collinson, M. (2009) 'Blended leadership: employee perspectives on effective leadership in the UK further education sector', *Leadership,* 5(3): 365–380.

Collinson, D. and Hearn, J. (eds), (1996) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities and Managements.* London: Sage.

Dickson, M. W., Hartog, D. D., and Mitchelson, J. K. (2003) 'Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: making progress, and raising new questions', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14: 729–768.

Edwards, P. K. and Scullion, H. (1982) *The Social Organization of Industrial Conflict.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Edwards, P. K., Collinson, D. L., and Della Rocca, G. (1995) 'Workplace resistance in Western Europe', *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 1(3): 283–316.

Fairhurst, G. T. (2001) 'Dualisms in leadership research'. In F. M. Jablin and L. L. Putnam (eds), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 379–439.

Fairhurst, G. (2007) *Discursive Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. and Grant, D. (2010) The social construction of leadership: A sailing guide. *Management Communication Quarterly* 24(2): 171–210.

Fleming, P. (2005) 'Metaphors of resistance', *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1): 45–66.

Fleming, P. and Spicer, A. (2007) *Contesting the Corporation.* Cambridge,UK*:* Cambridge University Press.

Fletcher, J. K. (2004) 'The paradox of post-heroic leadership: an essay on gender, power, and transformational change', *The Leadership Quarterly,* 15: 647–661.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Foucault, M. (1979) *The History of Sexuality.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (2000) 'At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies', *Human Relations,* 53(1): 7–32.

Fromm, E. (1977) *The Fear of Freedom.* London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Gabriel, Y. (1997) 'Meeting God: when organizational members come face to face with the supreme leader', *Human Relations*, 50(4): 315–342.

Gardner, W. L. and Avolio, B. J. (1998) 'The charismatic relationship: a dramaturgical perspective', *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 32–58.

Gemmill, G. and Oakley, J. (1992) 'Leadership: an alienating social myth', *Human Relations,* 45(2): 113–129.

Ghemawat, P. (2005) 'Regional strategies for global leadership', *Harvard Business Review*, December: 98–108.

Gibney, J., Copeland, S., and Murie, A. (2009) 'Toward a "new" strategic leadership of place for the knowledge-based economy', *Leadership*, 5(1): 5–23.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1987) *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Goffee, R. and Jones, G. (2001) 'Followership: it's personal too', *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11): 148.

Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. and McKee, A. (2002) *The New Leaders.* London: Little, Brown.

Gordon, D. (2002) 'Conceptualising leadership with respect to its historical-contextual antecedents to power', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(2): 151–167.

Graen, G. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995) 'Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader–member exchange theory of leadership over 25 years', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2): 219–247.

Graham, J. W. (1986) 'Principled organizational dissent', *Research in Organizational Behaviour,* 8, 1–52.

Graham, L. (1995) *On the Line at Subaru-Isuzu*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Grint, K (ed.) (1997) *Leadership: Classical, Contemporary, and Critical Approaches.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grint, K. (2005) *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gronn, P. (2002) 'Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4): 423–452.

Hale, J. R. and Fields, D. L. (2007) 'Exploring servant leadership across cultures: a study of followers in Ghana and the USA', *Leadership,* 3(4): 397–417.

Hardy, C. and Clegg, S. R. (1999) 'Some dare call it power'. In S. R. Clegg and C. Hardy (eds), *Studying Organization: Theory and Method*. London: Sage, pp. 368–387.

Hartog, D. D. and Dickson, M. W. (2004) 'Leadership and culture'. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, and R. J. Sternberg (eds), *The Nature of Leadership.* London: Sage, pp. 249–278.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D. L. (2009) 'Men, diversity at work, and diversity management'. In M. Ozbilgin (ed.), *Theory and Scholarship in Equality, Diversity and Inclusion at*

Work: A Research Companion. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 372–382.

Heifetz, R. A. and Laurie, D. L. (1997) 'The work of leadership' *Harvard Business Review*, Jan–Feb, 124–134.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. (1996) *Management of Organizational Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hirschman, A. D. (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hogg, M. (2001) 'A social identity theory of leadership', *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184–200.

Holvino, E. (2010) 'Intersections: the simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies', *Gender, Work and Organization,* 17(3): 248–277.

House, R. (1971) 'A path–goal theory of leadership: lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3): 323–352.

Howell, J. and Shamir, B. (2005) 'The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: relationships and their consequences', *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1): 96–112.

Jackson, B. and Parry, K. W. (2008) *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Studying Leadership.* London: Sage.

Jameson, J. (2007) *Investigating Collaborative Leadership in Learning and Skills.* Lancaster University Management School: Centre for Excellence in Leadership.

Jepson, D. (2009) 'Studying leadership at cross-country level: a critical analysis', *Leadership*, 5(1): 61–80.

Jermier, J. M., Knights, D., and Nord, W. R. (eds), (1994) *Resistance and Power in Organisations*. London: Routledge.

Jones, A. M. (2006) 'Developing what? An anthropological look at the leadership development process across cultures.' *Leadership,* 2(4): 48–498.

Kellerman, B. (2008) *Followership: How Followers are Creating and Changing Leaders.* Boston, MA; Harvard Business School Press.

Kelley, R. E. (2004) 'Followership'. In G. R. Goethals, G. Sorenson and J. M. Burns (eds), *Berkshire Encyclopedia of World History*. Sage Reference/Berkshire. pp. 504–513.

Klein, N. (2000) *No Logo*. London: Flamingo.

Knights, D. (1997) 'Organization theory in the age of deconstruction: dualism, gender and postmodernism revisited', *Organization Studies*, 18(1): 1–20.

Knowles, H. (2007) 'Trade union leadership: biography and the role of historical context', *Leadership*, 3(2): 191–209.

Kondo, D. K. (1990) *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lakomski, G. (2005) *Managing Without Leadership.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Leidner, R. (1993) *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and The Routinisation of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Leonard, P. (2009) 'Leading partnerships: How do you lead when not "in charge"?' Unpublished doctoral thesis, Lancaster University Management School.

Lipmen-Blumen, J. (2005) *The Allure of Toxic Leaders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lord, R. G. and Brown, D. J. (2003) *Leadership Processes and Follower Self-Identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Maccoby, M. (2007) *The Leaders We Need*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Marshall, J. (1995) *Women Managers Moving On.* London: Macmillan.

Martin, J. (1990) 'Deconstructing organizational taboos: the suppression of gender conflict in organizations', *Organization Science*, 1(4): 339–359.

Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S. B., and Dukerich, J. M. (1985) 'The romance of leadership', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(1): 78–102.

Meyerson, D. E. (2001) *Tempered Radicals*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Milgram, S. (1963) 'Behavioral study of obedience', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 69(2): 137–143.

Mingers, J. (2000) 'What is it to be critical? Teaching a critical approach to management undergraduates', *Management Learning*, 31(2), 219–237.

Mintzberg H. (2006) 'The leadership debate with Henry Mintzberg: community-ship is the answer.' *The Financial Times:* FT.Com

Mole, G. (2004) 'Can leadership be taught?'. In J. Storey (ed.), *Leadership in Organizations*. London: Routledge, pp. 125–137.

Mumby, D. (2005) 'Theorizing resistance in organization studies', *Management Communication Quarterly,* 19(1): 19–44.

Mumby, D and Stohl, C. (1991) 'Power and discourse in organizational studies: absence and the dialectic of control', *Discourse and Society*, 2(3): 313–332.

Northouse, P. G. (2004) *Leadership Theory and Practice,* 3rd edn. London: Sage.

Nye, J. S. (2008) *The Powers to Lead.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osborne, R., Hunt, J., and Jauch, L. R. (2002) 'Toward a contextual theory of leadership', *The Leadership Quarterly,* 13(6): 797–837.

Ospina, S. and Sorenson, G. (2007) 'A constructionist lens on leadership', in G. R. Goethals and G. L. J. Sorenson (eds), *The Quest for a General Theory of Leadership.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp.188–204.

Ospina, S. and Su, C. (2009) 'Weaving color lines: race, ethnicity, and the work of leadership in social change organizations', *Leadership,* 5(2): 131–170.

Pearce, C. L. and Conger, J. A. (eds), (2003) *Shared Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Porter, L. W. and McLaughlin, G. B. (2006) 'Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather?' *The Leadership Quarterly,* 17(6): 559–576.

Prasad, A. and Prasad, P. (1998) 'Everyday struggles at the workplace: the nature and implications of routine resistance in contemporary organizations'. In P. A. Bamberger and W. J. Sonnenstuhl (eds), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations,* Stamford, CT: JAI, 15, pp. 225–257.

Prince, L. (1998) 'The neglected rules: on leadership and dissent'. In A. Coulson (ed.), *Trust and Contracts: Relationships in Local Government, Health and Public Services.* Bristol: The Polity Press, pp. 95–126.

Raelin, J. (2003) *Creating Leaderful Organisations.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Ray, T., Clegg, S., and Gordon, R. (2004). 'A new look at dispersed leadership: power, knowledge and context'. In J. Storey (ed.), *Leadership in Organizations.* London: Routledge, pp. 319–336.

Real, K. and Putnam, L. (2005) 'Ironies in the discursive struggle of pilots defending the profession', *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19(1): 91–119.

Reed, M. (1997) 'In praise of duality', *Organization Studies*, 18(1): 21–42.

Rejai, M. (1979) *Leaders of Revolution.* London: Sage.

Ricketts, K.G. and Ladewig, H. (2008) 'A path analysis of community leadership within viable rural communities in Florida', *Leadership,* 4(2): 137–157.

Riggio, R. E., Chaleff, I., and Lipman-Blumen, J. (eds) (2008). *The Art of Followership: How Great Followers Create Great Leaders and Organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosener, J. (1990) 'Ways women lead', *Harvard Business Review,* 68(6): 119–125.

Scott, J. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, J. C. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shamir, B. (1999) 'Taming charisma for better understanding and greater usefulness: a response to Beyer', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4): 555–562.

Shamir, B. (2007) 'From passive recipients to active co-producers: followers' roles in the leadership process'. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. C. Bligh, and M. Uhl-Bien (eds), *Follower-Centred Perspectives on Leadership.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age, pp. ix–xxxix.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., and Arthur, M. B. (1993) 'The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: a self-based concept theory', *Organization Science*, 4(4): 577–594.

Shamir, B., Dayan-Horesh, D., and Adler, D. (2005). 'Leading by biography: towards a life-story approach to the study of leadership', *Leadership,* 1(1), 13–29.

Shamir, B., Pillai, R., Bligh, M., C., and Uhl-Bien, M. (eds), (2007) *Follower-Centred Perspectives on Leadership.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Sinclair, A. (1998) *Doing Leadership Differently.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Sinclair, A. (2007) *Leadership for the Disillusioned.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Smircich, L. and Morgan, G. (1982) 'Leadership: the management of meaning', *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 18(3): 257–273.

Tourish, D. and Vatcha, N. (2005) 'Charismatic leadership and corporate cultism at Enron: the elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and organizational collapse', *Leadership*, 1(4): 455–480.

Trethewey, A. (1997) 'Resistance, identity and empowerment: a postmodern feminist analysis of clients in a human service organization', *Communication Monographs*, 64: 281–301.

Van Knippenberg, D. and Hogg, M. (eds), (2003). *Leadership and Power: Identity Processes in Groups and Organizations.* London: Sage.

Westwood, S. (1984) *All Day, Every Day: Factory and Family in the Making of Women's Lives.* London: Pluto Press.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour.* Aldershot, UK: Saxon House.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007) 'Trait-based perspectives of leadership', *American Psychologist,* 62, 6–16.

Zoller, H. M. and Fairhurst, G. T. (2007) 'Resistance leadership: the overlooked potential in critical organization and leadership studies', *Human Relations,* 60(1): 1331–1360.