Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
The Leadership Quarterly 18 (2007) 586 – 605
The Leadership Quarterly
www.elsevier.com/locate/leaqua

Intergroup leadership

Todd L. Pittinsky *, Stefanie Simon

John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 79 J.F.K. Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Abstract

Strong leadership within a group can increase the likelihood of conflict with other groups. This *ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off*, occurring in contexts from businesses and political parties to ethnic groups and nations, raises questions about how a different kind of leadership can improve intergroup relations. Although leadership theory often focuses on a single group, sidelining questions of intergroup dynamics, some leadership literature addresses intergroup relations. Concurrently, some intergroup relations literature directly addresses leadership. Here, we synthesize and attempt to catalyze research on leadership that promotes positive intergroup relations*: intergroup leadership*. We begin by reviewing the ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off. Next, we examine five theoretical approaches to leadership that show potential to promote positive intergroup relations. Finally, we identify six characteristics of the literature as it has developed and might develop in the future. These serve as possible directions for research to further illuminate the science and practice of intergroup leadership.
Published by Elsevier Inc.

Keywords: Intergroup relations; Intergroup attitudes; Allophilia

1. Intergroup leadership

How can a political leader, enmeshed in and beholden to a political party, lead across the aisle? How can a business leader encourage divisions to work together efficiently and productively? How can community leaders work across divides of race, ethnicity, age, political party, and sexual orientation in today's increasingly pluralistic, multicultural world? The ever-increasing economic, social, and political interdependence between organizations, communities, states, and nations increases the frequency and diversity of settings in which groups come in contact with one another (Northouse, 2007). Leaders at all levels confront challenges in promoting positive relations among groups, which we refer to as *intergroup leadership*.

Leaders often ignore these challenges. Although it may be more responsible or even ethical for leaders to think about other groups as well as their own (Burns, 1978; Rost, 1991), it is more common to find insular styles of leadership that encourage boundaries between groups and discourage understanding of outside groups (Kellerman, 2004). Although followers are often critical of poor leadership within their own group (Pittinsky, Rosenthal, Bacon, Montoya, & Zhu, 2006), they are not typically concerned about their leaders being ingroup-focused and ineffective at promoting positive

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: todd_pittinsky@harvard.edu (T.L. Pittinsky).

1048-9843/$ - see front matter. Published by Elsevier Inc.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.005

relations with other groups. Indeed, followers often actively prefer leaders who favor the ingroup (Duck & Fielding, 1999, 2003; Platow, Hoar, Reid, Harley, & Morrison, 1997; Platow, O'Connell, Shave, & Hanning, 1995).

But whether or not leaders or followers are attuned to intergroup leadership, it is central to any group's well-being, for the alternative is often intergroup conflict. And as humankind moves toward greater interdependence, the costs of conflict between groups become ever greater. This may be most apparent at the international level, but it is also evident at the national level. Within countries, it is less and less the case that any single racial or ethnic group can claim a numeric majority (Johnston, Poulsen, & Forrest, 2007); national leaders will have to bring racial and ethnic groups together to lead effectively. Within geographic regions, political leaders seek integration for economic progress (Nye, 1963, 1967). And within organizations and institutions, leaders struggle for ways to bring disparate work groups, divisions, and acquisitions together.

Why then has the study of leadership, with its breadth of perspective, most often focused on the relations of leaders to their own followers? Why haven't the dynamics of intergroup leadership been vigorously explored? A primary reason is that most of the numerous definitions of leadership emphasize intragroup dynamics by describing leadership as a relational process in which one individual influences one or more other individuals toward the achievement of a common goal (Bass, 1990). Inquiry is thus steered away from members of other groups; such people are the concern of other leaders.

1.1. Ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off

Classic research by sociologists and psychologists has identified a general tension between internal group cohesion (i.e., the extent to which members of a group are bound together; Forsyth, 2006) and external conflict in social systems (e.g., Markides & Cohn, 1982). Leaders often add fuel to the fire. History shows us that there is often, though not always, an "ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off" (Pittinsky, 2005, 2007): Strong ingroup leadership comes at the expense of relations with outgroups. The very foundations of strong leadership, such as fostering strong group cohesion, can become stepping stones to intergroup conflict. This trade-off need not be intended to cause conflict; it may not even be intentional at all. Intergroup relations may be harmed as a natural consequence of basic leadership processes. Strong leadership is associated with feelings of group connectedness—but so is intergroup conflict.

Leaders are advised that "one aspect of effective leadership is the development and maintenance of group cohesiveness" (Dobbins & Zaccaro, 1986, p. 216). Group cohesiveness is even normatively described as a goal of various kinds of leadership, including transformational leadership (e.g., Jung & Sosik, 2002) and charismatic leadership (e.g., Choi, 2006). So deep is the positive relationship between strong leadership and high cohesiveness that cohesiveness is used as an indicator of effective leadership (Weinberg & McDermott, 2002). Of course, this emphasis is not without good reason, as research has demonstrated that group cohesiveness is positively related to such important leadership processes as follower trust (Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, & Popper, 1998), follower willingness to sacrifice for the leader (Shamir et al., 1998), follower satisfaction (Dobbins & Zaccaro, 1986; Fox, 1957), and follower collective efficacy—followers' shared belief in their group's collective ability to achieve a goal (Bandura, 1997; Paskevich, Brawley, Dorsch, & Widmeyer, 1999).

But when the effects of cohesion are examined from the perspective of intergroup relations, the trade-off comes into sharp relief. Cohesiveness in groups can foster competition with outgroups (Fisher, 2000). Cohesion predicts both behavioral and attitudinal intergroup bias (Gaertner & Schopler, 1998). Forms of militant leadership characterized by high group cohesiveness support both aggressive objectives and contentious tactics (Fisher, 2000). There can even be a self-reinforcing cycle: Intergroup conflict begets group cohesion (Coser, 1956; Sherif, 1966) which in turn produces effective leadership.

Moreover, when cohesive groups are in competition or conflict with one another, individuals in one group often hold negative stereotypic attitudes about the other groups. For instance, when highly cohesive groups form a strong concurrence-seeking norm—a phenomenon known as *groupthink*—they often develop a stereotyped view of the outgroup as evil (Janis, 1982). When two groups are in conflict, seeing outgroup members as identical to each other makes wholesale action against individuals of the outgroup easy to rationalize (Park & Ryan, 1991). For example, Hughes, Campbell, Hewstone, & Cairns (2007) found that Protestants in segregated areas of Northern Ireland tended to assume that all Catholics share an extremist political and social agenda. Individuals who saw the outgroup as evil saw themselves as being inherently moral and good. Thus, a type of dualistic thinking takes place: "Our cause is sacred; theirs is evil" and "We are righteous; they are wicked" (Beck, 1999).

The image of the outgroup as the enemy sets in motion self-reinforcing processes that exacerbate negative intergroup relations. For example, Herrmann, Voss, Schooler, & Ciarrochi (1997) demonstrated that individuals have certain images of “the other” that will influence the way they react to other people’s actions. Specifically, an action taken by an “enemy” other is perceived as more harmful than the same action taken by an “ally” other (Herrmann et al., 1997). The “enemy” image—portraying the outgroup as hostile, manipulative, and untrustworthy—serves to justify negative actions toward the outgroup (Brewer & Alexander, 2003). And once an enemy image is in place, it can interact with actions taken by the leader in dangerous ways. Research by Castano, Sacchi, & Gries (2003) found that the effect of the “other image” is moderated by the degree to which the other is perceived as entitative (i.e., a cohesive entity). That is, higher levels of entitativity lead to an even greater perception of harmfulness when the image of the other is that of an enemy rather than that of an ally. These findings suggest that leaders do not even need to use explicitly demonizing language about the outgroup to evoke the perception that the outgroup is threatening; language that merely implies the high entitativity of an enemy outgroup—expressions such as “Russia feels” or “Moscow is angry”—may increase the perception of threat and contribute to intergroup conflict (Castano et al., 2003, p. 465).

The ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off is found not only in deviant and extreme cases, but generally. Some of the most widely employed models of leadership harbor the seeds of intergroup conflict. For example, leaders are influential largely to the extent that they are prototypical of the group; however, such leaders create similarities within a group and differences between groups (as seen in the Social Identity Theory of Leadership; see Hogg, 2001). Moreover, charismatic leaders increase identification with the ingroup in part by positively distinguishing it from other groups (Shamir et al., 1998).

1.2. Resolving the trade-off in favor of the ingroup

For some leaders, the trade-off is not much of a dilemma at all. Leaders whose positions are threatened often accept the trade-off quite readily. History is replete with leaders who have exploited, or in some cases created, intergroup hostilities in order to secure their positions (Bekkers, 1977). For instance, Oberschall (2000) argued leaders played a major role in creating violence in a previously peaceful Yugoslavia. Serbian political and social elites demonized and dehumanized other ethnicities to create a crisis atmosphere in which they could mobilize a followership. Serbian nationalists stated that Albanians were threatening Serbians and that Serbians were not protected against Albanian violence. In Iraq, Saddam Hussein pitted one group against another to strengthen his position. The consequences of his strategy are still clearly seen in the inability of Iraqis to establish a representative government, due largely to mistrust and fear between Iraq’s major communities (Khalilzad, 2006).

Rabbie & Bekkers (1978) noted that leaders can create or exacerbate intergroup conflict to polarize the ingroup’s relationship with an “evil” outgroup. Intentionally sacrificing intergroup relations for ingroup leadership can be deadly, as when leaders scapegoat or demonize other ethnic groups or other nations to build support for war (Hermann & Kegley, 1996). For example, during the 1982 Falklands War between Britain and Argentina, Margaret Thatcher demonized the Argentines; her leadership ratings as British Prime Minister increased (Hogg, 2001).

Taken together, both the annals of history and a wealth of research and theory suggest that leaders often resolve the ingroup/outgroup leadership trade-off by sacrificing intergroup relations for their own strong ingroup leadership.

1.3. Resolving the trade-off in favor of positive intergroup relations

Whereas it is common for leaders to promote their own leadership at the expense of intergroup relations, it is not universal. There is the possibility of an alternative—leadership that resolves the ingroup/outgroup trade-off in a way that lessens intergroup ill will or even creates good will among groups.

Indeed, there is increasing evidence in the social sciences that strong ingroup affiliations do not have to lead to negative relations with outgroups (e.g., Brewer, 1999; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Park & Judd, 2005). Until recently, it had been widely believed, for example, that “in-group feeling results in out-group sentiment… that one side derives its identity from the fact of its opposition to the other” (Fisher, 2000, p. 182). Social scientists are reassessing the assumption that ingroup regard is positively correlated with outgroup denigration, arguing instead that the two are independent (Brewer, 2007; Brewer & Caporael, 2006). Outside of the laboratory, Gibson (2006) tested the link between ingroup identification and intolerance in South Africa and found that ingroup

identification was not a good predictor of intolerance. In fact, this research revealed that neither Black majority nor White minority-group identification activated much intolerance of the outgroup.

These data raise the possibility of a type of leadership that promotes positive intergroup relations. This type of leadership becomes a more important topic as researchers tackle questions of leadership for the common good and as the common good increasingly includes those outside a leader's formal group and formal responsibility (Bryson & Crosby, 2006; Hickman, 2004; Lorenzi, 2004; Rost, 1991; Sternberg, 2007).

1.4. A social psychological perspective

A vibrant field of intergroup relations research offers many insights into positive intergroup relations, and the realities and possibilities of intergroup leadership. Recall that we are speaking of positive relations between groups, not between individual members within one group, the latter concern being addressed by most if not all leadership models. Our focus on groups coming together confronts a real tension—embodied in the phrase *intergroup leadership*—between the separateness inherent in distinct groups (*intergroup*) and the move toward integration (*leadership*). Thus, leaders would be wise to use theory and research from this field to achieve the goal of any intergroup leadership—to promote positive intergroup relations.

For this reason, in the next section, we draw on research and theory both on intergroup relations and on leadership for insights into specific ways in which leaders can improve intergroup relations. We draw largely from social psychology, although we reference corollary theories and arguments from related literatures in sociology and political science. Social psychological perspectives may be particularly helpful in shifting our perspective on leadership from promoting positive *intragroup* relations to promoting positive *intergroup* relations. Social psychology spans levels of analysis (from individual to systemic); its well-developed subfield of intergroup relations has profitably addressed intergroup dynamics in a range of settings (organizational, national, and multinational); and it has a tradition of considering leadership. Indeed, in one of the classic social psychology studies of intergroup relations, Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif (1961) identified leadership as a factor in intergroup relations. Two particularly important theories for understanding intergroup relations are Social Identity Theory, which Tajfel & Turner (1979) described as individuals' perception of themselves in intergroup contexts as belonging to a valuable and positively distinct group, and Social Categorization Theory, which Turner (1985) described as categorizing the social world into groups to which we belong (ingroups) and those to which others belong (outgroups). Models developed around these and other theories hold important implications for leadership involving multiple groups.

2. Pathways to promote positive intergroup relations

Here we examine five pathways of encouraging positive intergroup relations: encouraging contact, managing resources and interdependencies, promoting superordinate identities, promoting dual identities, and increasing positive intergroup attitudes. Each of these pathways has important implications for intergroup leadership. It is not our intention to suggest that one of these pathways is more effective than another or that they should be considered in isolation. In fact, the connections among them offer a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of intergroup leadership.

2.1. Encouraging contact

One of the earliest approaches to improving intergroup relations to appear formally in the literature was the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954), which posited that increasing the exposure of members of the ingroup to members of an outgroup will increase the ingroup's positive regard for the outgroup and decrease prejudice and stereotyping (Allport, 1954; Williams, 1947). However, researchers have long noted that mere contact is not enough to improve group relations. For example, Allport's Contact Hypothesis specifies four fundamental conditions for such an improvement: equal-status groups, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of a legitimate authority. Pettigrew (1986) later refined Allport's original theory, proposing that researchers must also consider individuals' past experiences and their personality characteristics. Pettigrew further specified an addition to Allport's four conditions for contact to improve group relations: individuals first must have the potential to become friends. Then, Pettigrew theorized, ingroup and outgroup members must progress through decategorization, salient categorization, and finally recategorization. A recent meta-analysis by Pettigrew & Tropp (2006), based on 203 studies, revealed that contact typically reduces

intergroup prejudice. Further, their findings show that this positive effect generalizes beyond the immediate contact situation.

Contact has been central to many models of positive intergroup relations. In the classic Robbers Cave study (see "Managing Resources and Interdependencies" below), Sherif et al. (1961) found that, although bringing the groups into contact did not by itself result in decreased prejudice (indeed, in their study contact increased hostility), hostility between the groups did decline and each group began to view the outgroup in positive terms when the groups were brought into contact *and* needed to work together to achieve a superordinate goal. Not only does contact theory help leaders understand how groups might be brought together, but it also assigns leaders a very particular role in positive intergroup relations. Intergroup contact is more readily accepted and has more positive effects when it has explicit social sanction from authorities (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998).

Groups in conflict with one another are often unlikely to come into direct contact with one another. For example, ethnic groups often live in separate neighborhoods and attend different schools. Thus, leadership at the institutional level plays an important role in encouraging contact between groups and making it possible. For example, in the ethnically diverse city of Singapore, a government housing initiative offers low-cost government-built housing to all citizens of Singapore to prevent a wealth distinction and establishes ethnic quotas to prevent sectarianism. The housing distribution makes contact between different ethnicities possible and aims to promote understanding through constant exposure to diverse groups (Sin, 2003).

Contact theory provides a good starting point for examining intergroup leadership because the different mediating mechanisms through which contact promotes positive intergroup relations surface in other models. As will be shown, Gaertner and colleagues (Common Ingroup Identity Model; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989; Gaertner et al., 2000) argue that contact works beneficially when an individual's representation of two separate groups changes into an inclusive ingroup identity either by making a superordinate identity salient (see Promoting Superordinate Identities below) or by perceiving a goal shared by both groups (i.e., a superordinate goal). Contact is therefore a key strategy in promoting positive intergroup relations.

2.2. Managing resources and interdependencies

Campbell's (1965) Realistic Conflict Theory suggests that negative intergroup behavior may arise simply because two groups are in competition for a scarce resource. Such "zero-sum" scenarios are "realistic" conflicts because the competition is for real resources (Nelson, 2006, p. 51). The hostility and prejudice that Campbell predicted would emerge in such situations was demonstrated in Sherif et al.'s (1961) classic Robbers Cave study. Sherif and colleagues created—then attempted to reduce—conflict between two groups of 12-year-old boys at a summer camp. They first created conflict by having the two groups (the "Eagles" and the "Rattlers") compete for a scarce resource. This competition resulted in outgroup discrimination, such as name-calling and raids on each other's cabins. The experimenters found that conflict was only reduced when the two groups had to achieve a goal that required them to work together (i.e., a superordinate goal). The superordinate goals reduced ingroup/outgroup distinctions and helped group members recategorize their own group identities into a common group identity (Nelson, 2006).

This study also includes one of the first attempts to integrate considerations of leadership into an understanding of intergroup relations (Sherif et al., 1961). The researchers observed, for example, that neither group committed aggressive acts toward the other group unless such behavior was sanctioned by the group's leader. Yet the study also showed how leadership might help establish positive relations by demonstrating that leadership and positive intergroup relations were related in cyclical and potentially positive ways: "Leaders find that the trend toward intergroup cooperation in activities involving superordinate goals widens the spheres for joint endeavors and planning future contacts" (Sherif et al., 1961, p. 213). Thus, leaders can play an important role in promoting positive intergroup relations when groups are in competition over a scarce resource because intergroup hostility can be reduced by shared goals (Sherif & Sherif, 1979). In fact, Jackson (1993) found that more permanent reduction and resolution of conflict between groups requires a *series* of superordinate goals. Cooperation among groups toward the achievement of several shared goals helps establish and maintain harmony by encouraging individuals to perceive more positive and accurate information about the outgroup and thus helps individuals to reformulate their opinions of the outgroup (Sherif & Sherif, 1979).

Researchers have also recognized the effectiveness of negotiation for leaders dealing with conflict due to limited resources (Carnevale & Pruitt, 2000; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986) and with interdependence in organizational, political, and

social settings (Kramer, 2007). Negotiation is more likely to succeed when each group believes that the other group is motivated and willing to cooperate (Carnevale & Pruitt, 2000). Leaders in situations of intergroup conflict can achieve such a climate of trust by eliciting cooperative behavior from the other group and by communicating their own trustworthiness and willingness to cooperate (Kramer, 2007). A wealth of research on trust and cooperation has noted a virtuous cycle (Lawler, 2004) in which trust begets cooperation and cooperation spurs more trust (Deutsch, 1973; Kramer, 2007).

2.3. Promoting superordinate identities

Creating a superordinate group identity with which members of different groups can identify can help to eliminate, or at least reduce, intergroup tensions (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a). Group members redefine category boundaries so that they perceive themselves as a part of a larger group and recognize commonalities with the members of other groups (Park & Judd, 2005). In effect, members break down their "us versus them" categories and form a broader "we" category. In the context of cross-ethnic relations and immigration, recategorization in its pure form can resemble melting-pot assimilation models (Gordon, 1964; Zangwill, 1908/2005) in which old ethnic loyalties are supplanted by loyalties to a new, homogenous society.

Recategorization into a superordinate group identity can take various forms. It can take advantage of cross-cutting group memberships (Crisp & Hewstone, 2001; Deschamps & Doise, 1978; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b, 2002), making individuals aware that outgroup members ("the other") are at the same time members of shared ingroups (Urban & Miller, 1998). Alternatively, recategorization can change individuals' conceptions of the degree to which the very categories underpinning their perception of group distinctiveness are in fact distinct.

A particularly comprehensive model of recategorization, the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner et al., 1993), focuses on the processes whereby recategorization results in a reduction of negative intergroup relations by shifting the nature of categorization from ingroups and outgroups to more inclusive identities. According to this model, the cognitive and motivational forces of ingroup favoritism can be harnessed and redirected to reduce negative intergroup relations such that an individual's sense of two separate groups as "us and them" is transformed into a sense of an inclusive superordinate group through the coalescing of group boundaries, rather than by their complete elimination (Gaertner et al., 1989, 1993). Gaertner et al. (1993) proposed that a common ingroup identity is achieved by increasing the salience of existing common superordinate group memberships or by introducing factors that are perceived to be shared (e.g., superordinate tasks).

Research has demonstrated the positive effects of recategorization on intergroup relations. For example, Gaertner & Dovidio (1986) manipulated the seating pattern of two groups so that members of these groups were segregated, partially integrated, or fully integrated. Their findings revealed that, compared to members of segregated groups, members of the partially and fully integrated groups experienced the merged groups as a single unit, exhibiting less intergroup bias in leader choice and expressing more satisfaction with their membership in the new group. Using a similar paradigm, Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell, & Pomare (1990) demonstrated that, even in the absence of cooperative interaction, participants induced to feel like one group had lower degrees of outgroup bias in their evaluations of ingroup and outgroup members. In related research, Kramer & Brewer (1984) and Brewer & Kramer (1986) demonstrated that framing group memberships as a common superordinate identity led to higher cooperation and less defensiveness across groups than framing them as subordinate subcategories did.

Transformational leaders employ a similar logic of superordinate identification. Bass (1985) described transformational leadership as leadership that motivates followers by raising their levels of awareness about the importance of goals, by getting followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the group, and by shifting followers to address higher-level needs. It is not surprising that transformational leadership, with its focus on the greater good, is positively related to followers feeling a heightened sense of *collective identity* (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) and *commitment* (Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004). Moreover, transformational leadership has also been positively associated with followers' motivation to pursue collective goals and collective values (Bass, 1985), suggesting that this leadership style would successfully create a common ingroup identity by introducing factors that are perceived to be shared (Gaertner et al., 1993).

The benefits of recategorization and associated superordinate identifications have been observed by disciplines other than social psychology. For example, in political science research, Transue (2007) found that attachment to a superordinate national identity improves intergroup relations. Specifically, this study revealed that priming a U.S.

identity eliminated the difference between Whites' support for tax increases that benefited public schools in general and their support for educational opportunities for minorities.

Political leaders reveal their practical use of recategorization strategies in popular political appeals such as "We are one" and "One nation, one flag" (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a, p. 145). Some political appeals, however, have advanced superordinate identities at the expense of subgroup identities. President Theodore Roosevelt, for example, stated: "In this country we must all stand together absolutely without regard to our several lines of descent, as Americans and nothing else" (Roosevelt, 1916/1989). Researchers have questioned whether promotion of superordinate identities can benefit intergroup relations without simultaneous attention to individuals' subgroup identities.

2.4. Promoting dual identities

Although promoting superordinate identities is an appealing approach to reducing intergroup conflict and encouraging positive intergroup relations, some have argued that it may be problematic (Moghaddam & Solliday, 1991). Researchers have noted that neglecting to value individuals' subgroup identities when introducing a superordinate identity can sometimes make intergroup relations worse. Although superordinate identities have the potential to bind subgroups together, they can also challenge and potentially destroy distinctive and valuable subgroup identities (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a). Hewstone & Brown (1986) argue that being encouraged (or forced) to give up a valued social category can be perceived as a threat. Their reasoning follows from Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which describes group memberships as deeply incorporated into and fundamental to individuals' self-concepts. Consequently, recategorization can actually result in increased intergroup bias and conflict, as subgroups seek to reassert their distinctiveness in response to the threat posed by recategorization (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a).

An alternative is dual identifications—identifying both with a subgroup and with a superordinate group. Hewstone & Brown (1986) describe the Mutual Intergroup Differentiation Model, a model of positive intergroup relations in which a superordinate identity is promoted alongside the preservation of distinct subgroup identities. Their model argues that the nested subgroup identities within a superordinate identity should be valued as highly as the superordinate identity in order to promote positive intergroup relations (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). What is perhaps the foremost contemporary experiment in promoting dual identities—the European Union (EU)—calls for two simultaneous identities, a superordinate identity as a European and a subordinate (but fully preserved and honored) national identity (Ulrich, Christ, & Schlüter, 2006).

The Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner et al., 1993) discussed earlier, also recognizes the potential downside of eliminating subgroup boundaries completely, arguing that it limits the positive attitude change to situations where there is a need for cooperation and, as a result, where the superordinate identity is salient. Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker (1999) noted that promoting a superordinate identity need not force individuals to give up their subgroup identities. According to the model, recognizing both connection across groups (i.e., superordinate group identity) and difference (i.e., subgroup identities) is the best strategy to engender attitude and behavior change that will generalize to other situations.

Research supports an approach of supporting dual identities in order to promote positive intergroup relations. For instance, when individuals are categorized exclusively at the superordinate level, ignoring their subgroup identities, they demonstrate relatively high intergroup bias, whereas when individuals are categorized simultaneously at both the superordinate and subgroup levels, they demonstrate less bias (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a,b). Hence, although emphasizing a superordinate identity without recognizing subgroup identities can undermine intergroup relations, posing a threat to the uniqueness of valued subgroup identities and resulting in intergroup bias (see Barreto & Ellemers, 2002; Eggins, Haslam, & Reynolds, 2002), a dual-identity approach seems at times to attenuate these threats.

Research shows not only that a dual-identity approach can be desirable, but also that subgroup identities may be impossible to ignore. Thus, it is important for leaders to understand the implications of subgroup identities in intergroup situations. For instance, research by Duck & Fielding (1999) examined follower responses in situations in which two subgroups were integrated into a superordinate group. They found that nomination of a leader from one subgroup or the other divided rather than united members of the larger group, promoting identification at the subgroup level rather than at the superordinate group level (Duck & Fielding, 1999). In addition, a leader's subgroup membership was a hindrance to their effectiveness in leading the superordinate group. Subgroup members perceived leaders who were not aligned with either subgroup (i.e., leaders who were members of both subgroups or who were members of neither subgroup) to

be more fair, more concerned for the interests of the superordinate group, and more impartial in their concern for the interests of the various subgroups. The only observed deviation from this pattern occurred when the superordinate group, consisting of both subgroups, was placed in competition with another group, in which case subgroup members were significantly more likely to believe that leaders from the other subgroup would act in the best interests of the superordinate group, representing both the superordinate and the various subgroups. It took the presence of an external group to create, among the subgroups, a stronger sense of being part of one superordinate group (Duck & Fielding, 1999).

In an extension of this work, Duck & Fielding (2003) examined (a) how group members respond to ingroup and outgroup leaders when a leader's behavior confirms or disconfirms behavioral expectations and (b) the effect of those responses on members' identification with the organization. The researchers examined these dynamics in the case of stable relations among the groups, as opposed to the case of a merger, in which a new superordinate identity is introduced. Results indicated that participants perceived leaders from their own subgroup (ingroup leaders) favorably regardless of their behavior but viewed leaders from a different subgroup (outgroup leaders) favorably only when they behaved in an unexpected manner by favoring the participant's own group. When an outgroup leader behaved in an expected manner—favoring his or her own subgroup—participants judged the leader as less fair, less concerned for the company (the shared identity), and less supporting of the participant's own subgroup than all other leaders. When an outgroup leader behaved in a confirming way, participants' attitudes to the superordinate group also changed; they were less likely to perceive the company (the superordinate group) as one group and identified less strongly with it. These findings identify an increased complexity for leaders when both subgroup and superordinate group identities are emphasized. More generally, they show how important it is for a leader to pay attention to subgroup dynamics, even while emphasizing a superordinate identity.

One particularly important aspect of subgroup dynamics is status differentials between groups. For example, Jetten, Duck, Terry, & O'Brien (2002) considered mergers of groups with unequal status. They found that low-status ingroup leaders were preferred over high-status outgroup leaders, confirming previous research demonstrating that low-status groups are more concerned than high-status groups with a leader's premerger group membership (Jetten et al., 2002). Interestingly, the data further revealed that a leader's subgroup membership was of less concern when the leader stressed equality, which assuaged concerns of ingroup favoritism (Jetten et al., 2002). Taken together with Duck & Fielding's (1999, 2003) research, these studies demonstrated the impact of a leader's behaviors in creating positive intergroup relations. A leader must reassure members of the subgroups to which they do not belong that they are concerned with the overall interests of the superordinate group.

Research suggests that dual identities can minimize some of the risks of focusing exclusively on a superordinate identity. Nevertheless, dual identities have been associated with conflicting outcomes in the literature, with some research finding that introducing superordinate identities may at times aggravate rather than improve subgroup relations (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003). Researchers, for example, have reported that in some cases a superordinate identity can actually provoke or exacerbate subgroups' negative feelings about each other. Individuals tend to perceive their ingroup as more prototypical of the superordinate group than the outgroup is (i.e., ingroup projection; Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). In such situations a superordinate identity can lead group members to perceive the outgroup negatively (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Waldzus et al., 2003). Indeed, both superordinate identities and dual identities appear to have their limitations.

There are situations in which superordinate identities are not likely to be meaningful enough to motivate behaviors. In international politics, the notion of a superordinate identity (i.e., being human) is unlikely to be meaningful enough to motivate behavior. In other cases there may be such great tension that superordinate identities are quickly overshadowed by subgroup identities. In the U.S. political system, Republicans and Democrats share an identity as U.S. citizens, but that identity is typically overshadowed by their critically important subgroup identities. Although there have been efforts to focus the Christian, Muslim, and Jewish communities on their shared identity as Abrahamic faiths, the strength of their subgroup identities often overwhelms that shared identity. In cases when superordinate identities are strong enough to promote more positive relations, the salience of superordinate identities may ebb and flow influencing their efficacy. Research has demonstrated that there is movement between identities (Fox-Wolfgramm, Boal, & Hunt, 1998). For example, research examining biculturalism and multiple social identities more generally, focusing on such topics as the alternation model (LaFromboise & Rowe, 1983), code-switching theories (Saville-Troike, 1981), and identity adaptiveness (Pittinsky, Shih, & Ambady, 1999; Shih, Pittinsky, & Ambady, 1999), reveals that specific situations make different social identities more or less salient.

Other research has noted that superordinate identities are often contingent upon a context of cooperative interaction (Hewstone & Brown, 1986) or commitment to achieving a superordinate goal (Gaertner et al., 2000; Sherif et al., 1961), and thus the benefits of the superordinate identity is limited to specific situations. For example, superordinate identities may be effective in situations in which groups cooperate to confront a mutual threat, but may be less so in the absence of such threat. As Benjamin Franklin said while the United States was fighting for its independence, "If we do not all hang together, we will surely hang separately." Groups often coalesce when facing a mutual threat, or what Sumner (1906) refers to as "antagonistic cooperation" (p. 18). For example, Waltz's (1979) conception of the balance-of-power theory explains that nations will align with former enemies when both are faced with a superior power (Ripsman, 2005). The formation of the League of Nations following World War I represents another type of political system emerging out of conflict: a coalition against aggressors (Nye, 2007).

Finally, superordinate identity strategies may improve intergroup relations, yet at a different level of analysis stoke conflict. For example, the nations in the European Union are experiencing historically unprecedented levels of integration and cooperation as a common European identity is embraced while distinctive national identities remain. In most senses, then, the EU could be heralded as a success of positive intergroup relations. But it would be naïve to overlook the fact that a significant motivation for the unification of Europe is to compete more effectively with "others"—namely the United States, China, and India.

For all these reasons, it becomes interesting to consider cases where, even in the absence of superordinate identities, positive intergroup relations might result. Such cases are considered by the two-dimensional model and by the allophilia (intergroup liking) construct, discussed in the following section.

2.5. Increasing positive intergroup attitudes

A final model describes the enhancement of intergroup relations when salient group boundaries are present. This Two-Dimensional Model of Intergroup Attitudes (TDMIA) specifically examines cases of "us liking them." Central to this model are (a) a focus on distinct groups—"us" and "them"—and (b) the assertion that positive intergroup attitudes ("we like them") are largely independent of negative attitudes. That is, the model proposes that positive intergroup attitudes (i.e., intergroup liking or allophilia) are not the mirror opposite of negative intergroup attitudes (i.e., disliking, prejudice) but instead have their own distinct forms and functions in intergroup relations.

The model has three tenets. The first posits that there are two distinct dimensions of intergroup attitudes. This assertion is unique; intergroup research typically assumes that positive and negative intergroup attitudes are unidimensional. For example, the "feeling thermometer" measure commonly employed in psychology and political science research (Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004) places positive and negative intergroup attitudes as opposite poles of a single dimension. In contrast, the TDMIA suggests that there is a negative dimension (captured by prejudice constructs) and a positive dimension (captured by the allophilia construct). The implications of this tenet include the possibility that promoting less-negative intergroup attitudes and relations is not synonymous with promoting more positive intergroup attitudes and relations. According to the model, liking and disliking, although often negatively correlated, are to a certain extent independent, with their degree of independence being more pronounced in certain contexts. This suggests that positive intergroup relations can involve the reduction of negative intergroup attitudes or the promotion of positive attitudes (or both) and that such reduction and promotion may be linked with different psychological processes.

Recent research supports the model's conceptualization of positive intergroup attitudes as a dimension distinct from negative intergroup attitudes. The most direct evidence comes from research on the allophilia construct (Pittinsky, Rosenthal, & Montoya, 2007), which examines the less theorized and researched positive dimension (Dienstbier, 1970; Phillips & Ziller, 1997). This research shows that intergroup attitudes are similar to other attitudinal constructs that were initially conceptualized and studied as a single dimension but later found to be two-dimensional (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994). For example, although researchers have viewed trust and distrust as extreme values along a single attitudinal dimension (e.g., Bigley & Pearce, 1998), other research suggests that they may be distinct constructs (Katz, 2001; Kramer, 1996; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; Saunders & Thornhill, 2004). Research similarly suggests the independence of competition and cooperation as two distinct (albeit related) dimensions of intergroup interaction (e.g., Deutsch & Krauss, 1960).

The second and third tenets of the TDMIA flow from the first. As independent dimensions, positive and negative intergroup attitudes have distinct antecedents (tenet 2) and distinct influences on intergroup relations (tenet 3). General support for the claim that liking and disliking the other have distinct antecedents comes from classic work on operant

conditioning, specifically the reinforcing nature of stimuli that are good for us and the punitive nature of stimuli that are bad for us. This work suggests that the processes that attract us to things that are good for us (and therefore reinforcing) are distinct from the processes that repel us from things that are bad for us (and therefore punishing). Festinger (1954), in the context of operant conditioning, argued that reinforcements associated with other people are uniquely associated with attraction, whereas punishment is uniquely associated with repulsion. Lewin (1951), for instance, posited that experiencing another as benefiting the self is particularly important to attraction, whereas experiencing someone as harmful to the self is particularly important to repulsion. Indeed, a wealth of research finds that these basic processes (reinforcement/attraction, punishment/repulsion) are distinct and independent.

In the context of intergroup attitudes, these findings suggest that positive and negative intergroup attitudes should generally be associated with distinct and somewhat independent processes. More specifically, they suggest that the perception of positive value or benefit in the "other" should be a particularly important antecedent to intergroup liking. Such positive value may manifest in different ways, such as perceived acceptance by the other and cooperative intent or similarity (Byrne, 1971; Rosenbaum, 1986), each of which should be particularly important to the engagement of liking.

The third tenet of the TDMIA proposes that positive and negative intergroup attitudes are associated with different intergroup behavioral orientations and behaviors. The model argues that positive intergroup attitudes are uniquely associated with enhanced recognition of outgroup contributions and with greater proactive support of the outgroup by members of an ingroup. Importantly, research has shown that positive intergroup attitudes predict positive intergroup relations better than negative intergroup attitudes do (e.g., Ho & Jackson, 2001). Pittinsky & colleagues found that allophilia was a stronger predictor of individuals' willingness to support the extension of policies to benefit outgroups than negative attitudes were. Also, allophilia more robustly predicts more personal forms of proactive support of outgroups—such as willingness to directly assist outgroup members—than do negative attitudes (Ratcliff & Pittinsky, 2007).

Research on the distinction between positive and negative interpersonal emotions (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001) provides a compelling framework for this tenet. According to Fredrickson's (1998, 2001) "broaden-and-build" theory of positive emotions, positive emotions are more closely linked to positive behaviors. Consistent with this theory, and in support of the model, research has demonstrated that, when examined independently, positive intergroup emotions are more closely linked to positive intergroup behaviors than negative intergroup emotions (Dijker, 1987).

The TDMIA has important implications for understanding how leaders can promote positive intergroup relations (e.g., Pfeifer, Love, & Jackson, 2006). First, the model's attention to positive relations between *distinct* groups, whether in the context of shared identities or not, provides an alternative pathway to positive intergroup relations, especially in situations where creating superordinate identities is not feasible or where the potential costs of emphasizing superordinate identities are too great (as described earlier). The model also offers insight into multiculturalism's mix of both positive intergroup attitudes—understanding and valuing unique characteristics of various groups—and negative intergroup attitudes—fear and distrust (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Park & Judd, 2005).

Perhaps most critically, the model sheds light on a set of actions for intergroup leadership that are missed when intergroup attitudes are implicitly or explicitly assumed to be unidimensional. Laws enacted and institutions created in recent years reveal that policymakers understand the need to create positive intergroup relations but frame their responses largely as reducing hate, eliminating conflict, fighting prejudice, and battling racism, implicitly or explicitly assuming that to reduce the negative is to increase the positive or that an absence of hate is sufficient for positive intergroup relations. For example, the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) seeks to "fight racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and promote equality of treatment between EU citizens and third country nationals" (ENAR, 2007). The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) aims to "combat against racism, xenophobia and related intolerance" (FRA, 2007), as does the UN World Conference Against Racism. Individual countries have enacted hate-crime legislation. But these "anti-hate" initiatives do not necessarily introduce liking into the intergroup processes, and the research reviewed above suggests that liking contributes to positive intergroup relations in ways that the absence of disliking does not. To the extent that negative and positive intergroup relations are independent, leaders must address each independently. Leaders will need to increase allophilia as well as reduce intergroup hate in order to encourage positive intergroup relations.

The literature on dual identities, discussed earlier, has associated dual identities with effects ranging from more positive (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004) to more negative intergroup outcomes (Ulrich et al., 2006; Waldzus et al., 2003). TDMIA suggests a possible reason: The introduction of

superordinate identities and the maintenance of subgroup identities may have differential effects on intergroup liking and disliking. Similarly, the TDMIA may illuminate complex and potentially conflicting results of intergroup contact. It may turn out to be the case that different forms of contact, and the presence or absence of different supportive conditions, may affect liking and disliking in different ways. Some forms of contact in combination with some specific enabling conditions will do more to increase liking whereas others do more to reducing disliking. The model's emphasis on the positive dimension is not meant to suggest that the work of reducing negative intergroup attitudes is not critical. But it does indicate that positive relations will depend on promoting liking as well as on reducing disliking.

The positive dimension illuminated in the TDMIA may be connected to transformational leadership. Transformational leadership promotes values such as equality (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999) and encourages followers to act on the values they accept as a collective (Bass, 1985; Price, 2006). Transformational leadership enables leaders to influence group members toward behaviors that promote universal values (Goethals, 2005) and, because universal values such as equality are positively related to prosocial feelings and attitudes toward outgroup members, transformational leadership may influence group members' propensity for positive categorization of outgroup members. For example, Dasgupta & Rivera (2006) found that the presence of conscious egalitarian beliefs eliminated discriminatory behavior toward gay men.

Recent research has found that such equality values lead to proactive support of outgroups, in part through their interactions with allophilia (the positive dimension). Interestingly, the highest level of support came from those who both endorsed equality values and felt allophilia for the members of a minority group (Pittinsky & Montoya, in press). It may be, then, that transformational leaders encourage followers to behave in accordance with their internal values either by introducing equality values that interact with allophilia already present in the followers or by introducing both equality values and allophilia. Indeed, even a brief review of the literature illustrates that some of the most celebrated transformational leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King, Jr. practiced a combination of transformational leadership and intergroup leadership that promoted liking of the other.

3. Directions for intergroup leadership

We turn now to a set of topics derived from a review of the intergroup leadership literature that indicate promising directions for future research and theory: characteristics of individual leaders, positivity bias, focus on procedure, emotional responses to the outgroup, multigroup models, and intergroup leadership amid similarity and difference.

3.1. Characteristics of individual leaders

The study of intergroup leadership has largely focused on the implications of social and structural possibilities for leadership strategy. But research and theory, not to mention history, suggest that the traits and skills of individual leaders can also matter. Leadership literature suggests certain traits (e.g., intelligence, confidence, and sociability) and skills (e.g., problem-solving, motivation, and persuasiveness) can be important to an understanding of leadership processes in general. Leader prototypicality and interpersonal skills are particularly germane to intergroup leadership.

3.1.1. Prototypicality

Social Identity Theory has had a wide impact on the study of intergroup relations, influencing many of the theories described above. More recently, Hogg's (2001) Social Identity Theory of Leadership proposes that leadership is a structural feature of groups and, therefore, that leader and follower are interdependent roles nested in a social system and tied together by a common ingroup identity. Leadership, the theory argues, may be understood as a group process that arises from social categorization and depersonalization processes linked with social identity. Through depersonalization processes, group members assimilate to the ingroup prototype. The most prototypical member of a group will have influence because of social attraction processes that make followers agree and comply with a prototypical leader.

Prototypicality becomes an even more influential base for leadership perceptions as group membership becomes more salient and members identify more strongly with the group (Hogg, 2001). Individuals will rely less on implicit leadership theories—their beliefs about the traits and behaviors proper to leaders (as described in Leader-

Categorization Theory; Hunt, Boal, & Sorenson, 1990; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982)—and more on how a leader seems to represent the group's values, attitudes, and behaviors (Hoyt & Chemers, in press). For example, the way leaders dress can make them appear representative of their group. George W. Bush's cowboy clothes give him a "regular guy" appearance, Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat's headscarf helped the Palestinian people identify with him, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah's combination of distinctive items of clothing from various regions of Pakistan suggested a newly unified national identity with him as its leader (Reicher, Haslam, & Platow, 2007).

Prototypical leaders exemplify what makes the group distinct from and better than rival groups (Reicher et al., 2007). The effect of the leader's prototypicality becomes more complex—and perhaps more critical—in the context of intergroup leadership. Distinct groups will have distinct prototypes. This suggests that leaders need to appear prototypical of each group *and* of the superordinate group. Duck & Fielding (2003), whose research was reviewed earlier, demonstrated that leaders must be attuned to how members of their aligned and unaligned groups may perceive their behavior differently. Savvy political leaders know this, emphasizing different characteristics in different settings to appeal to different audiences. These leaders appear chameleon-like and their opinions seem to mirror the popular opinion of the moment (Hermann & Hagan, 1998). For example, Bill Clinton's popularity was due in part to his responsiveness and ability to change according to the situation (Dowd, 1996). Research and theory need to catch up with practice; using the prototypicality construct is one valuable way to do so.

3.1.2. Interpersonal skills

A leader's interpersonal skills are also important to intergroup leadership, especially when the groups are in conflict, a topic addressed in the research and theory on third-party conflict-resolution facilitators. Fisher (2000), for example, suggested that facilitators of interpersonal conflict should develop many of the communication and relationship-building skills of the "helping professions." Skills such as speaking genuinely and respectfully, conveying concise and organized messages, and listening reflectively and with empathy would complement a deep knowledge of group processes and the capacity to facilitate group interaction (Fisher, 2000). These skills are often examined in research that looks at the constituent microprocesses of intergroup relations, but such individual differences are not considered in more general research on intergroup leadership or intergroup relations. Their inclusion promises to add complexity to models and bring together insights from research conducted at different levels of analysis.

3.2. Positivity bias

A positivity bias permeates the study of leadership. Positive leadership for positive ends is the overwhelming focus of analysis and theorizing, whilst "bad" leadership for "bad" ends is too often ignored (Kellerman, 2004). In the case of intergroup leadership, the goals of which are often considered "good," an interesting corollary bias can be observed—a reluctance to examine cases of intergroup leadership that involve actions of questionable morality intended to serve a higher purpose of bringing groups together.

In fact, leaders committed to positive goals often justify immoral behavior in pursuit of those goals (Price, 2006). Models and insights deduced from such cases are not more meritorious, but are essential to a fuller understanding of intergroup leadership. Many argue that leadership necessarily introduces a "dirty hands" problem: Leaders may need to act in immoral ways to achieve ends that would be considered moral (Bellamy, 2007). Machiavelli made exactly the same point (Hancock, 1994) and utilitarian logic, with its resonance and appeal, is often invoked in support of bad means to good ends (Bellamy, 2007). The scientific study of intergroup leadership would benefit from attention to the full range of pathways—both good and bad—to intergroup leadership goals.

3.3. Focus on procedure

Research demonstrates that fairness, like trust, can help prevent conflict amongst groups (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986). Research on procedural justice (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Tyler, 2000) provides important insights into how processes influence perceptions of justness and fairness and how those perceptions in turn influence individuals. The general body of work on procedural fairness suggests a process-based approach to leadership, in which leaders exercise their authority in ways that followers experience as fair. Followers then become more supportive of their leaders' goals (De Cremer & Tyler, 2007; De Cremer, Tyler, & den Ouden, 2005; Tyler & De Cremer, 2005). By employing processes perceived to be fair, leaders can activate internal motivations for followers to act in ways that benefit their group,

including a willingness to cooperate with others in the group (Tyler & Blader, 2003). Once people identify with a group, they put the welfare of the group above their own welfare (Tyler, 2002). Moreover, when leaders use fair procedures, followers are more likely to identify with the collective, leading them to cooperate willingly on shared goals (De Cremer & Van Knippenberg, 2002).

Research is beginning to examine the important implications procedural justice has for intergroup leadership. Tyler & De Cremer (2005) researched the experience of organizational merger. Reasoning that merger requires leaders to motivate cooperation from employees whose valued identities may now be threatened and whose identifications may need to change, the researchers found that a leader's procedural fairness helped motivate employees to cooperate and to identify with a superordinate group—the new company. Employees who experienced the implementation of the merger as fair were more likely to feel connected to and identify with the new company.

Procedural justice has been widely demonstrated to be an operant process in legal, political, and educational settings and can therefore provide useful insights into intergroup leadership in these contexts (Tyler, 2000). When new authorities are created, such as the EU and the New Parliament in Russia, a primary way for leaders to gain individuals' support for their decisions is to prove that they make decisions fairly (Tyler, 2000). Procedural justice also positively affects individuals' identification with their group and trust in their leader (De Cremer, van Dijke, & Bos, 2006).

When leadership must be exercised across groups that may have conflicting needs and different standards of fairness, it is more difficult for leaders to be perceived as fair and just. Huo, Molina, Sawahata, & Deang (2005) suggested that leaders can focus individuals' attention on fairness by emphasizing both subgroup and superordinate group identities. They found that when individuals were asked to evaluate a decision by their leaders that went against the individuals' immediate interests, they were not concerned with leaders' procedural fairness when only their subgroup identity or only the shared superordinate identity was emphasized. However, when both identities were emphasized, the leaders' procedural fairness did figure into the evaluation (Huo et al., 2005). These findings suggest that although leaders might feel that emphasizing either ingroup or superordinate group identities is beneficial, the degree to which their actions are judged as fair may depend at least in part on emphasizing both identities. A process-based approach to ingroup leadership, then, may have much to show leaders about how to promote positive intergroup relations.

3.4. Emotional responses to the outgroup

Research on Intergroup Emotion Theory (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000) integrates Social Identity Theory and appraisal theories of emotion. It provides a bridge between the study of emotions and models of positive intergroup relations developed from more sociocognitive perspectives, representing a fruitful domain for intergroup leadership research. This research suggests that leaders can actively manipulate the emotional responses their followers have to outgroups and that these emotional responses subsequently influence the course of intergroup relations.

For example, followers respond emotionally to leadership attempts to bring groups together and these emotional responses may mediate critical processes such as an individual's evaluation of an outgroup (Bodenhausen & Moreno, 2000; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991). Research on emotions in the intergroup context reviewed earlier (in the section, Increasing Positive Intergroup Attitudes) suggests that leaders should consider their followers' positive and negative intergroup emotions as largely independent. Emotional responses of followers to outgroups will be associated with action tendencies toward those outgroups (Mackie et al., 2000; Maitner, Mackie, & Smith, 2006) and will influence followers' preferences for public policies that range from the vengeful to the conciliatory (Lerner, Gonzalez, Small, & Fischhoff, 2003). Emotional responses may be particularly important to intergroup leadership because followers' emotional responses to outgroups may be more easily shaped than their cognitive responses. Research suggests that individuals' affective evaluations of outgroups may be more malleable, and malleable under a wider range of conditions, than such cognitive representations as stereotypes (Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Bachelor, 2003).

Of course, appealing to and manipulating followers' emotions can aggravate intergroup relations as well as improve them. Brewer & Alexander (2003) found that in intergroup relations, emotional responses (e.g., fear, anger, and resentment) and their associated action orientations (e.g., retreating, attacking, and resisting, respectively) will translate into images of the outgroup as an "enemy" and preferences for unfriendly or hostile behavior and policies toward that group. By the same token, leaders can draw attention to more positive images of an outgroup, which should translate

into images of the outgroup as an "ally" and preferences for more positive behaviors and policies toward that group (Brewer & Alexander, 2003).

3.5. Multigroup models

For the sake of analytical clarity, intergroup relations researchers typically focus on two-group models of intergroup relations. For intergroup leadership, this means a leader working toward more positive relations between two groups. Although such an approach has merits (e.g., it is easy to operationalize in experimental studies and easy to comprehend), we suggest that a two-group model examination should serve as a starting point for research and that future research should increasingly model intergroup leadership involving greater numbers of groups.

Such situations are everywhere. Leaders of multinational organizations must promote positive relations among units from many different nations, with associated cultural differences (House et al., 2004). The citizenry of most nations consists of many different religious and ethnic groups. Most modern democracies have coalition governments whose leaders must work across multiple party lines. To address economic, security, environmental, and human-rights issues, political leaders must span many different groups within the government (Hermann & Hagan, 1998) and the broader society. Attempts to address complex global issues such as environmental degradation, poverty, excessive consumption of natural resources, and the increasing disparity between wealthy and disadvantaged nations, can involve over 100 nations (Larson, 2003). More explicit models of how intergroup leadership unfolds when there are multiple parties is an intriguing and beneficial area for future research.

3.6. Intergroup leadership amid similarity and difference

An influential body of research on intergroup relations suggests that the more similar two groups are, the less conflict there will be between them. Similarity–dissimilarity approaches such as Byrne's (1971) similarity-attraction relationship model and Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski's (1991) terror-management theory suggest that ingroups will like outgroups that have similar beliefs and worldviews. Groups are expected to dislike those with dissimilar beliefs and worldviews (Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner, 2005). These findings suggest that bringing together similar groups should be easier than bringing together dissimilar groups. They also suggest that emphasizing similarity would be a viable intergroup leadership strategy, as we saw earlier in the case of recategorization by emphasizing similarities between groups.

Nevertheless, similarity-based models of intergroup leadership come up short in certain regards. In the real world, leaders are often faced with groups divided by great differences and research suggests that emphasizing similarity at the expense of difference can actually aggravate rather than ameliorate intergroup relations (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a). In addition, evidence suggests that social diversity, while it has many social costs (Brewer, 1997; Frederickson, 1999; Moghaddam & Solliday, 1991), also has social benefits (Berry, Kalin, & Taylor, 1977; Glazer & Moynihan, 1970; Taylor & Lambert, 1996). Emphasis on similarity may reduce the accessibility of those benefits (Berry & Bourcier, 1989; Cameron & Berry, 1990). Similarity can contribute to adherence to a single set of norms and therefore limit diverse thought and action (Dovidio, Gaertner, & Lamoreaux, 2007), undermining group creativity (Antonio et al., 2004) and collective effectiveness (Sommers, 2006). There are also cases in which leadership that promotes positive intergroup relations may be valuable, yet differences among groups remain very salient (e.g., deliberations among political parties). Similarity-based approaches may be less useful in such cases. And in cases where difference is acutely salient, an emphasis on similarity may not be possible, such as when states are in the midst of dissolution, and respective states are actively in the process of declaring sovereignty over respective territories (Brown, Kaser, & Smith, 1994).

Potential directions for research and theory on intergroup relations are suggested by the argument that similarity is not the only basis for attraction and may not be the universal operant mechanism in positive intergroup relations that it is often assumed to be (Montoya & Horton, 2004; Singh, Ho, Tan, & Bell, 2007). For example, proximity and common fate are also bases for attraction (Campbell, 1958) and might be foundations for models of intergroup leadership. The Two-Dimensional Model of Intergroup Attitudes (Pittinsky et al., 2007), described earlier, proposes liking amid salient differentiation between the ingroup and the outgroup.

Taken together, the frequent need for intergroup leadership across dissimilarity and the social science evidence that similarity is not the only pathway to positive intergroup relations suggest that bringing diverse groups together *as* diverse groups is a viable and important topic of research in a world of great social diversity.

4. Conclusion

Though the study of leadership has often adopted a perspective considering leaders and their followers, we adopted an alternative perspective: intergroup leadership. In particular, we examined the science and practice of leadership that promotes positive intergroup relations, addressed more than ever by models and theories of intergroup relations.

At times, intergroup leadership will involve working to reduce or eliminate negative dimensions of intergroup relations. At other times, it will involve increasing positive intergroup relations (Pittinsky et al., 2007). Leaders will need to reduce competition *and* increase cooperation, reduce distrust *and* increase trust, reduce hate *and* increase allophilia in order to encourage positive intergroup relations. To the extent that negative and positive intergroup relations are independent, leaders must address each independently. The study of intergroup leadership is necessarily nuanced and complex.

But so, too, is it compelling. The study of intergroup leadership not only allows us to better understand important leadership phenomena that have been under-researched and theorized, but it also enables us to better imagine a world in which different groups are neither in conflict with each other nor simply tolerating each other, but are actively engaged in positive relations with each other. Here, then, is a fertile and important area of inquiry for social scientists, where science can meet practice in the service of society.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Laura Bacon, Laura Maruskin, Matthew Montoya, Jennifer Ratcliff, Max Ritvo, Seth Rosenthal, Sloan Strike, and the issue editor and reviewers for helpful comments on an early draft of this manuscript, and Joseph S. Nye, Jr. for identifying the positivity bias in the intergroup leadership literature. The Center for Public Leadership, the Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation, and the Dean’s Research Fund at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and the Alan B. Slifka Foundation provided financial support for this research.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 507−510.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect versus neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 629−639.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*, (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 181−217.

Beck, A. T. (1999). Images and misperceptions in war: The deadly construction of the ENEMY. In A. T. Beck (Ed.), *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence* (pp. 197−224). New York: HarperCollins.

Bekkers, F. (1977). Threatened leadership and intergroup conflicts. *Journal of Peace Research*, *14*, 223−247.

Bellamy, A. (2007). Dirty hands and lesser evils in the war on terror. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, *9*, 509−526.

Berry, J. W., & Bourcier, D. (1989, June). *Attitudes toward official bilingualism in Eastern Ontario*. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Meetings, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Berry, J. W., Kalin, R., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). *Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada.* Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services.

Bigley, G., & Pearce, J. (1998). Straining for shared meaning in organization science: Problems of trust and distrust. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 405−421.

Bodenhausen, G. V., & Moreno, K. N. (2000). How do I feel about them? The role of affective reactions in intergroup perception. In H. Bless & J.P. Forgas (Eds.), *The message within: The role of subjective experience in social cognition and behavior* (pp. 283−303). London: Psychology Press.

Brewer, M. (1997). The social psychology of intergroup relations: Can research inform practice? *Journal of Social Issues*, *53*, 197−211.

Brewer, M. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 429−444.

Brewer, M. (2007). Evolving perspectives on ingroup–outgroup relations. In T. L. Pittinsky (Chair), *Positive intergroup relations*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the 8th annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Memphis, TN.

Brewer, M. B., & Alexander, M. G. (2003). Intergroup emotions and images. In D. M. Mackie & E.R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 209−225). New York: Psychology Press.

Brewer, M., & Caporael, L. (2006). *An evolutionary perspective on social identity: Revisiting groups.* Madison, CT: Psychosocial Press.

Brewer, M., & Kramer, R. (1986). Choice behavior in social dilemmas: Effects of social identity, group size, and decision framing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*, 543−549.

Brown, A., Kaser, M., & Smith (Eds.). (1994). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of Russia and the former Soviet Union*, (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bryson, J., & Crosby, B. (2006). *Leadership for the common good.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Oxford, UK: Harper & Row.

Byrne, D. (1971). *The attraction paradigm.* New York: Academic Press.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Berntson, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, *115*, 401−424.

Cameron, J., & Berry, J. W. (1990, April). *Intergroup attitudes: Self-esteem and threats to identity*. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association Meeting, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, *3*, 14−25.

Campbell, D. T. (1965). Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Carnevale, P. J., & Pruitt, D. G. (2000). *Negotiation in social conflict*, (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Castano, E., Sacchi, S., & Gries, P. H. (2003). The perception of the other in international relations: Evidence for the polarizing effect of entitativity. *Political Psychology*, *24*, 449−468.

Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Study*, *13*, 24−37.

Conger, J., Kanungo, R., & Menon, S. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 747−767.

Coser, L. (1956). *The functions of social conflict.* New York: Free Press.

Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Multiple categorization and implicit intergroup bias: Differential category dominance and the positive–negative asymmetry effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 45−62.

Dasgupta, N., & Rivera, L. M. (2006). From automatic antigay prejudice to behavior: The moderating role of conscious beliefs about gender and behavioral control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 268−280.

De Cremer, D., & Tyler, T. (2007). The effects of trust in authority and procedural fairness on cooperation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 639−649.

De Cremer, D., Tyler, T., & den Ouden, N. (2005). Managing cooperation via procedural fairness: The mediating influence of self-other merging. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *26*, 393−406.

De Cremer, D., van Dijke, M., & Bos, A. E. R. (2006). Leader's procedural justice affecting identification and trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *27*, 554−565.

De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation? The effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 858−866.

Deschamps, J. C., & Doise, W. (1978). Crossed category memberships in intergroup relations. In T. H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups* (pp. 141−158). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R. M. (1960). The effect of threat upon interpersonal bargaining. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *61*, 181−189.

Dienstbier, R. A. (1970). Positive and negative prejudice: Interactions of prejudice with race and social desirability. *Journal of Personality*, *38*, 198−215.

Dijker, A. J. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *17*, 305−325.

Dobbins, G., & Zaccaro, S. (1986). The effects of group cohesion and leader behavior on subordinate satisfaction. *Group & Organization Studies*, *11*, 203−219.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Lamoreaux, M. J. (2007). In T. L. Pittinsky (Ed.), *Crossing the divide: Intergroup leadership in a world of difference* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Dowd, M. (1996, September 12). Liberties: The man in the mirror. *The New York Times* (pp. A23).

Duck, J. M., & Fielding, K. S. (1999). Leaders and subgroups: One of us or one of them? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *2*, 203−230.

Duck, J., & Fielding, K. (2003). Leaders and their treatment of subgroups: Implications for evaluations of the leader and the superordinate group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 387−401.

Duckitt, J., Callaghan, J., & Wagner, C. (2005). Group identification and outgroup attitudes in four South African ethnic groups: A multidimensional approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 633−646.

Eggins, R., Haslam, S., & Reynolds, K. (2002). Social identity and negotiation: Subgroup representation and superordinate consensus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 887−899.

European Network Against Racism (ENAR). (2007). *About ENAR.* Retrieved September 4, 2007, from http://www.enar-eu.org/en/about/

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2007). *Welcome to the website of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA).* Retrieved September 4, 2007, from http://fra.europa.eu/fra/index.php

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117−140.

Fisher, R. J. (2000). Intergroup conflict. InM. Deutsch, P. T. Coleman, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 176−196). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Forsyth, D. R. (2006). *Group dynamics* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Fox, W. M. (1957). Group reaction to two types of conference leadership. *Human Relations*, *10*, 279−289.

Fox-Wolfgramm, S. J., Boal, K. B., & Hunt, J. G. (1998). Organizational adaptation to institutional change: A comparative study of first-order change in prospector and defender banks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 87−126.

Frederickson, G. M. (1999). Models of American ethnic relations: A historical perspective. In D. A. Prentice & D.T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 23−34). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, *2*, 300−319.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 218−226.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61−89). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology: Vol. 4* (pp. 1–26). London: Wiley.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Banker, B. S., Houlette, M., Johnson, K. M., & McGlynn, E. A. (2000). Reducing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorization, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *4*, 98–114.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Nier, J. A., Ward, C. M., & Banker, B. S. (1999). *Across cultural divides: The value of a superordinate identity.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gaertner, S., Mann, J., Dovidio, J., Murrell, A., & Pomare, M. (1990). How does cooperation reduce intergroup bias? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 692−704.

Gaertner, S., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 239−249.

Gaertner, L., & Schopler, J. (1998). Perceived ingroup entitativity and intergroup bias: An interconnection of self and others. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *28*, 963−980.

Gibson, J. L. (2006). Do strong group identities fuel intolerance? Evidence from the South African case. *Political Psychology*, *27*, 665−705.

Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1970). *Beyond the melting pot.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Goethals, G. R. (2005). Presidential leadership. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*, 545−570.

Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1105−1118.

Hancock, C. L. (1994). Cicero versus Machiavelli: Does the end justify the means? *Contemporary Philosophy*, *16*, 8−28.

Hermann, M. G., & Hagan, J. D. (1998). International decision making: Leadership matters. *Foreign Policy*, *110*, 124−137.

Hermann, M., & Kegley, J. (1996). Ballots, a barrier against the use of bullets and bombs. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *40*, 436−459.

Herrmann, R. K., Voss, J. F., Schooler, T. Y. E., & Ciarrochi, J. (1997). Images in international relations: An experimental test of cognitive schemata. *International Studies Quarterly*, *41*, 403−433.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1−44). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hickman, G. (2004). *Organizations of hope: Leading the way to transformation, social action, and profitability.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Construction and critical advances* (pp. 48−70). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Ho, C., & Jackson, J. W. (2001). Attitudes toward Asian Americans: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*, 1553−1581.

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

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000a). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *4*, 143−156.

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000b). Subgroup relations: A comparison of mutual intergroup differentiation and common ingroup identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 242−256.

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2002). The effects of status on subgroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 203−218.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Gupta, V. & GLOBE Associates (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoyt, C. L., & Chemers, M. M. (in press). *Social stigma and leadership*. In C. L. Hoyt, G. R. Goethals, & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.). Social psychology and leadership. New York: Praeger.

Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2004). Ambiguity in social categorization: The role of prejudice and facial affect in race categorization. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 342−345.

Hughes, J., Campbell, A., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2007). Segregation in Northern Ireland: Implications for community relations policy. *Policy Studies*, *28*, 35−53.

Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Sorenson, R. L. (1990). Top management leadership: Inside the black box. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 41−65.

Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Sawahata, R., & Deang, J. M. (2005). Leadership and the management of conflicts in diverse groups: Why acknowledging versus neglecting subgroup identity matters. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 237−254.

Jackson, J. W. (1993). Realistic group conflict theory: A review and evaluation of the theoretical and empirical literature. *Psychological Record*, *43*, 395−495.

Janis, I. L. (1982). Counteracting the adverse effect of concurrence-seeking in policy-planning groups: Theory and research perspectives. In H. Brandstatter, J. H. Davis, & G. Stocker-Kreichgauer (Eds.), *Group decision making* (pp. 311−313). New York: Academic Press.

Jetten, J., Duck, J., Terry, D. J., & O'Brien, A. (2002). Being attuned to intergroup differences in mergers: The role of aligned leaders for low-status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 1194−1201.

Johnston, R., Poulsen, M., & Forrest, J. (2007). Ethnic and racial segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas, 1980–2000. *Urban Affairs Review*, *42*, 479−504.

Jung, D. I., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups. *Small Group Research*, *33*, 313−336.

Katz, N. (2001). Sports teams as a model for workplace teams: Lessons and liabilities. *Academy of Management Executive*, *3*, 56−69.

Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Khalilzad, Z. (2006). *U.S. envoy outlines political blueprint for Iraq.* U.S. Dept. of State Retrieved August 21, 2007, from http://usinfo.state.gov/mena/Archive/2006/Feb/13-462544.html

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, *10*, 257−274.

Kramer, R. M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchic relation: Trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In R. M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 216−245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. M. (2007). Leadership and trust-building in intergroup negotiations: Structures, processes, and outcomes. In T. L. Pittinsky (Ed.). *Crossing the divide: Intergroup leadership in a world of difference*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kramer, R., & Brewer, M. (1984). Effects of group identity on resource use in a simulated commons dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 1044−1057.

LaFromboise, T. D., & Rowe, W. (1983). Skills training for bicultural competence: Rationale and application. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *30*, 589−595.

Larson, M. J. (2003). Low-power contributions in multilateral negotiations: A framework analysis. *Negotiation Journal*, *19*, 133−149.

Lawler, E. E. (2004). Leading a virtuous-spiral organization. *Leader to Leader*, *32*, 32−40.

Lerner, J. S., Gonzalez, R. M., Small, D. A., & Fischhoff, B. (2003). Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment. *Psychological Science*, *14*, 144−150.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 438−458.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers.* New York: Harper.

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

Lorenzi, P. (2004). Managing for the common good: Prosocial leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *33*, 282−291.

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 602−616.

Maitner, A. T., Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2006). Evidence for the regulatory function of intergroup emotion: Emotional consequences of implemented or impeded intergroup action tendencies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *42*, 720−728.

Markides, K., & Cohn, S. (1982). External conflict/internal cohesion: A reevaluation of an old theory. *American Sociological Review*, *47*, 88−98.

Miller, D. A., Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2004). Effects of intergroup contact and political predispositions on prejudice: Role of intergroup emotions. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *7*, 221−237.

Moghaddam, F. M., & Solliday, E. A. (1991). "Balanced multiculturalism" and the challenge of peaceful coexistence in pluralistic societies. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, *3*, 51−71.

Montoya, R. M., & Horton, R. S. (2004). On the importance of cognitive evaluation as a determinant of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 696−712.

Mummendey, M., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 158−174.

Nelson, T. D. (2006). *The psychology of prejudice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nye, J. S. (1963). East African economic integration. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, *1*, 475−502.

Nye, J. S. (1967). *Pan-Africanism and east African integration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nye, J. S. (2007). *Understanding international conflict: An introduction to theory and history.* New York: Longman.

Oberschall, A. (2000). The manipulation of ethnicity: From ethnic cooperation to violence and war in Yugoslavia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *23*, 982−1001.

Park, B., & Judd, C. (2005). Rethinking the link between categorization and prejudice within the social cognition perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *9*, 108−130.

Park, B., & Ryan, C. S. (1991). Social categorization and the representation of variability information. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology*, *Vol. 2* (pp. 211–245). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Paskevich, D., Brawley, L., Dorsch, K., & Widmeyer, W. (1999). Relationship between collective efficacy and team cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. *Group Dynamics, Theory, Research, and Practice*, *3*, 210−222.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1986). The intergroup contact hypothesis reconsidered. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 169−195). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Pettigrew, T. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65−85.

Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751−783.

Pfeifer, D. M., Love, M., & Jackson, B. (2006). Indigenous leadership at the crossroads: The Hui Taumata as a case study of allophilia. In N. S. Huber & M. Harvey (Eds.), *Leadership at the Crossroads.* College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.

Phillips, S. T., & Ziller, R. C. (1997). Toward a theory and measure of the nature of nonprejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 420−434.

Pittinsky, T. L. (2005). Allophilia: A framework for intergroup leadership. In N. Huber & M. Walker (Eds.), *Building leadership bridges: Emergent models of global leadership* (pp. 34−49). College Park, MD: International Leadership Association.

Pittinsky, T. L. (2007). The science and practice of intergroup leadership. In T. L. Pittinsky (Ed.), *Crossing the divide: Intergroup leadership in a world of difference*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pittinsky, T. L., & Montoya, R. M. (in press). Is valuing equality enough? Equality values, allophilia, and social policy support for multiracial individuals. *Journal of Social Issues*.

Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., Bacon, L. M., Montoya, R. M., & Zhu, W. (2006). *National Leadership Index 2006: A national study of confidence in leadership.* Cambridge, MA: Center for Public Leadership, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Pittinsky, T. L., Rosenthal, S. A., & Montoya, R. M. (2007). *The allophilia scale: Development and validation of a measure of positive intergroup attitudes*. Unpublished manuscript.

Pittinsky, T. L., Shih, M., & Ambady, N. (1999). Identity adaptiveness: Affect across multiple identities. *Journal of Social Issues*, *55*, 503−518.

Platow, M., Hoar, S., Reid, S., Harley, K., & Morrison, D. (1997). Endorsement of distributively fair and unfair leaders in interpersonal and intergroup situations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *27*, 465−494.

Platow, M., O'Connell, A., Shave, R., & Hanning, P. (1995). Social evaluations of fair and unfair allocators in interpersonal and intergroup situations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *34*, 363−381.

Price, T. (2006). *Understanding ethical failures in leadership.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement.* New York: Random House.

Rabbie, J., & Bekkers, F. (1978). Threatened leadership and intergroup competition. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *8*, 9−20.

Ratcliff, J., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2007). *Unmixed positive regard: How warmth and competence stereotypes lead to outgroup support*. Manuscript in preparation.

Reicher, S. D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. (2007). The new psychology of leadership. *Scientific American Mind*, *8*, 22−29.

Richeson, J. A., & Nussbaum, R. J. (2004). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *40*, 417−423.

Ripsman, N. (2005). Two stages of transition from a region of war to a region of peace: Realist transition and liberal endurance. *International Studies Quarterly*, *49*, 669−694.

Roosevelt, T. R. (1989). Americanism. *Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedia*, (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Meckler (Original work published 1916).

Rosenbaum, M. E. (1986). The repulsion hypothesis: On the nondevelopment of relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1156−1166.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* New York: Praeger.

Saunders, M. N. K., & Thornhill, A. (2004). Trust and mistrust in organizations: An exploration using an organizational justice framework. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *13*, 493−515.

Saville-Troike, M. (1981). *The development of bilingual and bicultural competence in young children.*Urbana, IL: Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 376).

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 387−409.

Sherif, M. (1966). *The psychology of social norms.* Oxford, UK: Harper Torchbooks.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1979). Research on intergroup relations. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L., & Ambady, N. (1999). Stereotype susceptibility: Identity salience and shifts in quantitative performance. *Psychological Science*, *10*, 80−83.

Sin, C. H. (2003). The politics of ethnic integration in Singapore: Malay "regrouping" as an ideological construct. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *27*, 527−544.

Singh, R., Ho, L., Tan, H., & Bell, P. (2007). Attitudes, personal evaluations, cognitive evaluation and interpersonal attraction: On the direct, indirect and reverse-causal effects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*, 19−42.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1991). Terror management theory of self-esteem. In C. R. Snyder & D.R. Forsyth (Eds.), *Handbook of social and clinical psychology: The health perspective* (pp. 21−40). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Sommers, S. R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 597−612.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinant of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, *9*, 359−380.

Sternberg, R. (2007). A systems model of leadership: WICS. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 34−42.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways.* Boston: Ginn.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33−48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

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

Taylor, D. M., & Lambert, W. E. (1996). The meaning of multiculturalism in a culturally diverse urban American area. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *136*, 727−740.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Transue, J. E. (2007). Identity salience, identity acceptance, and racial policy attitudes: American national identity as a uniting force. *American Journal of Political Science*, *51*, 78−91.

Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances of group processes.* Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Tyler, T. R. (2000). Social justice: Outcome and procedure. *International Journal of Psychology*, *35*, 117−125.

Tyler, T. R. (2002). Leadership and cooperation in groups. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*, 769−782.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *7*, 349−361.

Tyler, T. R., & De Cremer, D. (2005). Process-based leadership: Fair procedures and reactions to organizational change. *Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 529−545.

Ulrich, J., Christ, O., & Schlüter, E. (2006). Merging on Mayday: Subgroup and superordinate identification as joint moderators of threat effects in the context of European Union's expansion. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*, 857−876.

Urban, L. M., & Miller, N. (1998). A theoretical analysis of crossed categorization effects: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 894−908.

Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M., & Weber, U. (2003). Towards tolerance: Representations of superordinate categories and perceived ingroup prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 31−47.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Walumbwa, F., Wang, P., Lawler, J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *77*, 515−530.

Weinberg, R., & McDermott, M. (2002). A comparative analysis of sport and business organizations: Factors perceived critical for organizational success. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *14*, 282−289.

Williams, R. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions: A survey of research on problems of ethnic, racial, and religious group relations.* New York: Social Science Research Council.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C., & Bachelor, J. (2003). Intergroup contact: Effects on group evaluations and perceived variability. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 93−110.

Zangwill, I. (2005). The melting-pot. In I. Zangwill (Ed.), *The melting pot drama in four acts.* Whitefish, MT: Kessinger (Original work published 1908).