Faculty Research Working Papers Series

Allophilia and Intergroup Leadership

Todd L. Pittinsky

May 2005

RWP05-038

Allophilia and Intergroup Leadership

Todd L. Pittinsky
Harvard University

Keywords: allophilia, intergroup leadership

Correspondence should be directed to:

Todd L. Pittinsky
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
79 J.F.K. Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
todd_pittinsky@harvard.edu
Phone: (+1) 617-384-7283

Citation:

Pittinsky, T. L. (2005). *Allophilia and intergroup leadership*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Abstract

One of the most pressing concerns confronting leaders is intergroup conflict, often inspired or facilitated by prejudice. Not only might leaders inherit conflicts between political, religious, or organizational groups, but they may unwittingly contribute to them. Foundations of strong *intragroup* leadership, such as fostering strong group identification and cohesion, are often stepping stones to *intergroup* conflict. I refer to this as the “ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff.” While the reduction of prejudice is essential to the reduction of intergroup conflict, I argue that the necessary approach is not to replace prejudice with the neutral stance of tolerance. Something critical lies beyond the reduction of prejudice and the promotion of tolerance: positive intergroup attitudes, *allophilia*. While the academic and applied literature on intergroup relations is well supplied with terms for negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., xenophobia, sexism, racism, anti-Americanism, classism, ageism, homophobia), there are surprisingly few terms for positive intergroup attitudes. Allophilia is a term I coin, derived from the Greek words meaning “liking or love of the other” (2). The concept of allophilia provides a powerful anchor for a new framework for understanding intergroup leadership. To initiate the development of a framework of allophilia and leadership, I address three interrelated questions in this article: (1) What is allophilia in the context of intergroup relations?; (2) What role does—and might—allophilia play in intergroup leadership?; and (3) What are the keys to further developing allophilia as a framework for intergroup leadership theory and practice? The framework prompts leaders to push their societies and the world community away from the natural direction in which individuals and social systems might otherwise unfold, leading them instead on a trajectory of positive intergroup relations.

Allophilia and Intergroup Leadership

Leaders confront many challenges that are rooted in conflict among social identity groups. Not only might they inherit conflicts between political, religious, or organizational groups, but they may unwittingly contribute to them. When one considers ingroup leadership in the context of intergroup relations, a tradeoff quickly surfaces. Foundations of strong *intragroup* leadership, such as fostering strong group identification and cohesion, are often stepping stones to *intergroup* conflict. I refer to this as the “ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff.” This insight of the ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff builds on classic work by sociologists and more recent work by psychologists, work which examines the tradeoff between internal cohesion and external conflict (e.g., Markides & Cohn, 1982) but does not focus on the perspective of groups’ leaders.

Leaders whose concern is restricted to the members their own ingroup are likely to sacrifice intergroup relations for ingroup leadership. Some make the tradeoff quite deliberately, exploiting, or in some cases creating, intergroup hostilities to rally followers and enhance ingroup cohesion in pursuit of their goals (Bekkers, 1977). In other words, while leaders can establish credibility, define constituencies, and motivate followers through ingroup identities (“we are X” and “X is good”), they can also do so through intergroup identities (“we are not Y” and “Y is bad”). Leaders whose positions are threatened may be more likely to initiate conflict and competition with another group in order to hold on to their power (1). Leaders will scapegoat or demonize the people of other nations to build support for war or to achieve domestic objectives (Hermann & Kegley, 1995).

For leaders who define their sphere of concern and their constituencies more broadly than their own ingroup, balancing the ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff is essential but problematic. Some of the most important acts of leadership bring mutually hostile identity groups (e.g., ethnic, national, religious, linguistic, and others) into harmony.

Because the actions of the former group of leaders are so harmful and the success of the latter group is so important, the study of the intersection of leadership and intergroup attitudes is crucial to a science of leadership studies. The central questions of

such a study might be “how can negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., prejudice) be reduced?” and “how can leaders promote tolerance for members of other identity groups?”

In fact, these questions are not sufficient for theory and the goals they proclaim are not sufficient for the practice of leadership to reduce and prevent conflict. Something critical lies beyond the reduction of prejudice and the promotion of tolerance. Beyond tolerance lie positive intergroup attitudes, *allophilia*. While the academic and applied literature on intergroup relations is well supplied with terms for negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., xenophobia, sexism, racism, anti-Americanism, classism, ageism, homophobia), there are surprisingly few terms for positive intergroup attitudes. Allophilia is a term I coin, derived from the Greek words meaning “liking or love of the other.” The concept of allophilia provides a powerful anchor for a new framework for understanding intergroup leadership.

This article introduces the framework of allophilia for understanding leader effects on intergroup attitudes. I argue that allophilia promotion, rather than prejudice reduction, is a primary and under-examined facet of leadership. To contribute to a deeper understanding of allophilia and leadership, I address three interrelated questions:

- What is allophilia in the context of intergroup relations?
- What role does—and might—allophilia play in intergroup leadership?
- What are the keys to further developing allophilia as a framework for intergroup leadership theory and practice?

Allophilia in Intergroup Relations

The story of intergroup relations in the world is often the story of entrenched hatred, intolerance, and violent conflict. Negative attitudes in the form of prejudice are often a critical trigger to intergroup conflict. Gordon Allport (1954) put forth the classic definition of prejudice: an antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalization. Prejudice may be experienced as strong negative feelings and/or expressed through behavior. Some subsequent definitions of prejudice have suggested that it can entail not only strong dislike, but also strong liking for the members of another social identity group. However, when prejudice is operationalized by researchers, and when it is

discussed by practitioners, only negative prejudices are emphasized (3). Scant attention has been paid in scholarship or communities of practice to positive prejudices. I introduce the concept and term *allophilia* to the literature to focus attention on under-investigated positive feelings toward members of outgroups.

Allophilia is theoretically fascinating and practically useful, offering a compelling anchor for a framework of intergroup leadership. Figure 1 locates *allophilia* vis-à-vis its related constructs of (negative) prejudice and tolerance. When leaders wish to reduce prejudice, the typical remedy they seek is to bring their groups into a state of tolerance. However, tolerance is not the logical antithesis of prejudice, but rather is the midpoint between negative feelings and positive feelings toward others. The introduction of *allophilia*, positive intergroup attitudes, as an anchor identifies a new domain for theory, research, and leader interventions beyond prejudice reduction: *allophilia* enhancement.

Figure 1. *Prejudice, Tolerance, and Allophilia*

Why have intergroup researchers overlooked the study of *allophilia*? Why are positive intergroup attitudes so under-theorized and under-studied? One reason is that prejudice has caused so much suffering that researchers have felt compelled to address it. A second reason is that, while prejudices are widely held throughout the world, *allophilia* may be less common. Negative intergroup attitudes may not only be more prevalent than positive intergroup attitudes, they may also be more natural. For example, evidence suggests that when constructing identities, people are accepting of those who are familiar and similar, but will distance themselves from those who are dissimilar and less familiar (Druckman, 1994). Social psychological research has shown that merely dividing participants into groups based on minimal and arbitrary criteria will lead individuals to prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory acts, both in favor of “their own” and at the expense of “the others” (Brewer, 1979; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Tajfel, 1982).

Prejudicial attitudes are so rooted in individual psychology and so perpetuated by our social systems that individuals will engage in discriminatory acts even to the disadvantage of their own groups.

The fact that allophilia is less common than prejudice is not, however, a valid reason for scholars and practitioners to overlook it (4). Some of the most important human experiences occur only infrequently. In fact, allophilia's rarity may suggest that its occurrence is related to acts of transformational leadership.

Allophilia and Intergroup Leadership

To understand leader effects on intergroup allophilia, it is instructive to first consider the general impact of leaders on intergroup attitudes. There is little question that leaders can exert powerful influence over their followers' attitudes (5). In a seminal study of intergroup relations, Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif (1961), identified leadership as a critical factor in intergroup attitudes and relations. Others (e.g., Grove, 2001) have expanded on this idea by suggesting that leadership can interact with ingroup and outgroup attitudes (e.g., nationalism) to incite nationalist mobilization (Grove, 2001).

Figure 2 illustrates a range of possible feelings a follower might have for members of another social identity group under conditions of weak or strong ingroup leadership.

Figure 2. *Follower Attitudes towards Ingroup and Outgroup Members*

		Attitudes toward outgroup members		
		Prejudice	Tolerance	Allophilia
Ingroup leadership	Strong	A.	B.	C.
	Weak	D.	E.	F.

The “ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff” referenced earlier refers to the possibility that the same things a leader does to promote strong ingroup leadership (i.e., promote group cohesion and encourage strong identification) may exacerbate conflict

with other groups. For some “bad” leaders (Kellerman, 2004), this may be a desirable outcome. They are content to sacrifice intergroup leadership in order to be strong ingroup leaders. This is represented by Cell A—strong ingroup leadership accompanied by prejudice toward the outgroup. Cell B, in which there is strong ingroup leadership and tolerance for the outgroup, is the focus of many analyses and popular normative interventions, and is often considered the desirable state to be achieved. However, Cell C, in which there are both strong ingroup leadership and *positive* attitudes for outgroup members, is the overlooked cell, which the allophilia and intergroup leadership framework highlights. Here are the loftiest of leadership ambitions. Because the combination of strong ingroup leadership and positive attitudes for outgroup members is uncommon and difficult to achieve, this may also be the cell where the strongest and best leadership is required. In Cells D, E, and F, ingroup leadership is weak so there is no ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff.

Allophilia promotion requires strong and skillful leadership for at least two reasons. First, it is likely that allophilia promotion requires that people be pushed beyond their natural predispositions to prejudice. Second, it requires leaders to abstain from some very effective strategies for consolidating their own power.

Several leadership strategies might be considered as alternatives to allophilia promotion: prejudice reduction, superordinate goals and superordinate identities, intergroup contact, and individuation. Each is intended to improve intergroup attitudes, and by extension, to improve intergroup relations. While investigating these alternative strategies, I will simultaneously explore whether allophilia enhancement is necessary for improving intergroup relations.

Prejudice Reduction

A leader can demonstrate intergroup leadership by calling on followers to feel, or at least to show, less prejudice toward members of other social identity groups; the ultimate goal is tolerance. For example, in the wake of the September 11th terrorist attacks in the United States, several American civil rights leaders pled for tolerance toward Arab-Americans.

But is tolerance promotion a sufficient leadership strategy to reduce intergroup

conflict? It appears not to be for at least two reasons. The first is realistic group conflict (Blake & Mouton, 1961; Diab, 1970; Sherif, 1966; Sherif et al., 1961). Groups may engage in competitive activities where one group's victory necessarily harms the other's interests. Such "real" conflict leads to frustration, antagonism, and—ultimately—prejudice. A vicious cycle occurs in which individuals on each side become more strongly identified and attached to their own group and thus become even more antagonistic toward the other. Even if intergroup relations are stabilized at the level of tolerance, they will quickly disintegrate into prejudice when real-world conflicts arise. Therefore, countervailing forces in the direction of allophilia need to be introduced. This way, when problems born of actual conflict arise, intergroup relations are likely to deteriorate to the level of tolerance but not to the level of prejudice.

The second reason is the human predisposition toward categorical thinking. The last three decades of social cognition research have demonstrated quite powerfully that humans are hard-wired and predisposed to category-based thinking. Thus, prejudices are, in part, a byproduct of the way our minds naturally organize information. Because of this, anchoring intergroup relations at the point of tolerance is not a strong enough countervailing force to keep groups from slipping back into prejudice, whereas anchoring intergroup relations in allophilia may be.

Figure 3 locates the direction in which realistic conflict and categorical thinking move intergroup attitudes; it illustrates the importance of leader efforts to foster allophilia in order to counteract these influences.

Figure 3. *Realistic Conflict, Categorical Thinking, Prejudice, Tolerance, and Allophilia*

Superordinate Goals and Superordinate Identities

Research suggests that recategorizing the members of a different identity group as part of one's own ingroup can reduce intergroup conflict; negative intergroup attitudes

vanish as the outgroup becomes part of the ingroup. Leaders may therefore try to compel their followers to expand their view of the ingroup to encompass the outgroup. Working cooperatively is particularly effective at dissolving former subgroups into a new, inclusive group (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993; Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker, 1999; Gaertner, Dovidio, Rust, Nier, Banker, Ward, Mottola, & Houlette, 1999). Nonaggression within certain groups, such as the community of liberal democratic nations, may result from leaders and citizens of these countries identifying themselves as part of a larger single ingroup, all of whose members deserve mutual support (Hermann & Kegley, 1995; Mintz & Geva, 1993). In fact, wars are less easily justified against those who are similar to us, and are more often fought between states with different political systems than between states with similar political systems (Hermann & Kegley, 1995; Maoz & Abdolali, 1989; Maoz & Russett, 1993, 1992).

Recategorization can occur through the emphasis of similarity and the de-emphasis of differences. The salience of a cross-cutting social identity has been shown to influence intergroup relations (e.g., Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P., 2005; Marcus-Newball, Miller, Holtz, & Brewer, 1993; Silver & Brewer, 1997; Urban & Miller, 1998). Psychological research on cross cutting identities draws on insights from anthropology (e.g. Murphy, 1957), sociology (e.g., Coser, 1956), and political science (e.g., Almond & Verba, 1963; Lipset, 1960).

Recategorization can also occur through the introduction of superordinate identities or superordinate goals. Superordinate identities are overarching categories, such as national identity in a nation comprising distinct ethnic populations. Superordinate goals are shared by two or more groups who rely on each others' support to achieve them. Superordinate goals change the relationship between groups, breaking the cycle of hostility and conflict. Superordinate identities and superordinate goals may occur naturally, giving leaders the opportunity to highlight them in order to make them salient, or they may be actively promoted. Indeed, leaders are often normatively advised to foster common identities (Kaufmann, 2003) such as pan-ethnic (e.g., Arab), pan-geographic (e.g., African), or pan-religious (e.g., Muslim) identities.

Nevertheless, superordinate identities and superordinate goals, and the recategorization processes they stimulate, are not sufficient leadership practices to reduce

intergroup prejudice and conflict. Some differences between social identity groups are bona fide and robust. Leaders may strategically emphasize commonalities to attain shorter-term goals, but the differences are likely to reemerge over time. Bad leaders (Kellerman, 2004) will go so far as to exaggerate and even fabricate such differences in order to capitalize on them politically. For example, in the past, Serbs and Croats spoke a common language known as Serbo-Croatian. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, nationalist leaders in the two independent and hostile nations, Serbia and Croatia, each claimed to have their own languages: Serbian and Croatian. Two separate languages—which for all practical purposes do not exist—have now been constructed and two separate linguistic identity groups have been created, a powerful illustration of the ingroup/outgroup leadership tradeoff. In Rwanda, bad leaders capitalized on differences in the physical features of Tutsis and Hutus to strengthen ingroup cohesion and promote intergroup conflict in the form of a civil war culminating in genocide, undoing six hundred years of shared commerce, language, culture, and intermarriage.

Because group differences are sometimes genuine and robust and may even be desirable (Hornsey & Hogg, 2002), and because perceptions of difference can so easily be created (even without any factual basis) and manipulated, recategorization strategies such as superordinate goals and superordinate identities are not sufficient to reduce intergroup prejudice and conflict. Such strategies may work in laboratory settings, but in the real world, identity groups prove to be remarkably resilient. Superordinate groups working toward superordinate goals can quickly splinter again, with disastrous outcomes. Leaders must attend directly their followers' attitudes toward "the other" rather than hoping to make "the other" vanish into "us."

Recategorization strategies also run afoul of a level-of-analysis paradox: rather than eliminating a conflict, they may simply move it to a higher level of social organization. U.S. President Reagan (1985, p. 1434) recognized this in a description of meetings with then-General Secretary Gorbachev:

Just think how easy his task and mine might be in these meetings that we held if suddenly there was a threat to this world from some other species, from another planet, outside in the universe. We'd forget all the little local

differences that we have between our countries ...

Hackman similarly observes: “The best way to get peace on earth is an invasion from Mars” (J. R. Hackman, lecture, fall 1999). Indeed, superordinate groups are often created in response to a threat from an outgroup. But the accompanying positive attitudes and reduced conflict are predicated on other negative attitudes and other increased conflict. Often the positive attitudes that threats promote will not outlast the threat that created them. After the rival Athenians and Spartans joined forces against a mutual enemy during the Persian Wars (500-449 B.C.), they fought each other in the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.). The alliance of the United States and the Soviet Union against a mutual enemy during World War II was immediately followed by the 44-year Cold War.

Contact

Allport (1954) suggested that contact between groups under optimal conditions would effectively reduce intergroup prejudice; drawing on earlier theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Williams, 1947), he identified those conditions as equal status between groups, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authority (e.g., through laws or customs).

While intergroup contact, under very specific conditions, does appear to help reduce intergroup prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000), encouraging contact is not, however, a sufficient leadership strategy for reducing intergroup conflict for at least four reasons. First, contact has been shown to aid in prejudice reduction in very specific and limited circumstances at best, but has not been shown to foster positive attitudes. Second, contact between group members is not always possible when there is conflict. Third, Allport’s four prerequisite conditions for contact to work are frequently outside a leader’s control, if not downright impossible. This limitation is particularly damning because research has found that the right conditions are critical, and that contact in suboptimal conditions may actually *increase* prejudice. Fourth, contact is not the only determinant of intergroup attitudes; for example, they are also formed by the propensity to categorical

thinking. Thus, while contact may influence intergroup attitudes, it is not a sufficient leadership strategy for reducing intergroup conflict.

Individuation

It is logical to ask why leadership should promote positive attitudes toward some group rather than simply encouraging followers to see members of the outgroup as individuals. However, there are three reasons why it would not be a sufficient strategy to simply think about the members of other identity groups as individuals.

First, most important political and policy decisions are made about groups, not individuals. Some policies are intended to address group-based inequities. Peoples' positions on other policies, for example immigration policies, may be influenced by their attitudes toward outgroups. If leaders promote *no* attitudes about outgroups, then followers are most likely to maintain their negative or neutral attitudes, with deleterious effects on policy.

Second, leaders themselves operate at the group level. Leaders are defined in relation to groups of followers. In situations where conflict might arise, the identity of the conflicting leader and followers are salient as a group, not as individuals.

The third and perhaps most compelling reason is, once again, the human propensity for category-based thinking. Therefore it is essential to balance negative intergroup attitudes with positive intergroup attitudes—allophilia.

Case examples

For all of the reasons noted above, the four intergroup leadership strategies reviewed—prejudice reduction, superordinate goals and superordinate identities, contact, and individuation—are not sufficient to reduce prejudice and reduce conflict. In contrast, allophilia promotion provides a critical framework for the advancement of effective intergroup leadership.

Thus far, we have recognized that allophilia enhancement is a rare but important intergroup leadership strategy. Allophilia may apply to many different types of leadership, including political, quasi-political, religious, organizational, and athletic leadership. One can see glimmers of it in secular and religious leaders' words and actions,

particularly in some of the most widely credited and highly regarded global leaders. While a comprehensive case study is beyond the scope of the current article, consideration of the intergroup relations strategies of a number of transformational leaders (Bass, 1985) suggests that they were very likely motivated by allophilia—positive intergroup attitudes—above and beyond simple tolerance. At the least, these leaders were motivated to promote allophilia as a way to address or prevent conflict.

For example, Nelson Mandela, the renowned South African peacemaker, never wavered on his universal vision of a multi-ethnic South African society. To promote his vision, he learned the language and the history of the “other,” the Afrikaans language and history. At the 1995 Rugby World Cup finals, he cheered for South Africa’s national team, previously regarded as a powerful symbol of “white” nationalism, and sported the team captain’s jersey (Lieberfeld, 2003).

Martin Luther King, Jr. is widely recognized for his leadership in racial desegregation in the United States. But King also waged a war on poverty by initiating a movement known as the Poor People’s Campaign. King attempted to extend the civil rights movement beyond race, and beyond championing the rights of the racial identity group to which he belonged, to include economic class. While it is difficult to infer motives from a distance, the care and attention King paid to exposing the lack of rights and care afforded the poor in the United States, a group to which he did not belong, went far beyond promoting tolerance. Indeed, King was explicit about the importance of moving beyond mere tolerance toward positive intergroup attitudes. He remarked that, while he originally felt love was in the domain of individual relationships, he later concluded that it could be a “potent instrument for social and collective transformation” (Carson, 1998, pp. 23-24).

The allophilia framework may also help us understand the factors that led some individuals to take great personal risks during the Second World War. For example, many Danes resisted German deportation of Jews; a small number of Germans sheltered and protected Jews; and Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat, faked documents to help establish “safe houses” to save Hungarian Jews. Tolerance—the absence of prejudice—is unlikely to fully explain these brave acts. While it is possible that social justice motives, rather than allophilia, may have motivated their first steps, love for the beneficiaries of

these courageous acts may have come to sustain many of the individuals who brought them about.

A widely circulated set of images in the late 1980s showed Princess Diana hugging children with HIV, and she was often seen with children in developing countries by her side. These images surfaced in a time when people were tremendously fearful of direct social contact with those with HIV. These children were, for western audiences, the “other,” suffering from a largely misunderstood illness and separated from the Princess by economic class, ethnicity, and geography. This pairing powerfully captured the differences between the Princess and the children, and her act—a simple hug—demonstrated for the world not just tolerance for the other, but love.

Allophilia in Intergroup Leadership Theory and Practice: An Agenda

Much work remains to be done to advance a framework for intergroup leadership based on allophilia enhancement as an emergent model of leadership. A major direction for work on the allophilia and intergroup leadership framework will entail multifaceted research to understand the components and factors of allophilia. This will help us to research practical intervention strategies that leaders can use to foster allophilia.

At present, allophilia is best understood as a general, theoretical construct. However, researchers are currently developing a more nuanced and precise empirical understanding of allophilia (Pittinsky & Rosenthal, 2005). This research will enable us to identify and measure the specific factors that make up the general construct of allophilia. In order to accomplish this, over 3,500 statements describing facets of allophilia were collected from a diverse cohort of 281 respondents: 65% female, 35% male; aged 18 to 74. Thirty-three percent of the respondents were non-white; 46% were from outside the United States. These descriptions of allophilia were rephrased in the form of questions, redundancies were eliminated, and the 122 most compelling and relevant questions were selected for further study. These questions were then customized to measure allophilia toward a specific social identity group and administered to approximately 300 research participants. A preliminary statistical factor analysis of these data revealed several factors or components of allophilia, including: (1) respecting the group, (2) believing that positive traits characterize the group, (3) seeing the group as competent, (4) feeling

connected to the members of the group, and (5) feeling warm toward the members of the group. These factors were moderately correlated, suggesting that they are conceptually related to each other, but they also each contributed independent variance, suggesting that they each offer distinct insights into allophilia.

Continued work on the factors of allophilia will yield not only theoretical knowledge, but also critical insight into leadership practice. Our factor analysis will yield a measurement tool (i.e., a questionnaire) for the empirical study of allophilia in intergroup leadership; investigation of allophilia as a predictor variable, an outcome variable, and a mediator or moderator variable can then begin in earnest. Furthermore, each factor of allophilia brought to light will suggest a lens through which positive intergroup attitudes can be understood and a means by which they can be fostered by leaders.

Conclusion

One of the most pressing concerns confronting leaders is intergroup conflict, often inspired or facilitated by prejudice. While the reduction of prejudice is essential, I argue that the necessary approach is not to replace prejudice with the neutral stance of tolerance but with positive intergroup attitudes—allophilia. A framework of intergroup leadership anchored in allophilia prompts leaders to push their societies and the world community away from the natural direction in which individuals and social system might otherwise unfold, leading them instead on a trajectory of positive intergroup relations.

Notes

- (1) George Orwell's novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), suggests that leaders might entirely fabricate an external enemy in order to create the conditions for followership.
- (2) For example, a full text keyword search for "allophilia" in the following online databases produced no results: Academic Search Premier (EBSCOhost), PsycINFO, Sociofile, Educational Resource Information Center (EBSCOhost), JSTOR, PAIS (Public Affairs Information Service) and LexisNexis.
- (3) Similar behavior can be observed in the literature on stereotypes. It is overwhelmingly the study of negative stereotypes, with very little theoretical or empirical work on positive stereotypes (Pittinsky, Shih, & Ambady, 2000; Shih, Pittinsky, & Ambady, 1999).
- (4) I am indebted to Harvard psychologist J. Richard Hackman for pointing out that Chris Argyris' work on authenticity is noteworthy in this regard. Wishing to study authenticity, Argyris was confronted with an obstacle: it occurs only infrequently. Believing authenticity was nonetheless important to study, he created laboratory conditions under which it was likely to be expressed; in those settings he began his influential research.
- (5) A body of work applies Social Identity Theory (SIT) to leadership. In this literature, SIT, a lynchpin construct of intergroup relations research, is often profitably applied to *intragroup* leadership dynamics. For examples, see the work of Chen and Van Velsor (1996), Hogg (2001), and Van Vugt and De Cremer (1999). For applications of SIT to *intergroup* leadership dynamics, see Duck and Fielding (1999); Turner, J. C. & Haslam, S. A. (2001); Hogg (1996); Jetten, Duck, Terry, and O'Brien (2002); Katz (1977); Platow, Hoar, Reid, Harley, and Morrison (1997); Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif (1961); and De Cremer and Van

Vugt (2002).

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Seth Rosenthal and John Elder for helpful comments on an early draft of this article, Katherine Chen and Kathleen Kaminski for research assistance, and Joe Bourneuf, Head of Reference for Widener Library at Harvard College, for his help with Greek conjugations. The Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government provided financial support.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes in five nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bekkers, F. (1977). Threatened leadership and intergroup conflicts. *Journal of Peace Research*, 14, 223-247.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1961). Comprehension of own and of outgroup positions under intergroup competition. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 5, 304-310.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005). Social identity complexity and outgroup Tolerance. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 428-437.
- Carson, C. (Ed.). (1998). *The autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Warner Books.
- Chen, C. C., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). New directions for research and practice in diversity leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 285-302.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- De Cremer, D., & Van Vugt, M. (2002). Intergroup and intragroup aspects of leadership in social dilemmas: A relational model of cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 126-136.
- Diab, L. (1970). A study of intragroup and intergroup relations among experimentally produced small groups. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 82, 49-82.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, patriotism, and group loyalty: A social psychological perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 38, 43-68.
- Duck, J. M., & Fielding, K. S. (1999). Leaders and subgroups: One of us or one of them? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 2, 203-230.
- 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. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4, 1-26.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Nier, J. A., Ward, C. M., & Banker, B. S. (1999). Across cultural divides: The value of superordinate identity. In D. A. Prentice and D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173-212). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Rust, M. C., Nier, J., Mottola, G. R. Banker, B., Ward, C. M., & Houlette, M. (1999). Reducing intergroup bias: Elements of intergroup cooperation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 388-402.
- Grove, A. (2001). Theory, perception, and leadership agency: A multiple processing model of nationalist mobilization. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 7, 1-32.
- Hermann, M. G., & Kegley, C. W., Jr. (1995). Rethinking democracy and international peace: Perspectives from political psychology. *International Studies Quarterly*, 39, 511-534.
- Hogg, M. A. (1996). Intragroup processes, group structure, and social identity. In W. Robinson (Ed.), *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel* (pp. 65-93). Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- Hogg, M. A., & Hornsey, M. J. (2002). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 143-158.
- 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.
- Katz, R. (1977). The influence of group conflict in leadership effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20, 265-286.
- Kaufmann, K. M. (2003). Cracks in the rainbow: Growing commonality as a basis for Latino and African-American political coalitions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56, 199-210.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Kelman, H. C. (1986). Interactive problem solving: A social psychological approach to conflict resolution. In W. Klassen (Ed.), *Dialogue toward inter-faith understanding* (pp. 293-314). Tantur/Jerusalem: Ecumenical Institute for Theological Research.
- Lieberfeld, D. (2003). Nelson Mandela: Partisan and peacemaker. *Negotiation Journal*, 19, 229-250.
- Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co.
- Maoz, Z., & Abdolali, N. (1989). Regime types and international conflict, 1816-1976. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 33, 3-35.
- Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1992). Alliance, contiguity, wealth, and political stability: Is the lack of conflict among democracies a statistical artifact? *International Interaction*, 17, 245-267.
- Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1993). Normative and structural causes of democratic peace, 1946-1986. *American Political Science Review*, 87, 624-638.
- Marcus-Newhall, A., Miller, N., Holtz, R., & Brewer, M. B. (1993). Cross-cutting category membership with role assignment: A means of reducing intergroup bias. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 125-146.
- Markides, K., & Cohn, S. F. (1982). Eternal conflict/internal cohesion: A reevaluation of an old theory. *American Sociological Review*, 47, 88-98.
- Messick, D. M., & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 40, 45-81.
- Mintz, A., & Geva, N. (1993). Why don't democracies fight each other? An experimental assessment of the "political incentive" explanation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 37, 484-503.
- Montville, J. V. (1989). *Conflict and peacemaking in multi-ethnic societies*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Murphy, R. F. (1957). Intergroup hostility and social cohesion. *American Anthropologist*, 59, 1018-1035.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and*

- discrimination: The Claremont symposium (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pittinsky, T. L., & Rosenthal, S. The measurement of positive intergroup attitudes: The Allophilia Scale. Unpublished manuscript.
- Pittinsky, T. L., Shih, M., and Ambady, N. (2000). Will a category cue affect you? Category cues, positive stereotypes and recall for applicants. *Social Psychology of Education, 4*, 53-65.
- Platow, M. J., 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.
- Reagan, R. (1985). *Public papers of the presidents of the United States. Ronald Reagan. 1985. Book II. June 29 to December 31, 1985*. Washington, DC: Federal Register Division, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup cooperation and competition: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University Book Exchange.
- Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L., and Ambady, N. (1999). Stereotype susceptibility: Identity salience and shifts in quantitative performance. *Psychological Science, 10*, 81-84.
- Silver, M., & Brewer, M. B. (1997, May). Perceptions of multiple group loyalty, and a new scale for loyalty measurement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, DC.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*, 1-39.
- Turner, J. C., & Haslam, S. A. (2001) Social identity, organizations and leadership. In M. E. Turner (Ed.), *Groups at Work. Advances in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 25-65.
- Urban, L. M., & Miller, N. (1998). A theoretical analysis of cross categorization effects: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 894-908.
- Van Vugt, M., & De Cremer, D. (1999). Leadership in social dilemmas: The effects of group identification on collective actions to provide public goods. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 587-599.

Williams, R. J. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.