

Leadership

S Alexander Haslam, School of Psychology, University of Queensland, QLD, Australia

Stephen D Reicher, School of Psychology, University of St. Andrews, Scotland, UK

Michael J Platow, Research School of Psychology, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Leadership is the process through which one or more people influence other group members in a way that motivates them to contribute to the achievement of group goals. As such, it is a group process that is demonstrated through the followership of others. Over time, the field of leadership research has moved through several distinct phases. Initially, a classical approach viewed leadership as a reflection of particular individuals' special qualities. This was then supplanted by a contextual approach which supplemented this analysis with considerations of social and organizational context. More recently, an identity approach has emphasized the importance of the psychological bond between leaders and followers. This progression represents a response to four key observations about the leadership process: (1) different forms of leadership are required in different contexts, (2) followers' perceptions of leaders are critical, (3) leaders and followers motivate and influence each other, and (4) in the process of developing the power to change the world, leaders and followers are themselves transformed.

Leadership is the process of influencing people in a way that motivates them to contribute to the achievement of group goals (e.g., [Haslam et al., 2011](#); [Hollander, 1985](#)). As such, it is a central feature of effective organizations and societies, and the focus of intense academic and public debate for over 2000 years. Testament to this, the British Library in London holds over 12 000 books that have leadership in their title (including 35 that are simply entitled *Leadership*). This interest arises from the fact that in fields as diverse as politics and religion, science and technology, art and literature, sport and adventure, industry and business, leadership is commonly seen as the process by which means people are marshaled to contribute to the collective projects that ultimately become the stuff of history.

Definitional Issues

The above definition of leadership contains at least four important elements that are important to recognize. First, leadership is a process not a property. Accordingly, it is not something that a person possesses, but rather something that he or she *does*. Second, leadership is not something that a person does on his or her own. It necessarily involves *other* people – most particularly, those over whom influence is exerted. Third, it follows from this that ultimate proof of leadership is not found in the actions of leaders (e.g., their speeches, their policy, their vision), but in the *followership* of those they influence ([Gibb, 1947](#); [Haslam et al., 2011](#); [Hollander, 1995](#)). Fourth, it is important to distinguish leadership from a range of other processes with which it is commonly confused. Leadership is not primarily a matter of power, coercion, or resource management ([Turner, 2005](#)). Rather, because it is about influence, it is about winning others over so that they *want to do* what is being asked of them and do so willingly not grudgingly, with enthusiasm rather than rancor.

Bearing these points in mind, the literature on leadership is primarily concerned with the question of what it is that allows

the plans and vision of an individual to be translated into the actions of a group. What is it that turns one person's wishes into a mission that directs the work of dozens, thousands, or millions of other people?

As we argue in our recent book, *The New Psychology of Leadership* ([Haslam et al., 2011](#)), over time researchers have tended to answer this question in one of three broad ways. Those who follow a *classical approach* generally frame their answers in terms of the qualities that particular individuals have (or do not have). Building upon this, adherents of a *contextual approach* tend to supplement such analysis with a consideration of features of social and organizational context that promote (or else compromise) the effectiveness of individual leaders. And finally proponents of an *identity approach* see leadership as a group process that centers on a social-psychological bond between leaders and followers. While the first of these approaches can be considered 'old,' the second is more 'contemporary,' and the third is relatively 'new' ([Haslam et al., 2011](#)).

The Old Psychology of Leadership: A Classical Approach

According to [Plato \(380BC/1993\)](#), leaders are those small number of people who are born with a cluster of traits that set them apart from the general population – for example, quickness of learning, courage, and broadness of vision. Although it was largely discursive and anecdotal, Plato's analysis provided a narrative framework that has informed most leadership research in the subsequent two-and-a-half millennia – a literature that can be sampled liberally in the popular texts that proliferate in airport bookstores. Its popularity, however, was cemented in the nineteenth century through the writings of the Scottish essayist Thomas Carlyle who declared "the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men who have worked here" (1840: p. 5). Carlyle's 'great man' analysis

focused his readers' attention firmly on the psychology of individual (male) leaders and argued that their distinctive and exceptional qualities qualified them not only for responsibility and high office, but also for widespread admiration and respect. More recently, it is also the exceptional nature of such 'stuff' that is seen to justify the exorbitant salaries that are routinely awarded to executive leaders.

What, though, is the stuff of leadership? In an early influential review, Stogdill (1948) identified 29 personality dimensions that various researchers had associated with successful leadership. Within these, he singled out five factors for special attention: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status. In a later review, Mann (1959) looked at the predictive power of over 500 different personality measures that he organized into seven meaningful clusters: intelligence, adjustment, extroversion, sensitivity, masculinity, conservatism, and dominance. The primary observation in both reviews was that personal attributes are generally rather unreliable predictors of leadership. Nevertheless, two attributes have proved to have enduring appeal for researchers and commentators alike – charisma and intelligence.

Leadership as Charisma

Although it was an important concept in earlier writings (particularly, early Christian commentaries; Esler, 2003), the term charisma is generally seen to have been popularized by the German social and economic theorist Max Weber. For Weber (1921/1946) *charisma* was "a certain quality of an individual personality by which [a leader] is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities," (p. 359). Inspired by this, in recent years, neo-Weberians have treated charisma as an aspect of leadership that hinges on an individual's capacity to articulate a group vision, to recruit others to his or her cause, and to develop close and strong relationships with group members (e.g., Bass and Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978).

Consistent with this analysis, research provides fairly consistent evidence that leaders who are both visionary and empathic are more successful than those who are not. In particular, findings from major studies in the 1940s showed that leaders who *initiate structure* (e.g., by devising plans that flesh out their vision) and show *consideration* toward followers tend to be more successful than those who do not (Fleishman and Peters, 1962). Research in this tradition also indicates, however, that followers' *perceptions* are critical in this process. This speaks to Weber's observation that it is followers who confer charisma upon the leader and who, on this basis, prove willing to commit their energies to his or her cause. At the same time, though, there is also evidence that such attributions vary considerably with features of the social context. Among other things, this is because evaluators seem generally to see leaders of in-groups to be far more charismatic than those who lead out-groups (Platow et al., 2006).

Leadership as Intelligence

Despite the fact that the construct of charisma therefore seems quite 'slippery,' one might imagine that – as a result of its proud

psychometric heritage – *intelligence* would prove to deliver greater predictive traction. Indeed, a key reason why this has been an important research focus is that in most reviews this emerges as the best single predictor of leader success (e.g., Mann, 1959). However, measures of leader intelligence such as IQ typically account for only a very small amount of variance in leader success (around 3–5%), whereas again *perceived* intelligence accounts for far more (around 30%; Judge et al., 2004). Moreover, it also appears that analytic intelligence (of the form measured by IQ tests) is often less predictive of leaders' success than their creative intelligence and emotional intelligence (defined as "the ability to understand and manage moods and emotions in the self and others"; George, 2000). In the end, however, as with charisma, these various forms of intelligence prove extremely hard to pin down (Antonakis et al., 2009), and whether or not a person is perceived to have them varies markedly as a function of who is doing the perceiving and when. Accordingly, over time, such observations have led researchers to place increasing emphasis on the importance of *social context* in the leadership process.

The Contemporary Psychology of Leadership: A Contextual Approach

In response to the limited predictive power of approaches that focus only on the character of the leader in isolation, most contemporary researchers advocate *contextual* approaches to leadership that take account of the situations in which leaders operate. Radical approaches of this form suggest that context is everything, and that the character of the individual counts for nothing (e.g., as proposed by Zimbardo in his analysis of the Stanford Prison Experiment; Zimbardo, 2007). However, largely because these models envisage leaders as having little or no role to play in the leadership process, such analyses have garnered little support among leadership theorists and practitioners. It is therefore far more common for researchers to endorse *contingency models* in which context is seen to moderate but not entirely suppress the contribution of the individual leader.

Leadership as Contingency

The contingency approach is defined by the assertion that leadership arises from a perfect match between the individual and the circumstances of the group that he or she leads (Gibb, 1958). There are a very large number of such theories, but Fred Fiedler's (1964) *least preferred co-worker* (LPC) model is probably the most influential (at least in academic circles). This argues that leaders can be distinguished in terms of their disposition toward their LPC and that context can be differentiated in terms of (1) the quality of leader–member relations, (2) the degree to which the task is structured, and (3) the leader's position power. High-LPC leaders (those with a positive view of their LPC) are predicted to be the most effective in conditions where either (1) relations are good, structure is high, and the leader's position is strong, or (2) relations are bad, structure is low, and the leader's position is either weak or strong. Stated crudely, task-oriented, or 'hard' (i.e., low-LPC) leaders are predicted to do well when conditions are all very

favorable or all very unfavorable, but relationship-oriented or 'soft' (i.e., high-LPC) leaders are predicted to do well when conditions are more mixed.

Contingency theories vary considerably in the attributes of the leader and the characteristics of the situation that they consider important. Nonetheless, they remain the most widely embraced class of leadership theory (Fiedler and House, 1994). In particular, they are a popular component of management and personal development courses that typically seek first to classify individuals as having a particular leadership style and then to train them to identify (or create) situations in which this style will be effective.

Yet, despite being very popular, there are some serious empirical and theoretical problems with such models. In the first instance, they can be criticized for being reductionist in their attempts to distil a complex whole down to a limited subset of component parts that are seen as fixed and as having no capacity to shape each other. For example, these approaches do not allow for the possibility that the quality of leader-member relations might have a bearing on a leader's power (and vice versa) or that perceptions of task structure might be a determinant of leader-member relations (and vice versa). Such objections speak to the fact that contingency models typically treat the interaction between person and context as *mechanical* rather than *dynamic* (Reynolds et al., 2010).

A somewhat different problem is that while contingency models, like Fiedler's, recognize the importance of leaders' relationship with followers, those followers are themselves not subjected to any meaningful form of psychological analysis. Might not their perceptions of the leadership process differ from those of the leader, and might not this have a bearing on their followership? As with classical approaches, a core problem with contingency models is thus that they treat rank-and-file group members as passive consumers of leadership rather than active agents (Reicher et al., 2005). Beyond these theoretical concerns, however, an even more basic problem is that empirical support for such models is mixed at best – and tends to become weaker as tests move from the laboratory into the field.

Leadership as Transaction

Disenchantment with basic contingency models is reflected in two distinct theoretical movements that have grown in popularity in recent decades. The first of these is the *transactional approach*. This argues that any analysis of leadership needs to be complemented by an examination of the role that followers play in validating and empowering any leader. Most closely associated with the work of Edwin Hollander (1964), this approach argues that leadership emerges from a process of *social exchange* whereby followers work to enact a leader's commands only when they believe that the leader is doing something for them in return. More specifically, it is suggested that followers will only respond constructively to a leader's creative ideas if that leader has built up 'idiosyncrasy credits' based on demonstrated service to the group. As support for this analysis, research points to evidence that followers are more likely to support a leader if he or she is elected rather than appointed, and if he or she emerges from within the group rather than being imposed on it from outside.

Much of Hollander's own work has involved exploring the relevance of these ideas to leadership in the world at large (e.g., Hollander, 1995). In particular, he notes that large disparities in the benefits that leaders and followers receive for their work will tend to trigger a sense of inequity that ultimately detracts from group performance. Aside from an impressive array of empirical studies that bear this point out, this analysis can also be seen to provide a compelling explanation for failures of big business (e.g., as seen in the 2008 Global Financial Crisis) – where unfettered enthusiasm for the ideology of the 'great man' leads to overconfidence in the abilities of a few highly paid leaders and disregard for the legitimate concerns of followers.

More recently, though, empirical work on the transactional dimensions of leadership has also been taken forward by proponents of *leader-member exchange (LMX) theory* (e.g., Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). A key argument here is that low-quality LMX relationships (which center on standard contractual obligations) tend to lead to negative group outcomes, whereas high-quality relationships (in which both parties actively promote the interests of each other) enhance outcomes not only for those who share that relationship (e.g., the specific leader and follower) but also for the broader entity of which they are part (e.g., the group or organization as a whole).

A large body of empirical work is consistent with these arguments – showing that when leaders and followers are motivated to help each other out, this tends to have positive consequences both for them and their group (Ilies et al., 2007). Exchange-based approaches also have intuitive appeal because explaining leadership with recourse to a cost-benefit analysis makes sense in terms of theories of economic exchange that have widespread currency elsewhere in psychology (and in the social sciences more generally, particularly sociology and economics). Nevertheless, the concepts of 'cost' and 'benefit' prove to be very elastic and can be difficult (if not impossible) to specify independently of the vantage point from which they are assessed. One followers' meat is another's poison, and indeed what the same follower considers meat in one context, he or she will consider poison in another.

Finally, again, another objection to this approach is that it reduces a higher-order experience to a relatively mechanical cost-benefit analysis. Whereas plenty of texts attest to the joy of experiencing great leadership, *The Joy of LMX* seems an unlikely title. In part this is because it treats followership as a question of "What is in it for me?" when such questions seem remote from the phenomenology of successful leadership. Indeed, there is evidence that asking such questions often leads to group disintegration rather than group success (Tyler and Blader, 2000).

Leadership as Transformation

Recognition of the fact that leadership often appears to rely on leaders and followers rising above their personal self-interest has led to a reemphasis of the role that leader charisma plays in facilitating acts of citizenship, loyalty, and service to the group. This concern is central to models of *transformational leadership*, as evidenced, for example, by the work of James MacGregor Burns (1978). Burns prefaced his work with a stark assessment of the failings of approaches that see

leadership as being primarily about power and resource management rather than influence. True leadership, he contended, arises from *working with* followers and is about much more than simply satisfying their wants and needs in exchange for support. In particular, he suggested that leadership necessarily moves beyond a contractual arrangement whereby people act in particular ways because they feel *obliged* to and, instead, engages with higher-level sensibilities that lead people to pursue a particular course of action because they *want* to, and because they feel that what they are doing is *right*.

Transformational theory expands on these ideas by drawing on motivational and developmental theories which assert that human development involves people's progression from lower-level understandings of themselves and their world (dictated by relatively base urges for things like money) through to more sophisticated higher-level understandings (underpinned by loftier concerns for things like self-actualization and self-esteem). For Burns, a key feature of successful leadership is that it helps people progress up such hierarchies, thereby allowing them to scale greater psychological and moral heights.

Nevertheless, while transformational theory suggests that leadership involves processes of mutual respect and shared perspective, it is worth noting that the psychological theorizing on which it draws assumes that the highest state of motivation and morality is characterized by individual autonomy (Ellemers et al., 2004; Haslam, 2001). This emphasis on the individual is also apparent in practice where, as with classical approaches, measures of transformational leadership (in particular, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ); Bass and Avolio, 1997) focus on the abilities and qualities of the individual leader.

One unique feature of the MLQ is that it is completed not only by individual leaders but also by their superiors, peers, and subordinates (as well as outsiders – e.g., clients). This process of *360 degree feedback* is seen to provide a more valid assessment of the extent to which a leader is charismatic, intelligent, inspirational, and considerate. Indeed, a clear advantage of such procedures over those used by proponents of classical approaches is that they recognize that these characteristics are ultimately conferred by followers rather than simply possessed by leaders themselves (i.e., as argued by Lord and Maher, 1991; Weber, 1921/1946).

Again, though, as with advocates of classical models of old, those who adopt this approach (especially practitioners) often treat these characteristics as fixed and personal rather than dynamic and social. The approach also provides limited insight into the processes that lead to a given leader being seen as having transformational qualities. For example, there appear to be few personal characteristics that people like Mahatma Gandhi, Adolf Hitler, Princess Diana, Nelson Mandela, Margaret Thatcher, and Saint Paul have in common, and which separate them from less charismatic mortals. As we will clarify further below, what they do have in common is the fact that they envisioned, and became emblematic of, particular forms of progress for groups that, at particular points in history, met with some 'success.' Indeed, this latter observation has led researchers like James Meindl (1993) to argue that leadership has much less to do with the character of leaders than with the favorability of the general social environment

within which they operate and the romantic attributions to leadership that followers make under these circumstances (for a more radical critique of this form, see Gemmill and Oakley, 1992).

In sum, then, work on transformational leadership makes a strong case for the importance of coming to terms with a leader's transformational capacity, but it sheds relatively little light on the psychological processes that underpin this capacity. It is here that we can turn to insights from the social identity tradition. For here, three decades of research have focused very much on the social psychology of motivation and influence, and on the capacity for this to be transformed by shared group membership.

The New Psychology of Leadership: An Identity Approach

Although it has clear limitations, work in classical and contingency traditions is instructive in a number of ways – most obviously in pointing to the fact that an adequate theory of leadership needs to explain a number of disparate features of this process. At core, these relate to the following four observations:

1. Different forms of leadership are required in different contexts (Fiedler and House, 1994).
2. Followers' perceptions of leaders are all-important (Lord and Maher, 1991), but vary as a function of social context.
3. Leaders and followers have a dynamic capacity to motivate and influence each other (Ellemers et al., 2004; Reicher et al., 2005).
4. In the process of developing the power to change the world, leaders and followers are themselves transformed (Burns, 1978; Turner, 2005).

In striving to develop an analysis that might account for these observations, two further points are worth making that are commonly overlooked. The first is that leaders are never just leaders in the abstract. They are always leaders of some specific group or collective – a country, a political party, a sporting team, and so on. By the same token, second, their followers do not come from anywhere. Potentially at least, they too are members of the same group. Leaders and followers are therefore bound together by their being part of – and by their sense that they are part of – a common group.

This idea that leadership centers on individuals' conception of themselves as group members is at the heart of work in the social identity tradition (e.g., see Haslam, 2001; van Knippenberg and Hogg, 2003; Turner, 2005). Social identity refers to a person's sense that he or she is member of a particular social group (e.g., a nation, an organization) and that this group membership is important and meaningful (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Social identity thus allows people to define the self as 'we' and 'us' (rather than just 'I' and 'me') and to use this as a basis not only for perception but for action (Turner, 1982).

When it comes to leadership, work that has explored the dynamics of social identity makes at least four key contributions to our understanding of this process (Haslam et al., 2011).

First, it shows that when people define themselves in terms of a given group membership, they are motivated to see that in-group as positively distinct from other out-groups, and that here what counts for an individual is not his or her personal fate but the standing of their group as whole (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Second, it shows that different forms of group behavior stem from different definitions of this social identity (Reicher et al., 2005). In other words, how we behave as a group depends on 'who we think we are.' Third, it shows that social identities are always bound up with social context – depending, among other things, on where we are and who we compare ourselves with (Oakes et al., 1994). Fourth, it shows that social identity is the necessary basis for collective behavior (Turner, 1982). It is only when we define ourselves as members of a common group that we can act as a group.

Leadership as Identity Representation

All of the forgoing points have important implications for the analysis of leadership. Indeed, just as John Turner (1982) asserted that social identity is what makes group behavior possible, so too one can argue that it is social identity that makes both leadership and followership possible (Haslam, 2001; Turner and Haslam, 2001).

This point can be spelled out further by noting that when people define themselves in terms of a given social identity (e.g., as 'us Australians') they seek both to discover what being a member of that group entails (e.g., liking sport, disliking 'tall poppies') and then to act in ways that accord with this (e.g., going to sports matches, deriding high-flyers). But who do we turn to for information about these things? The obvious answer is fellow in-group members. Indeed, one potent way of thinking about leaders is to see them as precisely such people: individuals who are perceived to be qualified to provide information about us and our place in the world by virtue of the fact that they are representative – or, in more technical language, *prototypical* (Turner, 2005) – of groups with which we identify.

These ideas have been supported by a large body of research. In particular, experimental research has shown that leaders who are prototypical of a perceiver's in-group exert more influence over them than those who are nonprototypical (Hogg and van Knippenberg, 2004). Indeed, a consistent finding in this work is that the capacity for a leader to shape the attitudes and behavior of others – in particular, by encouraging original and creative acts of followership – increases to the extent that he or she is seen to be 'one of us' (Haslam and Platow, 2001). Experiments show that it is only when a leader has a history of representing and advancing the interests of a contextually defined in-group, that followers prove willing to 'go the extra mile' in order to turn help translate the leader's vision for the group into reality.

Research by Michael Hogg also shows the influence of prototypical leaders is attributable to their prototypicality rather than the fact that they conform to particular leadership stereotypes (Hogg and van Knippenberg, 2004). In other words, it matters more that a leader looks like 'one of us' than that he or she looks like a 'typical' leader. Indeed, research shows that when stereotypical leader qualities such as trustworthiness, fairness, and charisma predict who emerges as

a leader (and who does not), this is because, in the context in which they are studied (i.e., for the particular group in question) these are qualities that are prototypical of the in-group (Haslam et al., 2011).

Extending this point, the programmatic work of Michael Platow also shows that stereotypical leadership qualities like trustworthiness, fairness, and charisma are actually the *consequence* of in-group prototypicality (Platow et al., 2003). It is therefore possible to refine Weber's (1921/1946) claim that leaders' charisma is conferred by followers by observing that this only occurs to the extent that the leaders in question are representative of 'us' (Platow et al., 2006). Refining Meindl's (1993) insights, it also appears that the extent to which followers romantically (mis)attribute group success to the superior quality of leaders is similarly contingent on those leaders' in-group prototypicality (Haslam et al., 2011).

Importantly, too, to the extent that a group member is seen as in-group prototypical, he or she is given greater latitude to display creativity by moving the group in new directions – directions that might otherwise be seen as inappropriate, objectionable, or disloyal (Platow et al., 2006). Yet, by the same token, if aspects of leadership (including the process of appointment) serve to break leaders' ties to their group, then this will tend to undermine their capacity to direct the group effectively. This claim is consistent with evidence that group processes and structures which set leaders apart from the group they are trying to lead tend to undermine both follower support and overall group performance (Hollander, 1985).

Leadership as Identity Realization

The above arguments suggest that a leader's capacity to influence followers flows from his or her capacity to represent a group membership that they both share. But shared identity is not something that is fixed and given. It is also something that can be cultivated (and, for that matter, destroyed). Appreciation of this point leads to the claim that precisely because social identity constitutes such a powerful social force, then anyone who is interested in shaping and changing the world needs to be interested in defining social identity. As Steve Reicher and Nick Hopkins argue (Reicher et al., 2005; Reicher and Hopkins, 1996) leaders thus need to be *entrepreneurs of identity* who work with followers to craft a sense of who they are and what they want to be in ways that make the case for their own relative in-group prototypicality.

One extensive body of work that supports these ideas has involved detailed examination of politicians' speeches to explore the processes through which social identity shapes collective action. One pertinent example is provided by analysis of speeches by leaders of British political parties (Margaret Thatcher and Neil Kinnock) to their respective party conferences during the British miners' strike of 1984–85 (Reicher and Hopkins, 1996). This showed how these speeches served to construe events in such a way that (1) the leader's party could be seen as representative of a positively defined in-group encompassing (almost) the entire population and (2) the leader's policies were consonant with the definition of that in-group identity.

Work of this form shows how identity definition mobilizes followers around a collective vision of identity. Yet however

compelling a vision, and whatever its ability to mobilize in the short-term, vision and rhetoric alone are not enough to sustain followers' faith in social identity in the longer term. For social identity is only useful to the extent that it allows group members to envision and then *create* a better future. Accordingly, if collective mobilization fails to translate the definition of identity into consonant forms of material reality, then that definition – and those leaders who advance it – will fall by the wayside. By contrast, where mobilization does succeed in creating realities that reflect a given definition of identity, then that definition will enjoy increasing support and the leader will receive considerable acclaim. In these terms, then, the X-factor that Gandhi, Hitler, Diana, Mandela, Thatcher, and Paul had in common was that they were effective *identity impresarios* who worked hard to develop structures that allowed the idea of 'us' to be lived out and translated into material change in the world (Haslam et al., 2011).

Conclusion

The forgoing analysis leads us to the conclusion that leadership is a group process that centers on an identity-based relationship between leaders and followers wherein leaders gain effectiveness through an ability to represent and realize the meaning and aspirations of the group. On the one hand, this acts as a constraint upon leaders. Leaders cannot say anything or get followers to do anything. They are reliant on their ability to persuade followers of their prototypicality and normativity, and this in turn depends upon features of social context. But on the other hand, it is social identity that enables leaders to energize people with their vision, and to recruit the agency of followers in order to transform both their self-understanding and the world they inhabit (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005).

Leaders, followers, and situations are not static elements that exist and operate independently of each other. Rather, they interact to shape each other. Moreover, it is through this dynamic interaction – and the process of galvanizing a collection of disparate 'I's into a powerful world-changing 'we' – that the transformational power of leadership is generated. Ironically, too, it is also in this process that the seductive myths of leadership come to the fore and prove to be its undoing. For once they have changed the world by mobilizing the power of the group, there is great temptation (and considerable inducement) for leaders to fall back on classical models which lead them to imagine that this was all their own doing. Airport bookshelves heave under the weight of such hubris and beckon us to our ruin.

See also: Collective Behavior, Social Psychology of; Group Processes, Social Psychology of; Identity and Identification, Social Psychology of; Self-Categorization Theory; Social Identity in Social Psychology; Social Psychology.

Bibliography

- Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N.M., Dasborough, M., 2009. Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *Leadership Quarterly* 20, 247–261.
- Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J., 1997. *Full Range Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden, Redwood City, CA.
- Bass, B., Riggio, R.E., 2006. *Transformational Leadership*, second ed. Taylor & Francis, New York.
- Burns, J.M., 1978. *Leadership*. New York.
- Carlyle, T., 1840. *Heroes and Hero Worship*. Harrap, London.
- Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., Haslam, S.A., 2004. Motivating individuals and groups at work: a social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management Review* 29, 459–478.
- Esler, P.F., 2003. *Conflict and identity in Romans: the social setting of Paul's letter*. Fortress Press, Minneapolis.
- Fiedler, F.E., 1964. A contingency model of leader effectiveness. In: Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 1. Academic Press, New York, pp. 149–190.
- Fiedler, F.E., House, R.J., 1994. Leadership theory and research: a report of progress. In: Cooper, C.L., Robertson, I.T. (Eds.), *Key Reviews in Managerial Psychology*. Wiley, New York, pp. 97–116.
- Fleishman, E.A., Peters, D.A., 1962. Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial success. *Personnel Psychology* 15, 43–56.
- Gemmill, G., Oakley, J., 1992. Leadership: an alienating social myth? *Human Relations* 45, 113–129.
- George, J.M., 2000. Emotions and leadership: the role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations* 53, 1027–1055.
- Gibb, C.A., 1947. The principles and traits of leadership. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 42, 267–284.
- Gibb, C.A., 1958. An interactional view of the emergence of leadership. *Australian Journal of Psychology* 10, 101–110.
- Graen, G.B., Uhl-Bien, M., 1995. Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly* 6, 219–247.
- Haslam, S.A., 2001. *Psychology in Organizations: The Social Identity Approach*. Sage, London.
- Haslam, S.A., Platow, M.J., 2001. The link between leadership and followership: how affirming a social identity translates vision into action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, 1469–1479.
- Haslam, S.A., Reicher, S.D., Platow, M.J., 2011. *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power*. Psychology Press, London and New York.
- Hogg, M.A., van Knippenberg, D., 2004. Social identity and leadership processes in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 35, 1–52.
- Hollander, E.P., 1964. *Leaders, Groups, and Influence*. New York.
- Hollander, E.P., 1985. Leadership and power. In: Lindzey, G., Aronson, E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, third ed. Random House, New York, pp. 485–537.
- Hollander, E.P., 1995. Organizational leadership and followership. In: Collett, P., Furnham, A. (Eds.), *Social Psychology at Work: Essays in Honour of Michael Argyle*. Routledge, London, pp. 69–87.
- Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J.D., Morgeson, F.P., 2007. Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92, 269–277.
- Judge, T.A., Colbert, A.E., Ilies, R., 2004. Intelligence and leadership: a quantitative review and rest of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89, 542–552.
- van Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M.A. (Eds.), 2003. *Leadership and Power: Identity Processes in Groups and Organizations*. Sage, London.
- Lord, R.G., Maher, K.J., 1991. *Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Mann, R.D., 1959. A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin* 56, 241–270.
- Meindl, J.R., 1993. Reinventing leadership: a radical, social psychological approach. In: Murnighan, J.K. (Ed.), *Social Psychology in Organizations: Advances in Theory and Research*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 89–118.
- Oakes, P.J., Haslam, S.A., Turner, J.C., 1994. *Stereotyping and Social Reality*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Plato, 380BC/1993. *The Republic*. Oxford.
- Platow, M.J., Haslam, S.A., Foddy, M., Grace, D.M., 2003. Leadership as the outcome of self-categorization processes. In: van Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M.A. (Eds.), *Leadership and Power: Identity Processes in Groups and Organizations*. Sage, London, pp. 34–47.
- Platow, M.J., van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S.A., van Knippenberg, B., Spears, R., 2006. A special gift we bestow on you for being representative of us: considering leader charisma from a self-categorization perspective. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 45, 303–320.
- Reicher, S.D., Hopkins, N., 1996. Self-category constructions in political rhetoric: an analysis of Thatcher's and Kinnock's speeches concerning the British miners' strike (1984–5). *European Journal of Social Psychology* 26, 353–372.

- Reicher, S.D., Haslam, S.A., Hopkins, N., 2005. Social identity and the dynamics of leadership: leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. *Leadership Quarterly* 16, 547–568.
- Reynolds, K.J., Turner, J.C., Branscombe, N.R., Mavor, K.I., Bizumic, B., Subašić, E., 2010. Interactionism in personality and social psychology: an integrated approach to understanding the mind and behaviour. *European Journal of Personality* 24, 458–482.
- Stogdill, R.M., 1948. Personality factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology* 25, 35–71.
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C., 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin, W.G., Worchel, S. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Brooks/Cole, Monterey, CA, pp. 33–47.
- Turner, J.C., 1982. Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In: Tajfel, H. (Ed.), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 15–40.
- Turner, J.C., 2005. Examining the nature of power: a three-process theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 35, 1–22.
- Turner, J.C., Haslam, S.A., 2001. Social identity, organizations and leadership. In: Turner, M.E. (Ed.), *Groups at Work: Advances in Theory and Research*, pp. 25–65. Hillsdale, NJ.
- Tyler, T.R., Blader, S.L., 2000. *Cooperation in Groups: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Behavioral Engagement*. Psychology Press, Philadelphia, PA.
- Weber, M., 1921/1946. The sociology of charismatic authority. In: Gerth, H.H., Milles, C.W. (Trans. and Eds.), *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 245–252.
- Zimbardo, P., 2007. *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil*. Random House, London.