IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Social-cognitive, relational, and identity-based approaches to leadership

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1630688 since 2017-03-28T15:17:29Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.03.001

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

11 November 2026

IRIS AperTO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

This is the authors' final version of the contribution published as:

Lord, B.G., Gatti, P., & Chui, S. (2016). Social-cognitive, relational, and identity-based approaches to leadership. For 50th Anniversary Special Issue of *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 136,* 119-134, DOI 10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.03.001.

The publisher's version is available at:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749597816301388

When citing, please refer to the published version.

This full text was downloaded from iris-Aperto: https://iris.unito.it/

Social-Cognitive, Relational, and Identity-Based Approaches to Leadership

Abstract

We review the leadership literature published in this journal during the 50 years since its inception. Our focus is on three major contributions to leadership theory – social-cognitive, leader-member exchange, and social identity theories – as well as the role in advancing leadership theory of seminal theories published in this journal. During this period, the conceptualization of leadership has become more inclusive and dynamic, expanding to include both leaders and followers, and their team and organizational context. Dynamics pertain not only to the development over time in leader-member relationship, but also to within-person changes in active identities and behavioral styles that repeatedly occur. This complexity creates sensemaking challenges for all parties, as they both create and experience leadership processes.

The purpose of this article is to contribute to the 50th year celebration of *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processe*s (hereafter OBHDP) by looking backwards at the many theoretical and empirical contributions to the leadership literature made by articles published in this journal and also by looking forward, suggesting ways that the literature could be advanced in the future. We do this by emphasizing the role of context, both in shaping the leadership research in the early years of the journal and by emphasizing that leadership processes are also dependent on situations in multiple ways; one's followers, tasks, organization, culture, and time all affect the nature of leadership. To advance theory, we maintain that both leader and follower identities play critical roles in adapting leadership processes to situational constraints, and we develop a perspective that integrates identities with dynamic processes. Further, we argue that though often relegated to the background, time helps articulate these diverse processes both in a dynamic and in a theoretical sense. By developing this framework, we illustrate how a dynamic, identity-based perspective can advance understanding of intra- and inter-personal processes associated with leadership.

We begin by taking a look at both key empirical contributions made by articles published in this journal, and the social science context in which OBHDP was founded. We then hope to show how OBHDP was critical in advancing the leadership field in terms of understanding social-cognitive processes related to leadership and in emphasizing the relational processes that develop between leaders and their subordinates or teams. Then, we focus on the identity area, showing how it can provide an integrative framework for such themes that is dynamic and contextually sensitive. Finally, we address future leadership needs relevant to both theory and practice.

Leadership Theory and OBHDP

In keeping with the emphasis of this journal, our focus is on theory development. Table 1 groups by topic influential articles that were published in this journal, were widely

cited, and had lasting effect on research and theory. It shows the prominence of both social-cognitive and relational leadership research as well as a continuing interest in the effects of leadership on outcomes. Outcomes like creativity or moral behavior, and more typically group or organizational performance, were explained by a variety of constructs ranging from contingent rewards, to charisma, to follower identities, to leadership substitutes. Although Table 1 is useful for identifying key articles and for illustrating broad themes, by itself it does not provide much insight into how the leadership field developed. Consequently, we begin with a more narrative, historically-based description of leadership trends in the early years of the journal, many of which were personally experienced by the first author of this article.

Early research and the changing nature of leadership science. Like most social science, the study of leadership reflects broad trends in scientific thinking, and that contextual influence is evident in research published in early issues of this journal. In 1966, when OBHDP was founded, our understanding of psychological processes was quite different than it is today. Social science then was in the midst of shifting from a behavioral to a cognitive, information processing perspective. Also, the first edition of Katz and Kahn's (1966) book applying social psychology and open systems theory to organizations was published. It emphasized the dynamic interdependence of organizations and environments, processes such as informal leadership, and the dependence of organizations on roles and their associated norms and values. Additionally, the field of social-cognition was developing, as witnessed by new and influential attribution theory work, which provided a basis for understanding social sensemaking (Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967). Thus, the conceptual tools that afforded a better understanding of leadership as a behavioral, social cognitive, role-based, organizational construct were available to support development of seminal leadership theories, many of which were published in OBHDP whose principal objective has always been to advance theory. These factors allowed social science and leadership science to advance in tandem as

new theoretical perspectives were developed and applied to organizations and leadership processes.

Leadership situations versus stable leadership styles. Early leadership research in OBHDP emphasized that the social and task contexts had important effects on leadership processes. For example, followers' performance affected their supervisor's leadership style (Lowin & Craig, 1968), and situational factors explained far more variance in leader decision making style than did individual differences (Hill & Schmitt, 1977). Similarly, research using observational coding reported that leader behavior changed substantially as a function of the task (Hill & Hughes, 1974). Thus, research showed that leadership style was a flexible, social, and task-dependent process. This perspective on antecedents to leadership dovetailed with research showing that outcomes of leadership style also depended on the leadership situation (e.g., Fiedler, 1964).

Despite such early indications that context was an important antecedent of leadership, most early research in this journal and elsewhere focused on stable aspects of leaders such as traits or styles as the primary determinant of leadership (See Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, & Eagly, in press for a review of leadership research that also covers the 50 years prior to the founding of OBHDP). Leadership was viewed chiefly in entity rather than process terms, and mainstream research conceptualized differences among leaders in terms of behavioral styles for which measures were well established in the leadership field by the time OBHDP was founded.

This research relied on *perceived* leadership styles as reported by a leader's followers as being valid measures of leader behavior. Researchers assumed that retrospective ratings were accurate if they produce interpretable factors scores and behavioral dimensions had high internal consistency. What wasn't fully realized at the time was that followers integrated their perceptions of leadership with other aspects of situation (i.e., group performance, liking of

the leader, follower affective states, task knowledge), and these factors also affect their ratings of leadership (Keller Hansbrough, Lord, & Schyns, 2015). Measures of leadership style had a surface structure that emphasized behavior; but at a deeper level, they reflected raters' knowledge structures and sensemaking procedures as well as memories of behaviors, reflecting both the social and personal context within which measurement occurred. Such rating scales were the focus of much research applying social-cognitive approaches to understanding leadership perceptions and leader behavior ratings, yet the issues uncovered apply to most contemporary leadership measures.

Social Cognitive Approaches to Leadership

The application of developing social-cognitive approaches to leadership showed that for both leaders and followers, how they interpreted leadership processes and outcomes was a critical mediating process linking leaders and followers. It put attribution processes at the heart of leadership dynamics (Martinko & Gardner, 1987; Mitchell & Green, 1979), and it also emphasized that the match of perceived characteristics to the implicit theories of leaders (Eden & Leviatan, 1975) and followers (Sy, 2010) affected perceptions of leaders and followers, and descriptions of, as well as reactions to, their behavior.

Behavioral Ratings and Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs)

Two studies published in 1975 initiated research themes revealing important limits of the behavioral style approach, initiating ILT research. Research showed that the factor structure of leadership measures could be replicated from ratings of fictitious individuals, indicating that the "structure" in behavior was provided by the cognitive schema of perceivers, not necessarily the actual behavioral patterns of leaders (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). This effect was replicated by others (Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977; Weiss & Adler, 1981), and it provided the early impetus for research on ILTs much of which was published in this journal. More recently, this theme was extended to implicit followership theories (IFTs) (Sy,

2010), and the combination of ILTs and IFTs has been associated with the nature of the perceived leader member exchange (van Gils, van Quaquebeke, & van Knippenberg, 2010).

A more telling problem, also revealed in research published in OBHDP (Staw, 1975), challenged the typical paradigm of collecting behavioral ratings and correlating them with performance outcomes as a way to build theory. Specifically, Staw's empirical research indicated that the causal process may be just the reverse of typical reasoning with knowledge of group outcome causing changes in process descriptions, suggesting a reverse causality effect which operated through the mental structures and sensemaking processes of raters who typically were group members. The finding that performance knowledge affected behavioral descriptions drew immediate reactions from leadership researchers (e.g., Mitchell, Larson, & Green, 1977), who questioned whether the effects of performance information on ratings would apply when people interacted extensively with each other. Nevertheless, Staw's classic article was replicated in longitudinal research using subjects with extensive interaction (Downey, Chacko, & McElroy, 1979), and subsequent research in this journal showed that it was the consistency of performance cues (Binning & Lord; 1980), not the familiarity among group members as suggested by DeNisi and Pritchard (1978), that influenced this effect of performance information on descriptions of leadership and other group processes. The finding that experimentally manipulated knowledge of a group's performance significantly affected descriptions of leadership behavior in that group has been replicated under a variety of conditions, being greatest when causal attribution for performance focuses on the leader either because of his/her perceptual salience (Phillips & Lord, 1981) or because the rater's culture emphasizes dispositional rather than situational attributions (Ensari & Murphy, 2003). More recent applied research reflecting a similar theme (Agle, Nagarajan, Sonnenfeld, & Srinivasan, 2006) used top-management team ratings of their CEO's charisma, finding that these ratings were significantly correlated with both objective (ROA, ROS, sales growth) and

perceptual measures of *past* performance, but these leadership ratings did not predict similar measures of *future* performance.

Recent theorizing consistent with the Agle et al. (2006) findings also suggests that part of the emphasis on entity-based explanations for leadership may stem from adopting a retrospective, sensemaking perspective toward the past, that may not generalize to a future that is yet to be determined (Lord, Dinh, & Hoffman, 2015). Other contemporary research shows that ILTs are used to resolve ambiguity in the inferential processes linking performance and leadership perceptions (Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015). Clearly, cross-sectional correlations between leader behavior ratings and performance can reflect multiple causal directions, and the causal arrow may often flow from outcomes to behavioral descriptions, as Staw's (1975) seminal research showed.

Leader Categorization Theory

Categorization theory research published in OBHDP provided a perceptually-based explanation for the effects of implicit leadership theories on leadership ratings, proposing that leaders were recognized or categorized as such based on a very general perceptual process that depended on an underlying categorical structure defined by a central category prototype (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). A *prototype* is an abstraction of typical features of category members that defines a category for perceivers. Here the key idea was that categorical structures such as prototypes helped perceivers understand leadership, and they provided a heuristic basis for both encoding and retrieval of likely behavior. Later research showed that categories were processed as patterns (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007), which explained why prototypical but unseen traits or behaviors tended to be recognized if consistent with perceiver's overall schema.

More contemporary thinking also emphasizes that the patterns that define prototypes are constructed on-the-fly by perceivers (Hanges, Lord, & Dickson, 2000; Lord, Brown,

Harvey, & Hall, 2001), allowing categories to be more dynamic and context sensitive, reflecting both aspects of leaders (race, gender, ethnicity) and raters (emotions, goals, needs). Supporting this argument, Sy et al., (2010) showed that ethnicity affected the content of category prototypes; Foti, Knee, and Backert (2008) showed that prototypes changed over time as a result of group interactions; and MacDonald, Sulsky, and Brown (2008) showed that priming interdependent or independent identities affected the prototypicality of transformational versus transactional leadership items.

Although focused on pattern-matching processes as explanations of leadership perceptions, categorization theory also provided a linkage to the attributional issues raised by Staw (1975). Specifically, categories also could be used in an inferential manner, being activated when perceivers made dispositional inferences to a leader for performance outcomes (Ensari & Murphy, 2003; Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015). Whether leaders were categorized as such based on a recognition, pattern-driven process or an inferential, attributional process, subsequent information processing was guided by the prototypical structure of cognitive categories. Consistent with this idea, an early study of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1989) also showed that categorization processes had a substantial effect on transformational leadership rating processes.

Because it explained the linkage of several prototypical traits to leadership perceptions, categorization theory provided a natural linkage to trait theories of leadership. Leader categorization theory strongly indicated that some traits such as intelligence should predict leadership perceptions, yet research relating traits to leadership perceptions showed very inconsistent effects. Part of the explanation for this variability stemmed from the fact that category prototypes changed with the leadership context so for example, different traits would define military as compared to educational or religious leaders as shown by research on categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984). Another reason for variability was provided by

advances in methodology associated with meta-analysis (Lord, De Vader & Alliger, 1986), which showed a strong relation of intelligence to leadership perceptions. Meta-analysis explains much of the variability in results in terms of sampling error. Subsequent meta-analyses have shown traits to predict many aspects of leadership. For example, Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002) reported that the regression of leadership assessments on the five factor theory personality dimensions yielded a multiple R of .48.

Attribution Theory

In a classic article published in this journal that applied attribution theories to leadership, Green and Mitchell (1979) looked at leader attributional processes as antecedents to their responses to subordinate performance. Building on the seminal work of Kelley (1967) and others, they theorized that rewards and punishment, closeness of supervision, expectancies for future performance, and aspirations for performance would vary with attributions for performance, with attributions to member ability having a particularly strong effect. Subsequent empirical research provided support for many of these ideas, showing that internal attributions lead to more punitive leader responses to poor follower performance than external attributions (Mitchell & Wood, 1980). Foreshadowing more contemporary work, Ilgen, Mitchell, and Fredrickson (1981) looked at both how supervisors responded to subordinates and how subordinates responded to supervisors, illustrating the importance of contextual factors like supervisory power and task interdependence. Research extended this dynamic focus further, showing that the impression management tactics of subordinates affected supervisor's disciplinary behavior (Wood & Mitchell, 1981), and Martinko and Gardner (1987) developed a comprehensive theory of attributions linking both leaders and members. This line of research supported two important conclusions. First, how supervisors responded to subordinate performance was mediated by their sensemaking process; and

second, both supervisors and subordinates adjusted their behavior to situational factors as they understood them.

More contemporary research in this journal has integrated attribution theory with other constructs. For example, Martinko, Moss, Douglas and Borkowski (2007) found that differences between managers and subordinates in attributional style affected social justice perceptions, which in turn, affected evaluation of relationship quality. Several studies show that culture moderates attributional effects: De Voe and Iyengar (2004) found that attributions of employee motivation to internal (intrinsic) and external (extrinsic) sources differed with culture; Ensari and Murphy (2003) found that culture affected the tendency to make dispositional attributions, which then affected how information was assimilated with ILTs; and Zemba, Young and Morris (2006) found that culture influenced individual versus group attributions for organizational accidents. Thus, how perceivers make causal attributions has become an important aspect of our understanding of leadership and followership processes and how they differ across cultures.

However, it should be stressed that social-cognitive theory now views systematic, thoughtful attributional processes as the exception rather than the rule. More typically, people make sense using automatic processes which are emphasized in their culture, such as categorizing others in trait or entity terms in western cultures, and only later correct initial interpretations if perceivers are sufficiently motivated and adequate time and cognitive resources are available. Emotional states of raters, which also may operate outside of awareness, also affect ratings of leadership, and these states may reflect a contagion process triggered by the emotions leaders express (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Naidoo & Lord, 2008). Further, emotions conveyed by leaders may be a catalyst for effective vision communication (Venus, Stam, & van Knippenberg, 2013), and they may be a critical part of the sensemaking processes that lead to organizational identification in newcomers (Sluss, Ployhart, Cobb, &

Asforth, 2012). One general interpretation of the leadership research covered so far is that perceivers use their implicit theories to automatically make sense of a leader's attributes and behaviors, but they do this within a broader context that integrates task outcomes, salient organizational values, perceiver's internal feelings and embodied states, and their active identities.

Sensemaking is a dynamic and complex social construction process that is enacted over time and includes behaviors of both leaders and followers (Weick, 1995). Another important component of sensemaking involves "identity work" that constructs a sense of who one is and how one's self-identity relates to the work context (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Sluss et al., 2012). Extending this sensemaking focus, Gerstner and Day (1997) emphasized that the relationship with one's supervisor provided a lens for interpreting one's entire work experience. As we will explain in the next two sections of this manuscript, this lens develops over time as leaders and followers form a specific dyadic exchange, but it also is highly dependent on internal follower processes associated with active goals, identities, and emotions (Bargh, Green, & Fitzsimons, 2008; Ferguson & Bargh, 2004; Fitzsimons, & Shah, 2008; Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012; Venus, et al., 2013) and external processes that depend on team and organizational contexts (Brands, Menges, & Kilduff, 2015). The richness with which we now understand the factors affecting leadership perceptions and processes reflects the cumulative advance in social science theorizing over the past 50 years as we have moved from understanding entities, that is leaders, to understanding situationally embedded leadership processes, that depend on dyadic, team, and organizational contexts. These multi-level, dynamic leadership processes extend from the past and project into the future, shaping what we see; how it is interpreted; the emotions, goals, and identities that are activated; and the actual futures that emerge.

Social Exchanges among Leaders and Followers

As Table 1 illustrates, a second prominent theme in highly influential OBHDP articles concerned the nature of exchanges between leaders and followers. Research on social relationships published in OBHDP overlapped with social cognitive research, both historically and substantively. Over time, this research expanded to include team as well as dyadic relationships, and it reflected an increasing emphasis on temporal dynamics.

Vertical Dyad Linkages (VDL)

Early research. OBHDP had close ties with the Vertical Dyad Linkage approach to leadership, which "views the particular relationships between the leader and each of his individual members as the basic unit of analysis" (Dansereau, Cashman & Graen, 1973, p. 187). Rather than focusing on behavioral styles associated with leaders (average leadership style), this approach emphasized that each dyad member could develop unique social exchanges with their leaders (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975), creating a social context for ongoing leadership processes. Using a longitudinal approach, Dansereau et al. found that "the *degree of latitude* that a superior granted to a member to negotiate his role was predictive of subsequent behavior on the part of both superior and member" (p. 46). This finding restructured thinking, emphasizing that social exchanges and roles were negotiated over time, and depended on both supervisor and subordinate. This research theme developed into concerns with role making (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) as a determinant of what is now called leader-member exchange, but it actually reflects a dynamic, social construction of leadership processes that develops over time as subordinates move through different stages in the role-making process.

Many of the articles which laid the foundations of this theoretical approach were published in this journal in the early '70s. They focused on the *dyad*, and on the *leader-member relationship*, maintaining that leadership style makes a significant difference in organizations "in terms of how it is *interpreted*" (Graen, Dansereau & Minami, 1972, p. 235)

by the members of the leader's group, more than in terms of what the leader does, again emphasizing the importance of perceptions to the leadership processes. Perceived negotiation latitude was associated with lower propensity to quit, higher performance ratings, and higher satisfaction with supervisors (Vecchio & Gobdel, 1984).

Expanding themes. Extending the concern with social context, the VDL approach also developed beyond its original boundaries, to analyze "interunit differentiation" (Cashman, Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1976) by investigating vertical chains in organizations, and concluding that "…a member is dependent upon a relationship [between the supervisor and the former's boss] to which he is not a party" (p. 294). This was, at least implicitly, a harbinger of the social network perspective (Sparrowe & Liden, 2005), emphasizing the multiple ties among employees and an expanding social context for the VDL.

Reflecting the task and social themes noted earlier, the dual attachment model (Graen, Novak & Sommerkamp, 1982; Seers & Graen, 1984) explicitly considered the characteristics of one's job (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) and integrated them with the leader-member exchange (Graen & Cashman, 1975). The dual attachment saw task and relational domains as jointly defining the job (Graen, et al., 1982), while the personal domain was added later as a moderator of the relationship between each of the other two domains and the outcome variables (Seers & Graen, 1984). These studies provided support for the predictive value of the dual attachment concept, although the personal moderator variables (i.e., growth need strength for the job characteristic model, and leadership need strength for the leader-member exchange model) were less successful. Terminology also changed with these papers (Graen et al., 1982; Seers & Graen, 1984), emphasizing the contemporary term LMX. This research is still vibrant today; its sustained impact on the leadership field is shown by Graen and Uhl-Bien's (1995) 25-year review being the most widely cited article in the leadership field (Lord et al., in press).

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

Because of its centrality to many organizational processes, the nomological network for this relationship-based approach to leadership was extended with subsequent research. Developing from a focus on its antecedents and outcomes, LMX theory expanded to the derived concept of team-member exchange (TMX, Seers, 1989) and was integrated with other leadership theories. Thus, the relational aspect of LMX was centered in the team as well as the organizational context in which social exchanges occurred.

Antecedents. Though the antecedents of LMX have received less research attention than its outcomes, those that have been investigated include demographic (Green, Anderson, & Shivers, 1996), personality (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Ilies, 2009), relational, and organizational variables like span of control (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012). An antecedent which has gained much attention is *similarity* between the supervisor and the subordinate. It had already been investigated in OBHDP by Green and colleagues in 1996, with mixed findings that foreshadowed more recent work: only gender dissimilarity was related to lower LMX values, while no significant results were found for age and education dissimilarity. While similarity is an example of relational antecedents, personality traits and their effect on the relationship also showed mixed results (Dulebohn et al., 2012). Lastly, among organizational characteristics, the negative relation of unit size with LMX (Green et al., 1996) shows the importance of a supervisor's ability to commit time and resources to the relationship.

One antecedent with more of a motivational emphasis, is the regulatory focus of followers. Fit between follower's promotion versus prevention regulatory focus and a leader's transformational versus transactional emphasis can create a self-regulatory process that "feels right" to subordinates, increases stability, and reduces turnover intentions (Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg, 2011). This may be because social evaluations

have a goal dependent nature (Ferguson & Bargh, 2004), and individuals who are perceived to be more instrumental to ones goals are perceived more favorably (Fitzsimons & Shah, 2008). As Ferguson and Bargh emphasized, "liking is for doing," and followers may like leaders more when they are seen as being instrumental to goal attainment, which would be enhanced by the fit between a subordinate's goal orientation and a leader's typical behavior. This process may operate similarly in leaders as fit with a leader's self-regulatory style may make subordinates more desirable and easier to work with (Kark & Van Dijk, 2007).

As Higgins (1997, 1998) noted, regulatory focus is grounded in the activation of ideal versus ought identities, which suggests that ultimately it is identities that underlie the nature of effective leader member exchanges (Jackson & Johnson, 2012; Lord, Brown, & Frieberg, 1999). Echoing this point, Sluss and Ashforth (2008), emphasized that subordinate's identification (relational identification) with the subordinate-manager role relationship also can be the basis for organizational identification, and we suggest that such convergence across levels may reflect the appropriate activation of identities and motivational processes as a guide to role making, as well as the more diffuse cognitive, affective and behavioral processes that Sluss and Ashforth emphasized.

Outcomes. So many outcomes are influenced by LMX that a good metaphor for it is "a lens through which the entire work experience is viewed" (Gerstner & Day, 1997, p. 840). Articles in this journal provide links to most of the classical outcomes: satisfaction with working relationships (Green et al., 1996), in-role and extra-role performance (Hui, Law, & Chen, 1999), the latter measured as organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intentions or actual turnover (Ballinger, Lehman, & Schoorman, 2010). Aside from the many positive influences that high LMX has been shown to have, surprisingly, there is also a risk that a good relationship will amplify the effects of succession events: people with high-quality LMX will perceive a change in leader as a loss that creates negative affective

reactions and may make them more likely to leave the organization (Ballinger et al., 2010). Another risk of high LMX is that it magnifies "the negative relation between abusive supervision and basic need satisfaction" (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012, p. 49). Such surprising effects call for further attention.

Temporal dynamics. Both antecedents and outcomes of LMX have tended to be investigated in studies that underemphasize the dynamics, even though general role-making theory recognized that the outcomes and negotiating latitude developed over time in an interdependent manner. A broader aspect of temporal dynamics involved the investigation of the LMX in conjunction with particular phases of employees' life in the organization. These relationships begin quickly, being guided by initial affect and expectations (Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993), but as they develop through a series of exchanges between leaders and members (Dienesch & Liden, 1986), the basis for LMX shifts. Individual characteristics tend to be important at the initial interaction, but behavioral factors, such as performance, soon begin to show a greater influence (Nahrgang et al., 2009). As attribution theory research shows, it is the interpretation of performance that has a critical effect on dynamic processes, and differences in interpretation can affect social justice perceptions and LMX (Martinko et al., 2007).

One interesting temporal dynamic concerns the nature of social exchanges. As relational identities develop, the nature of social exchanges shifts from being negotiated on an act-by-act basis to being more focused on the good of the relationship (Flynn, 2005). Trust in the other party then becomes the key glue binding the social fabric together (Sue-Chan, Au, & Hackett, 2012). Trust, in turn, depends on social justice (procedural, interactional, and distributive justice perceptions), but also on perceiving one's organization and supervisor as being fair. Supervisor-focused justice affects LMX as well as trust (Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002; Rupp, Shao, Jones, & Liao, 2014), and ultimately citizenship behavior directed at

supervisors. Thus, social exchanges with both supervisors and organizations reflect a focus not only on justice processes, but also on the individuals or organizations who are seen as being responsible for those processes.

Multi-Level Perspectives on Social Exchanges

A complement to leader-member exchange is team-member exchange quality (Seers, 1989), viz., "a way to assess the reciprocity between a member and the peer group" (p. 119). This construct made its first appearance in the OBHDP 25 years ago, and has recently received renewed attention (see Farmer, Van Dyne & Kamdar, 2015). Other constructs that could be linked to team-member exchange for their focus on other members of the work group in addition to leader and follower include: LMX consensus and excellence (Schyns & Day, 2010), relative LMX or RLMX (Henderson, Wayne, Shore, Bommer, & Tetrick, 2008), and the "social comparisons" of LMX or LMXSC (Vidyarthi, Liden, Anand, Erdogan, & Ghosh, 2010). As Day and Schyns (2010) noted, continued methodological improvements in Within and Between Analysis and Multilevel Analysis spurred these developments. Some authors would say that LMX in itself "is multilevel in nature" (Henderson, Liden, Gilbkowski, & Chaudhry, 2009, p. 519), and these constructs in a certain sense require a multilevel perspective.

From an additional standpoint, it would also be advisable to think about a "multilevel perspective *within* individuals" by recognizing that their active identity differs over time, in part depending on LMX relationships. For example, Chang and Johnson (2010) analyzed the relationship of the supervisor's relational identity and the supervisee's LMX stating that "supervisor relational identity is not only related to the bottom-line but it also relates to social and psychological contexts at work" (p. 805). Their work shows the importance not only of the dyadic relationships, but also the impact of a self-identity oriented toward the relationship. Thus, as with the social-cognitive approach, we find that what began over 40

years ago with the recognition that leaders develop qualitatively different exchanges with subordinates has developed into a richer, dynamic, contextual theory that includes multiple levels that embed individuals in their organization.

Cumulatively, both the role-making and the social-cognitive approaches to understanding leadership processes have developed an appreciation of the many factors that create a context for leadership and structure dynamic exchanges between leaders and followers. Where these theories are weakest, however, is in providing a basis for understanding how these myriad factors are integrated in a specific relationship, or which factors are the most critical constructs for either leadership theory or leadership application. In the following section we show how a careful consideration of identity, and its role in both momentary task activities and long-term personal development or organizational identification, can help address such issues, enhancing both our understanding of leadership processes and identity dynamics.

An Integrated Perspective of Identity-Based Leadership Studies

Our coverage of both the behavioral/social cognitive and the social exchange literature revealed two important parallels: early research in both areas focused on the effects of what were thought to reflect relatively stable structure such as behavioral styles or a particular exchange quality with a follower, but more recent research reflects a richer, more situated and dynamic theoretical perspective. Both areas also emphasize effects of followers (perceivers) as well as leaders in explaining behavioral ratings or social exchanges. Interestingly, identity research shows a similar trend with early research (Markus, 1977) emphasizing the effects of self-schemas in particular domains that described enduring and distinguishing qualities of a person (e.g., the "I" described by William James, 1890, such as "I am tall"), whereas more recent research emphasizes a dynamic self (e.g., Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012) that is embedded in a social context.

We maintain in this section that this parallel is more than a curiosity, and it likely reflects the fact that self-relevance is fundamental in understanding any situation. Indeed, it is so important that a number of specific emotional mechanisms have evolved to guide situational reactions, and they are triggered by a very fast and automatic primary appraisal of self-relevance (Izard, 1991). Moreover, both in the social exchange literature (Liden, et al., 1993) and in the social cognitive literature (Srull & Wyer, 1989), evaluative reactions often set the stage for later processing. Self-relevance also has motivational consequences which fit with the observation of Oyserman et al. (2012) that one core notion of the self-concept/identity literatures is that these mental constructs and their social manifestation create a "force for action." This argument is consistent with work relating leadership to followers' motivation through the activation of their self-concept (Lord et al., 1999; Lord & Brown, 2004; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

Thus, as we seek to understand dynamic processes and consider the role of time itself, the self provides a critical theoretical construct, which is the reason for its prominence in the remainder of this review. Not only are affect, cognitions, knowledge structures, and motivation integrated around the construct of identity; one's origins in the past, interpretation of the present, and projection into the future depend on "identity work" (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010), and they are carried out by a richly connected dedicated brain-scale processing structure that is widely referred to as a *default network*, although it is comprised of several subnetworks (Gusnard, 2005). Indeed, a hallmark of episodic memory is the ability to locate the self in the past, and this is possible because we continually locate the self in all situations, orienting situational interpretations around self-relevant needs and goals (Bargh et al., 2008). Consequently, one's active identity becomes a mediating structure linking contextualized interpretations to situationally appropriate actions. As we explain shortly, when the self becomes a conscious focus, many situational features are integrated as a context-specific

identity is constructed, providing an interpretive and behavioral platform that is tuned to the situation.

Self-Concept, Identity, and Dynamic Leadership Processes

Self-concept and identity. As illustrated by our coverage of leader-member exchange, the emergence and refinement of one's identity is an ongoing and central aspect of organizational membership that depends, in part, on the relationship with one's supervisor (Sluss et al., 2012). There is a rich and sometimes confusing corpus of studies on the self-concept and self-identity, so we begin with careful definitions of constructs, which are often used inconsistently in the relevant literature. We then focus on dynamic factors.

The *self* is a complex mental structure involving self-concepts and self-identities on which meaning for actions and events is based. The *self-concept* consists of beliefs about the self that can be affective or cognitive (Fiske & Taylor, 2013), and they are anchored in a psychological tradition that focuses on the individual. The self-concept has been used in a variety of ways that range from a memory-based representation to a processing structure that regulates attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Markus & Wurf, 1987). Intuitively, it is "what comes to mind when one thinks of oneself" (Oyserman et al., 2012, p. 69). Yet, a more precise definition is required, which we maintain depends on how information related to the self is processed in the brain.

An influential perspective is that the self-concept is a confederation of self-schemas derived from past experience that are represented in verbal, visual, and embodied forms (Markus & Wurf, 1987). *Self-schemas* are modular processing structures consisting of beliefs about one's qualities or one's behavior in a given domain, e.g., I am friendly, I am a leader (Kunda, 1999; Markus, 1977). Oyserman et al. (2012) use the term identities to describe mental constructs that seem very similar to self-schemas, depicting the self as being an aggregation of specific identities. However, we reserve the term *identity* to reflect a self-

construal that often is created on-the-spot as one consciously thinks of the self, and which also may take account of the social context. That is, we use identity to refer to a brain-scale, consciously-created processing structure that adjusts self-schemas through top-down feedback. Following Markus & Wurf (1987), we use the term self-schemas to reflect the more enduring knowledge structures which can have influences that are either automatic or more conscious. Self-schemas tend to exist for central aspects of the self, which are active in many situations, and tend to be important to an individual or represent dimensions on which an individual is extreme. Self-schemas also have close linkages with scripts that are used for understanding situations and automatically generating behavior. Whether labeled as self-schemas, or identities, these processing structures, once activated by situational cues and used to guide interpretations, have strong implications for behavior. As Oyserman et al. note, "what the cued identity carries with it is not a fixed list of traits (e.g., warm, energetic). Rather, the cued identity carries with it a general readiness to act and make sense of the world in identity-congruent terms, including the norms, values, strategies, and goals associated with that identity, as well as the cognitive procedures relevant to it" (p. 93).

The accessibility of self-schemas (and associated scripts and skills) varies from situation to situation, and the set of self-schemas that are active at any one moment is called the *working self-concept* (WSC) (Markus & Wurf, 1987). Research in this area emphasizes how these self-schemas are represented in memory structures that are evoked by situational cues or primes. Typical studies focused on how situational factors influence reaction times for accessing information (e.g., Markus & Kunda, 1986). Such studies showed how the momentarily active WSC automatically guides judgments, behavior, self-regulation and social perceptions. Thinking in terms of a variable WSC helps us understand how an individual might move in and out of leadership or followership roles in a flexible manner that

also affects the accessibility of interpretive structures, affective reactions, and behavioral skills in leadership and followership domains.

Whereas the self-concept literature tends to emphasize domain-specific knowledge representation and early aspect of self-relevant information processing, *self-identities* reflect a global interpretation of the self that emphasizes its grounding in social and situational processes. Self-identity research also builds on a sociological tradition. LMX and TMX and leadership in general, being social in nature, clearly involve leadership identities. Although drawing on the WSC, one's active identity typically is constructed through a self-focused person construal process (see Freeman & Ambady, 2011 for a detailed description of person construal processes) that creates a conscious and general meaning for the self-knowledge that is momentarily active. As we use the term, one's identity is therefore an integrative construct that takes account of many diverse factors in addition to self-knowledge as it constructs an appropriate and meaningful interpretation (e.g., social and task context, roles, activated self-schema, current affect, current goals, social stereotypes, and very recent information processing, etc.). The interactive combination of such factors can create new, situationally-tuned identities. That is, they reflect what Dinh et al., (2014 have termed compilational aggregation processes, in which the resulting aggregate differs in fundamental ways from the underlying input.

Automatic, modular versus conscious, brain-scale processes. Our distinction between self-schemas and identities becomes clearer if we consider what is involved when a construct becomes conscious. Dehaene (2014) depicts the brain as a collection of local, modular processing structures, some of which would involve self-schemas. Many of these structures carry out relevant processing without ever becoming conscious, but some local modules have linkages with larger brain-scale processing structures (called a global neuronal network or workspace by Baars, 1989 and Dehaene & Naccache, 2001). If sufficiently

activated, these connected local processing structures can gain access to this global neuronal workspace (GNW), which is synonymous with being consciously perceived. Thus, self-schemas if sufficiently activated, can become conscious, and thereby foster the creation of a schema consistent, but situationally integrated identity. This is a more general, contemporary, and neurologically-based interpretation of what a working self-concept may involve if it becomes conscious.

Drawing on Dehaene's (2014) theory, conscious perception, which occurs approximately 300 msec after stimulus onset, involves three critical factors. First, with consciousness, information becomes represented symbolically in the GNW and can be combined with symbolic representations from other areas of the brain in a way that creates a new, context-specific interpretation. In other words self-schema are interpreted, contextualized, and transformed into active identities, in our use of the term. Second, strong connections with the frontal regions of the brain involved in goal representation (generally viewed as the dorsal lateral-prefrontal cortex) integrate active identities with momentary goals, tuning processing structures for goal-related activities. Goal-related information then has a processing advantage that is modulated by a dopamine-based system, being more easily activated than competing information that is not goal-related (Johnson, Chang, & Lord, 2006), yet this occurs under constraints from active identities (Lord, Diefendorff, Schmidt, & Hall, 2010). Third, the resulting, conscious integration, or identity in our terms, is then broadcast through massive projections in the converse direction to local processing structures throughout the brain, thereby modulating and synchronizing local sensory structures with higher level interpretations, making us sensitive to identity-consistent information and identity-relevant motivational processes. Importantly, this modulation process tunes many local processing structures (including self-schema) to the broader, integrative conscious

identity that produces situationally-tuned interpretations and behaviors, and over time, evolving self-schema.

It is also important to recognize that processing at the local level is often very fast, reflecting extensive past learning that has been proceduralized so that responses can be performed efficiently. Part of the reason for such rapid processing within modules is that as local units interact, nerve impulses do not have far to travel. In contrast, conscious brain-scale processes can integrate a far larger amount of information in formulating a more situated meaning or flexible response. But this process is necessarily slower because meaning is constructed from interactions of units in different brain regions; therefore, the distance each nerve impulse travels is much larger. Thus, there is a tradeoff between speed and flexibility that is associated with the local versus brain-scale distinction. Self-schemas, which are often used rapidly and unconsciously, are resistant to change (Markus, 1977); whereas, as we have argued, identities that emerge from integrating self-schema with situational information, are more flexible. For example, although one may think of themselves as a leader, one may allow others to assume a leadership role when he or she is also cognizant of their need to develop leadership skills or their greater expertise in a specific domain.

When social contexts, such as leaders, or task demands sufficiently activate a self-schema to create an active identity, numerous emotional, motivational, and cognitive processes are initiated that guide actions and interpretations, but this happens in a way that reflects the integration of many situational constraints. For example, the activation of a relational identity can then help structure the dynamics of leader-member relations (Chang & Johnson, 2010), but relational identities may also reflect constraints from culture, active values (Lord & Brown, 2001) or organizational identities (Sluss et al., 2012). What is important to recognize about such a process, however, is that it happens very, very fast, literally in the blink of an eye, so introspectively the difference between self-identities

(conscious, global interpretations) and self-schemas (local, unconscious processing structures) generally goes unrecognized. However, the distinction is important as it explains how a relatively enduring facet of the self, such as self-schema, can guide situational interpretations and behavior in a flexible way. It also adds a processing explanation to identity theories that are grounded in the social context such as social identity theory or role identity theory.

Like the self-schemas on which they are based, self-identities can vary from situation to situation depending on the aspects of the self that are active and the way they are interactively combined. Identity construction in familiar situations may merely reflect a conscious self-categorization process that is closely linked to the content stored in self-schemas. However, typically identities can do more than organize different types of self-knowledge, they can create entirely new, context-sensitive meanings and interpretations as they make sense of disparate information. When individuals struggle to understand and adjust to new roles such as one's first leadership position, researchers aptly describe the process as "identity work" (Ibarra, 1999; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003) which because of their conscious nature can be investigated through methodologies such as discourse analysis. An analogous term "self-concept work" would seem out of place in such investigations, although parallel changes in the self-concept likely occur behind the scenes as self-relevant knowledge structures are developed in a new domain or as top-down feedback from constructed identities changes self-schema.

Identity levels. Contemporary theory recognizes that self-concepts can be represented and social identities constructed at different levels of inclusiveness (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Sedikides & Brewer, 2001; Hogg, 2001). The *individual self* emphasizes one's distinctiveness from others in terms of traits or abilities. These personal identities may involve, for example, one's evaluation of their leadership skill level and their distinctiveness from other

individuals. *Relational selves* are defined in terms of role relationships, such as one's LMX, and self-worth when evaluated in terms of relational identities depends on appropriate role fulfillment. *Collective selves* are defined in terms of group membership, and when collective identities are active, one's self-worth depends on the perceived favorableness of the prototype that defines one's group compared to other groups. Identities also follow this three-level distinction, as self-construal can integrate self-concepts at any level with other information to create a level-specific meaning bearing on "who I am", "who we are" or "how our group compares to others." Identities can also be constructed in a manner that spans multiple levels, for example when relational and organizational identifications converge (Sluss & Ashforth, 2008; Sluss et al., 2012).

One's identity provides a rich organizing structure for many individual and social processes, as we show in Table 2, but they have generally been addressed in isolation, whereas our conceptualization of identity suggests they often would be integrated by conscious processes. As active self-concepts vary from individual, to relational, to collective levels, there are also changes in the basis for self-identities (traits, roles, and group prototypes, respectively) and the basis for social motivation (self-interest, other's benefit, collective welfare, respectively). Given this range of different impacts, the level at which the self is defined is also important for understanding many leadership processes. For example, recent research finds that self-concept levels are antecedent to leadership behavior (Johnson, et al.,, 2012), as shown in Table 2. Follower self-concept level also can be influenced by leaders, creating powerful and multidimensional effects on the way followers construct their identities, which in turn, affect behaviors, attitudes, and evaluative structures (Johnson, Selenta, & Lord, 2006; Lord et al., 1999; Lord & Brown, 2004). Thus, LMX or TMX create identity structures affecting leaders and followers or team-members that have very broad

effects, which in part explain why such an extensive leadership literature has developed with respect to these topics.

Dynamics of cognition, motivation, and identity. As Hogg (2001) notes, the web of identities is dynamic and situationally sensitive locating the self in the social world, although central aspects of self-concepts tend to endure. Leadership identities are also constructed over time through identity work, which involves trying out provisional identities and refining them over time based on task and social feedback (Ibarra, 1999). Identity work also links the past and present to the future. This is such an important process that humans have highly evolved and extensive structures for such processing (Gusnard, 2005), which are called default networks because they tend to be active when one is at rest, but are disengaged during task activities so metabolic resources in the brain can be reallocated. Default networks locate tasks and outcomes in self-structures, thus they are involved in gauging the initial importance of tasks and in mobilizing motivational resources; default networks also help us evaluate task outcomes in terms of self-relevance, and thus help us learn from feedback as we build domain specific skills and self-schematic representations. Default networks are likely to be involved in both the generation of leadership claims and the evaluation of leadership grants, which DeRue and Ashford (2010) explain are central to leadership emergence in social contexts. For example, using a sample of trainers who were blind, Chui (2016) has shown that experimentally manipulated leadership claims affect leadership identities.

It is widely agreed that the self-identity regulates many behavioral, affective, and cognitive processes (Baumeister & Vohs, 2003; Vohs & Baumeister, 2004) Carver & Scheier, 1998; Lord et al., 2010). Yet, knowledge of how default networks operate suggests that this regulation is largely indirect, working primarily through constraints on goal emergence and affective responses. Goals emerge within the constraints from the active self which often operate in a nonconscious manner (Bargh, Green, & Fitzsimons, 2008) and have

substantial effects on how information is processed (Gollwitzer, 1990; Johnson et al., 2006), and particularly on how social relationships are evaluated (Ferguson, & Bargh, 2004; Fitzsimons & Shah, 2008). Thus, how goals emerge is an important area for understanding a leader's effects on motivational and information processing (Dragoni, 2005), but it is also helpful to consider how leadership processes at the level of active identities set the stage for goal emergence and goal maintenance. By influencing active identities, leaders can create a cascade that affects the meaning of a task to an individual, the goals they set, and the way they process information.

Active identities also play a crucial role in affective responses and regulation. Stimuli and events provoke affective responses when they have the potential to affect the self, a process called primary appraisal (Izard, 1991). Here, too, leaders play an important role. For example, organizational change that threatens one's identity creates anxiety which must be managed by middle-level managers (Huy, 2002). Some affective responses are directly related to goal-level processes, such as momentary anger at events or people that block goal attainment, whereas other more enduring affective responses to outcomes directly involve personal selves (pride or guilt) and social selves (shame or gratitude). Leadership that engages such self-relevant emotions can have profound and lasting effects.

There is debate as to what level of the self is most critical in influencing motivational and affective processes. For example, Sedikides and Gaertner (2001) argue that the individual-level self has emotional and motivational primacy because the individual self is valued more highly and is more rigorously protected than the collective self. In contrast, Hogg (2001) argues that the group-level self is sovereign because humans rely on group processes to satisfy many needs, and the continued interaction with people requires repeated adjustments of the self. It is likely that each level is important in different circumstances, but the content of goals and feedback processes differ. Thus, leaders can have varied

motivational and affective effects when they activate different identity levels that extend to behaviors like helping compared to theft (Johnson & Lord, 2010) or how a wide range of organizational processes are evaluated (Johnson, Selenta et al., 2006).

It has also been argued that all levels of the self-identity are at least partially involved in motivational and self-regulatory processes. For example, Stets and Burke (2000) propose that there are points of integration among these alternative levels, in that when individuals see themselves in a particular role relationship (e.g., student-teacher), differentiation among the parties is maintained, and each party negotiates a role relationship that is consistent with their individual identity as the LMX literature shows. Similarly, roles generally exist within a social structure, which may involve work groups and organizations, that helps specify the norms within which role relations are negotiated (See Sluss et al., 2012 for a compelling example). Thus, as the TMX literature suggests, other role-relations in one's group serve an important social comparison function. It is in this sense that identities are truly multi-level, with aspects of all levels having an influence, even when one particular level is emphasized. As Stets and Burke (2000) suggest, "…people largely feel *good* about themselves when they associate with a particular group, typically feel *confident* about themselves when enacting particular roles, and generally feel that they are "real" or *authentic* when their person identities are verified." (p. 234). We turn now to the functioning of each of these three identity levels. Although we discuss each separately for convenience, the reader should keep in mind that all these levels are part of a coherent system that is consciously integrated as identities are constructed.

Individual level identities and leadership. Because individual level identities also emphasize values associated with achievement and power which differentiate the self from others, leadership often focuses on the internal aspects of individuals in these domains, such as achievement-related task goals or status differences among individuals. Leaders can prime

immediate performance objectives or more long-term development objectives (Lord & Brown, 2004). They can also emphasize different individual level WSCs or they can stress the more integrative meaning created by individual level self-identities. For example, Stam, Lord, van Knippenberg and Wisse (2014) maintain that a leader's vision is translated into vision pursuit when it is relevant to individual level identities and individuals elaborate and develop this self-relevance. Transformational leadership is thought to affect individual performance and attitudes through its effects on task goals (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). For example, such leaders might promote caution by emphasizing ought selves or more enthusiasm by emphasizing ideal selves.

Relational level and identity theory. Identity theorists acknowledge that the self-system is closely linked to role performance (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Stets & Burke, 2000). With a sociological perspective based mostly on structural symbolic interaction theory, role identity theorists describe role-based identity as a mechanical form (to use Durkheim's terminology) of societal integration, while the group-based identity advanced by social identity theory promotes an organic form of societal integration (Stets & Burke, 2000).

The identity theory perspective understands identities as *sets of meanings* people use to define who they are as role occupants (McCall & Simmons, 1978). When perceived self-identities fit the required meanings and standards, role occupants are more at ease. Identity theorists hold that individuals do not view themselves as similar to the others with whom they interact, but as different: each role is related to, but set apart from, counterroles (Stets & Burke, 2000). A society's social order can be conceptualized as being organized and structured by positions and roles which have shared expectations and understandings because actors in the same structure shared the same culture, symbols, and meanings (Burke, 2006). As a result, others' perceptions of actors can shadow the latter's behaviors as they play out their roles, and thus maintain the stability of the social system. In identity theory, a role-based

identity expresses interconnected uniqueness, while LMX emphasizes the linkages of leaders and followers as they develop a unique role relationship. The focus on relations, roles and negotiation processes – the latter concept arising early in the development of identity theory (see McCall & Simmons, 1978) – can clarify the connection between this theory and LMX.

The relation between LMX and identity has been investigated recently, finding close links: Chang and Johnson (2010) showed that leader relational identity – the type that we could say is closest to both identity theory and LMX – moderates the relation of LMX with subordinate task performance and citizenship behaviors. Thus, the negative effect of low-quality LMX on performance is mitigated when supervisors had strong relational identities. In a more recent article, leader and follower identities predicted LMX quality, as did the fit between leader and follower identities and interactions among fit at different self-identity levels (Jackson & Johnson, 2012). Specifically, relational identity similarity was the strongest predictor of both subordinate-rated and supervisor-rated LMX. Other identity research on leadership also provides evidence of negotiated roles: Riley and Burke (1995) found that individuals are less satisfied with their role and less inclined to remain in a group if they cannot negotiate differential leadership performance in a group that verifies their identity. Leadership styles that conflict with identity-based self-regulatory styles have also been associated with increased turnover (Hamstra et al., 2011). Lastly, the dyadic organizing process between leaders and followers not only forms relational identities within a context (Graen & Scandura, 1987), but networks of these dyads within the same context can facilitate the emergence of collective identities.

Collective level and social identity theory. Social identity theorists focus on the impact of group membership on social categorization of the self and others, that is, on shared representation and the social comparison with in-group and out-group members. Leader identity theory is a social conception of the unique leader characteristics that define a group-

based leader prototype (van Knippenberg, 2011; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003), which is more specific than the prototype described by leader categorization theory. Use of a group-based prototype increases with a rater's identification with a group. This result brings about an in-group prototype and shared perceptions, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors. Consequences of both leader and group member identification with groups are "conformity, normative behavior, solidarity, stereotyping, ethnocentrism, intergroup discrimination, in-group favoritism" (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003, p.6).

Moreover, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, and Hogg (2004) closely studied the antecedents, consequences, and moderating role of follower self-concept in affecting leadership effectiveness. They claimed that the collective self-conception was fluid and could be moderated by self-construal, self-efficacy, self-esteem and self-consistency. Moreover, this collective self-conception, reflecting the influence of group prototypicality, can create a basis for leader-follower processes. Van Knippenberg (2011) examined recent empirical studies on leader group prototypicality and asserted that followers' strong shared sense of group membership could shape the group's potential for tackling uncertainty and adapting to new situations with creativity and innovation. In short, social identity theory theorists assert that group identification is a driving force behind different leadership and group member processes and effectiveness.

Leaders and followers who embrace collective selves are expected to have high collective commitment in goal pursuit (Stam et al., 2014), strong solidarity with generalized exchange (Willer, Flynn, & Zak, 2008), and support for a fair organizational culture with procedural justice (Holmvall & Bobocel, 2008; Johnson, Selenta et al., 2006). Howell and Shamir (2005) also proposed that followers with strong collective identity orientations would have a high tendency to build charismatic leader-follower relationships, leading to positive organizational outcomes. Collective identity, if perceived as an identity that can be honed and

groomed, has implications both in leadership development and group actions. Day and Harrison (2007) discussed the potential of collective identity to promote advanced perspective-taking and more moral reasoning which can influence others through modeling processes. Collective identities also support more distributed forms of leadership which may be essential for modern organizations to succeed.

Researchers have also examined the power of collective identities as a resource base for different kinds of group actions. Normative common goals and collective identities can drive organizational vision and goal pursuits (Stam et al., 2014), create solidarity for group stakeholder actions (Rowley & Moldoveanu, 2003), and mobilize people power for social actions (Polletta & Jasper, 2001). Similar to the identity theory theorists (Stets & Burke, 2000), Rowley and Moldoveanu (2003) explained that the shared sense of common identity and common culture could create a "consciousness" that develops the impetus for action, a motivational mechanism beyond an interest-based perspective of personal benefits. That means that people are willing to put aside their personal interests in the event of a shared, salient and common goal if their collective identity is activated. Identity, in this case, can become a powerful resource for group actions. Transformational leadership is thought to emphasize such identity-based processes.

"Being", "Doing", and 'Becoming'

While Stets and Burke (2000) described the "being" (who one is) of the social identity theory, and the "doing" (what one does in one's role) of the identity theory, as the central features of one's identity, recent leadership studies place much emphasis on the "becoming" characteristic of identity. The focus on identity as an important construct in leadership development draws from literature that links the development of leader identity with leadership effectiveness (Day & Sin, 2011). This literature also describes identity changes as leaders progress from novice, to intermediate, to expert skill levels (Lord & Hall, 2005). With

increasing skill, it is thought that leaders are able to shift their focus from concern with their own emergence as leaders, to their impact on others, and to understanding others at a deeper, more principled level. On the other hand, the identity work literature (Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Ibarra, 1999; Snow & Anderson, 1987), depicts the complex processes involved when the future-oriented part of the self-concept, possible or provisional selves, interacts with the role-based identity to achieve role transition in a career or to become a leader.

Leaders and followers can be assimilated into their work group or differentiated from their work group (Brewer & Gardner, 1996) and this will affect active identity levels, which in turn can affect the dynamic equilibrium of the LMX quality. In general, the human need of belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) creates the motivational mechanism for assimilation into social units and an interdependent construal of the self, whereas differentiation from social units associated with autonomy motivation promotes an independent construal of the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Such processes are especially crucial in novel tasks or when roles are not fully specified by formal organizational structures (Graen & Scandura, 1987; Katz & Kahn, 1966). In such situations, supervisors may have to rely on the followers' unique expertise and skill sets that the leaders do not have. This opens up the opportunity for dynamic dyadic organization of "role-taking", "role-making", and "role-routinization" which shifts the LMX structure and active identities. Katz and Kahn (1966) described such informal enactment of behavior by organizational members as a kind of "organization in motion" when the energy of a system becomes visible. These ongoing and interlocking relationships therefore contribute to the performance outcomes of organizations.

Implications and Future Recommendations

This review has shown how the leadership construct has developed from a static focus on stable individual attributes and behavioral styles to a more contextualized, dynamic, multi-

level, multi-person construct that guides emerging roles and identities, and in the process affects many organizational outcomes. The field has also advanced from investigating constructs defined largely by raters' implicit theories to more science-based ideas such as roles and identity development. We expect these trends to continue in the future as the relation of leadership to larger social structures such as social networks is investigated. Just as the early work on VDL showed that hierarchical relations were not all the same and developed over time, future network research should consider different types of linkages and how they might affect network functioning. Each link in a network is actually a type of role relationship that may develop and change over time and may fulfill different functions as it develops. Further, each linkage can provide a unique social influence on one's identity (Andersen & Chen, 2002), consequently, not all identity work is entirely internal; it may reflect the ebb and flow of diverse "net-mates" and their expectations or evaluations.

We have not fully addressed the role of affect, but perceiver's affective states are important determinants of leadership ratings, which further complicates the meaning of both behavioral ratings and role differentiation measures. Affect directly influences ratings of charisma (Bono & Ilies, 2006), and liking of leaders is both an important determinant of transformational leadership ratings (Brown & Keeping, 2005) and is an early predictor of LMX relationships (Liden et al. 1993). Moreover, the potential of people and events to positively or negatively influence one's identity creates emotional reactions, and change, particularly change in identity, has affective consequences. Similarly, affect and embodied reactions are often an important component of leadership cognitions (Lord & Shondrick, 2011) and cognitions in general (Niedenthal, Barsalou, Winkielman, Krauth-Gruber, & Ric, 2005). Consequently, affect is an underlying aspect of all the processes previously discussed that needs to be regulated in order to optimize role making, identity work, and cognitive

processing in general. Affect is also related to time focus, in that a future focus creates greater uncertainty and anxiety than a focus on the past.

The focus on dynamics also suggests that how leaders use time may be an important issue for future research. The being, doing, and becoming foci emphasized by identity theory have a natural analog in past, present, and future temporal foci (Shipp, Edwards, & Lambert, 2009). An emphasis on the past or present solidifies current roles and identities, whereas a future emphasis promotes flexibility, "becoming", and tolerance for uncertainty. Here the notions of provisional identities, and possible selves are more germane. Thus, in addition to directly shaping roles and identities, leaders can influence these constructs indirectly by shaping the way time is conceptualized and used. The effects of event sequences and timing (Albert, 2013) are also likely to be important and can be influenced by leaders. Leadership processes are also constrained by the way that society conceptualizes and uses time (Zerubavel, 2003), and there are substantial differences across organizations in their orientation towards and use of time (Ancona, Goodman, Lawrence, & Tushman, 2001).

An orientation toward the future is also important because it expands the potential affordances for individuals, organizations, and societies (Lord et al., 2015). Affordances are latent action possibilities in an environment which may be unknown until they are created by human actions. Affordances become more restricted as the future approaches the present and becomes entangled with multi-level systems of constraints such as current roles and identities. For self-concept and identity-related constraints, stability depends in part on one's current time orientation. Consequently, a leader's past versus future time orientation may also influence constraint durability, and thereby the degree that the future affords new ways of behaving and new potential identities. Interestingly, neurological structures called default networks, which have been associated with autobiographical memory and processing information about the self (Gusnard, 2005), are also involved in imagining the future and in

counterfactual reasoning concerning how events could have been different (Schacter et al., 2012). Thus, although one's active identity can ground oneself in the current situation, identity-related processing can also project the self into many possible future situations. We expect that how leadership influences the potential of others to imagine and reason about the future is a critical leadership process that is closely related to how identities are consciously constructed.

As complexity theory suggests, new futures may reflect the emergence of structures in a bottom-up manner moving from individual structures such as self-schemas and identities, to interpersonal structures such as roles, to larger structures such as teams and networks, and so on. The linkages from one level to another thus become a critical basis for stability or an opportunity for growth and development, and leadership processes play a key moderating role. For example, role relations with one's supervisor could promote or impede identity development. Similarly, group identities create norms that may restrict identity exploration and growth because they provide the parameters for self-definition (Hogg, 2001), particularly for individuals who strongly identify with a group. Social cognitive processes are also an important part of this process. ILTs and IFTs guide expectations and perceptions of others and thus are the building blocks of emerging structures like roles and work-related identities. In addition, like other cognitive structures such as goals and social categories, they have a role in managing the uncertainty and anxiety associated with change or an unpredictable future (Hirsch, Mar, & Peterson, 2012). Leaders must adequately address all these factors – developing roles, identities, time orientations, implicit theories, affect, and reducing anxiety – to foster flexible adaption to future challenges.

Accordingly, in general we believe that how these factors are integrated should be investigated further. Ideally, we would like to see future projects that are capable of linking all these factors, for instance exploring how individual, relational, and collective identity

levels for leaders and followers operate through relational exchanges (and indirectly LMX) to influence ILTs and IFTs. The organizing power of identity level (see Table 2) should be analyzed further in connection with the factors that have already been investigated, and also with other new topics such as goal setting, OCBs, voice, other proactive behaviours, or the leader's decision process. Adding time orientation to such research designs would help us understand how leaders produce constructive principled change in their organization. We would also like to see careful attention to the distinction between local and brain-scale effects associated with our differentiation of self-schema compared to active identities.

Conclusions

Although it is not possible to predict the future with any certainty, demographic trends suggest that organizations in future will be more multicultural, more global, and multi-focused – focused not just on the bottom line in terms of profits, but also on social and sustainability issues. Many aspects of society are likely to take different forms as we move to a postmodern society and respond to such changes. This will probably produce both cultural changes and changes in expectations and functioning of leadership processes (Spisak, O'Brian, Nicholson, & Van Vugt, 2015). It will also likely require new identities that are more inclusive of diverse groups and also extend further into the future, spanning multiple lifetimes. Future leaders will need to be more complex and be able to flexibly move from one mental schema to another, adopting multiple roles, multiple perspectives, and at times behaving in paradoxical ways (Zhang, Waldman, Han, & Li, 2015). Leadership studies therefore need to adopt an integrated approach that captures such constructs in explaining how leaders catalyze complex goals, change, and long-term visions. Part of this process likely will involve how context, particularly relational and broader social contexts, guide the conscious integration that creates identities. This identity construction, in turn, may be crucial for shaping a leadership vision that is inclusive and is actively pursued (Stam et al., 2014).

The three topics we address in this paper – social cognitions, relationships, and identity – are central to understanding and managing such processes. Cognitions and information processing are important because there is often an inertia caused by difficulties in shifting from familiar, well-developed schema such as ILTs or IFTs to considering new possibilities, and this slows adaption to change and limits the exploration of future possibilities. This limitation is particularly likely when new self-schema are required, and when those schema are embedded in social relations. Considering new identities is stressful for individuals limiting the adoption of new roles (Karelaia & Guillen, 2014), and it is also stressful for organization, who may need to redefine themselves to address new challenges and process information in using new and unfamiliar cognitive frames (Hahn, Preuss, Pinkse, & Figge, 2014). For example, reducing the carbon intensity of electricity generation may require a shift from viewing the grid as being based on a central to a distributed form of energy production (e.g. rooftop solar collectors or wind turbines), but such change may not just require new business models for energy suppliers, they may also require new definitions of what an energy supplier is. Creating new futures and new niches for people, organizations, and societies is an important collective leadership process (Spisak et al., 2015), but we expect that such change will only be embraced when appropriately connected with emerging or imagined individual, relational, and organizational identities.

Further, as people grow and continually develop, periodic changes in how they see themselves will be punctuated by changing social relationships, and those changes are often resisted by others for a variety of reasons. Thus, a critical challenge for leaders is not just to show ambidexterity (Rosing, Frese, & Bausch, 2011) in terms of task considerations but also ambidexterity in the social domain: leaders need to support the way that others see themselves, particularly in terms of dyadic exchanges, but they also need to expand their view of human potential, recognizing and encouraging possibilities in others that are not yet

fully developed. This issue is compounded when one considers constructs such as shared leadership, because identities are part of relational networks, and part of our leadership identity may be derived from such networks (Balkundi, Kilduff, & Harrison, 2011; Brands, et al., 2015).

In short, we have argued that adjusting to and creating the future will be influenced by cognitive, relational, and identity-related processes which also change and develop. How these processes are integrated in specific individuals (or teams) as they create more inclusive, forward-looking identities, and how they are affected by different temporal foci and the flow of time (See the discussion of this theme by Lord et al., 2015) is an important issue for future leadership theory and research. For example, although as we have argued, active identities may be critical in the self-regulation of behavior, acting differently may also be a first step in creating new identities (Ibarra, 2015), and this principle may extend from individual to organizational processes as shown by Hazy's (2007) description of identity change at Intel.

When considered in terms of constructs such as implicit theories, social cognitions, roles, identities, and their dynamic interaction over time, the future looks bright for leadership research as there is still much to do. The future looks more challenging, however, when evaluated in terms of the potential for typical methodology to adequately measure these constructs. As this review has shown, people respond to others in terms of the self-relevant meaning constructed by momentarily active identities, and these identities regulate what we feel, how we think, and what we do. Leadership perceptions, and social perceptions in general, are part of this process when they play out in many social contexts, but they are as reflective of the momentary states and knowledge structures of perceivers as they are of the actions of people being perceived.

References

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*, 161-174.

Albert, S. (2013). *When: The Art of Perfect Timing*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ancona, D. G., Goodman, P. S., Lawrence, B. S, & Tushman, M. L. (2001). Time: A new research lens. *Academy of Management Review, 26*, 645-663.

Andersen, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An interpersonal social–cognitive theory. *Psychological Review, 109*, 619-645.

Baars, B. J. (1989). *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Balkundi, P., Kilduff, M., & Harrison, D. A. (2011). Centrality and charisma: Comparing how leader networks and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1202-1222.

Ballinger, G. A., Lehman, D. W., & Schoorman, F. D. (2010). Leader–member exchange and turnover before and after succession events. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113*(1), 25-36.

Bargh, J. A., Green, M., & Fitzsimons, G. (2008). The selfish goal: Unintended consequences of intended goal pursuits. *Social Cognition, 26*, 534-554.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, leniency, and general satisfaction related to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49*, 509-527.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachment as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497-529.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Self-Regulation and the Executive Function of the Self. In Mark R. Leary & June Price Tangney (Eds.). *Handbook of Self and Identity*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Binning, J. F., & Lord, R. G. (1980). Boundary conditions for performance cue effects on group process ratings: Familiarity versus type of feedback. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *26*, 115-130.

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(4), 317-334.

Brands, R. A., Menges, J. I., & Kilduff, M. (2015). The leader-in-social-network schema: Perceptions of network structure affect gendered attributions of charisma. *Organization Science, 26*, 1210-1225.

Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "We"? Levels of collective identity and self representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 83-93.

Brickson, S. (2000). The impact of identity orientation on individual and organizational outcomes in demographically diverse settings. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 82-101.

Brown, D. J., & Keeping, L. M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 245-273.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117-134.

Burke, P. J. (2006). Perceptions of leadership in groups: An empirical test of identity control theory. In Kent McClelland and Thomas J. Fararo (Eds.). *Control System Theories in Sociology.* Palgrave Macmillan Press: New York.

Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*(2), 83-92.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the Self-Regulation of Behavior*. Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press.

Cashman, J., Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *15*(2), 278-296.

Chang, C-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2010). Not all leader-member exchanges are created equal: Importance of leader relational identity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(5), 796-808.

Chui, S. L. M. (2016) *Leader Identity Construction at Social Enterprises: Effects of Social Feedback, Identity Level, Work Role Salience and Organizational Context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Durham University Business School, Durham, UK.

Dansereau, F., Cashman, J., & Graen, G. (1973). Instrumentality theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *10*(2), 184-200.

Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*(1), 46-78.

Day, D. V., & Harrison, M. M. (2007). A multi-level, identity-based approach to leadership development. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*, 360-373.

Day, D. V., & Schyns, B. (2010). The importance of agreement and consensus in leadership research: Introduction to the special issue. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *19*(3), 253-258.

Day, D. V., & Sin, H. P. (2011). Longitudinal tests of an integrative model of leader development: Charting and understanding developmental trajectories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 545-560.

Dehaene, S. (2014). *Consciousness and the Brain: Deciphering how the Brain Codes our Thoughts.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Dehaene, S., & Naccache, L. (2001). Towards a cognitive neuroscience of consciousness: Basic evidence and a workspace framework. *Cognition, 79*, 1-37.

DeNisi, A. S., & Pritchard, R. (1978). Implicit theories of performance as artifacts in survey research: A replication and extension. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21*, 358-366.

DeRue, D. S, & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who Will Lead And Who Will Follow? A Social Process of Leadership Identity Construction in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(4), 627-647.

DeVoe, S. E., & Iyengar, S. S. (2004). Managers' theories of subordinates: A cross-cultural examination of manager perceptions of motivation and appraisal of performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 93*, 47-61.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(1), 36-62.

Downey, H. K., Chacko, T. I., & McElroy, J. C. (1979). Attribution of the "causes" of performance: A constructive, quasi-longitudinal replication of the Staw (1975) study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24*, 287-299.

Dragoni, L. (2005). Understanding the emergence of state goal orientation in organizational work groups: The role of leadership and multilevel climate perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1084-1095.

Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, *38*(6), 1715-1759.

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

Ensari, N. & Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-cultural variations in leadership perceptions and attributions of charisma to the leader. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 92*, 52-66.

Farmer, S. M., Van Dyne, L., & Kamdar, D. (2015). The contextualized self: How Team–Member Exchange leads to coworker identification and helping OCB. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 583–595.

Ferguson, M. J., & Bargh, J. A. (2004). Liking is for doing: The effects of goal pursuit on automatic evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 557-572.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *1*(1), 149-190.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Fitzsimons, G. M., & Shah, J. Y. (2008). How goal instrumentality shapes relationship evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 319-337.

Flynn, F. J. (2005). Identity orientations and forms of social exchange in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 30*, 737-750.

Foti, R. J., & Hauenstein, N. M. A. (2007). Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 347-355.

Foti, R. J., Knee, R. E., & Backert, R. S. (2008). Multi-level implications of framing leadership perceptions as a dynamic process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 178-194.Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2011). A dynamic interactive theory of personal construal. *Psychological Review, 118*(2), 247-279.

Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2011). A dynamic interactive theory of person construal. *Psychological Review*, *118*(2), 247-279.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827-844.

Gollwitzer, P. M. (1990). Action phases and mind-sets. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds). *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 53-92). New York: Guilford.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organising. *Research in Organisational Behaviour, 9*, 175-208.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. (1975) A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership Frontiers,* (pp. 143-166). Kent, Ohio: Kent State Univ. Press, 1975.

Graen, G., & 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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219-247.

Graen, G., Dansereau, F., & Minami, T. (1972). Dysfunctional leadership styles. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *7*(2), 216-236.

Graen, G., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *30*(1), 109-131.

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

Green, S. G., Anderson, S. E., & Shivers, S. L. (1996). Demographic and organizational influences on leader–member exchange and related work attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *66*(2), 203-214.

Gusnard, D. A. (2005). Being a self: Considerations from functional imaging. *Consciousness and Cognition, 14*, 679-697.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250-279.

Hahn, T., Preuss, L., Pinkse, J., & Figge, F. (2014). Cognitive frames in corporate sustainability: Managerial sensemaking with paradoxical and business case frames. *Academy of Management Review*, *39(4)*, 463-487.

Hamstra, M. R. W., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2011). Transformational-transactional leadership styles and follower's regulatory focus: Fit reduces followers' turnover intentions. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 10*, 182-186.

Hanges, P. J., Lord, R. G., & Dickson, M. W. (2000). An information processing perspective on leadership and culture. A case for connectionist architecture. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49,* 133-161.

Hazy, J. K. (2007). Leadership or luck? The system dynamics of Intel's shift to microprocessors in the 1970s and 1980s. In M. Uhl-Bien & R. Marion (Eds.). *Complexity Leadership Part I: Conceptual Foundations* (pp. 347-378). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Glibkowski, B. C., & Chaudhry, A. (2009). LMX differentiation: A multilevel review and examination of its antecedents and outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(4), 517-534.

Henderson, D. J., Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer,W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2008). Leader–member exchange, differentiation, and psychological contract fulfillment: A multilevel examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 1208-1219.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30,* 1-46.

Hill, T. E., & Schmitt, N. (1977). Individual differences in leader decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 19, 353-367.

Hill, W. A., & Hughes, D. (1974). Variations in leader behavior as a function of task type. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11,* 83-96.

Hirsch, J. B., Mar, R. A., & Peterson, J. B. (2012). Psychological entropy: A framework for understanding uncertainty-related anxiety. *Psychological Review, 119,* 304-320.

Hogg, M. (2001). Social identity and the sovereignty of the group: A psychology of belonging. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self* (pp. 125-143). Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Hogg, M., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 35,* 1-52.

Holmvall, C. M., & Bobocel, D. R. (2008). What fair procedures say about me: Self-construals and reactions to procedural fairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 105, 147*-168.

Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*(2), 243-269.

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

Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77*(1), 3-21.

Huy, Q. N. (2002) embotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47,* 31-69.

Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 764-791.

Ibarra, H. (2015). *Act Like a Leader, Think Like a Leader*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Ibarra, H., & Barbulescu, R. (2010). Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(1) 135-154.

Ilgen, D. R., Mitchell, T. R., & Fredrickson, J. W. (1981). Poor performers: Supervisors' and subordinates' responses. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *27*(3), 386-410.

Izard, C. E. (1991). *The Psychology of Emotions.* New York: Plenum Press.

Jackson, E. M., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). When opposites do (and do not) attract: Interplay of leader and follower self-identities and its consequences for leader–member exchange. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(3), 488-501.

Jacquart, P. & Antonakis, J. (2015). When does charisma matter for top-level leaders? Effects of attributional ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal, 58,* 1051-1074.

Johnson, R. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit effects of justice on self-identity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 681-695.

Johnson, R. E., Chang, C-H, & Yang, L. Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(2), 226-245.

Johnson, R. E., Chang, C-H. D., & Lord, R. G. (2006). Moving from cognition to behavior: What the research says. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 381-415.

Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C.-H. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(6), 1262-1272.

Johnson, R.E., Selenta, C., & Lord, R. G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99,* 175-201.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *2*, 220-266.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 765-780.

Karelaia, N., & Guillen, L. (2014). Me, a woman and leader: Positive social identity and identity conflict. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 125,* 204-219.

Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 500-528.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Keller Hansbrough, T., Lord, R. G., & Schyns, B. (2015). Reconsidering the accuracy of follower leadership ratings. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 26(2), 220-237.

Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Devine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol.15, pp. 192-240). Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22,* 375-403.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(1), 36-51.

Kunda, Z. (1999). *Social Cognition: Making Sense of People*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does taking the good with the bad make things worse? How abusive supervision and leader–member exchange interact to impact need satisfaction and organizational deviance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 117*(1), 41-52.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 662-674.

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, values, and subordinate self-concepts. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 133-152.

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership Processes and Follower Self-Identity*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. (2005). Identity, deep structure and the development of leadership skill. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 591-615.

Lord, R. G., & Shondrick, S. J. (2011). Leadership and knowledge: Symbolic, connectionist, and embodied perspectives. *Leadership Quarterly, 22, 207-222.*

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concept in the leader follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78,* 167-203.

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multi-level consequences for leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 311-338.

Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (in press). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402-410.

Lord, R. G., Diefendorff, J. M., Schmidt, A. M., & Hall, R. J. (2010). Self-regulation at work. *Annual Review of Psychology, 61,* 543-568.

Lord, R. G., Dinh, J. E., & Hoffman, E. L. (2015). A quantum approach to time and organizational change. *Academy of Management Review, 40*(2), 263-290.

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

Lowin, A., & Craig, J. R. (1968). The influence of level of performance on managerial style: An experimental object-lesson in the ambiguity of correlational data. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3*, 440-458.

MacDonald, H. A., Sulsky, L. M., & Brown, D. J. (2008). Leadership and perceiver cognition: Examining the role of self-identity in implicit leadership theories. *Human Performance, 21*, 333-353.

Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253.

Markus, H. & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamics self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299-337.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*, 918-928.

Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 858-866.

Martinko, M. J., & Gardner, W. L. (1987). The leader-member attribution processes, *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 235-249.

Martinko, M. J., Moss, S. E., Douglas, S. C., & Borkowski, N. (2007). Anticipating the inevitable: When leader and member attribution styles clash. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 104*, 158-174.

McCall, G., & Simmons, J. L. (1978). *Identities and Interactions.* New York: Free Press.

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

Mitchell, T. R., Larson, J. R. Jr., & Green, S. G. (1977). Leader behavior, situational moderators, and group performance: An attributional analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 18*, 254-268.

Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Ilies, R. (2009). The development of leader–member exchanges: Exploring how personality and performance influence leader and member relationships over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(2), 256-266.

Naidoo, L. J., & Lord, R. G. (2008). Speech imagery and perceptions of charisma: The mediating role of positive affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(3), 283-296.

Niedenthal, P. M., Barsalou, W. W., Winkielman, P., Krauth-Gruber, S., & Ric, F. (2005). Embodiment in attitudes, social perception, and emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9(3),* 184-211.

Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., & Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity* (pp. 69-104). New York: Guilford Press.

Phillips, J. S., & Lord R. G. (1981). Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28*, 143-163.

Podsakoff, P. M., Bommer, W. H., Podsakoff, N. P., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2006). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and subordinate attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors: A meta-analytic review of existing and new research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *99*(2), 113-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., Niehoff, B. P., MacKenzie, S. B., & Williams, M. L. (1993). Do substitutes for leadership really substitute for leadership? An empirical examination of Kerr and Jermier′s situational leadership model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 54*(1), 1-44.

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27,* 283-305.

Redmond, M. R., Mumford, M. D., & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55*(1), 120-151.

Riley, A., & Burke, P. J. (1995). Identities and self-verification in the small group. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*(2), 61-73.

Rosing, K., Frese, M., & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 22*: 956-975.

Rowley, T. J., & Moldoveanu, M. (2003). When will stakeholder group act? An interest- and identity-based model of stakeholder group mobilization. *Academy of Management Review, 28(*2), 204-219.

Rupp, D. E., & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925-946.

Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. (2014). The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123(2), 159-185.

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

Schacter, D. L., Addis, D. R., Hassabis, D., Martin, V. C., Spreng, N., & Szpunar, K. K. (2012). The future of memory: Remembering, imagining, and the brain. *Neuron, 76*, 677-694.

Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Neubaum, D. O. (2005). The effect of leader moral development on ethical climate and employee attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*(2), 135-151.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol 25, pp. 1-65). San Diego: Academic Press.

Schyns, B., & Day, D. (2010). Critique and review of leader–member exchange theory: Issues of agreement, consensus, and excellence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *19*(1), 1-29.

Sedikides, C., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self.* Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Sedikides, C., & Gaertner, L. (2001). A homecoming to the individual self: Emotional and motivational primacy. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self* (pp. 7-23). Philadelphia, PA: Psychological Press.

Seers, A. (1989). Team-member exchange quality: A new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *43*(1), 118-135.

Seers, A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). The dual attachment concept: A longitudinal investigation of the combination of task characteristics and leader-member exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33*(3), 283-306.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic Leadership – A self-concept based theory. *Organizational Science, 4*, 577-594.

Shipp, A. J., Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2009). Conceptualization and measurement of temporal focus: The subjective experience of the past, present, and future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 110*, 1-22.

Sluss, D. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (2008). How relational and organizational identification converge: Processes and conditions. *Organization Science, 19*, 807-823.

Sluss, D. M., Ployhart, R. E., Cobb, M. G., & Ashforth, B. (2012). Generalizing newcomer's relational and organizational identifications: Processes and prototypicality. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*, 949-975.

Snow, D. A., & Anderson, L. (1987). Identity work among the homeless: The verbal construction and avowal of personal identities. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*, 1336-1371.

Sparrowe, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (2005). Two routes to influence: Integrating leader-member exchange and social network perspectives. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 50*(4), 505-535.

Spisak, B. R., O'Brien, M. J., Nicholson, N., & Van Vugt, M. (2015). Niche construction and the evolution of leadership. *Academy of Management Review, 40*(4), 291-306.

Srull, T. K., & Wyer, R. S. (1989). Person memory and judgment. *Psychological Review*, *96*(1), 58-83.

Stam, D., Lord, R. G., van Knippenberg, D., Wisse, B (2014). An image of who we might become: Vision communication, possible selves, and vision pursuit. *Organizational Science, 25*(4), 1172-1194.

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

Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*(3), 224-237.

Sue-Chan, C., Au, A. K., & Hackett, R. D. (2012). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between leader/member behavior and leader-member-exchange quality. *Journal of World Business*, *47*(3), 459-468.

Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organisational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations, 56,* 1163-1193.

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113,* 73-84.

Sy, T., Shore, L. M., Strauss, J., Shore, T. H., Tram, S., Whiteley, P., & Ikeda-Muromachi, K. (2010). Leadership perceptions as a function of race–occupation fit: The case of Asian Americans. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(5), 902-919.

van Gils, S., van Quaquebeke, N. & van Knippenberg, D. (2009). The X-factor: on the relevance of implicit leadership and followership theories for leader-member exchange agreement. *European journal of work and organizational psychology, 19,* 333-363.

van Knippenberg, D. (2011). Embodying who we are: Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22,* 1078-1091.

van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 825-856.

Vecchio, R. P., & Gobdel, B. C. (1984). The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*(1), 5-20.

Venus, M., Stam, D., & van Knippenberg, D. (2013). Leader emotion as a catlyst of effective leader communication of visions, value-laden messages, and goals. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 122,* 53-68.

Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., Anand, S., Erdogan, B., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Where do I stand? Examining the effects of leader–member exchange social comparison on employee work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 849-861.

Vohs, K. D. & Baumeister, R. F. (2004). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Vos, M., & van der Zee, K. (2011). Prosocial behavior in diverse workgroups: How relational identity orientation shapes cooperation and helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(3), 363-379.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1981). Cognitive complexity and the structure of implicit leadership theories. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*(1), 69-78.

Willer, R., Flynn, F. J., & Zak, S. (2012). Structure, identity, and solidarity: A comparative field study of generalised and direct exchange. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 57*(1), 119-155.

Wood, R. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1981). Manager behavior in a social context: The impact of impression management of attributions and disciplinary actions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28,* 356-378.

Zemba, Y., Young, M. J., & Morris, M. W. (2006). Blaming leaders for organizational accidents: Proxy logic in collective- versus individual-agency cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*, 36-51.

Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y. L., & Li, X. B. (2015). Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(2), 538-566.

Table 1. Twenty most cited leadership articles in OBHDP and their principal contribution.

Topic	***Authors***	***Year***	***Cites***	***Main contribution***
SOCIAL COGNITIVE THEORY				
Attributions and Measurement	Staw	1975	414	Performance information influences leadership ratings.
Implicit leadership theory (ILT)	Rush, Thomas & Lord	1977	307	Shows that performance information affects ratings of leader behavior and that factor structure reflects perceiver's ILTs.
Attribution in leader-member interaction	Green & Mitchell	1979	581	Developed propositions and a model of the attributional processes in leader-member interactions.
Responses to poor subordinate performance	Mitchell & Wood	1980	320	Internal attributions led to punitive responses, particularly when the consequences of poor performance were serious.
Causal attribution and perceptions of leadership	Phillips & Lord	1981	244	Inferential model of categorization based on leader salience and effect of salience on attributions to leader
Categorization theory	Lord, Foti & De Vader	1984	955	Developed categorization-based explanation of leadership perceptions and behavioral ratings
LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE				
Leadership style and turnover	Dansereau, Cashman & Graen	1973	270	Detailed description of the VDL model (and first use of the term VDL), which can add to the explanation of the ALS model
Differential role making through VDL	Dansereau, Graen & Haga	1975	2587	Superiors developed *leadership* exchanges with some subordinates, and *supervision* authority-based relationships with others.
VDL outcomes	Vecchio & Gobdel	1984	332	Replicated relation of VDL with performance, supervisor satisfaction & turnover
Team-member exchange	Seers	1989	548	Development and first test of the TMX construct and scale.
Antecedents and outcomes of LMX	Green, Anderson & Shivers	1996	310	Tested a model with demographic and organizational antecedents of LMX, and work attitudes as outcomes of all these variables
Antecedents of in-role and extra-role performance	Hui, Law & Chen	1999	411	Effects of LMX on performance and OCB, considering affectivity and job mobility in the model.
LEADERSHIP AND IDENTITY				
Self-concept and leadership theory	Lord, Brown & Freiberg	1999	494	Developed propositions about the relationships between a three-level conceptualization of the self and leadership theory.
LEADERSHIP AND CONTEXT				
Substitutes theory	Kerr & Jermier	1978	1694	Different substitutes can reduce a leader's ability to influence subordinates.
Do *Substitutes* really substitute?	Podsakoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie & Williams	1993	228	Developed a revised scale to measure substitutes. Aggregate effects supported Kerr and Jermier's idea, while moderating effects of substitutes provided less support.
LEADERSHIP STYLES				
Charismatic leadership	Howell & Frost	1989	590	Compared charismatic, structuring, and considerate leaders and their effects on followers' task satisfaction and performance.
Creativity and leader behavior	Redmond, Mumford & Teach	1993	504	Leader behavior influences subordinate creativity.
Ethical leadership	Brown, Treviño & Harrison	2005	1459	Developed and tested an ethical leadership scale. Analyzed the construct and its nomological network.

Leader moral development	Schminke, Ambrose & Neubaum	2005	279	Effects of leader moral development on the organization and on followers.
Leader reward/punishment behavior effects subordinates	Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff & MacKenzie	2006	236	A meta-analysis tests several potential influences of leader reinforcement behavior and found a close relationship with employees' perceptions of justice and role ambiguity.

Note. VDL = Vertical Dyad Linkage, LMX = Leader-Member Exchange; Citations based on Google Scholar search done 9 February 2016.

Table 2. The Organizing Effect of Active Identity on Values, Social Justice and Exchange, Commitment and Organizational Behavior

Focal Construct	ACTIVE IDENTITY			Source
	Individual	Relational	Collective	
Effects of Identity	Self is differentiated from others; worth signaled by social comparison in terms of personal outcomes; key motive is self-interest	Self is defined by roles & dyadic relations; role behavior & evaluation by others signals worth; key motive is other's welfare	Self is defined through group membership; inclusion in group signals worth; key motive is welfare of group or collective	
Value type	Self-enhancement – power, achievement & hedonism emphasized	Self-transcendence – emphasizes beneficence and universalism	Conservation – emphasizes tradition, security & conformity	Schwartz (1992)
Social Justice	Distributive – perception that work outcomes are fair	Interpersonal – employees given information and treated with respect & dignity	Procedural – system determining outcomes is accurate, unbiased and representative	Johnson, Selenta & Lord, 2006
Social Exchange	Negotiated – each task needs explicit compensation; high transaction costs	Relational – role expectations need to be satisfied; trust in other & future reward is key	Generalized – group is expected to benefit from exchange; social norms prevent exploitation	Flynn (2005); Jackson & Johnson (2012)
Commit-ment at work	Continuance commitment – Appraisal of personal investments	Affective and Normative Commitment to one's supervisor – Emotional attachment and need to reciprocate to a specific person	Affective and Normative Commitment to one's organization – Emotional attachment and need to reciprocate to a group	Johnson, Chang & Yang, 2010
Predicted Behavior	Abusive Leadership	Considerate Leadership	Transformational leadership	Johnson, et al. (2012)
Diversity and prosocial behavior	Detached – Such people act in terms of self-interest, they will not be inclined to cooperate with others in general.	Inclusive – Such people show prosocial behavior towards work-group members from a different social group	Focused on the ingroup – Such people show prosocial behaviour towards fellow team members but are less inclined to cooperate with dissimilar workgroup members.	Vos & van der Zee, 2011

iris-AperTO

University of Turin's Institutional Research Information System and Open Access Institutional Repository

Processes in diverse organiza-tions	Identity affects majority orientation toward minority (and their reactions)			Brickson, 2000
	Cognition: hyper-simplification of the "other" (marginal integration) Affect: ambivalence Behavior: situation dependent	Cognition: individuals as unique entities (integration with others) Affect: empathy (comfort) Behavior: disconfirmation of stereotypes	Cognition: group prototypes (perceived threat) Affect: hostility (dissatisfaction) Behavior: discrimination (confirmation of stereotypes)	

iris-AperTO

University of Turin's Institutional Research Information System and Open Access Institutional Repository