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Abstract

Social change is fundamentally a process of collective mobilization—of standing up for what ‘we’ believe in and against which that violates the values that define who ‘we’ are. Leaders play a central role in mobilizing social change. It is through a process of social influence that such a ‘we’ is created, and ultimately, embodied in collective behaviour. Yet, the role of leadership in mobilizing collective understandings are missing in this body of work. While social change has been studied as an intergroup process involving conflict between ‘ingroups’ and ‘outgroups’, leadership analysis has been limited to the study of characteristics and behaviour of individual leaders, the focus being on the (intragroup) relationship between a single leader and a group of followers.

However, to understand the precise processes through which social change is achieved, an intersection of social change and leadership that involves both intra- and intergroup dynamics needs to be considered more explicitly. This thesis will discuss the nature of leadership as a contest for influence, where competing visions for the society that ‘we’ want to become are pitted against one another. Across six studies, we aim to elucidate when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence.

Studies 1 and 2 explored when a leader candidate is successfully able to mobilize the public for change in competition with an existing leader defending the status quo. As predicted, pro-change candidates succeeded in influencing attitude change, securing votes and mobilizing change over a pro-status quo incumbent, only when they were aligned with the group’s change trajectory. When they were ‘non-aligned’ with the group’s normative trajectory, the incumbent retained their influence. Studies 3 and 4 examined whether support for a leader change as a function of contest. As predicted, when a pro-change leader was aligned with the group’s normative
trajectory, they were more influential and mobilize more support in the presence of competition than its absence. Instead, when pro-change leaders were non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they were more influential and mobilized more support in the absence than presence of competing alternatives. Studies 5 and 6 explored support for leaders with innovative change agendas. As predicted, even when the rhetoric of those leading for change does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’, they were successful in securing votes and mobilising collective action, but also gaining latitude to suggest change and affect who ‘we’ are.

These findings show that by pitting competing leaders with different and competing visions for the society, we not only gained a deeper understanding of when change can occur but also when change can fail, where the status quo is maintained or other forms of change prevails. The capacity of a leader to influence and mobilize followers for change depends on how well they are able to capture ‘who we want to be’, and doing so better than the available alternatives.
Chapter 1. Introduction

Social change is ever present throughout history. Looking back, we can think of examples such as the industrial revolution or the abolition of slavery that changed our societies for millions of people. Even today, social movements attempting to achieve change such as the Occupy Movement, the Arab Spring or Kony 2012 continue to emerge. Not surprisingly, change can seem to be ubiquitous to human societies, and understanding the precise processes that can lead to social change remains a central investigation in social psychological research (Dovidio, Gaertner & Saguy, 2009; Subašić, Reynolds & Turner, 2008; van Zomeren, Leach & Spears, 2012).

Psychology research in general, and social psychology research more specifically, have focused a great deal of attention on social change and how it is achieved. Research on social change has focused on a number of different areas. For example, one such focus has been on collective mobilization and collective action (Reicher, Spears & Haslam, 2010; van Zomeren, Postmes & Spears, 2008), which aims to understand how subordinate group members respond to their disadvantaged position and when marginalised groups will act collectively to challenge their oppression. Another major area is research on prejudice reduction and achieving intergroup harmony (e.g., Dovidio, Penner, et al., 2008; Wenzel, Mummendey & Waldzus, 2008), that aims to understand and reduce prejudice. The focus here is on explaining why people hold negative attitudes about other group members, and how they can be reduced to prevent discrimination and achieve social change toward social equality. Further research on social change focuses on challenging inequality and injustice for groups marginalized by the status quo (e.g., ethnic minorities; Wright & Lubensky, 2009).

While this analysis of social change is quite comprehensive, the role of leadership in bringing about social change is almost completely missing in this body of
work (Haslam & Reicher, 2012; Subašić, Reynolds, Reicher, & Klandermans, 2012; Subašić et al., 2008; van Zomeren et al., 2012). The reality is that leaders play a central role in social change contexts (Gusfield, 1966; Stewart, Denton & Smith, 2012).

Historically, major events that have changed our societies are almost always spearheaded by leaders who drive and give direction to the change process. In fact many of these instances in history are remembered through the leaders who led the change process. For example, leaders such as Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King Jr. or Nelson Mandela are celebrated for their efforts to transform our societies in abolishing slavery, advancing civil rights for African Americans or fighting against segregation in South Africa.

Given the prevalence of leadership in social change contexts, and the lack of attention given to the role of leadership in bringing about social change in social psychological research, understandings of both phenomena can be thoroughly enhanced when their intersection is considered more explicitly (Subašić, Reynolds, ‘t Hart, Haslam & Reicher, 2009; Subašić et al., 2012; Subašić, Reynolds & Mohamed, 2015).

As such, the focus of this thesis is on the role of leadership in bringing about social change. We aim to elucidate when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence.

Social Change and Leadership as Separate Areas of Inquiry

Within psychology, analyses of social change and leadership largely take place in separate research domains. This is because within social psychological research, social change has been studied as an intergroup process, with the focus being on intergroup relations between ‘ingroups’ and ‘outgroups’ (for recent reviews, see Dovidio et al., 2009; Subašić et al., 2008; Thomas, McGarty, & Mavor, 2009; van Zomeren et al., 2012). That is, the focus in social psychological research on social
change has been the study of inequality and conflict between groups. This research is aimed at both understanding the underlying psychological process behind such discrimination and subordination between groups, but also resolving conflict and improving intergroup relations (e.g., Kelman, 2007; Pettigrew, 1998).

On the other hand, leadership and social influence have been studied largely as intragroup processes, with the focus on a single leader and a single group of followers (e.g., De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner, van Knippenberg, & Sleebos, 2009; Hains, Hogg, & Duck, 1997; Haslam & Platow, 2001; Yukl, 2008). As discussed in more detail in the following chapters, much of leadership theories and research has been concerned with the individualistic styles and characteristics of a leader that make them outstanding or effective (e.g., Hannah & Avolio, 2011; Kipnis, 1958; Rahim & Buntzman, 1989), and more recently, the relationship between leaders and followers in making a leader seem visionary or charismatic (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Shamir, Arthur & House, 1994; Tyler & De Cremer, 2005). While these individualistic approaches are useful at describing what a good leader looks like, they have been criticized for not providing an underlying psychological explanation of how a leader is able to influence others (Haslam, Reicher & Platow, 2011; Subašić et al., 2015; Yukl, 1999).

An approach that does provide such an explanation is the social identity tradition. This approach argues that it is a sense of shared social identity between leaders and their followers that drives social influence (Turner, 1991) and effective leadership (e.g., Hogg, 2010; Turner & Haslam, 2001). A large body of evidence confirms that leaders who embody ‘us’ are seen as more effective in their roles and are also more likely to be supported (e.g., Fielding, & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Platow, van
Knippenberg, Haslam, van Knippenberg, & Spears, 2006). However, the focus of much of this work is on a single leader and a single group of followers.

While studying social change and leadership as distinct phenomena has served the fields well given the scope and depth of research on each phenomenon (Haslam et al., 2011; van Knippenberg, 2011; van Zomeren et al., 2012), contemporary understandings of both topics will be thoroughly enhanced when they are considered in an integrated analysis (Subašić et al., 2009; Subašić et al., 2012).

### Need for an Integrated Analyses of Social Change and Leadership

Social change is premised on a psychological transformation in how we define ‘us’ and ‘our’ social reality. Stability in social systems is more likely to prevail when such definitions remain the same. On the other hand, when such definitions of ‘who we are’ transform, it becomes possible for alternative ways of doing things to gain prominence—such as a challenge to the status quo (Subašić et al., 2008). Social change, and influencing social change, therefore, is essentially about a realignment of norms, values and beliefs that a group ascribes to.

The social influence processes are important in understanding precisely how such transformations in identity and social reality of intergroup relations can occur. This is because leadership and social influence are premised not only on leaders’ ability to represent and reflect what it means to be ‘us’, but also on their capacity to redefine who ‘we’ are now to reflect who ‘we’ want to be in the future (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher, Haslam, & Hopkins, 2005). Social change, then, is premised on a collective mobilization of a group for a realigned social identity in line with future aspirations.

Therefore, to understand how we can change societies, an intersection of social change and leadership that involves both intra- and intergroup dynamics needs to be considered more explicitly. One way to consider a more integrated analysis is to
conceptualize social influence and change as tripolar relations involving a contest between two or more competing sources of influence and a third party of ‘followers’ being mobilized for (or against) change in social relations. By studying leadership as a contest for influence—by pitting two opposing leaders who might be pro- or against change—we can not only gain a deeper understanding of when change can occur but also when change can fail, where the status quo is maintained or other forms of change prevails.

**Overview of Thesis**

In the following chapters, we first review the social identity tradition that has made a major contribution to understanding both social change and leadership processes, and thus provides the main theoretical basis of our analyses (Chapter 2). Next, we consider analyses of social change, and leadership and social influence as distinct areas of inquiry, reviewing the key trajectories of ideas that have (quite separately) shaped our understanding of both phenomena (Chapters 3 and 4). We then discuss the need for a more integrated account of social influence and social change in intergroup relations, and review recent work that speaks to such an intersection (Chapter 5). Next, we propose a novel integrated analysis of both intra- and intergroup dynamics involved in the collective mobilization of groups for change, with a focus on investigating leadership as a contest for influence constrained by the reality of intergroup relations (Chapter 6).

The empirical chapters (Chapters 7-9) review findings from six studies (within three empirical programs) that demonstrate these points. This research shows how competing leaders’ capacity to influence and mobilize a group for change depends on their ability to capture the group’s normative trajectory. In the final chapter (Chapter
10), we discuss key implications of our findings for studying social change and influence, discuss limitations and offer suggestions for future research in this domain.
Chapter 2. The Social Identity Approach

As we touched on in the introduction, social change is premised on a psychological transformation in how we define ‘us’ and ‘our’ social reality (Reicher, 2004; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; van Zomeren et al., 2008). Furthermore, leadership is a group process, where influence and support for change occurs as a function of individuals’ social identity and a leader’s standing within that group (e.g., Turner & Haslam, 2001; Haslam, 2004). That is, leadership is not just a relationship between leaders and followers. It is a relationship between leaders and followers who share the same psychological group or social identity. For this reason, in order to fully understand leadership and social change, we need to look at the social identity perspective on group processes and consider the dynamic interactions happening within and between groups.

Social identity refers to individuals’ sense of internalised group membership (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). It is the sense of self derived from the knowledge or acceptance of being in a particular group. It is social identity that leads people to think of themselves and others in their group as ‘us’ rather than ‘me’—as ‘us Australians’ or ‘us environmentalists’ or ‘us women’ (Turner, 1985, 1999; Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). We will see in the coming sections that it is social identity—this shared sense of ‘us’—that is the underlying process that drives influence (Turner, 1991) and effective leadership (e.g., Ellemers, de Gilder, & Haslam, 2004; Turner & Haslam, 2001).

The most powerful evidence of showing that the mere act of individuals categorising themselves as group members can lead to group-oriented behaviour (such as accepting social change, or being influenced by an ingroup leader) is the series of minimal group studies (Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel, Flament, Billig & Bundy, 1971). These studies showed that it is the mere shared sense of identity and not
any personal attraction or interest that leads to participants engaging in group-serving ways (Turner, 1982). In these studies, previously unacquainted participants were led to believe that they have been assigned to categories based on trivial criteria such as their preferences for abstract painters (Klee or Kandinsky) or their estimation of the number of dots on a screen (in fact, assignment to groups was random). They were then asked to award points to an anonymous member of the group that they belonged to (an ingroup member) and also to a member of one of the other groups in the experiment (an outgroup member). This design is efficacious in that it eliminated a range of factors such as personal liking, interdependence, history of cooperation or conflict, individualistic characteristics, or interpersonal exchange, that had previously been considered to drive group behaviour.

The robust finding that emerged from these studies was that even these minimal conditions, where participants had no history with other group members and no prior personal attraction to or knowledge of the group, were sufficient to produce group-oriented behaviour. It was found that participants were more likely to award points to an ingroup member than an outgroup member, despite not knowing any other information about them—despite the absence of factors that were previously seen as the basis of such behaviour such as interdependence, attraction, and so on.

A key contribution made by these studies is demonstrating that social identity makes a distinct psychological contribution to explaining how individuals perceive and act in a social world (Turner, 1982). Namely, it is more than just individuals acting as individuals in a group, but rather individuals acting as group members for the group. However, as Tajfel postulated, the results from the minimal-group studies should not be taken as an end-all and generalised to all group behavior—as it was the minimal-group conditions that produced the minimal-group behavior in these studies. All group behaviour is dependent on a series of contextual factors.
In this chapter we will detail the two phases of social identity theorising, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), and discuss how the theories speak to social change, as well as how they address influence and leadership in a broad sense. In the proceeding chapters, we will then review work on social change, and leadership more specifically.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) makes a distinct psychological contribution to explaining how individuals perceive and act in a social world. People live in an unequal world, where many belong to groups that are valued negatively. One key concern for these theorists were then related to how people responded to this unequal nature of the world—do they accept and adapt to this inequality, or do they challenge it? According to the theory, the path people take depended on a number of contextual factors.

First, people were said to have a need for a positive social identity that they achieved through establishing a positively valued distinctiveness for their own group compared to other groups. Depending on the status position of the group (e.g., dominant vs. subordinate, high vs. low), group members were said to differ in whether they would strive to maintain or achieve positive distinctiveness. Additionally, how they decide to act were said to depend on further group factors such as whether the group boundaries were perceived to be permeable or impermeable, and also whether intergroup relations are collectively understood to be either stable or unstable, and legitimate or illegitimate.

In this way, social identity theory was capable of predicting a variety of intergroup attitudes and behaviours. According to the theory, if members of low status groups understand the group boundaries to be permeable, they will tend to act to
advance their personal interests via strategies of individual mobility and attempt to
dissociate from their ingroup. However, such strategies will not be possible if low status
group members believed that group boundaries were impermeable. Then, low status
group members are more likely to engage in social creativity by using other dimensions
to make intergroup comparisons in the hope of improving their group’s standing, if
social relations between groups are perceived to be stable and legitimate. Whereas, if
social relations are perceived to be unstable and illegitimate, they should engage in
social competition with outgroups aiming to achieve social change.

In the case of high status group members, this theory predicts that they are more
likely to engage in ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination when intergroup
differences are seen to be stable and legitimate, but also how high status group members
may engage in outgroup favouritism if they see their superiority as illegitimate and
unstable. This shows that the theory is extensive and accounts for a broad range of
collective behaviour (beyond ingroup favouritism and outgroup derogation), and it is
important to take into account contextual and intergroup factors in predicting human
behavior.

Another important contribution of this theory is the distinction it makes between
individual behavior and group behavior. It argues that acting as a group member is
something qualitatively different from acting as an individual. People are certainly
capable of doing both—where they are not only seen as group members who act in
terms of their social identity in favour of their ingroup (e.g., collective action for social
change), but also as individuals engaging in individualistic behaviour in favour of their
personal self. This is conceptualised as the “interpersonal-intergroup continuum”.

Indeed, while social identity theory may have originated with the question of
why participants in the minimal group paradigm discriminated against the outgroup
members, it went on to explain a much broader range of behaviors, such as intergroup
conflict, ethnocentrism, and social change. It explains the conditions under which minority groups act to change their intergroup attitudes and actions in society, to challenge dominant groups and achieve social change, while at the same time explaining how members of advantaged groups act to maintain the status quo.

**Self-categorization Theory**

Self-categorization theory (SCT; Turner, et al., 1987) addresses a different question to the one originally investigated within the minimal group studies: why participants identified with the minimal groups at all, and why they behaved as a group member? This theory recognises that people are both individuals and group members, and explains when and how individuals will define themselves as an individual or a group member and the resulting implications. In addition to recognising that it is social identity that makes group behaviour possible, it also specifies a psychological process that underpins the transition from behaviour that is motivated by the sense of individual self (i.e., personal identity) to that which is motivated by one’s self as a group member (i.e., social identity). As such, it provides a conceptual framework for understanding and explaining when people would act collectively for a particular group cause, or follow a certain group leader.

SCT makes the distinction between personal and social identity. Rather than this being conceived as two different and separate entities, the self-concept is described to include both personal and social identity as different, hierarchical levels of self-categorization. At the interpersonal level, the self is defined as a unique individual in contrast to (ingroup) others available for comparison. At the intergroup level, the self is defined as a group member compared to other relevant outgroups. And lastly, at the superordinate level, the self is defined, most inclusively, as a human being relative to other living things. SCT argues for a degree of functional antagonism between the
different levels of the self, so that as one level of the self becomes salient, other levels tend to become less so. In this way, people can shift from thinking of themselves as a unique individual having their personal identity salient to thinking of themselves as a group member when their social identity is salient. It is social identity that is the basis of group behaviour.

When people’s social identity is salient and they are thinking of themselves as group members, their thoughts, beliefs and attitudes shift from being unique individual attributes to be assimilated on to that of the groups that is shared by other fellow ingroup members. This process of internalisation of the ingroup norms and attributes is known as the process of ‘depersonalisation’. It is through this process of depersonalization that group members start engaging and behaving in group normative ways. This means that, for example, for someone who goes to a Psychology lecture on Thursday afternoon and then to a college party in the evening, the values and norms that guide their attitudes and behaviour would be very different in the two different contexts. At the lecture, as a Psychology student, he or she may and strive to be studious and serious, while at the party he or she may be fun-loving and sociable.

Furthermore, just as depersonalisation affects how we view and respond in a given situation, it also affects how we respond to others around us. When our sense of self is depersonalised, the interests that concern us are seen as those of the group as a whole. In this way, group members may be prepared to sacrifice their individual needs to advance the group’s interests by engaging in collective action for the group, or even be willing to whole-heartedly support and follow a leader’s push for change. For example, this is evident when looking at people who risk their lives to follow a leader to war or fight in a revolution.

Another important point to note is that depersonalisation does not involve a loss of self, but rather a redefinition of self at a different level. This means that the
depersonalised self is just as psychologically valid and meaningful to a person as their personal self. When the self is depersonalised, a person can still feel, think and behave for themselves. But the difference is, in this case, what the person feels, thinks and behaves are based on how the group is doing in relation to other groups, or the group’s achievements, or what the group values. This point is crucial in explaining behaviour both leading to social change, like resistance or collective action, and also leadership and influence. For, if people were not able to act in terms of their social identity or psychological group, there would be no basis for coordinated group behaviour. People would not be able to know implicitly or explicitly what they value as a group or what goals they are aiming for. As such, it is a necessary basis for social engagement, but also an equally essential basis for someone to be guided and shaped by that engagement.

But how do people know whether to act collectively for a particular group cause, or follow a certain leader? This can be answered through explaining how categories are defined.

**Defining social identities.** What determines which identity emerges in a given situation? For example, what are the conditions that lead to an individual engaging in individualistic behaviour as opposed to thinking in terms of their social identity in a given context and engaging in group behavior (e.g., engaging in collective action to achieve social change)? Further, given that people belong to multiple groups, what determines which social identity becomes meaningful at any given point? This is determined by a combination of cognitive as well as contextual factors, namely ‘perceiver readiness’ and ‘fit’, by which an individual makes sense of a given stimulus.

Perceiver readiness, which Turner first described as *relative accessibility*, “reflects a person’s past experiences, present expectations, and current motives, values, goals and needs” (Turner et al., 1994, p. 455). It comprises the relevant aspects of cognition that the perceiver brings to the environment. For example, a perceiver who
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categorises frequently on the basis of nationality (e.g., “us Australians”) is, due to that past experience, more likely to formulate a similar self category under new conditions.

Also, the degree to which the group is valued and self-involving—how much an individual identifies with the social category or social identification—is seen as an important factor that affects a person’s readiness to use a particular social category. The more important a social category is for an individual psychologically, the more likely they are to attend to group-level information, and be affected by norms, aspirations and meanings associated with such identities.

The second factor, ‘fit’, further helps determine which social identity becomes meaningful at any given point. There are two aspects of fit. Normative fit derives from the extent to which the behaviour or attributes of an individual conforms to ‘our’ knowledge-based expectations in relation to the meanings of group identities. That is, when an individual fits with the perceived normative content of a category they will be categorised into that category. Thus, normative fit is evaluated with reference to the perceiver readiness component of the categorisation process. For example, a group of people could be categorised and labelled as ‘Liberal’ if they are perceived to be conservative and centre-right in Australia.

Another aspect of fit is comparative fit. This is determined by the meta-contrast principle which states that people are more likely to believe that a collection of stimuli represents an entity to the degree that the differences between those stimuli are less than the differences between that collection of stimuli and other stimuli (Turner et al., 1987). For predicting whether a group will categorise an individual as an ingroup or outgroup member, the meta-contrast principle may be defined as the ratio of the average similarity of the individual to outgroup members over the average similarity of the individual to ingroup members. The meta-contrast ratio is dependent on the context, or frame of reference, in which the categorisation process is occurring. That is, the ratio is
a comparison based on whichever stimuli are cognitively present. For example, if the frame of reference is changed such that potential outgroup members are no longer cognitively present, ingroup members might regard an individual as less similar to the group and are less likely to categorise that individual as belonging to that group.

For example, in relation to the issue of climate change, Australian Labor Party leader Bill Shorten, who advocates to cut emissions by 45 per cent on 2005 levels by 2030 and achieve net zero emissions by 2050, may seem like an environmentalist and someone who exemplifies the climate change movement in the context where a comparison is made with the Coalition and current Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, who has not only repealed the carbon tax, but aims to only cut emissions by 26–28 per cent on 2005 levels by 2030. However, Bill Shorten might easily be seen not very environmentalist-like in a context without the intergroup comparison, or in comparison to the even more left-wing Richard Di Natale, leader of the Australian Greens, who seeks to go further than Labor on climate change policy (including setting a 90 per cent renewable energy target for 2030). For someone who is deeply concerned about protecting the environment then, depending on the frame of reference, Bill Shorten can be categorised as an ingroup member or not. This is an important point because whether or not a leader candidate is seen to share identity with followers is a critical factor in driving influence, as discussed in more detail further below.

Using principles of perceiver readiness and fit, it is possible to explain which of many identities will be salient and guide perception, attitudes and behaviour for an individual at any given time. An important point is that because the meaning given to a situation is an outcome of categorisation processes that are inherently comparative, then self-categories and identification, and resulting group behaviour are also infinitely variable, contextual and relative. That is, whether or not people act collectively for a particular group cause, or follow a certain leader can depend on the intergroup context.
Social identity and social influence. Social identity is the driving force behind social influence (Turner, 1991). When social identity is shared, people are not only motivated to behave in ways that positively distinguish their own ingroup from other outgroups and promote their group’s collective interests, they are also more likely to mutually influence and persuade each other. That is, when people cognitively group themselves with ‘similar’ others, other ingroup members are perceived to be similar to oneself and as a result seen as a valid source of information. They tend to agree and expect other group members to agree in terms of their attitudes, judgements, and behaviour. And when there is disagreement, they become willing to either change their own attitudes and behaviour to be more in line with the ingroup or seek to influence or persuade ingroup others to achieve agreement.

However, not all opinions and judgements are equally accepted. Even within a group, responses by different group members are likely to differ in terms of how much they exemplify and represent group norms (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1998). As such, group members will differ in terms of how much they embody the group identity. SCT refers to this concept as relative prototypicality—the degree to which members of a group are more or less defining of the category as a whole. Like comparative fit, it is also determined by the principle of meta-contrast, which seeks to ensure that the differences perceived between categories are larger than the difference perceived within categories. That is, group members will be seen to be more prototypical to the extent that he or she differs more from outgroup members and less from ingroup members (e.g., David & Turner, 1999; Hogg, Turner & Davidson, 1990).

Relative influence within a psychological group is driven by these gradients of relative prototypicality (Turner, 1991). Within a group, how well a group member persuades and influences other group members depends on how well their attitudes or responses reflects the ingroup consensus or norm (e.g., van Knippenberg, 2000; van
Knippenberg, Lossie, & Wilke, 1994; van Knippenberg & Wilke, 1992). As such, it is the group member who is perceived to be the most prototypical in the group who emerges as the leader (Hogg, 1996; Reicher et al., 2001; Turner & Haslam, 2001; Turner et al., 1987; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, & van Dijk, 2000). The evidence for prototypical leaders being more influential is quite robust and is seen in studies using different paradigms, different measures of leadership effectiveness, and experimental as well as field settings (e.g., Fielding, & Hogg, 1997; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Platow et al., 2006; for recent reviews, see Haslam et al., 2011; Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast, 2012; van Knippenberg, 2011).

To summarise, we know now that social identity matters. It matters because it tells us not only who we are, but also how we relate to others, and as a result what is important to us, and how we should act. It tells us when and how to act collectively to either maintain the status quo or challenge it and achieve social change. It also tells us who to follow and what causes to be mobilized for.

However, despite the social identity tradition making a major contribution to understanding both phenomena, analyses of social change, and leadership and social influence have been quite separate. In the next two chapters, we will review work on social change, and leadership and influence, reviewing the key trajectories of ideas that have shaped our understanding of both phenomena as distinct areas of inquiry.

The social identity perspective has made a prominent contribution to the analyses of social change and social stability. Within this perspective, social identity, that is a shared understanding of who we ‘are’ and who ‘we’ want to be (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), is essential for processes that lead to social change in intergroup relations. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the idea that people can think of themselves as individuals (e.g., “I”, “me”) but also in terms of psychologically relevant and meaningful group memberships (e.g., “us Psychologists” or “us Liberals” or “us Australians”) is central in explaining change in social relations (Reicher, 2004; Turner et al., 1987). That is, depending on the comparison made, different identities (whether personal, or a particular social identity) come to the fore in being meaningful in guiding perceptions and behavior (for e.g., those supporting the status quo or challenging it to achieve social change).

This rationale has been applied expansively to understand a number of different phenomena directly relevant to social change processes, including dynamics of domination and resistance (e.g., Haslam & Reicher, 2012; Reicher, 2004; Reicher, 2011), prejudice and prejudice reduction (e.g., Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Dovidio et al., 2009), minority influence (Moscovici, 1980), and collective action (e.g., Drury & Reicher, 2005; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Wright, 2009). In this chapter we will review models of social change and discuss relevant work on understanding the processes that lead to social change.

Dynamics of Domination and Resistance

Dynamics of domination and resistance is one area directly relevant to social change processes that considers the renegotiation of relations within an intergroup
context. If we look at the dynamics that unfold in the context of unequal power relations, we can see that it is a struggle between two or more groups or sub-groups to redefine and change what it means to be ‘us’ and how ‘we’ want to be treated (Reicher, 2011). However, unequal power relations have not always been looked at as a power struggle between two groups with unequal social power. Social dominance approaches such as social dominance theory (Sidanius, 1993) and system justification theory (e.g. Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004) primarily see inequality, hierarchy and domination as an inevitable part of human life. These theories argue that we cannot help but unconsciously bolster the status quo (Jost, Pelham & Carvallo, 2002). According to these approaches then, there is only one system and everyone is (expected to become) assimilated into this system (i.e., one supporting the status quo).

These approaches have used examples of domination and even extreme brutality in history to back their arguments. For example, pointing to historical accounts of war camps (e.g., Holocaust) and slavery (e.g., slave trade in Africa and Latin America), they have argued that even under such extreme conditions of injustice and repression, victims accept the subordination and show preference for the outgroup over their ingroup (Jost, 2001). However, this is a static and one-sided view of the social world that fails to take into account the dynamic social processes that are involved in intergroup relations and social behavior (Reicher, 2011). For even these extreme cases of dominance were marked by instances of resistance. Resistance was both widespread and also numerous in many cases of domination. For example, in the Holocaust, active resistance by the Jewish people occurred in ghettos, concentration camps, and death camps (e.g., Glass, 2004). In the Rwandan genocide, the Tutsi population did not quietly wait for their inhumane extermination. They rebelled and eventually defeated the Hutu regime (e.g., Sharlach, 1999).
The point here is that these processes are dynamic intergroup processes whereby two or more groups attempt to manage power relations and their place in society (which in some extreme cases, as in the above examples, included violent clashes and ethnical abolishing of the marginalized group) in the shaping and reshaping of social identities (Reicher, 2011). By failing to consider these processes as dynamic and social, we lose the ability to understand when members of subordinated groups will accept an unequal status quo and when they will begin to challenge it (Reicher, 2004). Alternatives to the existing social order do exist, and it is important to consider the different ways of defining who ‘we’ are to be able to understand intergroup disparities and shed light on improving intergroup relations. This idea of considering multiple definitions of who ‘we’ are is central to this thesis, as leadership and influence processes, particularly those involved in achieving social change, are a contestation of ‘our’ identity between existing leaders seeking to preserve the status quo and those leaders driving social change.

The study of inequality and conflict between groups has been a major focus of social psychological research. Research aimed at both understanding the underlying psychological process behind such discrimination and subordination, and also resolving conflict and improving intergroup relations are abundant (e.g., Kelman, 2007; Pettigrew, 1998). We will come back to discuss work on domination and resistance in further detail in Chapter 5, where we discuss the intersection of social change and leadership. For now, we turn to models of social change that seek to explain how intergroup relations can change towards greater social harmony in order to fully understand when change can occur but also when change can fail (leading to the success of other forms of change or the maintenance of the status quo).
Prejudice Reduction and Intergroup Harmony

Research on understanding and reducing prejudice—on why people hold negative attitudes about other group members, and how they can be reduced to prevent discrimination and achieve social change toward social equality—has been a dominant focus of this area of research (for reviews, see Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Dovidio, Gaertner, et al., 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, 2008; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011; Wright & Taylor, 2007). While there have been different and numerous approaches to reducing intergroup tension proposed in the study of prejudice, one principle line of analysis has been Allport’s contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954). The premise of this approach is based on the idea that intergroup contact between individuals of different groups can reduce prejudice toward the outgroup as a whole.

However, Allport (1954) argued that contact needs to occur under the right conditions for it to diminish intergroup prejudice. A rapidly growing research literature supports this perspective, and has shown that positive intergroup outcomes are promoted to the extent that intergroup anxiety is reduced (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), empathy and perspective-taking is enabled (Batson, Lishner, Cook & Sawyer, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Vescio, Sechrist, & Paolucci, 2003) and new information is learnt about the outgroup (Pettigrew, 2004).

While intergroup contact has been shown to apply to a wide variety of groups and settings, one criticism of this work is that while personalised contact may lead to interpersonal liking, this feeling may not apply toward the outgroup as a whole. As when an individual starts thinking of themselves as group members instead of as individuals, they start making intergroup (rather than intragroup) comparisons and their thoughts and behaviour are guided by their social identity (Turner et al., 1987). Thus,
interpersonal judgements are unlikely to apply to intergroup judgements (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone & Brown, 1986).

Another model of prejudice reduction, also premised on the reduction of salience of intergroup categories and their differences, is the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman & Rust, 1993). This model builds on insights from SCT and focuses on the fluidity of social identity—the transformation of members' perceptions of group boundaries from “us” and “them” to a more inclusive “we”—to reduce intergroup prejudice. From this perspective, the development of a common ingroup identity facilitates more harmonious intergroup interactions. However, a problem of this approach is that it overlooks the reality that superordinate identities (e.g., national identities) typically are dominated by the advantaged subgroup’s identity and may not be equally inclusive of other, more disadvantaged subgroups and their identities (see Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). As a result, when applying this strategy to reduce prejudice, disadvantaged group members may be reluctant to endorse a common ingroup identity at the expense of their subgroup identity (Dovidio et al., 2009). Instead, they may seek continued recognition of their subgroup identity that enhance the intergroup contact experience.

To address the criticism that ‘common identity’ co-opts the disadvantaged for the status quo and as such increases the disadvantaged group’s participation in contact in enhancing current intergroup relations, a new model was proposed—the dual identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). This model argues that both subgroup and ‘common’ identities need to remain salient and relevant for the disadvantaged group in order to maintain their commitment to collective action for change. This work is useful in their consideration of divergent preferences of members of both dominant and subordinate groups for different forms of group representation (and subsequently different outcomes of preserving the status quo or achieving social change), as different
group preferences and the different ways in representing the group identity has been illustrated to have direct implications on intergroup relations.

For example, Dovidio, Gaertner and Saguy (2009) recognize that the difference in motivations of dominant group members to maintain a system that advantages them and motivations of subordinate group members to enhance their status have direct implications for preferred group representations and consequent intergroup relations. They argue that the resulting preference of dominant members for a common, one-group identity that seeks to preserve their dominance, and subordinate group members’ preference for a dual identity that acknowledges the meaningful differences between groups needs to be considered in order to fully understand intergroup attitudes and how conflict could be resolved.

Furthermore, recent research has demonstrated that different ways of representing the group identities can not only affect advantaged group’s perception of the disadvantaged, but also their willingness to protest on behalf of the disadvantaged group. Banfield and Dovidio (2013), examining how different ways of representing the group identities of White and Black Americans affect Whites' recognition of discrimination against a Black person, showed that inducing a dual identity, which emphasized both subgroup differences and a common-group representation, facilitated Whites' willingness to protest blatant discrimination.

These findings are important in demonstrating that alternatives to the status quo do exist and it is important to consider the different ways of group representation to fully understand when subordinate groups will accept the dominant viewpoint or when they will come together to collectively resist a marginalizing status quo to assert their own definition of who ‘we’ are within the broader intergroup context. Furthermore, they demonstrate that consideration of divergent preferences of members of both dominant and subordinate groups for different forms of group representation is important in also
facilitating the advantaged group’s participation in collective action to benefit disadvantaged groups and initiate change toward social equality.

Indeed, in order to fully understand the dynamics of intergroup relations involved in social change, it is important to explore the subordinate group’s stance and how they respond to their disadvantaged reality, but also the dominant viewpoint that often play a big role in maintaining the status quo. However, missing in this work is the consideration of a third party—often the population or numerical majority—that both subordinate and dominant groups try to influence. We will discuss work that consider the tripolar dynamics of social change further below.

**Minority Influence**

The work on minority influence by Moscovici and colleagues (e.g., Moscovici & Lage, 1976, 1978; Moscovici & Personnaz, 1980) is another area of research in social change that explicitly considered dynamics within an intergroup context. These authors argued that minorities act as agents of influence and social change ‘from below’ by challenging existing social relations. While conformity to majority has been widely studied and accepted (see Asch, 1951), Moscovici and colleagues argued that minority influence was also possible. Indeed, it is a more interesting as well as a more valuable area of inquiry to understand when and how some people might follow minority attitudes while resisting group pressure.

Moscovici and colleagues’ work on minority influence focused on how a minority can influence a majority and thus, modify normative expectations of the group. They made the distinction between compliance and conformity. While compliance is participants’ public conformity associated with majority influence, Moscovici argued that conversion is a more powerful form of influence whereby a minority can influence
a majority in changing their attitudes—in terms of private acceptance, in line with minority attitudes (Moscovici & Personnaz, 1980).

In their studies of social influence Moscovici, Lage, & Naffrechoux (1969) found that consistency in behavioural style is important in minorities influencing majority participants. They manipulated behavioural styles of minorities (consistent vs. inconsistent) in giving an incorrect answer in a colour perception test. In the consistent condition, two accomplices called blue slides green in all the trials, while in the inconsistent condition the two accomplices called the slides green only 2/3 of the trials. They found that when the minority was consistent they had an effect on the majority (8.42%) compared to an inconsistent minority (only 1.25% said green). A third (32%) of all participants judged the slide to be green (in line with minority opinion) at least once.

Further research by Moscovici and Lage (1978) also identified the normative context in which the judgment was made as important for a minority to have influence over a majority. They found that by instilling an originality context, participants chose the minority deviant option more often compared to in the objectivity condition. However, in the originality normality context, participants were also more likely to choose other novel responses other than the minority deviant option.

These results are in line with the social identity tradition, in particular SCT, where how innovation or creativity is perceived depends on three interrelated things. According to this tradition, these perceptions should be affected by perceivers’ self-categorization in terms of a salient social identity, the extent to which they identify with that social identity, and lastly (as explored in Moscovici’s minority influence studies) the norms associated with that social identity (Reicher, 2004; Turner et al, 1987). When someone identifies strongly with a given group, he or she will be more motivated to think and behave consistent with the values, norms, and ideology of that group (Turner,
1991). As such, participants in Moscovici’s minority influence study behaved in line with the normative context given to them. However, this also meant they chose other novel responses in addition to the minority’s deviant opinion.

Further, SCT argues that the recognition of shared membership is a key factor in determining how people engage with other people. When other people are seen as ingroup members, people will expect and also strive to have shared perceptions, understanding and behavior in group-related issues (Turner, 1991). As such, in order to reduce the uncertainty that deviant opinions may create by unsettling the status quo (Mueller, Melwani, & Goncalo, 2012), a source of influence, particularly those with deviant positions, needs to be seen as “one of us” who is “doing it for us” (Haslam et al., 2011; Turner, 1991). This phenomenon is apparent (albeit not explored as an influencing factor) in the minority influence studies. To the extent that minority group members are seen to share common ingroup category with participants, they should be more likely to be influenced by their responses.

Building on this work, Mugny and colleagues have reconceptualised minority influence as a tripolar process whereby a minority group seeks to influence and mobilise the support of the population or numerical majority against the dominant power majority (Mugny, 1982; Mugny & Papastamou, 1982). They found that minority influence was greater when members of the numerical majority were led to believe that they have a lot in common with the minority, this being the strongest for those whose opinions were already relatively similar to the minority opinions—where their sense of shared identity is stronger (Mugny & Papastamou, 1982).

However, a limitation of this work is the sole focus on the relationship between the minority and the population majority while neglecting the relationship between the population with those in positions of ‘power’ or established authority. In order to fully understand tripolar dynamics of influence, it is necessary to consider the majority’s
stance not only towards the powerless (i.e., minority), but also the powerful (i.e.,
dominant existing authority), because the powerful often play a big role in maintaining
segmented ways of defining the group identity and marginalizing attempts for social
change. It is important to consider this work to understand when social change will be
achieved or the status quo will prevail.

 Collective action

As discussed throughout this chapter, social and political change involves a
contest between two or more groups—particularly between those in positions of social
power seeking to maintain their dominant positions and those who have been
marginalized seeking to collectively challenge the status quo. Despite work on
‘minority influence’ emphasising the importance of considering tripolar relations, other
social change work has typically focused on the disadvantaged vs. privileged
dichotomy. Traditionally, empirical work in this area of research has focused either on
disadvantaged groups and their plight against the dominant who suppresses them in an
attempt to change their circumstances, or on dominant group attitudes and how their
discriminatory views and behavior can be changed (e.g., Fiske, 1998; Wright &
Lubenski, 2009; Wright & Taylor, 2007). We will review this more ‘traditional’ work
that focuses on the disadvantaged vs. privileged dichotomy first before moving on to
reviewing tripolar models.

A key approach in this literature is in relation to finding out how subordinate
group members respond to their disadvantaged position and when marginalised groups
will act collectively to challenge their oppression. This approach focuses on social
protest and collective action as a means to improve their group’s position and achieve
social change. The focus of much of this work is on how minorities can achieve change
in the reality of intergroup relations by targeting those in positions of authority—those
who epitomize the status quo (e.g., Branscombe & Ellemers, 1998; Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997; Ellemers, Wilke, & Van Knippenberg, 1993; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1996; Reynolds, Oakes, Haslam, Nolan, & Dolnik, 2000; Swim & Stangor, 1998; Wright, 1997, 2001; Wright & Tropp, 2002).

Recent work in collective action has focused on dominant group member attitudes and responses in fully understanding how to resolve intergroup relations. Consistent with social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), empirical research that considers high status group members’ attitudes demonstrates a strong motivation by high-status group members to defend or restore one’s group position. For example, Scheepers and Ellemers (2005) showed that after the possibility of change in the hierarchy was introduced, individuals assigned to a dominant group exhibited a defensive physiological threat response, reflecting their distress at the risk of losing their advantage. Georgesen and Harris (2006) demonstrated that participants assigned to a high power role were more discriminatory toward subordinates when their advantaged position was more tentative. In addition, high-status group members, and particularly those in favor of group-based hierarchy, are more likely to engage in actions that reinforce the dependency of low-status groups when they perceive their group’s status as less secure (Halabi, Dovidio, & Nadler, 2008).

Taken together, these studies demonstrate dominant group members’ reluctance in giving up their privileges. There has been a surge in recent research to understanding and developing strategies in getting dominant group members on board with achieving social equality. As such, empirical work has focused on dominant group members’ beliefs about the status hierarchy in terms of status and legitimacy (Saguy, Chernyak-Hai, Andrighetto, & Bryson, 2013), moral convictions, defined as strong and absolute stances on moralized issues (van Zomeren, Postmes, Spears & Bettache, 2011), as well
as prosocial emotions (Thomas et al., 2009) in motivating advantaged group members to challenge social inequality and shape social change outcomes.

However, focusing solely on bipolar intergroup relations can be problematic in understanding the precise processes of social change in intergroup relations. Because not only is minority challenge to authority and the status quo—on its own—rarely sufficient to achieve social change. It also does not reflect the broader social and political context of intergroup relations in which social change takes place (Tarrow, 1998; West, 1990). The reality is that such challenge and conflict occurs in front of an important audience—the general public or silent minority—whose role in the social change process has largely been unexplored (Mugny, 1982; Mugny & Perez, 1991; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). Our understanding of the social change process will be limited to the extent that the study of these processes is reduced to conflict between the dominant and the marginalized without considering the intra- and intergroup contexts that these processes take place in.

Subašić and colleagues (2008) argued that the process of maintaining the status quo by those in positions of leadership and authority involves a direct relationship not between the authority and the disadvantaged, but rather one between the authority and the silent majority—the voters and the followers. Often this process of legitimizing power involves a shared identity between the power and silent majority, in which the power majority will attempt to be seen as acting in the best interests of the group and fulfilling its legitimate role as long as it is perceived to share a sense of shared social identity (Subašić et al., 2008). They also argued that the minority challenge to established authority involves a contest for the hearts and minds of the silent majority. Then, whether or not the status quo prevails or social change is achieved, is to a degree a function of whether it is the authority or the minority that is able to influence the majority and harness their support.
Therefore, to understand the intersection of leadership and social change more fully, models that explicitly consider both intra- and intergroup dynamics are useful. A number of models of collective action that considers the tripolar nature of intergroup relations in a social change domain have recently been proposed. The politicized collective identity model developed by Simon and Klandermans (Klandermans, 2000; Klandermans & de Weerd, 2000; Simon, 1998; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Simon et al., 1998) focuses on collective identity, the struggle between groups for power, and importantly, the wider societal context. It is proposed that when people consciously engage in an intergroup power struggle on behalf of their group and recognize the importance of the societal context in which this struggle is fought out they exhibit politicized collective identity. They distinguish three antecedent stages leading to politicized collective identity as awareness of shared grievances, adversarial attributions, and involvement of society at large. Importantly, they also recognize that the intergroup power struggle should involve society at large. The full process of politicizing collective identity involves the minority attempts to mobilize the support of third parties (e.g., general public, societal audience). This is in line with work on minority influence by Mugny and colleagues (Mugny, 1982; Mugny & Papastamou, 1982) as discussed above.

The elaborated social identity model of crowd behaviour (ESIM; Drury & Reicher, 1999; Reicher, 1996, 1997a, 1997b; Stott & Drury, 1999; Stott & Reicher, 1998) is another model of collective action that considers the tripolar nature of intergroup relations in a social change domain. As we have outlined earlier, according to the social identity approach, there are certain conditions that are conducive of collective action, including group boundaries being seen as impermeable, as well as the actions of the dominant group being seen as illegitimate and current intergroup climate being seen as stable (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When group members perceive that they
are being treated unfairly, that this unfair treatment is likely to go on, and that it is not possible for them to simply leave the marginalised group, they will act collectively.

More specifically, examination of the actions of participants in crowd events suggests that changes occur in relation to social representation of participants (Drury & Reicher, 1999). This phenomenon of psychological change within participants in collective action is well established (Drury & Reicher, 2009; Stott & Reicher, 1998a; 1998b; Reicher, 1996). The ESIM of crowd conflict focuses on the emergence and development of crowd conflict. It starts with the premise that crowd behaviour is based within intergroup contexts (i.e., there is more than one point of view). It shows how identity of a group can develop and lead to changes in intergroup behaviour through intergroup dynamics.

For example, looking at how conflict develops in demonstrations, it can be observed that initially most demonstrators hold the belief and sense that they are respectable citizens exercising their democratic right to protest. This view is often distinguished from those “radicals” calling for more confrontational action. On the other hand, it is often the case that the police view all demonstrators as a dangerous threat and work to impede their progress. In turn this action can be seen as illegitimate by the demonstrators, unifying them (both the moderate demonstrators as well as the radicals) in opposition to the police, and leading to empowerment and engagement in such confrontational action as confronting the police cordon.

This work shows how intergroup interaction and psychological empowerment can feed into societal change in collective events. It is a cycle of interactions between groups in which subordinated groups emerge from each round at a higher level of empowerment which then sets the ground for the next cycle that makes social change possible (Drury & Reicher, 2009; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). It demonstrates the importance of understanding and recognising that there are different groups with
different and asymmetrical category representations that can influence change in understandings of the group's social realities in different ways.

Indeed, groups do not exist in a social vacuum. There are different groups or even ideas about the category definitions and they are often characteristically different or asymmetrical. Attention therefore needs to be given to the intergroup context because it is an interaction between the different groups that leads to change and collective action. When considering tripolar dynamics of influence, it is necessary to consider the majority’s stance not only towards the disadvantaged or minority group, but also the advantaged or dominant existing authority, as the advantaged often play a big role in maintaining the status quo. These ideas have been recently extended within the political solidarity model of social change (Subašić et al., 2008) and have implications for integrating leadership and social change paradigms to better understand how ‘leadership for change’ can successfully change the nature of relevant social relations in competition with existing authority that seek to maintain the status quo.

The political solidarity model (Subašić et al., 2008) recently explored how the dynamics of social change are shaped by a direct contest between multiple sources of influence. This model considers the tripolar nature of intergroup relations, and is consistent with, and extends in a number of novel ways, a number of approaches to social change that we have discussed in this chapter—work on minority influence by Mugny and colleagues (Mugny, 1982; Mugny, Kaiser, Papastamous, & Perez, 1984; Mugny & Papastamou, 1982; Mugny & Perez, 1991), the politicized collective identity model developed by Simon and Klandermans (Klandermans, 2000; Klandermans & de Weerd, 2000; Simon, 1998; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Simon et al., 1998), and the work on collective action and crowd behavior by Reicher and colleagues (Drury & Reicher, 1999; Drury et al., 2003; Reicher, 1996, 2001; Stott & Drury, 2000; Stott et al., 2001; Stott & Reicher, 1998).
This model conceptualizes social change as a tripolar influence process in intergroup relations—an ongoing struggle for majority support between the authority, seeking to maintain the status quo, and the minority, seeking to mobilize challenge to the status quo. It recognizes that authorities and power minorities are both involved in influencing and mobilizing the population majority. When people see the authority as violating norms and values that they thought should be upheld, they start rejecting the authority (i.e., those currently in position of leadership), creating the opportunity for other positions (i.e., minorities) to gain influence and support. That is, when identity ceases to be shared with the authority and becomes shared with the minority, majority challenge to authority in solidarity with the minority becomes possible.

The political solidarity model, thus, considers social change processes as tripolar and dynamic intergroup processes that involves a power struggle between the authority and minority to influence the majority by creating and maintaining a sense of shared social identity with this group. The question that is important to ask in understanding such dynamics is fundamentally one of self-categorical change involving members of the majority: When will members of the majority self-categorise in a way that makes challenge to authority possible (i.e., in solidarity with the minority)?

The political solidarity model has direct implications for understanding leadership in social change contexts. It is the case that leadership in such social change contexts is often a contest for influence, where ‘leadership for change’ seeks to challenge and change the nature of relevant social relations in the face of opposition from those (often already in positions of authority) that seek to maintain the status quo—all vying to influence and gain support of the same electorate (Subašić et al, 2012, 2015). However, as we have discussed, within social psychological research on social change, analyses of leadership and the role of leadership in influencing social change are almost completely absent. In the following chapters, we will review leadership
research and theorizing that have made a long-standing contribution to understanding leadership and influence, before proposing a novel integrated analysis of both intra- and intergroup dynamics involved in the collective mobilization of groups for change.
Chapter 4. Leadership and Influence: Transform, Transact or Fit a Stereotype?

Leadership is seen as something that can move the masses to achieve goals. Indeed, when thinking about key achievements of our societies, we are quick to think of the leaders that spearheaded those change processes. For example, it is difficult to think about the anti-apartheid revolution, without also thinking about Nelson Mandela, who led the movement to bring peace to racially divided South Africa. Indeed, one important element of leadership is leaders’ ability to inspire and mobilise followers to bring about change. Whether it is change involving wide-scale societal change such as revolutions rising against dictatorships or more peaceful change processes such as administering policy change in local government, there is always a leadership figure responsible for leading such change.

While there are several ways in which leadership has been approached, the focus of much of leadership theorising and research has been on the individual styles and characteristics of leaders that make them distinctively the ‘right’ person for positions of authority (e.g., Kipnis, 1958). More recently, prominent leadership theories have also focused on the relationship between leaders and followers (e.g., De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Hains et al., 1997; Haslam & Platow, 2001; Yukl, 2008). However, the emphasis here has still been on individual leaders’ behavioural styles that distinguish them as visionary or charismatic (Shamir, Arthur & House, 1994; Yukl, 2008). In this chapter we will review such models that focus on person- or leader-centred approaches to understand the intersection of leadership and change. We will also discuss their limitations in contributing to the understanding of leadership and social change processes.
Visionary Leadership

Much of leadership theorising has focused on leaders’ individual styles or behaviours that make them uniquely suited for a particular leadership position. A subset of these also focuses on change—notably organisational (rather than necessarily social) change, where much of this work deals with the question of motivating employees for some form of organisational change (e.g., Yukl, 2008). Examples of this approach are visionary leadership theories that describe how a leader can influence followers and inspire them to accomplish immense achievements by creating and communicating a vision for the group, offering innovative solutions to major social problems, and proposing and driving radical change. A central concept that all of these theories either implicitly or explicitly assert is that a charismatic, transformational, or visionary leader’s behaviour is, non-conservative, change-oriented and (not surprisingly) ‘visionary’.

Communicating an inspiring vision has been argued to be an important driver for change. Leadership models such as transformative and charismatic leadership theories focus on the argument that leaders’ effectiveness depends on their being able to create, communicate and implement a vision for the future. Indeed, most current leadership scholars argue that exemplary leaders are described by their followers as visionary and inspirational (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Conger, 1999; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), while recent empirical research has provided support for the positive impact of visionary leadership on follower support and organisational outcomes, for example follower perceptions of leadership effectiveness (see Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002). While empirical findings relating to these theories demonstrate with consistency that leaders described as charismatic, transformational, or visionary result in followers becoming highly committed to the leader’s mission, making significant personal
sacrifices in the interest of the mission, and also performing above and beyond the call of duty, there are a number of limitations of these theories as discussed further below.

**Transformational Leadership.** Theories of transformational leadership provide important insights about the nature of effective leadership. According to this model, influence is driven through leaders’ ability to identify the needed change and create a vision to guide the change through inspiration. In his Pulitzer prize winning text, Burns (1978) argued that true leadership is about defining aspirations and fulfilsments, and inspiring and transforming followers to work towards and achieve those hopes and aspirations. Versions of transformational leadership have been proposed by several theorists, including Bass (1985, 1996), Burns (1978), Sashkin (1988), and Tichy and Devanna (1986).

A broad range of leader behaviours have been identified that describe a transformational leader. Among these, leaders’ consideration and attendance to their followers, and also their capacity to initiate and structure roles and goals in order to inspire followers to achieve those goals emerged as being particularly important (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Similarly, Bass and Avolio (1997) have identified four components of transformational leadership (idealized influence (or charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration) that are included in their Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which is one of the most popular tools for assessing the transformational capacity of leaders.

There is considerable evidence that shows transformational leadership as being effective. Most are survey studies conducted using the MLQ and similar questionnaires and have found that key elements of transformational leadership correlated positively with indicators of leadership effectiveness such as subordinate satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Bass, 1998; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). While research and models of transformational leadership have been effective at providing a
powerful description of the capacity of transformative leaders to inspire enthusiasm and sense of higher purpose in those they lead, they are less helpful in explaining the psychological processes through which leaders are able to influence their followers (see van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013 for a recent critique). For example, what exactly is the nature of the consideration leaders need to show to those they lead? And what is the precise nature of the structures they need to initiate?

Transformational leadership and change. Bass and Riggio (2006) have noted that “transformational leadership is, at its core, about issues around the processes of transformation and change” (p. 225). They see transformational leader’s ability to articulate and empower a collective vision to be the reason for their success in bringing about change. A number of research findings have been reported on the relationship between transformative leader behaviors and change-oriented variables. For example, Jung and colleagues (2003) found that top managers’ leadership styles affected their companies’ innovation directly and indirectly via empowerment and organisational climate. In a similar vein, Bommer, Rich and Rubin (2005) found transformational leader behaviours to be associated with lower levels of employee cynicism about organisational change.

However, despite transformational leadership being strongly ascribed to change, there has not been a great deal of research evidence concerning the relationship between transformational leadership and individuals’ commitment to a specific change attempt pushed by a specific leader. In this thesis, it is argued to be important to explore how leaders can actively work together with followers in driving innovation and change, and when followers would support such change efforts. As such, research focusing on other aspects of change such as coping with change that the organisation (in general) is undergoing (e.g., Callan, 1993), or building a climate for innovation (e.g., Sarros,
Cooper & Santora, 2008)—that do not necessarily reflect leader-driven change-related outcomes—are less helpful.

One study that did focus on a specific change initiative was one by Herold and colleagues (2008) investigating the relationship between transformational and change leadership and followers’ commitment to a particular change initiative. They found transformational leadership to be more strongly related to followers’ change commitment than change-specific leadership practices such as developing a clear vision for what was going to be achieved by our work unit, or making a case for the urgency of this change prior to implementation, especially when the change had significant personal impact. For leaders who were not viewed as transformational, good change-management practices were found to be associated with higher levels of change commitment (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). What should be noted about the two contrasted types of leadership is that they are both styles of leadership that hinged on creating and communicating a vision, and inspiring and empowering followers to follow that vision.

**Charismatic Leadership.** Another theory that is seen to provide insights about the nature of effective leadership and the process of affecting change is the charismatic leadership theory. The original charismatic leadership theory by Weber (1947) described how it is special qualities that set leaders apart from ‘ordinary’ men and characterise revolutionary forms of leadership. Charismatic leaders are seen to have special gifts that allow them to invigorate and inspire followers to pursue new visions. They are said to be successful because they are able to articulate an innovative appealing vision, and communicate and express model behavior, and as such influence followers to achieve their visions. Charisma in leaders has been found to affect enhanced follower satisfaction (Fuller, Patterson, Hester, & Stringer, 1996; Howell & Frost, 1989), performance (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Shea & Howell, 1999),
and overall effectiveness (Lowe et al., 1996). Similar to transformational leadership theory, one characteristic that has been found to be of importance to charismatic leadership is having and articulating a clear vision for the group (Yorges, Weiss, & Strickland, 1999) and being agents of innovative and radical change (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Trice & Beyer, 1986).

Furthermore, charismatic leadership is seen to go beyond personal style and the strength of face-to-face communications. It recognises the role of followers in that charisma is something attributed to leaders by followers and without this attribution the extraordinary influence simply would not occur (Calder, 1977; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Oberg, 1972; Oommen, 1967; Shamir, 1992). Indeed, one contribution of this work is that they highlight the importance of shared and collective group processes in achieving group goals. This is evident through empirical research both in the production of charismatic leadership attributions as well as its consequences. Charismatic leadership has been found to lead group members to shift their focus from individual to collective gains (Bass, 1985; Klein & House, 1995) and enhance ‘we-feelings’ and group cohesion among group members (Conger & Kanungo, 1998).

**Charismatic leadership and change.** Charismatic leaders have been described to be powerful agents of social change. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., seen as a charismatic leader by many, is an example of a political leader who used powerful oratory, an engaging personality, and unwavering commitment to bring about positive change in the lives of millions of people. Recent empirical research has also provided support for the positive impact of charismatic leadership on followers’ general openness to organisational change (e.g., Fiol, Harris & House, 1999; Groves, 2006).

Fiol and colleagues (1999) present a model that explains how charismatic leaders and their interactions with followers can generate social change. To uncover the qualities and motives that define charismatic leadership, they analysed 42 speeches by
14 20th century U.S. presidents and showed that charismatic leaders employ consistent communication strategies for breaking down, moving, and re-aligning the norms of their followers. Specifically, they were found to employ such techniques as negation, inclusion, and abstraction more frequently during the middle phase of their tenure as leaders than in the earlier and later phases. In this middle phase—the frame moving phase—involving the simultaneous construction and destruction of what people know and believe represents the most challenging and critical period of a social change process. Though they do not talk about social identity explicitly, they do concede that the language used by the presidents reflect and shape social norms and attitudes. One limitation of this study is that they do not measure or know whether or when follower frames actually shift during a change process.

Extending these findings, Seyranian and Bligh (2008) tested additional communication tactics on a larger sample of US presidential speeches with an expanded presidential charisma measure. However, they only replicated some of the findings of Fiol et al., (1999). Seyranian and colleagues proposed that social identity theory may provide additional insight to understanding the framing process and explicating their results. They argued that the charismatic leader's effectiveness in bringing about social change may also depend on the ability to transform the group's shared values and identities into a new social identity to be more in line with the leader's vision. As such, it could be social identity framing that allows charismatic leaders to influence social change. These propositions are in line with those that argue that it may in fact be social identity that ‘makes’ a leader charismatic, as discussed below.

Limitations. There are limitations of this theoretical approach to leadership as well. First, there are ambiguities about the nature and source of charisma. What is the precise meaning of charisma? There are inconsistencies in how different charismatic theorists define charisma. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1988, 1998) proposed
that the attributions are determined jointly by characteristics of the leader, subordinates, and situation. In contrast, House (1977) and Shamir and associates (1993) have defined charismatic leadership in terms of how the leader influences follower attitudes and motivation, regardless of whether followers consider the leader extraordinary. There is a need for more clarity and consistency in how the term ‘charismatic’ is defined and used.

Furthermore, the notion that change agency is a defining property of charismatic leadership can be questioned. It is quite possible for charismatic leaders to resist social change in defense of the tradition as well. For example, Iranian revolutionary leader Ayatollah Khomeini, seen as a charismatic leader by social scientists (e.g., Arjomand, 2002; Bass, 1990; Bryman, 1992), was known for his agenda that fought to restore traditional Islamic order. Furthermore, Levay (2010) investigated charismatic leadership in an organisational setting and showed that charismatic leadership can also act in resistance to change and in defense of the status quo. In line with this, it has been argued that while innovation can be part of a charismatic leader’s vision, it does not define charismatic leadership (Wallis & Bruce, 1986). That is, charisma as a concept should be seen as “what legitimates the leader's mission, and not the mission itself” (Levay, 2010, p.130).

In addition, there are also limitations in explaining the underlying psychological processes of effective leadership. Charisma may, indeed, be a special gift, but what is the precise source of it and its power in yielding influence? Can it be attributed to leaders as a function of other more group-oriented processes? Indeed, ingroup leaders have been found to be attributed greater charisma than out-group leaders (Duck & Fielding, 1999; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989). While charisma may be seen as a special gift, Platow and colleagues (2006) argue that it is one that is bestowed on group members by group members for being representative of, rather than distinct from, the group itself. While traditionally charisma has been seen to be a result of
individuating (e.g. Bass, 1985), rhetorical (e.g. Emrich et al., 2001), or behavioural (e.g. Conger & Kanungo, 1998) factors, they found that participants attributed charisma to a leader based solely on the knowledge of a person’s relative representativeness of the group of which he or she was a member. It was only when leaders were lacking in ingroup qualities (if they had out-group rather than in-group-stereotypical characteristics) that leaders’ specific (individual) behaviours such as their rhetorical communications were found to be important.

Furthermore, another limitation of these theories is the descriptive and circular nature of the concept ‘visionary’. According to these theories, visionary leaders are effective and good at their job because they are precisely that, visionary. Indeed, such approaches are useful at describing what good leaders look like. However, they are less helpful in explaining the underlying psychological processes that allow leaders to be effective and influence others (Haslam et al., 2011; Subašić et al., 2015; Yukl, 1999).

**Vision and change.** More recently, empirical research has examined the role of vision in leadership effectiveness. For example, a number of studies assessed the relationship between vision content and communication style on followers’ perceptions of visionary leadership and leader effectiveness (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997; Holladay & Coombs, 1994; Howell & Frost, 1989). The results of these studies support the relationship between an emotionally expressive communication style, characterized by eye contact, facial expressiveness, effective gestures, and vocal variety, and follower perceptions of visionary leadership, charisma, and leadership effectiveness.

Further, the relationships among emotional communication skills, visionary leadership, and leadership performance has been examined utilizing actual managers and their direct reports in real organisations. Surveying 108 senior organisational leaders and 325 of their direct followers from 64 organisations across numerous
industries, Groves (2006) found that leader emotional expressivity was strongly related to visionary leadership, while leader emotional expressivity moderated the relationship between visionary leadership and organisational change magnitude. He concluded that visionary leaders with high emotional expressivity skills facilitated the greatest organisational changes in their respective organisations.

While vision communication has been found to be an important element of mobilizing followers for (organisational) change, there seems to be scarce evidence on precisely when and why vision communication is effective in influencing followers. Providing an explanation for this, Stam and colleagues proposed that vision should fit followers’ regulatory focus in order to be effective (Stam, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010a; see also Benjamin & Flynn, 2006; Damen, van Knippenberg, & van Knippenberg, 2008; Howell & Shamir, 2005). In two experiments Stam and colleagues (2010a) demonstrated that prevention-appeals led to better performance than promotion-appeals for more prevention-focused followers, while the reverse was true for more promotion-focused followers for both a dispositional measure of follower regulatory focus (Study 1) as well as a manipulation of follower regulatory focus (Study 2).

Stam, van Knippenberg, and Wisse, (2010b) further argued that vision needs to be focused on followers—by addressing followers personally and involving them in the vision—to be successful. They found that vision statements that focused on followers were more likely to lead to the creation of an ideal self and hence to higher follower performance than visions that do not focus on followers. This research shows that it is important for leaders to focus on followers to enable change.

However, there are some limitations of this study. The first limitation relates to the operationalization of the manipulated variables. In the follower-focused vision, the leader addressed the followers personally and tried to make them think about their role in the vision, while in the control condition the vision speech was given in third-person
and was directed at “people” in general. It could be argued that rather than being follower-focused, this manipulation was more or less personally relevant. When reading a message directed at “you”, participants might be more influenced compared to reading something about “people” in general. Furthermore, a leader addressing followers directly and striving to engage them in some decision making process may be creating a shared social identity with a given group of followers, which in turn could be the underlying psychological mechanism driving support for leader’s change proposal.

The second limitation relates to the dependent variable. Rather than measuring an actual change, this research focused on participant’s performance (on an idea generation task) and their ideal self. Ideal selves are said to motivate individuals because they provide a positive self-image to aim towards. However, there is no measurement or indication of whether this ideal self is translated into reality or not, i.e., whether change has been achieved. This is generally true of most empirical research in this area of research. Despite visionary leadership being argued to be an important driver of change, not many empirical studies have actually investigated or measured achievement of change.

The Focus on Followers

We will now review theories of leadership that are known and celebrated for their assertion of connecting leader effectiveness to followers. A main focus of these theories is on the role of followers or connection between leaders and followers in leaders being able to be effective and encourage followers to support and embrace new practices.

Transactional Leadership. Transactional leadership is about the quality of the relationship between the leader and his or her followers. One of the first people to recognise and appreciate the importance of followership was Hollander. Rather than
being passive bystanders witnessing leadership, Hollander saw followers as an active part of leadership projects. He suggested that the relationship between leaders and followers is one of interpersonal and social exchange and this is what effective leadership is based upon.

In 1958, Hollander coined the term ‘idiosyncrasy credit’ which refers to the idea that leaders (or other group members) have to first build up psychological group credits with other members of the group before they can suggest change and expect group members to be open to their idiosyncratic ideas. In this way, idiosyncrasy credit gives individuals latitude to suggest change that deviates from the current norms without being sanctioned for it by other group members. The central idea is that leaders first need to prove themselves to be valuable team players in the eyes of the followers before they can be trusted to take them on new paths. As such, a new member of a group is in a poor position to assert influence, especially in the direction of change. A range of studies have examined and tested these ideas (see Hollander, 1960; Hollander, 1961; Hollander & Julian, 1970).

Hollander first tested these arguments in 1960 in an experiment with groups of engineering students that required making a joint decision in a group task. The study tested whether competence on the group task and conformity to procedural norms in the earlier trials affected a person (confederate)’s ability to influence other group members with non-conformity in the later trials. In this study, influence was measured by the number of trials in which the confederate’s recommended solution was accepted as the group’s choice. Consistent with his predictions, Hollander found that the confederate’s influence increased as the trials progressed—with successive evidence of competence. Further, the non-conforming confederate also achieved high influence in groups when he demonstrated conformity to the group’s procedural norms in the early trials. These
results were all thoroughly consistent with predictions made from the idiosyncrasy credit model of conformity and status.

Hollander has also tested the effects of other factors on leaders’ ability to challenge group plans. Among these is the manner in which the leader was selected to the leadership position. Hollander and Julian (1970) tested and found that leaders who had been elected to their position, and hence had the explicit backing of group members (seen as having accrued idiosyncrasy credits), were more likely to challenge group decisions than leaders who had been appointed to their position. The researchers argued that without the backing of followers, leaders lack the security to display genuine leadership and therefore are less likely to suggest change.

However, the focus of this research is on whether leaders who have been elected are more likely to challenge group norms, rather than exploring how such challenges fared with the followers who elected the leader. Despite arguing that followers should be an important part of the leadership process, Hollander’s empirical work failed to operationalize and measure this aspect. Indeed, it is still unclear from this research how or when leaders can successfully encourage followers to support and embrace new practices. Furthermore, in these studies, the phenomenon of idiosyncrasy credit was never examined directly. It was confounded with other potentially important factors such as status, authority, and involvement. As a result, based on this work, it is difficult to pinpoint the precise source and nature of idiosyncrasy credit.

Another limitation of this work involves the operationalization of innovation as non-conformity, rather than change per se. What we are interested in as part of the current thesis is in understanding how leaders act as active agents of change and work together with followers in actively shaping their social reality. As such, questions can be raised about the feasibility of non-conformity or deviance as a platform for change, which will be discussed further in the next chapter.
A key contribution of this leadership model has been in re-emphasizing the role of followers in predicting effective leadership. If leadership is defined as the process of influencing group members in a way that contributes to the achievement of group goals, then the followership of those members should be every bit as important as the actions of leaders. However, limitations do exist.

First, there seems to be a lack of specificity about the precise nature and source of idiosyncrasy credit. In his 1958 paper he stated that three determinants of idiosyncrasy credits were an individual’s performance or competence in regard to a task or activity, characteristics of the individual not specific to these activities (both of which would constitute a gain in credits) and how much idiosyncratic behaviour they had already engaged in (which would constitute a drain on credits). Now, while task competence and idiosyncratic behaviour may be somewhat defined, the second determinant, individual characteristics seem very broad and undefined. And through the years, Hollander has pointed to many factors that could have an effect on how much idiosyncrasy credit a person has. For example, men are noted to have more credit than women, and those who are more senior and have more status are also said to have more credit. While these factors may all be descriptively true, the theoretical explanation that explicates the precise process is lacking (Haslam & Platow, 2010).

Overall, while the focus of leadership research has shifted to the quality of relations between the leader and the follower, followers are still seen to play a passive role in the leadership projects. The process of gaining idiosyncrasy credits as described by the model is still very much focused on the leader. The leader would do something for his or her followers, and in turn be validated and empowered by their followers. In a way, this could be seen as followers turning a blind eye to whatever idiosyncratic behaviour the leader engages in if they had proven themselves to the followers beforehand. The change process is still seen as something that is inherently about the
leaders themselves and not something the group as a whole embarks upon. The quality of relations between leaders and followers and seeing followers (in addition to leaders) as change agents is missing in this analysis.

**Leadership Categorisation Theory.** Another approach that has brought the focus of leadership to followers is leadership categorisation theory (Lord, Foti & Phillips, 1982). Proposed by Lord and colleagues, this approach recognises that what constitutes leadership is a leader having followers who perceive him or her as their leader. Without followers’ perception or acceptance of him or her as an appropriate and effective leader, a leader is not in a position to influence or mobilise a collective for a cause. They argued that in order to be successful, leaders need to conform to a set of expectations that are pre-conceived stereotypic behaviours or “prototypes” held by followers (e.g., Lord, Foti & De Vader, 1984; Palich & Hom, 1992; Nye & Forsyth, 1991).

According to Lord and colleagues, these stereotypes have a hierarchical structure and can range in their specificity. Those at the highest level of the hierarchy are abstract and broad, and are argued to be shared by all leaders regardless of which field they are located. These constitute characteristics such as intelligence, fairness or outgoingness. Those at the bottom of the hierarchy are more concrete and prescriptive, and are said to be of 11 basic categories. These each constitute attributes specific to the categories, that if a leader possesses will predict their success in a given field (e.g., sport) and not others (e.g., politics or business). This is said to explain why a leader in one domain (e.g., sport) may find it difficult to jump ship to another domain (e.g., politics or business) and be seen as effective. Furthermore, these leadership stereotypes are said to be fixed determinants of leader effectiveness and can account for the context specificity of appropriate leader behaviours in being seen as effective.
For example, Foti, Fraser and Lord (1982) found that subjects made clear distinctions between the characteristics possessed by political leaders and leaders in general, and also effective leaders. In their study, 120 subjects rated 17 items on how characteristic they were of four different leader labels: leader, political leader, effective leader, and effective political leader. The findings of the study indicated significant differences between the prototypes of leader and political leader, and between political leader and effective political leader.

Foti and colleagues (1982) also tested whether these prototypes affected how people rated real-world leaders. In their second study, 1,509 subjects’ responses to a series of Gallup polls (the "President Carter's Phrase Portrait," 1979) indicated that those items found to be most characteristic of ‘effective political leaders’ were also most highly correlated with high ratings for President Carter obtained from the Gallup poll. That is, those prototypes, argued to specify the characteristics associated with different categories (i.e., effective political leaders), were also found to affect leaders’ effectiveness ratings.

As was the case for Hollander’s work on idiosyncrasy credits, Lord’s work has made a key contribution in bringing the focus onto the followers and their perceptions and expectations in understanding effective leadership. In addition, Lord’s work also brings attention to the role played by social categories and categorisation in the leadership process. This sheds light on the fact that leadership in reality is a process engaged in by multiple parties where each party and their perceptions of each other play important roles. This point is related to the ideas of the social identity approach discussed in the next chapter.

Despite the contributions of this leader categorisation approach, there are limitations as well. There seems to be inflexibility in the expectations of followers, in that the stereotypes through which followers base their perceptions of leaders are fixed.
According to this theory, given a certain collection of attributes that characterise a leader, they will succeed in a given domain of leadership. That is to say all leaders in a particular field will possess the same characteristics, while in reality this is far from being true. For we can think of political leaders who are peace-loving and non-violent such as Martin Luther King or Gandi. There are other influential leaders along the likes of Hitler who have lead their followers down a path of violence and conflict. How do these stark differences fit with a single leader prototype in the political domain? The reality is that the attributes of a leader or followers’ expectations of that leader cannot be constrained to something that is fixed. Effective leadership is a process where both leaders and followers and their relationship are flexible and evolve as a function of developing dynamics within and between groups (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005).

**Summary and Conclusion**

To summarise, the models of leadership reviewed in this chapter are both person-centered, and consider an inter-individual leader-follower relationship (as exemplified by one of the core tenets of transformational leadership, ‘individualised consideration’, or the primary focus of Hollander’s idiosyncratic credit model being on the behavior of the leader). While they are good at describing what great leaders should be like, they fail to explain the underlying psychological processes that enable a leader to influence and mobilise support for change. The social identity perspective provides such an explanation. In the following chapter, we will first discuss social identity analyses of leadership and influence, and outline recent links made between leadership and social change that considers the intragroup relations in social change contexts.
Chapter 5. Leadership and Influence: A Group Process

As discussed in the previous chapter, the leadership literature has been very leader-centric, with the focus of much of this work being on individual characteristics or behavior of leaders. However, given that leadership is widely accepted to be “a process of social influence through which an individual enlists and mobilizes the aid of others in the attainment of a collective goal” (Chemers, 2001, p. 376), it is important to consider the broader group context that leadership and influence occurs in (Haslam et al., 2011).

In this chapter, we will first discuss the social identity perspective on leadership that considers leadership and influence as a group process. We will then review recent research that has considered the intersection of leadership and intra-group dynamics (that go beyond the leader character and behavioural style) in social change contexts more specifically. Particularly, we will review work that considers the different ways leaders can be ‘non-prototypical’ or ‘deviant’ from the group norm, including research that examines support for deviating and transgressing leadership (Abrams, Marques, Bown, and Dougill, 2002; Abrams, Randsley de Moura, Marques, & Hutchison., 2008; Randsley de Moura & Abrams, 2013). We will then review research that considers the active role leaders play in enacting change, and examines the importance of continuity of identity (as a psychological mechanism) in advancing and gaining support for change in the context of mergers (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg & Bobbio, 2008; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Monden & de Lima, 2002).

The Social Identity Perspective on Leadership

As we discussed in Chapter 2, the social identity perspective conceptualizes leadership and social influence as a group process where influence flows from the collaborative relationship between leaders and followers in shaping their social reality
LEADERSHIP AS A GROUP PROCESS

(Reicher, et al. 2005). Within this perspective, leadership and influence is driven by a sense of shared identity between leaders and followers (Turner, 1991; Turner & Haslam, 2001). Leaders who are seen to embody what it means to be ‘us’ (and not ‘them’) are more likely to be supported and endorsed. Because prototypical leaders are perceived to exemplify the group identity and are seen as the embodiment of what the group values and considers important, they are trusted by other group members to pursue the group's best interest, and therefore are more influential (e.g., van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

There is robust evidence supporting the role of leader group prototypicality in leadership effectiveness using field studies as well as laboratory experiments. Prototypical leaders have been found to be more effective (e.g., Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), perform better (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), endorsed more (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Ullrich, Christ, & van Dick, 2009), and even supported during organisational change (Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; van Knippenberg et al., 2008).

While the evidence showing that prototypical leaders are more influential is quite robust and has been demonstrated using different measures of leadership effectiveness, here we will review those studies that have focused on leaders’ capacity to influence change. The capacity of leaders to engender change and commit people to change is seen as a significant aspect of effective leadership (Yukl, 2012) and is relevant to the topic at hand. Leader group prototypicality has been demonstrated to be linked to leader effectiveness in facilitating openness to organisational change in a number of studies. For example, van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005), examined whether the extent to which the leader is representative of the group and self-sacrificing behavior of the leader influence leadership effectiveness, including
participants’ willingness to participate in organisational-change programs. One hundred and sixty-one employees of primary schools belonging to the IJmond-North primary school district of the Netherlands completed questionnaires that included measures of leader prototypicality and willingness to engage in organisational change. As predicted, they found that leader prototypicality (and leader self-sacrifice) was positively related to followers’ willingness to support change.

In a similar vein, a cross-sectional survey of 102 employees of a large Italian aerospace company by Pierro and colleagues (2005) examined the relationship between leader group prototypicality and followers’ resistance to organisational change. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire in group sessions administered in collaboration with the human resource manager of the company, that included measures of leader group prototypicality (completed with reference to participants’ work team leader) and openness towards organisational change. The results of the study showed that leader group prototypicality was positively related to follower willingness to support change, especially for followers with relatively high need for closure (i.e., dispositional need to reduce uncertainty) and team identification. The findings of both these studies demonstrate that leadership and influence, and support for change, are indeed driven by a sense of shared identity between leaders and followers.

However, research on leadership and prototypicality examines just that –leaders who are prototypical or not. In social change contexts, leadership is often a contest for influence, where ‘leadership for change’ seeks to challenge and change the nature of relevant social relations in the face of opposition from those (often already in positions of authority) that seek to maintain the status quo. When there are multiple leaders competing for influence in a group, they do not all advocate for the same position, but rather quite often differ from the group norms in different ways. Pro-change or alternative leaders especially voice different concerns to that of established authorities.
A pro-change position can be more radical but along the same trajectory of norms and values as the position espoused by an incumbent. Also, a pro-change leader may be more innovative and attempt to advance a different and somewhat novel set of ideas and values. While the leadership literature has failed to consider the impact of different positions of leaders, the deviance literature considers ingroup members whose position varies in relation to the norm. In order to investigate how these varying voices can impact successful or effective leadership, research on deviance and influence will be discussed next.

**Leadership and Deviance**

A challenge for many leaders in organisations or in political leadership positions is to drive change and take the group in new directions (Lakomski, 2001). The deviance literature considers the different ways to be ‘non-prototypical’ or ‘deviant’ from the group norm. They use the subjective group dynamics (SGD) framework (Marques, Páez, & Abrams, 1998) to investigate how group members respond to ‘deviant’ leaders who resist the mode of opinion within a group in an anti-normative direction.

The SGD framework, which holds that one way group members promote a positive social identity is by maintaining the subjective validity and legitimacy of ingroup norms, elaborates on the distinction between the direction and magnitude of fit with the norms. This framework proposes that in addition to judging group prototypes, group members use intragroup differentiation for a further purpose – to reinforce prescriptive ingroup norms. According to this framework, even though members deviate from the prototype, they can still be supported if they still maintain subjective validity and legitimacy of ingroup norms (Marques et al., 1998).

**Deviance and innovation credit.** Research by Abrams and colleagues (Abrams et al., 2008) looks at when leaders can challenge group norms (be deviant) and achieve
a license to ‘innovate’. This idea was first explored in one of Abrams and colleagues’ earlier studies that explored deviance of group members in general (i.e., not specific to leaders). They found anti-norm deviants in an organisation to attract more negative evaluations than pro-norm deviants, even though both were equally dissimilar to the ingroup prototype (Abrams et al., 2002). In their second study, they found British and overseas students were more positive toward ingroup members who deviated in the normative direction with respect to university policies for overseas students. These results show that judgments and reactions to deviants depend on (in)group membership and the direction of deviance, not just its magnitude (Abrams et al., 2002). An important point to highlight here is that pro-norm deviance was more supported mainly because it still maintains subjective validity and legitimacy of ingroup norms. This shows that even when group members deviate from normative expectations, they can be supported if their deviant behaviour is identity-oriented. This work has implications for leadership pushing an agenda for social change (that is also likely to deviate from normative expectations). Such change needs to be identity-oriented in order to be able to successfully mobilise the group for change.

More recently, Abrams and colleagues (2008) have explored when leaders can be deviant or ‘innovative’. Here, the focus was on when leaders can get away with an anti-norm position. They found that new leaders with an anti-norm position are evaluated more favourably than a current leader with the same position. This study found that while leadership can accrue from prototypicality and confers the right to define prescriptive norms of the group, innovation credit is only granted to future leaders and not to incumbent leaders. These results suggest that anti-norm future leaders are not rejected out of hand (as we may expect in line with the social identity approach to leadership), but are instead entrusted freedom to innovate. Abrams and colleagues
argued that this is because group members have no history with new leaders, and therefore have no pre-existing expectations of these leaders (Abrams et al., 2008).

It should be noted, though, that there is a disconnect between what this research actually measures and its stated research question. Innovation by leaders was operationalised in a way so that ‘innovation’ was being equated with being ‘anti-normative’. In this study, ‘innovative’ leaders were presented as being ‘anti-normative’ and represented at the negative end of a 21-point bipolar scale. This clearly indicated that the leader was simply against what was defined as the norm (the mid-point). However, it is quite possible for a leader to be innovative without necessarily rejecting group norms—by simply advocating for something that is novel in relation to the norms.

It should also be noted that, rather than looking explicitly at when leaders can suggest or propose change, this research instead focuses on deviance and when deviant behaviour will be accepted. Deviance does not necessarily reflect change, and therefore cannot be an appropriate platform for investigating and understanding support for social change. We will discuss this point in more detail further below.

**Transgression and support.** In the previous section we reviewed work that looked at leaders' anti-normative or deviant attitudes. In this section, we will review work that looks at leaders' transgressive behaviour which is distinct from deviance in mere opinion. Transgression involves the behaviour of manifestly breaking the law or social rules and therefore may attract more punitive judgements by followers. Leaders can sometimes become corrupt, delinquent, or deluded, resulting in serious transgressive acts. Examples range from political leaders who sanction acts that break international conventions (e.g., use of torture) to CEOs who illegally draw on pension funds or engage in dubious tax evasion or market manipulations and military commanders who engage in unprovoked attacks (e.g., the My Lai massacre).
Given their prevalence, transgression and dissent by influential leaders can be spread among followers, especially if this behaviour continues over time. It may be of use to look at when leaders are given leeway to dissent, because this too represents a form of non-normative behaviour on part of the leader. Furthermore, such a question is also oriented towards leaders maintaining the status quo in power relations (i.e., the leader’s own position in the face of their transgressive behaviour).

Additionally, despite dissent being a departure from the current norms of the ingroup (in the same way as change), it does not necessarily represent pro-change behaviour. Dissent in itself reflects a leader engaging in deviant or normatively undesirable ways that may or may not result in group change or even involve the active intention of change on part of the leaders. Support or not for such transgressions does relate to followers accepting non-normative actions on the part of the leader.

Research by Randsley de Moura and Abrams (2013) explored whether a person's role as a leader or member of the ingroup (vs. outgroup) affected how group members judged leaders’ transgressions. They also tested whether this relationship was affected by the severity of the transgression and whether it served group interests. In two studies that looked at transgressions using bribery (study 1) and blackmail (study 2), they found that ingroup leaders who transgressed were judged less punitively than an ingroup member, outgroup member or an outgroup leader. The results of this research demonstrates that there is a double standard when judging transgressions, where an ingroup leader is given more leeway to engage in such non-normative as well as socially undesirable behaviour. To answer the question of when leaders can dissent without serious punishment then, this research leads to the answer that merely by occupying the role of a (ingroup) leader, members of a group are able to engage in non-normative actions.
The evidence from these studies showing that followers treat nonconformist or dissenting leaders more favourably than other group members engaging in the same act makes sense. Supporting this, there is research that shows leaders to be trusted more and allowed to deviate more from group norms (e.g., Fiske, 2010; Hollander, 1958). Ingroup leaders are also found to be more influential than other group members (e.g., Pescosolido, 2001), and to receive more gratitude and loyalty from followers (e.g., Messick, 2005).

However, it is interesting that these results were not affected by the severity of transgression. The double standard was present in relation to a leader engaging in covert bribery and was also persistent in the more severe and criminal transgressive act of blackmail. Moreover, it is somewhat surprising that the extent to which participants believed the act of transgression served group interests or not, did not affect their judgements of the transgressor. This is a point of difference from Hollander's work on idiosyncrasy credits where he argued that leaders are given leeway to deviate or innovate when followers believe that the leader has earned the right to diverge from group norms because of their prior commitment to the group. This brings up questions regarding the precise conditions that allows a leader to engage in deviant behaviour. Is it important for leaders to prove themselves to their group? Or is the mere fact that they are a leader enough?

Further research by Abrams, Randsley de Moura and Travaglino (2013) aimed to bring light to these questions. Using an array of different ingroups and outgroups, they tested how ingroup or outgroup leaders and other group members who unexpectedly transgressed or did not transgress in an intergroup context were judged by followers. They also explicitly manipulated whether an ingroup transgressive leader is perceived as serving the group's interest. Interestingly, the results showed that knowing that the leader's transgressions were motivated by self-interest did not limit the
application of the double standard to ingroup leaders. Ingroup transgressive leaders
were more positively evaluated than outgroup leaders as well as other transgressive
group members, but not any more so when participants were told that the leader
was acting with a group-serving motive. This result is inconsistent with both the social
identity approach on leadership that holds that a leader who is seen as "doing it for us"
and behaving in group serving ways will be influential, as well as Hollander's
idiosyncrasy credit theory that argues that leaders are able to engage in idiosyncratic
ways after engaging in an interpersonal exchange with followers.

Also, it is important to note that this research was not designed to address the
question of when leaders can mobilise the group for change—but rather when leaders
can ‘get away with’ deviant behaviour (whether in group- or selfish interests). This is a
point of distinction for our work which is directly oriented towards the role of
leadership in bringing about social change. As such, this evidence is less helpful in
elucidating when and how pro-change leaders can actively suggest change and receive
support for their change agendas, as discussed below.

**Limitations: what are we really interested in?** As we have discussed, the
focus of research outlined in this section is on when and how leaders can get away with
something, rather than their ability to mobilise followers and move the group in a new
direction. The concepts of deviance and transgression and that of change are both cases
of leaders engaging in a departure from current normative thinking and behaviour.
However, it is important to recognise that deviance and transgression are not a good
platform to explore how social change is achieved.

We are interested in exploring not only when leaders can get away with
something, but when leaders can suggest change and get group members to fully
embrace that change as their cause, rather than just the leader’s. We are interested in
when organisational leaders can implement innovative change to their organisations
with the full support of their employees, and in how world leaders can transcend intergroup differences or bring about significant social change. The act of bringing about change is an active process that leaders engage in in order to get their followers on board and accept the leaders’ project. Therefore, there is a need to distinguish, conceptually, leaders’ acts of deviance and getting away with transgressive behaviour versus that of leadership and innovation for change in considering what is feasible as a platform for change. Research on deviance can elucidate when followers can turn the other cheek when a leader is being less than normative, but it does not show us how or when leaders can suggest change and expect not only lack of resistance towards change but also mobilisation in terms of active support for the change initiatives.

In reality, leaders play a much more active role in managing and driving change initiatives. Next we will review research that is more in line with the idea of an active role of leadership—and followership—in enacting change.

**Leaders and Followers as Agents of Change**

Leaders often play an active role in bringing to life their change projects and getting their followers on board. Work on organisational change, that has been done within the context of mergers and acquisitions, shows that leaders for change may be able to effectively remove resistance to change and mobilise support for their cause by catering to identity concerns of followers (van Knippenberg et al., 2008). Particularly, van Knippenberg and colleagues argue that leaders for change may be able to effectively remove resistance to change and mobilise support for their cause by dealing with and managing any threats to identity held by followers. We will now review this work, and also discuss its limitations in contributing to the understanding of leadership and social change processes.
Identity continuity\textsuperscript{1} for successful change. van Knippenberg and colleagues’ work on identity continuity in contexts of mergers and acquisitions examines the role of a sense of continuity in identity for successful implementation of change (see van Knippenberg et al., 2008; van Knippenberg et al., 2002). In organisational settings, mergers and acquisitions are major changes that employees can experience and they have long been recognised as having a great psychological impact on employees as well as managers. It has also been well documented that such changes to organisations are often resisted by their employees, and often result in failures (Conner, 1995).

According to van Knippenberg and colleagues (2008) such failures in the successful implementation of organisational change may occur due to a lack of perceived continuity by employees. It is argued that people value and derive a sense of meaning from continuity between their past, present and future self. This general conception, they propose, not only applies to people’s personal identities but also to their collective identities as well, where people also value a sense of stability in key aspects of their collective identity over time and situation.

However, during collective change processes, for example in the context of organisational mergers or acquisitions—where the acquired organisations are often requested to abandon the old organisational identity in favor of the new merged identity, this sense of continuity can be challenged. According to van Knippenberg and colleagues this is why change processes elicit so much resistance, as evident in organisational contexts where mergers and acquisitions often result in failures.

Viewed from a social identity perspective, a merger may be defined as a formal re-categorisation of two social groups as one new group. Because this new group incorporates another group—the new merger partner, a change in group membership is implied. A central concern that emerges then is the possibility of perception of a change

\textsuperscript{1} This work focuses on ‘identity’ continuity, which is different from social continuity (i.e., the status quo) that we talk about in opposition to social change.
in identity for all members involved, and how this change might affect employees’ level of identification. As we have discussed in Chapter 2, identity processes, particularly, group members’ identification with a social group can determine an array of group behaviours, including but not limited to influence as well as support for change.

This work looks at the importance of employee identification with the post-merger organisation, for change to be accepted and successfully applied. In order to gain deeper understanding in the tension between need for identity continuity and support for change, Ullrich, Wieseke and Dick (2005) conducted in-depth interviews in a recently merged German industrial company. They found that when managers perceived a lack of identity continuity, their post-merger identification was negatively impacted. In addition to mentioning several symbolic threats to their pre-merger identities, participants pointed out that an absence of continuity between past, present and future made identifying with the post-merger organisational identity very difficult, if not, impossible. Perhaps, if group members felt a sense of continuity in that, despite changes, it was still “their group”, they may be more accepting of changes.

Linking back to the work on vision and change, we can see that it is quite possible for a vision to be perceived as discontinuous not only in terms of it being (not) shared by the collective, but also in the way that vision is structured in terms of achievability in practice. We have seen that in order to make vision for change an attractive possibility for the future, vision needs to be connected to followers and shared collectively (e.g., Stam et al., 2010a; Stam et al., 2010b). Furthermore, this work on identity continuity also brings to attention the need for change managers to attend to feasibility in terms of integration of old with new, in a way that is conducive to post-change identification. For example, clear communication of the merged organisation’s goals and employees’ part in it and why the merger is necessary can lead to increase in post-merger identification (van Knippenberg et al., 2008).
Effective leadership of change thus requires that leaders not only act as agents of change, but also as agents of continuity (Reicher & Hopkins, 2003; Shamir, 1999; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Prototypical leaders may be positioned particularly well to combine the roles of agent of change and agent of continuity, because prototypical leaders represent the collective identity and are trusted to have the collective interest at heart. Changes envisioned by prototypical leaders are more likely to be viewed as identity consistent compared to the same changes advocated by less prototypical leaders.

Research by Bobbio, van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005) supports this proposition. Participants were asked to evaluate a leader advocating a merger between participants’ own organisation and another organisation in a scenario-based experiment. The leader was presented to be either prototypical, or non-prototypical. They found that participants were more willing to change when the leader was prototypical, and this effect was more pronounced when discontinuity threat was large rather than small.

However, it is also the case that not all organisational leaders are seen as prototypical. It is possible for a leader who is perceived as less prototypical by employees of one organisation to behave in ways that favor these employees (Jetten, Duck, Terry, & O’Brien, 2002). For example, leader’s group-orientedness toward their employees (e.g., offering support during integration, creating career opportunities, showing a positive attitude toward, and investing more time interacting with these employees) might compensate for his or her lack of group prototypicality. Such strategic use of acts (or claims) of group-orientedness by leaders to engender follower support is seen in organisational as well as political settings (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). For example, Lee Iacocca, the CEO of Chrysler, deciding to set his annual salary
to US$1 to combat the crisis at his company sent a clear message communicating the extent to which he was willing to act for the group.

This research is important in showing that leaders play an active role in enacting change. It shows the need for leadership of change to be sensitive to the identity concerns of their followers. Particularly, leaders for change may be able to effectively remove resistance to change and mobilise support for their cause by dealing with and managing any threats to identity that followers may have. However, it is important to note that often at the core of social change is indeed identity change (Subašić et al., 2015). Leaders have agency in shaping and defining identities, and leaders for change would strive to change who ‘we’ are in line with their change proposals in order to gain support. Leaders for continuity seek to do the same, striving for identity continuity so that followers would support their push for maintenance of the status quo. These ideas are explained clearly within the work on identity entrepreneurship where Reicher and colleagues (Haslam et al., 2011; Haslam & Reicher, 2007; Reicher et al., 2005) argue that leaders not only reflect and represent a given social identity, but also actively manage the category definitions in order to appear as the embodiment of the group. This work further demonstrates that the transformative potential of leaders lies in their ability to define shared social identities. We will discuss this work in more detail in the following chapter.

**Summary and Conclusion**

The research reviewed in this chapter have been useful in demonstrating that social identity is the driving force of leadership in social change contexts. The findings of these studies showed that leadership and social influence are indeed group processes where influence flows from the collaborative relationship between leaders and followers in shaping their social reality. For example, as reviewed in this chapter, leaders are
given license to deviate or innovate only if they maintain subjective validity and legitimacy of ingroup norms (e.g., Abrams et al., 2008), or leaders for change may be able to effectively remove resistance to change by ensuring identity continuity for followers (e.g., Pierro et al., 2005; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; van Knippenberg et al., 2008).

This research, while important and innovative, only progresses the analysis of leadership and the question of change so far. While focused on group processes (in contrast to taking a person-centred approach to leadership), this work fails to consider the broader intergroup relations that are important in understanding social change dynamics, and therefore, understanding the role of leadership in actively enacting social change. Furthermore, while these areas of research explore innovative and/or deviating aspects of leadership that is relevant to this thesis, they do not deal precisely with the questions we aim to examine—that is, to elucidate when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence. In the next chapter, we will first discuss recent work on identity entrepreneurship (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005) that makes the link between leadership and social change in the context of intergroup relations more explicitly, before reviewing recent research that considers contesting leadership.

Social change is often promoted through active leadership. Evidence of leadership processes in bringing about change can be seen in prison resistance case studies. Looking at prison systems in different countries with different social and political systems where effective prisoner resistance and even dominance was attained, emergence of a clear leadership structure was key in organising collective efforts for resistance and instilling change in the power dynamics between inmates and guards (Haslam & Reicher, 2012). For example, in Robben Island, South Africa (1962-1991) it was the leadership of inmates such as Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Jacob Zuma, Govan Mbeki, and Tokyo Sexwale that played a major role in the development of the anti-Apartheid movement and establishment of the new political order after the fall of Apartheid. Moreover, emergence of leadership in enacting collective resistance was evident in the much more oppressive Nazi camps as well. For example, in Sobibor Extermination Camp (1942-1943) a former lieutenant of the Red Army called Alexander Sasha Pechersky was known to play a major part in bringing together prisoners and rallying them against the guards in attempting a mass break out from the camp. These real life examples of resistance and change driven by leaders show the need for integrating social change processes with the study of leadership and social influence (Haslam & Reicher, 2012).

Research examining precisely when leaders can be successful in influencing change in followers' understanding of themselves and mobilising them for change against existing intergroup relations is lacking in the social psychological research of leadership. As researchers, we have largely overlooked that people do not respond to the inequalities, hostilities and conflicts between different groups they belong to in a quiet and isolated manner (Reicher et al., 2005; Subašić et al., 2012). Rather, they are assailed
and influenced by different voices that cause them to question and criticize the
conditions of injustice and oppression they had previously considered ‘normal’ and
legitimate, mobilizing them for change, while others continue to defend the status-quo
and the mindsets that support its maintenance (e.g. Mugny, 1982; Reicher & Hopkins,
2001; Simon & Klandermans, 2001; Subašić et al, 2008). Despite leadership efforts for
change occurring in a contest for influence, this contrastive process is rarely explored in
leadership work.

The notion of leadership being competitive and requiring a contrastive analysis
is a central theme of this thesis. Because, asking when a leader as a change agent can
successfully mobilise the masses for his or her cause, without considering the
competition offering alternative forms of social reality for those masses, would be an
incomplete and useless point of inquiry. The reality is that the same audience will be
exposed to multiple would be leaders all trying to define their identities and realities in
different ways (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005; Subašić et al, 2012). In the
political context, for example, it is the same electorate that competing politicians all vie
to gain the allegiance of leading up to an election. The question that needs to be asked
then is, which of the many voices for change will capture the group’s imagination and
when?

In this chapter, we will first discuss work on identity entrepreneurship (Haslam
et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005) that makes the link between leadership and social
transformation in the context of intergroup relations more explicitly, and shows that the
transformative potential of leaders lies in their ability to define shared social identities.
We will then review research that considers contesting leadership and outline our
empirical program.
Leaders as Identity Entrepreneurs

The social identity perspective on leadership argues that it is a sense of shared identity that makes leadership possible. According to this perspective, leaders can transform social reality by defining shared social identities. As we saw in the previous chapter, the basis of social influence and leadership is category definitions. As it is social identities that determine the boundaries of mobilisation, who will be mobilised, what they will be mobilised for, and who will be able to direct the mobilisation are all determined by the content of the social category. These same processes govern who will be included and excluded within the category and who is prototypical of that category.

Leaders who control category definitions are then in a position to advocate for and gain support for social change. Indeed, one of the ways in which leaders make particular forms of identity and their own leadership viable is by acting as entrepreneurs of identity (Haslam & Reicher, 2007; Reicher et al., 2005). Leaders not only passively reflect and represent group membership, but actively seek to shape identities in order to appear at the centre of it and transform realities (Haslam et al., 2011). They often seek to create an inclusive category such that they themselves can come to be representative and appear as the most viable leadership option.

This is evident when looking at how radically differently politicians define and characterise the meaning of their national identity. For example, over the course of the campaign before the recent US Presidential elections, Republican candidate, Donald Trump’s rhetoric called for an America that secured the border and stopped illegal immigration in order to ‘make America great again’. On the other hand, Hillary Clinton, the first female presidential candidate nominated by a major party (the Democrats), defined Americans as ‘stronger together’ and one nation for all that did not exclude people for looking a certain way, worshipping a certain way, or loving a certain way.
These markedly different definitions of identity are not descriptions, but rather projects intended to mobilise people to create a certain social reality.

Much of this work related to these ideas is rhetorical. Recently, Augoustinos and colleagues’ work on the political rhetoric of Obama shows how leaders actively realign social identity to mobilise followers for a particular agenda (Augoustinos & de Garis, 2012). Despite his representation of the American identity being questioned and contested within both the White and Black American communities, Obama had strategically managed his and the national identity to mobilise political support. The detailed discursive analyses by Augoustinos and colleagues demonstrated that Obama’s ‘entrepreneurial identity work’ managed the dilemmas around his racial identity by actively crafting an in-group identity that was oriented to an increasingly socially diverse and inclusive America—which he exemplified and embodied.

Identity entrepreneurship of leaders in influencing followers for change can be seen in the BBC Prison Study as well. The BBC prison study was a social psychological experiment run by Reicher and Haslam along with the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) in 2001 aimed at understanding tyranny and when it becomes psychologically acceptable. In part it was aimed at revisiting ideas raised in Zimbardo’s Stanford Prison experiment and examined the consequences of randomly assigning men into groups of differential status; guards and prisoners. The events that unfolded over the period of 8 days demonstrated that first, it is a shared sense of identity that makes leadership possible and second, the way in which leaders act as entrepreneurs of identity can make particular forms of identity and their own leadership viable (Reicher & Haslam, 2006).

In this study, within the prisoners, a senior trade union organiser by profession—referred to as DMp in the study—was able to emerge as the leader of the prisoners after articulating a shared prisoner identity and gaining shared consensus. In addition to this, DMp also had plans to implement change in the intergroup dynamics
that framed the study. He sought to unite both the prisoners and guards to challenge the experimenters who he saw as managers imposing unreasonable conditions over the study. To achieve this change, he engaged in identity entrepreneurship, creating and encouraging the participants to see themselves within a new set of categories. He did this by articulating the shared-ness of the conditions in the study for both prisoners and guards (for example, the unbearable heat in their quarters), and promoting a shared vision that he argued needed to be pursued collectively. By doing this, he was able to bring together the guards and prisoners as one collectivity with a shared identity, where now the relevant outgroup was that of the experimenters. It is important to note though, here, it wasn’t just the creation of a relevant comparison outgroup, but also DM₀’s ability to politically manage the comparative context to restructure the particular identity he envisioned and make himself a viable leader.

DM₀ was not the only prisoner with a vision. Another prisoner, PB₀, disagreed with DM₀’s plans to unite the guards and prisoners through a communal forum, but also had a vision of his own that was quite individualistic. It was clear from the conversations they had PB₀ thought of himself as an individual and advocated for a very exclusive approach focused on what ‘I’ wanted. As expected, his vision of how the group should be, based on individual acts of heroic subversion, was rejected by other group members and did not gain any support.

This area of research is important in showing that the transformative potential of leaders lies in their ability to define shared social identities. These arguments are also reflected in the recent social identity model of resistance proposed by Haslam and Reicher (2012). They argued that leadership is critical in harnessing the group to organising resistance and achieving social change most effectively. It is through redefining identity that certain group members are able to shape the perceptions, values and goals of group members. It is the same process (one of shared social identity) that
allow established authorities to oppress others but also subordinate members to challenge and have the potential to change existing power relations. Here we have seen that it is not enough to just provide a new vision as seen by PBp’s unsupported plans. Even though we have seen that vision could be a necessary component of change, we have also seen from this research that it is not sufficient in itself to bring the masses together and mobilise them for change. More importantly, leaders need to also cater to followers’ social realities in offering a future that they want to live in, because “the viability of a leader’s imagination is only as great as the ability of followers to bring it to fruition” (Reicher et al., 2005, p. 560).

Furthermore, it is important to recognise that despite leaders being able to actively transform identities in the hopes of making them more influential, they are also constrained by the social reality (Reicher, 2004). These constraints may come from previous ways in which identity has been defined and cemented into societies through laws, customs and institutions, as well as from the available leaders vying to gain influence in the same group. Opposition and challenge from other leaders have not been considered previously in exploring leader influence and their ability to mobilise followers for change. This is despite knowing from work on collective action that collective efforts for change are achieved in a context of contest; between dominant groups seeking to preserve the status quo and resistance groups seeking to achieve change in front of third parties whose support they wish to engage (Subašić et al., 2008). These tripolar influence relations need to be taken into account when attempting to understand who will have influence and have the capacity to change intergroup relations.

As we have outlined in the introduction of this thesis, and reviewed in the preceding chapters, the intersection of leadership and social change is missing and needed. In reality, there are almost always multiple would-be ingroup leaders, all in
contest with each other and all vying for support of the same public. Current leaders often try to maintain the existing social relations—or at least shape them in a way that will maintain their position of influence, and thereby the status quo in intergroup *power* relations. In contrast, emerging leaders tend to spearhead the challenge to the status quo and attempt to mobilise the public for change. Only rarely, however, has leadership been seen or studied as a contest for influence where existing leaders and those vying for leadership seek to redefine the nature of followers’ understandings of themselves and others within the broader intergroup relations context (Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005; Subašić et al, 2012).

What happens when alternatives exist and there are multiple sources of influence all vying to sway the public to their side, whether it is one of social change or preserving the status quo? A consideration of contesting sources of influence while scarce in the leadership literature, save for a few recent studies (see Alabastro, Rast, Lac, Hogg, & Crano, 2013; Halevy, Berson, & Galinsky, 2011; Rast, Gaffney, Hogg, & Crisp, 2012), is necessary in understanding the precise processes involved in collective mobilization for change. In the next section, we will discuss the need to explore leadership as a contest for influence before outlining our empirical program.

**Contesting Leadership**

Recent work in political psychology has attempted to answer this question by considering the success of leaders in comparison with each other. The focus of this work has ranged across a number of different outcomes, such as the complexity of political rhetoric of leaders (Conway III et al., 2012), consideration of personality traits in voting choice of early and late deciders (Catellani & Alberici, 2012), compensatory egalitarianism (Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Rudman, 2010), obedience to illegitimate requests (Passini & Morselli, 2010), and implicit political attitudes (Roccato &
Zogmaister, 2010) of voters. Even though this work considers the success of leaders in comparison with each other, the main focus is on individual characteristics of followers that affect their support of and voting intentions for leadership contenders. The social identity dynamics are not considered in this work, yet could play an important role in shaping many forms of political support.

Sheets and colleagues’ (2011) work comparing Obama and McCain in regards to their American-ness and Christian-ness in the 2008 US Presidential race is an important contribution in this regard. These authors looked at the affirmation of a collective identity in leaders’ rhetoric (through overt embraces of God and country in campaign messages) and how they relate to US citizen’s electoral attitudes and intended vote choice (Sheets, Domke, & Greenwald, 2011). They found that both explicit and implicit perceptions of these features related to voters’ overall candidate attitudes and voting intentions, but were significantly stronger for Republicans than Democrats. Specifically, Republicans tended to perceive their preferred candidate (their partisan leader, McCain) as more American and more Christian than his opponent (Sheets et al., 2011).

In a similar exploration of leadership in an intergroup context, Alabastro and colleagues (2013) also compared Obama and McCain before and after the 2008 U.S. presidential election. The focus of their work was on perceptions in terms of attitude similarity to each of the leaders (in- and outgroup leaders) among Liberals and Conservatives, taking into account how winning or losing affects intergroup leadership. Drawing from social identity principles and optimal distinctiveness theory, these authors expected perceptions of leader similarity to be determined by whether or not members want to appear distinct from, or assimilate with, a particular social identity. Given the competitive electoral context, participants in each political party would have an in- and outgroup leader before the election results are announced, and a superordinate ingroup leader depending on who won the election.
They argued that while prior to the election, a competitive (Liberals vs. Conservatives) intergroup context prevails, after the election the context shifts to an *intragroup* frame of reference (where the relevant social identity should now be Americans). Given that in majority of political elections, especially presidential elections, people belong to opposing parties before the election but must come together afterward to provide shared support for the elected leader, whether or not the leader is from one’s own group, it was expected that following a leader’s loss, members of the respective political party would aim to achieve a positive social identity by distancing themselves from the former ingroup leader (party leader), and assimilating to the newly elected superordinate ingroup leader (leader of all Americans).

In line with their predictions, they found that before the 2008 presidential election, Liberals and Conservatives viewed their respective ingroup leader (Obama or McCain) as more attitudinally similar to themselves than the outgroup leader. Following McCain’s loss, Conservatives changed their similarity perceptions, now viewing McCain as being attitudinally distant from themselves, while enhancing perceived closeness between Obama and themselves. These findings highlight the challenge leaders face when constructing or modifying a group’s identity, especially in a competitive situation following a success or failure. While Obama, as newly inaugurated President who became the leader of all Americans, conferred the right to redefine what it meant to be American and influence change, McCain, following his loss, now lost all capacity to shape the group’s identity and influence group behavior.

Taken together, the results of these studies demonstrate the important role played by group members’ perceived connectedness to leaders (in Sheets and colleagues’ study, it was how ingroup-like a leader is, and in Alabastro and colleagues’ study, it was perceived psychological similarity to leaders) in accepting a leader, and

---

2 Despite the US having a Republican President currently, the fact that a Democrat and a woman won the popular vote says something about Obama’s influence in redefining the American identity to be more inclusive.
particularly investigating leadership and followership as an intergroup process. These results are particularly telling, as they demonstrate the power of followers’ existing connection with a current leader that may prevent or inhibit making a connection with emerging leaders. Understanding how such a psychological connection is formed, maintained and lost in the presence of, and in contest with, different sources of influence is fundamental to understanding leadership and influence, and processes of social change.

However, while providing excellent groundwork in exploring leadership in an intergroup context, these studies come short in how they measure leadership. The focus of these studies have been on effects on follower connectedness with the leader, not on support for the leader and their change agenda. A recent study by Rast and colleagues (2012) explore leadership in terms of leader preference in a multi-leader context. Building on the social identity perspectives on leadership and influence, this research explores support for prototypical and non-prototypical leaders under self-related uncertainty. While traditionally evaluations of leaders are studied using a between-participants design, this is one of the first empirical studies where participants evaluated two prospective leaders—one high and one low in group prototypicality—in the same context.

The focus of this research was on exploring preferential support for identity-based leadership in contexts of self-related uncertainty. In line with predictions, participants supported the prototypical leader more strongly than the non-prototypical leader, but this effect was significantly weakened under uncertainty due to an increase in support for the non-prototypical leader. Based on uncertainty-identity theory, Rast and colleagues (2012) argue that the relationship between leader prototypicality and support weakens because uncertainty reduces cognitive accessibility in terms of how group prototypical a leader is perceived to be. That is, uncertainty creates an elevated
need for identity focus and structural clarity that leadership per se provides. As a result, under such circumstances, both potential leader options become viable leader alternatives.

In addition to expanding our understanding of leadership under uncertainty conditions, this research is also useful because it demonstrates that prospective ingroup leaders who hold positions that are non-prototypical (as leaders for change often are) can sometimes increase their chances of being influential within a group. That is, according to the results of this study, when followers are (a) experiencing elevated self-uncertainty, (b) when a leader’s position is seen to be “legitimate” and, importantly, (c) when there are no other cognitively accessible and more prototypical alternative available to group members, a non-prototypical leader may be supported.

This research is also valuable in that it explores the notion of support for leadership in contexts where more than one leadership alternative is available. We know that in reality the same audience is exposed to multiple would be leaders all trying to define the followers’ identities and realities in different ways, and it is a challenge for leaders to make sure that it is their voice that is heard. Often leadership alternatives involved in a contest of influence propose either a pro-social change or pro-status quo agenda—where existing leadership often seek to maintain the status quo and emerging leadership advocate a movement for change (but not necessarily always the case). In such cases, it becomes an especially difficult challenge for new leaders facing existing leaders with incumbency benefits.

**Challenges for new leaders in a contest for influence.** Leaders for change are often in the position of vying for influence in challenge to existing ways of defining reality—typically held by those currently in positions of authority or leadership. In such contexts, the contest between authorities and pro-change leaders, in the process of mobilizing the same public, is one between social stability and social change. As such,
stability and change are interdependent processes; one cannot prevail without the other failing. As a movement for change gains momentum, the status quo is more difficult to maintain, just as the more ingrained existing ways of defining the social reality are, the harder it is for change leaders to make their voice be heard (Subašić et al., 2008).

However, it should be noted that there is an asymmetry between the two (Subašić et al., 2008; Subašić et al., 2009; Subašić et al., 2015). Indeed, existing authorities have ‘incumbency benefits’ that can make it difficult for alternative leaders to voice their positions and secure followership. Existing leaders have such privileges as voter loyalty, benefit of the doubt, and also greater control over the means of communication to control the rhetoric being heard. They also typically occupy positions of power that enable them to discredit emerging leadership (Applebaum, 2003; Mahone, 2006), isolate leaders from their constituencies through house arrest (as with Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma) or imprisonment (as with Nelson Mandela), or even go as far as to kill those in opposing leadership positions (Haslam & Reicher, 2012). As Hollander argued, more established leaders will have accumulated ‘idiosyncrasy’ credit which allows them to deviate from established norms without endangering their authority or level of influence (Hollander, 1958; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008).

The social identity perspective also argues that established leaders start with an existing connection with followers that new or potential leaders will not have. Such existing shared identity serves as a basis for legitimate power and authority (Turner, 2005), making it hard for new leaders to emerge and make that connection with followers in the first place. However, existing leaders are in a position to make it even harder for new leaders. As a result of pre-existing connection with followers, established authorities are in a position to define what it means to be ‘us’, and more importantly, who is a part of ‘us’ and who is not. New leaders attempting to challenge the status quo often fall prey to being marginalized as outsiders (i.e., ‘them’), after
which their visions for change would most likely get discarded or swept aside without any consideration (Subašić et al., 2015). Furthermore, stability is often mobilized to consolidate continuity and demobilize challenge before it even arises. Collective events such as national celebrations are designed and organised to produce social order and sustain continuity (Reicher & Haslam, 2013). For instance, ceremonies, such as royal weddings and funerals serve precisely to recruit the weight of history in maintaining social order.

However, despite incumbency benefits, existing leaders can still fall prey to social reality constraints that diminish their influence. For example, changes in the social reality of intergroup relations can make an existing leader seem like they are no longer able to capture who ‘we’ are leading to a decline in support for them (as in the case of Winston Churchill after World War 2). In such cases it can also become difficult for incumbents to redefine the group’s identity in order to reflect changing group trends without seeming inauthentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), leading followers to become open to alternative leadership that better reflect changing goals and aspirations within a group.

In order to be successful, new leaders need to be responsive to the social reality of intergroup relations that redefine what is important to the group identity. Those leaders who are able to capture the group’s normative trajectory and offer a viable definition who ‘we’ are and who ‘we’ want to be better than other alternatives, will come to epitomize what it means to ‘us’. As such, they will not only have the capacity to advance group goals but also mobilise the group for change and translate innovative visions into reality. By studying leadership as a contest for influence—by pitting two opposing and different leaders who might be pro- or against change together—we can not only gain a deeper understanding of when groups can be mobilized for social change but also when such change efforts can fail, where the status quo is maintained or
other forms of social change prevails. Before we begin to investigate these questions, it is important to consider what we mean by social change and innovation.

**Defining Social Change and Innovation**

While there have been a number of research studies focusing on innovation and change processes (as outlined above), there does not seem to be a consensus in terms of conceptualising innovation in empirical research. Some work focuses on innovation in terms of the source of influence while others equate it to the act itself being against normative expectations. For instance, Moscovici and colleagues’ (Moscovici & Nemeth, 1974; Moscovici & Lage, 1976; Moscovici & Personnaz, 1980) work on minority influence—looking at how the population is influenced by the minority—illustrates the first of these conceptualisations. This research equates deviation from the norm by a minority as innovation, while the exact same behaviour by a majority is referred to as conformity. This is despite the fact that majority behaviour was also non-normative or deviant from group opinion. However, this equation of innovation to behaviour based on the source of influence is problematic. For even the majority or existing authorities can and do engage in acts of innovation. For example, CEO’s of organisations often implement new policies that are perceived as innovation or cutting edge change. Just because it is the majority opinion does not mean it is the normative opinion, especially when it is first introduced. The precise idea of change and innovation is shifting opinion and behaviour previously thought of as normative to something new, and this should not differ as a function of the source of influence.

Indeed, it makes more sense to think of innovation as something that is new or different and departs from normative expectations. A number of studies have conceptualised innovation in this way. For example, in Hollander’s idiosyncrasy credit experiments (Hollander, 1960, 1961; Hollander and Julian, 1970), non-compliance or a
departure from normative behaviour was referred to as innovation. Further, in Abram and colleagues’ (2008) work on deviance, support for anti-normative positions was referred to as support for innovation. These definitions seem to be on the right track, however, further distinctions need to be made.

First, a distinction needs to be made between leaders being deviant and leaders proposing an agenda for change. While subtle, it is an important distinction to make, because we are not interested in the notion of a deviant or non-compliant leader or finding out what happens when a leader simply resists the mode of opinion within a group. What we are interested in is a much more active leadership process that enables leaders to spearhead and enact change. That is, our aim is to find out when and how a leader is able to influence and mobilize a group to support his or her proposal for change, and embrace a new way of defining their social reality.

Second, in defining innovation we agree that being innovative is indeed being divergent from current norms and standards, as is any form of change. However, the idea that being innovative is being necessarily anti-normative (e.g., Abrams et al., 2008) is problematic. Innovation does not necessarily have to be challenging or contradictory to current norms. As defined by the Oxford Dictionary, innovation is more aptly thought of as “making changes in something established, especially by introducing new methods, ideas, or products”.

For the purposes of this thesis, we define social change as a departure from normative expectations and behavior of a group within an intergroup context. We further distinguish between two types of change: aligned change—change that is a departure from current norms and ideals, but still in line with the normative trajectory (i.e., in the direction that the group is already heading); and non-aligned change or innovation—change that is not only a departure from current norms and ideals, but also
novel or different in terms of where groups wants to head. We define this change as simply non-normative, that is, not anti-normative or contradicting current norms.

Outline of Studies
This thesis aims to understand the precise processes behind successful mobilisation of social change by elucidating when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals. We conducted six experiments within three programs of research to systematically test these ideas, as outlined below.

**Program 1.** In the first suite of studies we aimed to find out when a leader candidate is successfully able to mobilize the public for change in competition with an existing leader defending the status quo. By pitting a pro-change leader and a pro-status quo leader together in the same electoral context, we are able to examine the precise processes that allow a pro-change leader to be successful, but also when he or she might fail allowing the status quo to prevail.

Being representative of ‘who we are’ in the present has been the epitome of social identity leadership research. However, within change contexts, emerging leaders not only have to be vigilant about the direction their group is heading towards but also of their competition—often from established leaders who have successfully legitimized the status quo. We propose that in such contexts, leaders need to also be normatively aligned with ‘who we want to be’ in the future to be successful in mobilizing the group for change.

**Program 2.** As we have discussed, in the social identity leadership literature much of the work focuses on a single leader or a single group of followers, and overlooks that who will be able to mobilize ‘us’ centres not only upon aligning oneself with a given constituency, but doing so better than the available alternatives. In the second suite of studies we aimed to examine the intersection of leadership and social
change, and explore leadership as a competitive (and contrastive) process, looking at 1) whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest, and 2) the nature of contrast with available alternatives.

While several recent studies signal a broadening of leadership research to consider its more comparative and competitive aspects (see Alabastro et al., 2013; Halevy et al., 2011; Rast et al., 2012), this is the first empirical test of whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest and the nature of the competition. According to the social identity perspective, as the comparative context changes (i.e., whether or not there is a competing leader and who the competing leader is), so does perceptions of a leader’s representativeness, and as a result, their influence. We propose that the same pro-change leader will receive differing levels of support depending on whether there are competing voices for leadership and awareness of a comparative leader.

**Program 3.** The final empirical chapter outlines Study 5 and Study 6 exploring support for leaders with innovative change agendas. Building on the first two programs of the thesis, we found that change proposals that are aligned with the group’s normative trajectory are more likely to be supported. In this program, we aimed to examine how leaders can enhance support for their innovative or *non-normative* change proposals.

Here, we make the novel point of disentangling prototypicality of the leader and alignment of their rhetoric with the normative trajectory of the group (studied traditionally in change research). We propose that it is possible for leaders to spearhead and gain support for non-aligned or innovative change *and* be seen to be prototypical of ‘us’—in fact, it is prototypicality that enables leaders to advance innovative agendas for change that redefine and depart from current normative direction of the group.
In this program of research, we also aimed to investigate whether support for innovative change is based on idiosyncratic leader factors (as argued by Hollander’s idiosyncrasy model) or a sense of shared group identity between leaders and followers. Study 5 tests whether it is how long a leader candidate has been a member of the group (i.e., idiosyncrasy credits) or leader prototypicality (i.e., shared identity with followers) that drives support for pro-change leaders with innovative change proposals.

Study 6 includes a novel manipulation of leader alignment by framing innovative change agenda as ‘our’ idea (where the leader will be seen to be acting for the group) or leader’s own idea (where the leader will be seen to go their own way). The condition where the leader is seen to ‘go their own way’ is akin to Hollander’s idea of acting in an idiosyncratic fashion, which enabled us to compare social identity factors with Hollander’s idiosyncratic credit factors in enabling support for innovative change.

A key focus of this chapter is its use of identity content change as an outcome. This measure is a novel and particularly powerful leader outcome as change in ‘who we are’ can drive support for further change as well as behaviors such as collective mobilization in support of the new proposal. In both Study 5 and 6, we assessed change (using a pre-post design) in participants’ identity content as a function of leader statements.

In the following chapters, we will report findings of six empirical studies that tested these predictions and illustrated core points.
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In the social identity leadership literature there is consensus that the most prototypical group member is likely to be most influential. However, questions have been raised about being representative of ‘who we are’ in the present and the future-oriented aspects of leadership. For to be successful in mobilizing the group for change, leaders also need to be normatively aligned with ‘who we want to be’ in the future. Two experiments examined and found support for the idea that a new pro-change leader would be more successful than a pro-status quo incumbent in securing votes and mobilizing collective efforts for change, but only when aligned with the group’s change trajectory (Study 1 and 2). When the pro-change alternative was ‘non-aligned’, the incumbent maintained their influence (Study 2). These results indicate that emerging pro-change leaders need to be responsive to future aspirations of groups to bring about change ‘we can believe in’.
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Leadership and Social Change: Support for identity-based vision in a competitive context

Few topics have captured the attention of social, organisational and political psychologists as much as leadership. A common feature of much of this work is its focus on a single leader (e.g., their personality or style) and/or their relationship with a single group of followers (e.g., a team or organisation; for recent reviews see Haslam et al., 2011; Hogg, 2001; Turner & Haslam, 2001). In contrast, few studies have explicitly examined leadership dynamics in a competitive context, where there are multiple and competing visions of ‘who we are’ and ‘who we want to become’ (Subašić et al., 2015; Subašić et al., 2012).

However, in reality, and particularly within change contexts, emerging leaders not only have to be vigilant about the different ways in which ‘who we are’ and ‘who we want to become’ can be defined, but also of their competition—often from established leaders who have successfully legitimized the status quo (Foster, 2010; Levay, 2010; Oreg & Sverdlik, 2011). The leaders’ task in these contexts is to ensure that their message is not only heard, but heeded as “change we can believe in”, to borrow from Barack Obama’s presidential campaign slogan.

The competitive aspect of leadership is particularly important in contexts involving some form of social, (inter)group-level change, where ‘who we are’ and ‘how we relate to others’ is being questioned, redefined and, ultimately, mobilized (Subašić et al., 2012). In social change contexts, incumbents may seek to preserve the status quo in light of new candidates for leadership advocating an agenda for change, but there may also be multiple visions for the ‘change we need’. Much of the available research, however, overlooks the fact that a person’s capacity to mobilize ‘us’ centres not only upon their ability to align themselves with a given constituency, but their being able to do so better than the available alternatives (Subašić et al., 2015; Subašić et al., 2012).
In light of this, more research is needed that systematically examines: (a) leadership as a competitive (and contrastive) process; and (b) the intersection of leadership and social change (see also Haslam et al., 2011; Reicher et al., 2005; Subašić, et al., 2015). To address these lacunae, the studies presented in this chapter examine three inter-related questions: 1) Which of the multiple leadership alternatives for change will best mobilize ‘us’?, 2) When will a new, pro-change leader be preferred over a pro-status quo incumbent?, and 3) When will a pro-status quo incumbent prevail over a pro-change alternative? Before describing this research in detail, the sections below review previous work that speaks most directly to the leaders’ capacity to mobilize followers in status quo vs. social change contests.

**Leaders as prototypes and/or visionaries?**

The core questions of this chapter are underpinned by the social identity perspective (see Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987; Turner & Reynolds, 2001) because it speaks to both leadership and social influence, and the dynamics of social change. As discussed earlier, within this perspective, leadership is understood to be a group process, in which a sense of psychological connection with followers—shared social identity—underpins leader influence (Haslam et al., 2011; Hogg, 2001; Hogg, van Knippenberg, & Rast III, 2012; Turner & Haslam, 2001; Turner, Reynolds, & Subašić, 2008). This means that when we identify with a particular ingroup, we internalize and assimilate our perceptions, feelings and behaviours to the ingroup prototype (Turner et al., 1987). As a result, we see other ingroup members as part of ‘us’ and are more likely to be influenced by others ‘like us’ who share that social and psychological group membership (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1998). Group members who best embody ‘us’ (i.e., the most prototypical members), thus have the most influence within the group and are more likely to emerge as leaders (Hogg, 2001;
Turner & Haslam, 2001; van Knippenberg, 2011). As we have outlined earlier, this proposition is well established in the social psychological leadership literature, where a large body of evidence demonstrates that ingroup prototypical leaders are seen as more effective in their roles and are also more likely to be supported (e.g., Fielding, & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Platow et al., 2006).

Yet, while important, being representative of the group in this way is only one aspect of ‘identity leadership’ (Haslam et al., 2011). In order to bring about change, leaders also need to be concerned about the group’s future (Reicher et al., 2005). In this regard, being visionary and offering a compelling future for the group are often seen as qualities that mark out great leaders (Bass, 2008; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). But it is not just any future that has appeal—it needs to be a future that resonates with followers’ understandings of ‘who we are’ and ‘who we want to be’. That is, to mobilize support, a vision for ‘our’ future needs to align with the norms, values and aspirations of the relevant social identity.

Recent work on identity continuity by van Knippenberg and colleagues (see van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003; van Knippenberg et al., 2008) propose that leaders need to ensure a sense of continuity of identity—a sense that defining features of the group’s identity are preserved to overcome resistance to change. While this work emphasises the importance of ensuring continuity or conservation of ‘who we have been’ amidst change, an important aspect that has been neglected in leadership and social change research is group members’ own ideas of ‘who we want to be’. Here, identity is as much about becoming as it is about being (Reicher et al., 2010). It reflects both existing social reality and future aspirations (Haslam et al., 2011). As such, leaders for change need to go beyond representing ‘who we are’ in the here and now to also embody ‘who we want
to be’ in the future—and, centrally, they need to do so better than the available alternatives.

In order to be successful in projecting a vision that is shared by group members, leaders need to be aware of the social reality and context that shape the group identity. Even though leaders often proactively redefine the group identity in order to appear at the centre of it (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; e.g., Augoustinos & De Garis, 2012; Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012), they are very much constrained in this process by the social reality of intergroup relations as well (Reicher et al., 2005; Reicher & Hopkins, 2003). Changes in group values and aspirations as well as resistance by opposition and previous ways in which identity has been constructed and sedemented affect how well would-be leaders are aligned with group norms and values and hence their ability to exert influence.

**Leadership as a contest for influence in social change contexts**

As we have discussed, in much of the existing work, leadership has been studied as the relationship between a single leader and a group of followers (e.g., Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; see Subašić, et al., 2015; Subašić, et al., 2012 for a critique). The more competitive and contrasting aspects have been largely overlooked. This is despite the fact that based on the SCT analysis of group processes, prototypicality, and thus social influence, is a relative concept (Turner & Haslam, 2001). Several recent studies, however, signal a broadening of leadership research to consider its more comparative and competitive aspects (see Alabastro, et al., 2013; Halevy et al., 2011; Rast et al., 2012). A relevant example is research by Halevy and colleagues (2011) which compared ‘representative’ and ‘visionary’ leaders in terms of their capacity to attract follower support. In this research, the ‘representative’ leader was described as someone
who was highly similar to other group members, who had typical communication skills, and who seldom had opinions of her own regarding the future of the group. The visionary leader, in contrast, was described as someone who inspired others and had a clear vision for the future of the group, had exceptional communication skills, and while considered somewhat of an outsider, was wholeheartedly committed to the group. In line with the authors’ predictions, the ‘visionary’ leader was endorsed more strongly and seen as more effective than the ‘representative’ one.

This research highlights the point that, in a contest for leadership, similarity per se will have little appeal for followers. While prototypicality is not the same as similarity, it is often studied as such and Halevy and colleagues’ contribution highlights the pitfalls of this approach. However, this work also begs the question of whether it is possible to see a prototypical leader as visionary—as exemplary both in terms of the distinct qualities of the group and in being able to offer a viable, appealing vision for the group’s future. As Haslam and colleagues argue, vision needs to be shared with followers for it to be fruitful and translated into action (Haslam & Platow, 2001; Haslam et al., 2011; Steffens, Haslam, Ryan & Kessler, 2013). Rather than seeing vision and prototypicality as different aspects of identity leadership, we propose that, to have influence, leaders need to offer a vision for the future that is normatively aligned with who ‘we want to be’. This is supported by research on minority influence by Paicheler (1976, 1977) which demonstrates that even minorities with new or different attitudes, can be successful in influencing change in group attitudes when they are consistent or aligned with the normative trend of the group compared to when they are inconsistent or normatively non-aligned.

Yet in crafting a vision that is shared by group members (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; e.g., Augoustinos & De Garis, 2012; Rooyackers & Verkuyten, 2012) leaders are constrained by the social reality of intergroup relations (Reicher et al., 2005; Reicher &
As such, despite voter loyalty and incumbency benefits (Hollander, 1958), established leaders can lose support when they are unable to keep up with changing group norms. This is evident in how Winston Churchill—a very successful wartime leader—lost the general election in 1945 as a result of change in social relations (end of war; Franklin & Ladner, 1995). In addition, reality constraints make it difficult for existing leaders to keep up with such changes as changing their tune to appear in line with the change trajectory would seem inauthentic (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). For example, research by Abrams and colleagues (2008) showed that current leaders with an anti-norm deviant position to current norms were negatively evaluated, while future leaders with the same position were judged more positively and granted innovation credit. Therefore, while acknowledging the role that leaders may play in actively shaping the group’s normative trajectory, the context of interest in the present research is one where the group is on the cusp of change and faced with leaders who differ in their capacity to capture the emerging Zeitgeist.

**Current Research**

Despite pro-status quo current leaders being representative in the here and now, they are in fact ‘non-prototypical’ in a group that is changing. In social change contexts, then, leaders need to do more than ‘merely’ represent the group; they need to ensure their messages are aligned with future aspirations of their constituency. When current leaders and authorities are out of step with the changing group norms, power redistribution becomes more likely—making it possible for alternative voices that better capture ‘our’ goals and values to gain prominence (see Subašić et al., 2008). But this does not mean that any pro-change alternative will be able to successfully mobilize the constituency.
We propose that under conditions where change is imminent, and where there is distancing between the group and the pro-status quo leader, pro-change new leaders who are able to position their message and vision as normatively aligned with ‘who we want to be’ will be able to mobilize support for their cause—and do so better than the non-aligned alternatives (H1) and incumbents (H2). However, equally important is the question of what happens when there are no viable (i.e., normatively aligned) pro-change alternatives. In such cases, we propose that, somewhat paradoxically, the pro-status quo incumbents, despite being out of step with the changing group norms, may be preferred over the non-aligned new leaders advocating change (H3). Therefore, instead of novelty per se, better alignment with the group’s normative trajectory is what underpins change leaders’ influence and the capacity to mobilize collective action (or lack thereof).

Below, we report findings from two experiments that test these predictions in more detail. Normative trajectory is defined here as shared beliefs, values and goals. In Study 1, the normative trajectory of the group was highlighted via a manipulation of intergroup threat, given that threat has the capacity to sharpen central features of ‘who we are’ and who ‘we’ want to be (see Dovidio, 2013). In Study 2, rather than using intergroup threat to highlight (or not) a single normative dimension, the normative content was manipulated orthogonally in order to demonstrate that, rather than being shaped by content per se, influence is driven by leaders’ alignment with group norms and aspirations.

**Study 1**

The context for this study was a fictitious (but presented as real) election of a student representative for the University Council, ostensibly taking place at a time when the University was considering changing its admissions policy. The candidates
presented to be running for the position were the current student representative (with a pro-status quo stance) and a new candidate (with a pro-change stance).

First, in order to highlight the content of the normative trajectory of the group (i.e., valuing community involvement), we manipulated the presence (vs. absence) of intergroup threat. As discussed, one way to shape people’s understandings of group norms and clarify the central, defining features of ‘who we are’ in a given context is through intergroup threat (Dovidio, 2013). Rather than threat per se, then, it is the sharpening of group norms and values that is of particular interest in the present research. In line with this reasoning, a threat to a University’s standing (e.g., a drop in University rankings) heightens the importance of who ‘we’ are and particularly who ‘we’ want to be as something that ‘we’ should strive for above all else. In turn, whether or not a leader’s message speaks to the very norms and values that have now come to the fore of who ‘we’ want to be assumes increased significance.

In terms of alignment of leader messages with group norms, we manipulated the extent to which pro-change new candidates expressed views that reflected the group’s normative trajectory (aligned vs. non-aligned). In the aligned condition, the pro-change candidate was presented to emphasize community participation (Pro-community; in line with the normative trajectory of the group) while in the non-aligned condition, the pro-change candidate was presented to argue for stricter academic-based admissions criteria (Pro-academic). The incumbent candidate’s position was designed to be ‘out of step’ across conditions (i.e., arguing that current performance is optimal and that change is unnecessary). ³

³ The impact of being an incumbent as opposed to new contender for leadership has been explored in other work (e.g., Abrams et al, 2008) and as such was not of interest here.
A central feature of leadership for change is capacity to influence and mobilize followers for collective action—and to do so better than the available alternatives. As such, key dependent variables included an influence measure (change in participants’ attitudes regarding their preferred ATAR [Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank] score in line with the leader proposal), voting intentions and collective action intentions. Note that participants completed voting and collective action intentions items twice, first for the incumbent and then for the (either aligned or non-aligned) pro-change new leader, enabling a direct comparison between incumbent and new leaders on these particular measures.

It was hypothesized that, under conditions of threat, voting and collective action intentions will be higher in response to the aligned (compared to non-aligned) candidate (H1). This means that participants’ preferred ATAR score will change in line with the aligned leader’s message, but not when the new leader is non-aligned. Further, under conditions of threat, normatively aligned candidates should also be more influential than the pro-status quo incumbent (H2). Finally, the pro-status quo incumbent should attract more votes and elicit higher collective action intentions than ‘non-aligned’ new candidates (H3).

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants in this web-based experiment were recruited through advertising around campus and popular social network websites (e.g., Facebook) at the ANU. A total of 35 participants who had completed less than 50% of the survey were excluded (7 in the Pro-academic New Leader + No Threat condition, 3 in the Pro-academic + Threat condition, 9 in the Pro-community + No Threat condition, and 16 in the Pro-community + Threat condition). Nine participants were excluded for completing the
survey under 300 seconds (5 minutes; 5 in the Pro-academic + Threat condition, 1 in the Pro-community + No Threat condition, and 3 in the Pro-community + Threat condition). Twenty-two participants were excluded for failing manipulation checks (8 in the Pro-academic + No Threat condition, 3 in the Pro-academic + Threat condition, 5 in the Pro-community + No Threat condition, and 6 in the Pro-community + Threat condition). The final sample of 92 undergraduate students included 63 females and 28 males. They ranged in age from 18 to 29 years ($M=20.1, SD=2.13$). First year Psychology students received course credit.

**Design, Procedure and Materials**

This study employed a 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) $\times$ 2 (Threat: Threat/No Threat) factorial design, with an additional repeated measures factor (Target of Response: Pro-Status Quo Incumbent/Pro-Change New Leader) for voting and collective action intentions. After indicating consent (see Appendix A for form), participants were randomly allocated to one of four between-participants experimental conditions and directed to the appropriate questionnaire.

**Pre-manipulation measures.** Unless noted otherwise, participants’ responses on all items were measured on 7-point rating scales (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *very much*). See Appendix B for measures.

**Social Identification.** Participants first answered questions regarding their identification with their University. For those who do not identify with the group, norms may have less of an impact and therefore they are likely to disengage from the issue at hand (Louis, Davies, Smith, & Terry, 2007). This variable was measured to use as a covariate for control purposes. A five-item social identification scale (adapted from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) was used to measure identification with the University (e.g., “I feel strong ties to other [University] students”; $\alpha=.87$).
Preferred ATAR score - pre-manipulation. Participants then responded to one item in regards to their preferred ATAR score. The item was administered on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 65 to 95 at 5 point increments). This constituted a pre-measure and was contrasted with a post-manipulation measure of the same variable. In this way, we were able to assess a shift in attitudes as a function of leader statements.

Normative Content and the Threat Manipulation of Normative Trajectory. Participants then read a vignette which outlined the University’s focus (i.e., the group norm) on increasing its standards to compete with top international universities. The information stated that, to remain competitive internationally and to keep up with top universities like Stanford and Oxford, the University needed to focus on developing students’ leadership skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To communicate a group norm aligned with such attributes, the vignette stated that many students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing leadership and community involvement is an important goal for the University. Importantly, to sharpen the group’s normative trajectory, participants in the Threat condition read an additional paragraph highlighting the University’s fall in recent rankings while another university of similar standing had been on an upward trajectory, climbing seven spots on the ranking ladder (this information was omitted under No Threat conditions).

At the end of this section, all participants rated (on a 7-point scale) two items assessing agreement with the group norm (e.g., “As a [University] student, valuing leadership and community involvement is important for [University]”) to assess and enhance their agreement with this particular group norm (α=.83). This measure was also used as a covariate to control for differing levels of norm agreement.

Manipulation of Leader Normative Alignment. The next part of the vignette outlined information about the student representative candidates for the University council. The debate about changing the admissions criteria was described first. Then,
speeches by the candidates outlining their position regarding the issue were presented. The current student leader (the incumbent) proposed maintaining current standards and being relaxed about the whole issue. This pro-status quo statement remained constant across conditions.

The pro-change new leader statements varied, so that they were either aligned or non-aligned with the normative trajectory of the group. In the aligned condition, the message emphasized the importance of non-academic attributes such as community leadership and involvement and proposed a decrease of the ATAR score to 70 (Pro-community). In the non-aligned condition, the message emphasized the need to attract undergraduates who show academic excellence and proposed increasing the ATAR score to 90 (Pro-academic). See Appendix C for manipulations.

Post-manipulation measures. Preferred ATAR score - post-manipulation. This item was identical to the item presented prior to manipulations. It was included to assess the extent to which participants’ own attitudes changed as a function of the candidates’ positions in relation to their preferred ATAR score prior to manipulations.

Voting Intentions. Participants indicated the extent to which they were likely to vote for each candidate to represent the student body in the University council. This item was completed twice, once regarding the pro-status quo incumbent and once regarding the pro-change new leadership candidate. Given the comparative nature of this context, we are assuming that judgements towards new leaders are made in contrast to the incumbent leader. As such, the incumbent-relevant items were presented first.

Collective Action Intentions. Participants indicated how likely they would be to participate in collective action for each of the candidates (e.g., “Get together with other University students to try and do something about this issue as a group”). Five items reliably measured collective mobilization (adapted from Subašić, Schmitt, & Reynolds, 2011) in response to messages by the pro-status quo incumbent and the pro-change new
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candidate \( (\alpha = .81, .84, \text{respectively}) \). As for voting intentions, the incumbent-relevant items were presented first. See Appendix D for all dependent measures.

**Manipulation checks**

At the end of the survey, five questions were included to check that the information presented was understood in line with manipulations. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale the accuracy of each of the five statements in terms of what they had read in the beginning of the survey.

The first statement, “(a) to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on increasing leadership and community involvement”, assessed whether participants understood the prevailing group norm (held constant). The second statement, “(b) the [University] is dropping in international rankings”, checked whether participants correctly identified the presence (or absence) of threat.

The next three items assessed participants’ understanding of the relevant leader positions. The third statement, “(c) the incumbent holds that the [University] is doing well currently and proposed maintaining current standards”, assessed whether participants understood the incumbent position (held constant). The fourth and fifth statements, “(d) the new leader holds that to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to increase its academic standards and proposes to increase the ATAR score to 90”, and (e) “the new leader holds that to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on community involvement and leadership traits in addition to academic performance and proposes to decrease the ATAR score to 70”, checked whether participants correctly identified the new leader position as aligned or non-aligned.

Finally, participants were asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student (domestic, international) and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.
Results

Manipulation checks. When Threat was present ($M=6.53$, $SD=.69$) compared to absent ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.46$), participants were significantly more likely to indicate that the University was no longer the top university in Australia, $F(1,92)=259.26$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.74$. Participants also correctly identified the University’s norm (which was constant) regardless of the presence or absence of threat or Candidate B position, $F(1,91)=.01$, $p=.92$.

While no significant effects were found for the incumbent’s position (which was constant), $F(1,91)=.01$, $p=.93$, On the other hand, compared to participants in the Pro-academic condition ($M=1.39$, $SD=.80$), participants in the Pro-community condition ($M=6.76$, $SD=.48$) were significantly more likely to indicate that the pro-change leader was advocating greater community involvement, $F(1,91)=1458.03$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.94$. There were no other significant effects. Overall, findings suggest independent variables were manipulated successfully.

Main Analyses

Endorsement of group norm (i.e., community involvement) was included in the analyses as a covariate. We checked that participants’ agreement with group norm did not vary as a function of threat as this covariate was measured after the threat (but before leader alignment) manipulation, $F(1,97) = .95$, ns. Descriptive statistics and correlations between dependent variables are presented in Table 7.1. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 7.2.

---

4 Identification as a student at the University was not included as a covariate as it did not explain any variance in the dependent variables.
Table 7.1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preferred ATAR score: Pre-manipulation</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preferred ATAR score: Post-manipulation</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Voting Intentions for Incumbent</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Voting Intentions for New Leader</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collective Action Intentions for Incumbent</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collective Action Intentions for New Leader</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 92$.  
*p < .05, **p < .01.*
### Table 7.2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of New Leader Position and Threat. (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Leader Position</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower⁺</th>
<th>Upper⁺</th>
<th>Pre-manipulation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower⁺</th>
<th>Upper⁺</th>
<th>Post-manipulation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower⁺</th>
<th>Upper⁺</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred ATAR score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>82.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.42</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>80.93</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>78.52</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>76.68</td>
<td>80.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.03</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.73</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>78.54</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.22</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>80.07</td>
<td>82.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>78.51</td>
<td>82.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.88</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>78.02</td>
<td>81.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>78.48</td>
<td>81.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.15</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>77.69</td>
<td>80.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>79.01</td>
<td>81.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.52</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>78.35</td>
<td>80.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>80.69</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>79.46</td>
<td>81.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.15</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>80.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.59</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>78.44</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.97</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>80.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>79.55</td>
<td>81.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incumbent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Leader Position</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower⁺</th>
<th>Upper⁺</th>
<th>Voting Intentions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower⁺</th>
<th>Upper⁺</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Values are means (M), standard deviations (SD), and confidence intervals (Lower⁺, Upper⁺).
### Collective Action Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro-academic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro-community</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Threat</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table displays support for identity-based vision, with values and subscripts indicating statistical significance levels.
Note. Comparing Pre-manipulation and Post-manipulation Preferred ATAR Score: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing the incumbent and the new leader: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing the two alternatives for change: Means for New Leader (right column) that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. +95% Confidence interval
**Preferred ATAR score.** A 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) × 2 (Threat: Threat/No Threat) × 2 (Preferred ATAR score: pre-/post-manipulation) ANCOVA design, with repeated measures on the last factor, revealed a New Leader Position by Preferred ATAR score two-way interaction, $F(1,86) = 17.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .17$. As expected in H1, paired-sample comparisons showed that there was a significant decrease in the preferred ATAR score ($M = -.76$, $SD = 2.10$) in line with the new leader message when the leader was aligned with the group’s normative aspirations (community-oriented), $t(1, 45) = -2.46$, $p < .01$. However, this effect was not qualified by the presence of threat. Furthermore, unexpectedly, there was also a significant increase in the preferred ATAR score ($M = 1.52$, $SD = 2.96$) along with the non-aligned (academic-oriented) new leader position, $t(1, 45) = 3.49$, $p < .001$ (see Figure 7.1). This means that participants’ preferred ATAR scores changed in line with the aligned leader’s message as expected. However, unexpectedly, preferred ATAR scores also changed in line with the non-aligned new leader. These results will be discussed further below.

**Figure 7.1.** Preferred ATAR score measured before and after manipulation as a function of New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 1).
**Voting Intentions.** A 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) × 2 (Threat: Threat/No Threat) × 2 (Target of Response: Incumbent/New Leader) ANCOVA design, with repeated measures on the last factor, revealed a main effect of Target of Response, $F(1, 87) = 11.26, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$, where participants were more likely to vote for the incumbent over the new leader. There was also a New Leader Position by Target of Response two-way interaction, $F(1, 87) = 4.17, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$.

In line with H3, when the new leader was non-aligned (Pro-academic), participants were more likely to vote for the incumbent than this non-aligned new leader, $F(1, 43) = 10.81, p < .05, \eta^2 = .20$. However, contrary to H2, when the new leader was aligned (Pro-community), they received as much voting support as the incumbent did, $F(1,43) = .179, ns$. Again, unexpectedly, this effect was not qualified by the presence of threat, $F(1,86)=1.19, p=.28$ (see Figure 7.2).

![Figure 7.2](image_url)

**Figure 7.2.** Voting intentions for the incumbent and new candidates (measured) as a function of New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 1).

There was also a significant interaction between Threat and Target of Response, $F(1, 87) = 7.82, p < .05, \eta^2 = .08$. Participants were more likely to vote for the new leader (regardless of their position) over the incumbent under conditions of threat, $F(1,
42) = .15.19, *p* < .01, $\eta^2_p = .27$. This difference disappeared when there was no threat, $F(1,44) = .81, ns$.

Unexpectedly, contrary to H1, there was no difference in support between the aligned and non-aligned candidate, $F(1,87)=.02, p=.89$. Other main effects and two-way interactions were also non-significant.

In summary, contrary to H1, there was no difference in support between the aligned and non-aligned candidate. Also, in contrast to H2, there were no differences in voting intentions between the normatively aligned pro-change leader and the incumbent. However, in line with H3, the incumbent was more successful in mobilizing participants to vote than the non-aligned new candidate.

**Collective Action Intentions.** A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANCOVA revealed a main effect of Target of Response, $F(1, 87) = 4.54, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .05$, where participants were more likely to engage in collective action for the incumbent over the new leader. There was a two-way interaction between New Leader Position and Target of Response, $F(1,87)=5.72, p<.06, \eta^2_p=.06$. In line with H3, when the new leader was non-aligned (Pro-academic), participants were marginally more likely to engage in collective action in support of the incumbent compared to the non-aligned alternative, $F(1,43)=3.26, p=.78, \eta^2_p=.07$. However, contrary to H2, when new leader was aligned (Pro-community), they engendered as much support for collective action as the incumbent did, $F(1,43) = 2.17, ns$. Again, unexpectedly, this effect was not qualified by the presence of threat, $F(1,87)=.10, p=.32$ (see Figure 7.3).
Figure 7.3. Collective action intentions for the incumbent and new candidates (measured) as a function of New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 1).

Further, there was a significant two-way interaction between Threat and New Leader Position, $F(1,87)=4.85$, $p<0.05$, $\eta^2_p=0.05$. In support of H1, under threat, participants were more likely to engage in collective action for the new leader when the leader was aligned (Pro-community) than when the leader was non-aligned (Pro-academic), $F(1,42)=5.91$, $p<0.05$, $\eta^2_p=0.12$. However, under conditions of no threat, the aligned new leader (Pro-community) received as much collective action intentions as the non-aligned new leader (Pro-academic) did, $F(1,44)=11$, ns (see Figure 7.4). Other main effects and two-way interactions were non-significant.
Summary of findings. In summary, as expected in H1, Preferred ATAR score changed in line with the aligned leader’s message. However, results did not support hypothesis when the new leader was non-aligned. Further, supporting H1, Collective Action (but not Voting) Intentions were higher in response to the normatively aligned pro-change leader message than the non-aligned pro-change leader in the presence of threat. In contrast to H2, there were no differences in voting or collective action intentions between the normatively aligned pro-change leader and the incumbent. However, in line with H3, the incumbent was more successful in mobilizing participants to vote and engage in collective action than the non-aligned new candidate. Finally, interesting but unexpected findings emerged on the influence measure, whereby participants changed their preferred ATAR score in line with the non-aligned alternative.
Discussion

Overall, the results supported the idea that new, pro-change leaders who present a normatively aligned vision for the future would be more successful in influencing change in followers’ attitudes as well as mobilizing collective action (but not voting intentions) than non-aligned new leaders (H1). The results also supported the idea that when new leader alternatives advocate for something that is non-aligned with the group’s change trajectory, the pro-status quo incumbent may attract more votes and elicit higher collective action intentions and maintain their influence (H3). However, in contrast to H2, there were no differences between the incumbent and the aligned pro-change alternative. There are several aspects of the study that may explain these findings.

First, the nature of the Voting Intentions measure may have contributed to participants’ lack of commitment to one candidate over another. Namely, participants rated their intentions to vote for each candidate, rather than being forced to make a choice. Adding a categorical measure would encourage participants to choose one leader over the other much as in real voting contexts.

Second, misalignment between the threat and the norms of the group may be one reason for the lack of effects of the presence (or absence) of threat. A drop in rankings (i.e., a threat to the University’s academic standing) might not be relevant in heightening the importance of the group norms of particular interest in the present research (i.e., a focus on community involvement) as something that ‘we’ should strive for above all else. Therefore, in this case, threat might not have worked in sharpening of group norms and values along the relevant dimension.

Also, related to this, candidate statements did not directly address the particular threat faced by the University (i.e., a significant drop in rankings). Instead, the focus of the debate and the candidate speeches were on changing the University’s admission
criteria. This relative lack of a clear ‘alternative’ when it comes to addressing the present threat may have further contributed to participants’ reluctance to commit their vote to one candidate over another. In order to address the misalignment between the group’s circumstances and leader messages, rather than using threat as a way of highlighting what direction the group’s normative trajectory should take, a more direct manipulation of the group’s normative trajectory may be needed (see Study 2).

Finally, the ATAR score information in the candidate messages might have added conflict to their normative position. The lack of preferential support for the aligned new candidate over the incumbent may reflect the fact that students saw the call to decrease the ATAR cut-off, advocated by this leader, to be at odds with an important superordinate norm of students (i.e., focus on academic excellence). Similarly, the unexpected increase in preferred ATAR score in line with the non-aligned new candidate may reflect the fact that students believe academic excellence, advocated by this leader, to be an important aspect of student life. In Study 2, candidate messages were modified to uncouple these dimensions. Furthermore, as the academic-oriented focus seems like a viable alternative norm for the group in this context, in Study 2 we directly manipulate the normative content to focus either on academic achievement or community participation.

**Study 2**

Study 2 sought to address the limitations of our first study by using a more direct manipulation of normative alignment. More specifically, rather than using intergroup threat to highlight a particular normative dimension, the study sought to affect normative alignment directly through manipulations of group normative trajectory and leader message content. Here the normative content was manipulated orthogonally in order to demonstrate that, rather than being shaped by content *per se*, influence is driven by leaders’ *alignment* with group norms and aspirations. That is,
when leaders’ pro-change agendas are aligned with the future aspirations and values of the group, regardless of the content and direction of that normative trajectory, or the specific content of the leaders’ messages, they will succeed in securing votes and mobilizing support. As such, normative content was explicitly manipulated to have an academic or community focus—so that each of the alternative leaders (Pro-academic or Pro-community) was aligned with the norms in one condition but not the other. The attitudinal influence measure was removed as the study no longer included the debate around the possible change in ATAR score. Additionally, we added a categorical measure of voting choice (much like real voting scenarios) to measure preferential support for one leader over the other.

We also added a behavioural measure as a way of capturing the extent to which participants are mobilized into action by the different leadership alternatives. Participants were presented with flyers by a community volunteering agency and asked to take as many as they wanted (out of 10). It is important to note that because the flyers relate to volunteering and community involvement, this measure reflects support for the pro-change leader advocating for community involvement.

It was hypothesized that new candidates for leadership who are aligned with the group’s normative trajectory should be more influential and mobilize more support than those who are non-aligned (H1). Further, alternative leaders who are normatively aligned with changing group norms should also be more influential than the pro-status quo current leaders (H2). The opposite pattern should emerge, however, for ‘non-aligned’ alternatives, so that the pro-status quo leader is more influential and mobilizing than ‘non-aligned’ new leaders (H3).
Method

Participants

Participants were recruited during orientation week at university libraries and student spaces on campus. Four cases were deleted for incomplete questionnaires (1 in the Academic Normative Trajectory + Pro-academic New Leader condition, 2 in the Academic + Pro-community condition, and 1 in the Community + Pro-community condition) and an additional 12 for failing manipulation checks (3 in the Academic + Pro-academic condition, 4 in the Academic + Pro-community condition, 2 in the Community + Pro-academic condition, and 3 in the Community + Pro-community condition). The final sample of 136 participants, including 66 male, 69 female and 1 unknown, were predominantly undergraduate students (83.1%). They ranged in age from 17 to 35 ($M=20.77, SD=2.48$).

Design, Procedure and Materials

This study employed a $2$ (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) $\times$ $2$ (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) $\times$ $2$ (Target of Response: Incumbent/ New Leader) mixed design with within-participants on the last factor. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions. After consent was given (see Appendix A for form), participants were given the questionnaire to complete.

Participants first answered five items of the social identification scale ($\alpha=.77$), as in Study 1.

Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory. Normative content was manipulated so that the University was described as being focused on either academic and research excellence (same as Study 1) or leadership and community involvement, which stated that the University needed to focus more on enhancing community spirit,
leadership and involvement. Participants were again asked two questions assessing agreement with the group norm ($\alpha=.76$).

**Manipulation of Leader Normative Alignment.** Participants then read the information about the student representative candidates for the University council, and the debate about changing the admissions criteria, which was the same as in Study 1. The Pro-academic candidate statement paired with the University’s Academic normative trajectory signalled alignment while the same statement paired with the Community normative trajectory signalled non-alignment (and vice versa for the Pro-Community new leader statement). See Appendix E for manipulations.

**Measures.** One item assessed which candidate (the incumbent or the new candidate) participants were most likely to vote for (Vote Choice): “If I had to choose, which candidate am I most likely to place a vote for (please select one)”. Measures of Voting Intentions and Collective Action Intentions ($\alpha=.81$ and $\alpha=.84$, for the incumbent and new candidate respectively) were identical to Study 1.

**Behavioral measure of collective mobilization.** At the end of the questionnaire, participants were presented with 10 flyers by a local community volunteering organisation and invited to take as many as they wanted. This behavioural measure was a way of capturing the extent to which participants were mobilized into action by the leadership alternatives. It is important to note that because the flyers were related to community volunteering, the number of flyers taken represents capacity to mobilize by the non-aligned pro-change leader (advocating greater emphasis on community involvement as an undergraduate attribute). See Appendix F for all dependent measures.

**Manipulation checks.** At the end of the survey, five questions were included to check that the information presented was understood in line with manipulations. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale the accuracy of each of the five statements in terms of what they had read in the beginning of the survey.
The first and second statements, “(a) to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on increasing its academic standards and research excellence, and (b) to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on increasing its leadership and community involvement”, assessed whether participants correctly identified the content of the group normative trajectory. The next three items assessed participants’ understanding of the relevant leader positions and were the same as in Study 1.

Participants were then asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.

**Results**

**Manipulation checks**

Participants in the Academic normative trajectory ($M=6.34$, $SD=.83$) were significantly more likely than those in the Community normative trajectory ($M=3.39$, $SD=2.28$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing academic standards and research excellence, $F(1,134)=96.72$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.42$. Similarly, participants in the Community normative trajectory ($M=6.11$, $SD=1.28$) were significantly more likely than those in the Academic normative trajectory ($M=3.28$, $SD=2.25$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing leadership and community involvement, $F(1,134)=83.46$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.38$.

Additionally, we also checked whether participants’ agreement with the norm changed as a function of normative content. Participants in the Academic normative trajectory agreed with the Academic norm ($M=6.05$, $SD=.84$) as much as those in the Community normative trajectory agreed with the Community norm ($M=5.88$, $SD=.92$; i.e., there was no significant difference in these means), $F(1,134)=1.20$, $p=.28$. 
While no significant effects were found for the incumbent’s position (which was the same in all conditions), participants in the Pro-academic new leader condition \((M=6.23, \text{SD}=.96)\) were significantly more likely than participants in the Community new leader condition \((M=2.37, \text{SD}=1.84)\) to indicate that the new leader advocated for an increase in academic standards, \(F(1,134)=240.17, p<.001, \eta^2_p=.64\). On the other hand, participants in the Community new leader condition \((M=5.95, \text{SD}=1.26)\) were significantly more likely than participants in the Pro-academic new leader condition \((M=2.68, \text{SD}=1.93)\) to indicate that the new leader advocated for a focus on community involvement and leadership traits, \(F(1,134)=134.80, p<.001, \eta^2_p=.50\). There were no other significant effects. Overall, findings suggest independent variables were manipulated successfully.

**Main Analyses**

Covariates were not included in this study as they did not explain any variance in the dependent variables. Descriptive statistics and correlations between dependent variables are presented in Table 7.3. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 7.4.
Table 7.3. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting Intentions for Incumbent</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voting Intentions for New Leader</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective Action Intentions for Incumbent</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective Action Intentions for New Leader</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of Flyers</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 136$.*

*p < .05, **p < .01.*
Table 7.4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of Normative Trajectory and New Leader Position. (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Normative Trajectory</th>
<th>New Leader Position</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>New Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>3.18e</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>4.22e</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>4.34e</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>3.03e</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective Action Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>3.75e</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>4.56e</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>3.77e</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>3.17e</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Flyers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>0.55a</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>0.09ac</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Pro-academic</td>
<td>0.42a</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-community</td>
<td>0.97b</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comparing the incumbent and the new leader: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing the two alternatives for change: Means for New Leader (right column) that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. +95% Confidence interval
Voting Intentions. A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) × 2 (Target of Response: Incumbent/ New Leader) ANOVA, with repeated measures on the last factor, revealed a two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and New Leader Position, $F(1,132)=29.52, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.18$. In line with H1, the aligned new leader secured more support from voters than the non-aligned new leader (Academic Normative Trajectory: $F(1,63)=21.43, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.25$; Community Normative Trajectory: $F(1,69)=9.85, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.13$). The expected three-way interaction also emerged, $F(1, 132) = 53.39, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.29$. In line with H2, when the new leadership candidate was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group, that leader secured more support from voters than the incumbent (Pro-academic + Academic: $F(1,32)=18.66, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.37$; Pro-community + Community: $F(1,32)=12.98, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.29$). Further, in line with H3, when the new leader was non-aligned with the group’s normative aspirations, the incumbent secured more support from voters than the non-aligned alternative (Pro-academic + Community: $F(1,37)=10.70, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.22$; Pro-community + Academic: $F(1,31)=11.21, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.27$; see Figure 7.5). Main effects and other two-way interactions were non-significant.
Figure 7.5. Voting intentions for the incumbent and new candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 2).

**Vote Choice.** The vote choice was between the incumbent and new leader candidate and as such this measure only tests Hypothesis 2 and 3. A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed (separately for each of the Academic and Community normative trajectories) with $2 \times 2$ (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) with repeated measures on the last factor. There was a significant association between normative alignment of new pro-change candidates and vote choice both in the Academic normative trajectory, $\chi^2(1)=22.59$, $p<.001$, as well as the Community normative trajectory, $\chi^2(1)=30.96$, $p<.001$. In line with H2, the new leader received more votes than the incumbent when there was alignment between their statement and changing group norms. In contrast, as predicted by H3, where there was non-alignment between the new leader and group aspirations, the incumbent received more votes than the new candidate (see Figure 7.6).

In terms of odds ratios, the odds of participants voting for the pro-change new candidate were 15.52 times higher in the Academic normative trajectory and 23.68
times higher in the Community normative trajectory when that candidate aligned with norms than when they were non-aligned. On the other hand, the odds of participants voting for the Incumbent were 15.46 times higher in the Academic normative trajectory and 24.23 times higher in the Community normative trajectory when the new candidate was non-aligned with the group norms than when they were aligned.

**Figure 7.6.** Number of votes (frequency of responses per condition) for the incumbent and new candidates as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 2).

**Collective Action Intentions.** A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA revealed a two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and New Leader Position, $F(1,132)=19.49, p<.01, \eta^2_p=.13$. In support of H1, when the pro-change new leader was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group, they engendered greater support for collective action than when they were non-aligned (Academic Normative Trajectory: $F(1,63)=13.24, p<.01, \eta^2_p=.17$; Community Normative Trajectory: $F(1,69)=7.04, p<.05, \eta^2_p=.09$). This analysis also revealed the expected three-way interaction, $F(1,132)=51.96, p<.01, \eta^2_p=.28$. In line with H2, when the pro-change leader was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group they engendered greater support for collective action than the pro-status quo incumbent (Pro-academic + Academic: $F(1,32)=6.22, p<.05, \eta^2_p=.16$;
Pro-community + Community: $F(1,32)=17.94, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.36$. Finally, supporting H3, when there was non-alignment between the pro-change leader and the normative aspirations of the group, participants were more likely to engage in collective action in support of the incumbent compared to the non-aligned alternative (Pro-academic + Community: $F(1,37)=8.23, p<.05, \eta_p^2=.18$; Pro-community + Academic: $F(1,31)=35.52, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.44$; see Figure 7.7). Main effects and other two-way interactions were not significant.

**Figure 7.7.** Collective action intentions for the incumbent and new candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 2).

**Behavioral measure of collective mobilization.** A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic vs. Community) × 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-Academic/Pro-Community) between-participants ANOVA revealed a two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and New Leader Position, $F(1,132)=2.92, p=.09, \eta_p^2=.02$ (main effects were non-significant). Because the flyers relate to volunteering and community involvement, this measure reflects support for the pro-change leader advocating for community involvement. In line with H1, when the alternative was Pro-Community, participants...
took significantly more flyers when the leader was aligned with group norms (i.e., in the Community Normative trajectory) than when they were non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic Normative trajectory), $F(1,63)=4.28, p<.05, \eta^2_p=.06$. In contrast, the number of flyers taken when the new leader was Pro-academic did not differ as a function of the normative trajectory of the group, $F(1,69)=.10, p=.76$ (see Figure 7.8).

**Figure 7.8.** Mean number of flyers taken as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 2).

**Discussion**

By directly manipulating alignment with the group’s normative trajectory, Study 2 again tested the idea that normatively aligned pro-change leaders would be more influential than either their non-aligned counterparts or the pro-status quo incumbents. Overall, the results supported the hypotheses. More specifically, a clear pattern demonstrated that, to be able to mobilize group members, the rhetoric of those leading for change needs to reflect or align with ‘who we want to be’. Thus a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions than a non-aligned new leader (H1). Aligned new leaders were also more effective than current leaders
who were out of step with the group’s normative trajectory (H2), regardless of normative content (i.e., whether the focus of the group normative trajectory was academic- or community-oriented). When there was non-alignment between the new leader and group aspirations, the pro-status quo incumbent (even though they were out of step with the changing group norms in all conditions) maintained their position of leadership (H3). In other words, the same pro-status quo message was rejected under conditions where there were viable alternatives, but was supported where there was a lack of viable leadership for change.

**General Discussion**

Even though leadership is a contest for influence, where multiple would-be leaders vie for the support of the same group, it is rarely studied as such. The present research aimed to address this gap. The two studies presented in this chapter pitted two competing leaders, a pro-status quo incumbent and a pro-change alternative candidate, against each other in order to investigate the dynamics of influence involved in the process of mobilising for social change. These studies showed that a new, pro-change leader will succeed in mobilizing collective efforts for change over an existing leader when existing leaders are unable to keep up with the momentum for change, but only when emerging leaders are also aligned with followers’ understandings of intergroup relations and therefore seen to advance change ‘we believe in’ (Study 2). However, when new leadership candidates are unable to capture the group’s future aspirations, the current leader seems likely to retain their influence (Studies 1 & 2).

It is interesting that the same current leader message can elicit different reactions from group members depending on the nature of the available leadership alternatives. In the present research the current leader was portrayed as ‘failing’ to keep up with the group’s momentum for change in all conditions. Yet they were still able to retain their
influence when there were no viable pro-change alternatives. Therefore, it is not the case that, in the presence of poor leadership, followers make a desperate and blind grab for just any alternative. Rather it seems that leaders’ ability to redefine reality in a way that captures the group’s momentum is central in determining who will be successful in mobilizing the group for their cause.

This research also shows that rather than new leaders being given carte blanche to ‘innovate’ when they deviate from group norms (e.g., Abrams et al., 2008; Randsley de Moura, Abrams, Marques & Hutchison, 2011), it is actually harder for them to secure a followership when they are mis-aligned with ‘who we are’ and ‘who we want to be’. Moreover, in this research, a far from ‘perfect’ incumbent was able to maintain follower support in the absence of a well-aligned alternative. Yet it is only by pitting two leaders against each other in the same context, in front of the same ‘electorate’, that we are able to see which leader is preferred over other contenders and observe effects that we would have otherwise (when investigating a single leader-follower relationship) missed.

**Limitations and future directions**

This research makes a number of novel contributions to the leadership literature. We investigated the nature of change in leadership dynamics as a contest for influence much as it happens in real life — a feature which has been rather neglected in (social psychological) leadership research to date (for more about understanding leadership change, see Subašić & Reynolds, 2011; Turner et al., 2008). We also contrasted the capacity for influence of multiple new leadership alternatives with different positions in relation to changing group norms. Nevertheless, this research has a number of potential limitations that need to be addressed.
One limitation of Study 1 was the misalignment between the nature of threat facing the group and the nature of leader messages. As discussed earlier, this may have led to an indifference on part of the participants regarding their voting intentions. We addressed this limitation in Study 2 by replacing the presence (or absence) of threat with a more direct manipulation of normative alignment. Another way to address this limitation (and an interesting future direction) would be to contrast leader messages that were aligned with the nature of threat with those that were not. Under conditions of threat, whether or not leaders are able to adequately address the issue and provide a plausible solution will become an important consideration when making a decision about who should be ‘our’ leader. For example, during the surge in unauthorized boat arrivals in Australia in 2010, many Australians looked to their political leaders for a toughened suite of policies regarding immigration (Iyengar & Jackman, 2010). In this context, arguing for a softer approach to asylum seekers or emphasizing other issues altogether (e.g., the environment or education) would be more likely to fall on deaf ears.

Another promising future direction would be to directly contrast the pro-change new leader alternatives. In this study the contest was between the pro-status quo incumbent and a pro-change new candidate, rather than between pro-change alternatives who may be equally ‘new’ on the scene. In future work it will be useful to contrast multiple emerging, pro-change leaders (i.e., non-incumbents) as happens with such contests in real life (e.g., in elections), where we often have an incumbent that people are disengaging from, but more than one potential new leader vying to take over. We examine this question in the next program of studies (Chapter 8).

**Conclusion**

Overall, the findings reported in this chapter support the idea that how well a leader is able to influence and mobilize followers depends on how well he or she is able
not only to represent ‘who we are’ but also ‘who we want to be’. But more than this, whether a change in leadership occurs also depends on the intergroup context and the specific constellation of alternative leaders. When a current leader does not keep up with the changing norms and values of the group, they *may* lose support, but *only* when the available alternative better represents those norms. Thus they might still retain influence in the presence of new leaders whose vision for ‘the change we need’ fails to capture ‘who we want to become’. It seems that, in the absence of a clearly articulated identity-enhancing alternative, as followers, we would rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of.

But what will happen when there are no incumbents to fall back on? That is, when the leadership contest is between two new leaders—both advocating different visions of change for the group—who will be able to secure a followership and mobilise the group in a new direction? In Chapter 8, we present evidence from two studies designed to address this question.
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Abstract

The social identity leadership literature has scarcely examined leadership dynamics in a competitive context, where there are multiple and competing visions of group identity, norms and aspirations. In such contexts, to be successful in mobilizing the group for change, leaders need to go beyond representing ‘who we are’ in the here and now to also embody ‘who we want to be’ in the future—and, centrally, they need to do so better than the available alternatives. In line with this reasoning, we examined and found support for the idea that a pro-change leader who is able to capture the group’s normative trajectory would be more successful in mobilizing collective efforts for change than one who is ‘non-aligned’, and would do so better in the presence of such competition compared to its absence. These results indicate that emerging pro-change leaders need to be responsive to future normative aspirations of groups to bring about not just any change but change ‘we can believe in’.
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Leadership is inherently and (often) explicitly competitive. For example, in electoral contexts, emerging leaders advocating an agenda for change may be confronted with incumbents seeking to preserve the status quo, or even other visions for the ‘change we need’. Given that voters never consider a leader’s vision for change in isolation, but rather are exposed to multiple voices arguing for different and competing versions of ‘who we are’ and ‘who we want to become’, analyses of leadership and change that do not reflect this contrastive process will be incomplete (Subašić, et al., 2012; Subašić, et al., 2015). Nonetheless, as noted earlier in the thesis, research on leadership traditionally explores the relationship between a single leader and a single group of followers (e.g., a team or organisation) while neglecting the comparative nature of leadership dynamics (e.g., De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Haslam & Platow, 2001; Yukl, 2008).

To address this gap, in this program of research we aim to explore the influence processes underlying support for competing pro-change leaders each with a different vision for the direction the group should head towards. That is, when the competition is between two pro-change leaders (both equally new on the scene) with different visions of ‘who we should become’, who will influence and mobilise more support? Another way to ask this question is to ask, how does one leader for change come to be able to shape what values, goals and beliefs define who ‘we’ are (not) and what ‘we’ do, over another leader for change with different definitions of ‘who we should be’?

Two additional questions arise from our critique of extant work and its focus on single leader-follower relationships. First, does it matter whether the contest is between two new pro-change leaders, or between a pro-change leader and a pro-status quo
incumbent (as investigated in the first program of research)? Second, does it matter whether there is competition in the first place—in other words, whether leaders for change have the stage to themselves (as is the case in much of leadership research) or are required to share it with competitors?

More specifically, we examine whether support for a new leader changes as a function of: 1) presence vs. absence of leadership contest (i.e., single leader vs. two leaders; Study 3 and 4), and 2) who the competition is (i.e., incumbent or another new leader; Study 4). Ultimately, in each study we also address the core question of this thesis, which of the multiple leadership alternatives will best mobilize ‘us’ in a contest for influence. Before describing this research in detail, the sections below review previous work that speaks most directly to the leaders’ capacity to mobilize followers.

**Leadership as an intra- or intergroup process?**

In Chapter 7, we emphasised that the success of leaders for change is contingent upon (a) leaders offering a vision for the future that is viable and in line with shared future aspirations of the group, and (b) doing so better than the available alternatives. In much of existing work, however, this contrastive nature of leadership has been neglected (e.g., Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Subašić, et al., 2012 for a critique).

The focus of leadership research has been quite prolific, including the study of the role of leader prototypicality ranging across different methodologies, such as laboratory experiments, scenario experiments (i.e., assessing responses to hypothetical situations), and surveys in the field, as well as focusing on different leadership outcomes, such as perceived leadership effectiveness (e.g., Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997), performance (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005), leadership endorsement (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001;
Ullrich et al., 2009), creativity (Hirst, van Knippenberg & Zhou, 2009) and job satisfaction (e.g., Cicero, Bonaiuto, Pierro & van Knippenberg, 2008; Cicero, Pierro & van Knippenberg, 2010; Pierro et al., 2005). However, the context studied has mostly been one of intragroup relations.

These studies are typical of social psychological research on leadership in that they explore a single leader-follower relationship in studying the processes involved in social influence and leadership. Participants are asked to make judgments about individual leaders in isolation from other leadership positions explored in the study, despite the fact that in reality, even judgments about individual leaders are made in comparison to the available leadership alternatives.

This is also surprising given that based on SCT analysis of group processes, prototypicality, and thus social influence, is a relative concept (Turner & Haslam, 2001). That is, the defining qualities of ‘who we are’ can shift as a function of ‘who they are’—the outgroup that ‘we’ are being compared to. As such, the intergroup context—whether or not there is a competing leader with an alternative vision for ‘who we should become’, but also the content of those alternative visions—becomes important in understanding who will emerge as influential and innovative, and who will be dismissed as ‘out of touch’ or ‘too radical’ for the kind of future that ‘we’ aspire to.

**Considering the opposition**

While being representative of ‘who we are’ in the present has been the epitome of social identity leadership research, within change contexts, emerging leaders not only have to be vigilant about the direction their group is heading towards but also of their competition—often from established leaders who have successfully legitimized the status quo or even from new leaders with different ideas of ‘who we should become’. In such contexts then, leaders need to also be normatively aligned with ‘who we want to
be’ in the future to be successful in mobilizing the collective for change—and, do so better than the available alternatives. In line with this, in Program 1 (Studies 1 and 2), we found that a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions than one who was non-aligned, and also current leaders who were out of step with the group’s normative trajectory\(^5\).

However, in social psychological research on leadership so far, leadership has been studied as an intragroup process (Subašić et al., 2015; Subašić et al., 2012 for a critique). The reality is that the same audience will be exposed to multiple leaders all vying to gain support from the same electorate. Voters are assailed by different voices of politicians declaring their different agendas—emerging leaders attempting to mobilise the public for change or incumbents seeking to preserve the status quo, before having to decide who of all the candidates on the ballot paper deserves ‘our’ vote and should become ‘our’ leader. For example, in the 2013 Australian federal elections, liberal voters did not simply vote in Tony Abbott as their Prime Minister—they made a choice to support Abbott over the then Labor leader Kevin Rudd.

Given the contrastive process, how well a leader is able to capture the group’s attention then also depends on what the other available leaders are saying and doing. That is, perceptions of how good of a fit Tony Abbott is for Australia is likely to shift as a function of whether it is an incumbent seeking to preserve the status quo (Kevin Rudd, in 2013), or a new leader advocating for change (Bill Shorten, in 2016) who is his main contender. Based on SCT analysis of group processes, the prototype, thus, prototypicality and social influence, are defined through an intergroup comparison (Turner, 1991). Who ‘we’ are and who best represents ‘us’ is a production of social comparison with ‘them’. This means that as the comparative context changes (i.e.,

\(^5\) See Chapter 7 for a more elaborate analysis of these ideas.
whether or not there is a competing leader and who the competing leader is), so does perceptions of a leader’s representativeness, and as a result, their influence.

For example, moderate feminists are more likely to perceive separatist feminists as a faction or lower order outgroup in the absence of another comparison, but as “sisters in the fight against the patriarchy” in a broader context including comparisons with anti-feminists (David & Turner, 1999, p. 177). In their research, David and Turner (1999) found that moderate feminist participants’ feminism scores shifted away from separatist feminists in the absence of another comparison, while when the comparison was made with an anti-feminist message, participants’ attitudes shifted towards the source of influence. This research shows how the nature of comparison (whether there is an alternative available or not) can affect not only how well a source of influence is seen to represent ‘us’ but also how influential they can be.

**Current Research**

While several recent studies signal a broadening of leadership research to consider its more comparative and competitive aspects (see Alabastro et al., 2013; Halevy et al., 2011; Rast et al., 2012), in much of existing work, leadership has been studied as the relationship between a single leader and a group of followers (e.g., Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; see Subašić, et al., 2015; Subašić, et al., 2012 for a critique). A key process underpinning leadership and influence—the competitive and contrasting aspects—seems to be overlooked.

Given that in reality voters make judgments about individual leaders in comparison to other available alternatives, and that such a leader candidate’s standing within a group, and thus their ability to influence their constituency, is contingent on the broader intergroup context (i.e., other possible leadership contenders; Turner, 1991;
Turner & Haslam, 2001), it is important to stop overlooking the competitive and contrastive nature of leadership, and consider leadership as a contest for influence. In order to show the importance of considering leadership as an intergroup process, in this program of research, we directly contrasted conditions where participants are exposed to a single leader (which is typically studied in current social psychological research on leadership) to those where there are multiple leaders in competition. As such, this is the first empirical test of whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest and also who the competition is.

The current research aims to investigate who among the different alternatives for change will be able to gain the allegiance of the same electors they all vie to engage. We propose that the same pro-change leader will receive differing levels of support depending on whether there are competing voices for leadership, but also who the competing leader is. More detailed hypotheses are outlined for each study below. Next, we report findings from two experiments that test these predictions in more detail.

**Study 3**

Study 3 extends Program 1 in two ways. First, we directly test whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest. In Program 1 studies, contest was present in all conditions. In this study the presence (vs. absence) of leader contest is manipulated to directly test the effects of contest on leader influence. Second, we directly contrast two emerging, pro-change leaders. In Program 1 studies the contest was between the pro-status quo incumbent and a pro-change new candidate, rather than between pro-change alternatives (i.e., non-incumbents) who may be equally ‘new’ on the scene. In this study, we contrast two emerging, pro-change leaders (in within-participants analyses) as happens with such contests in real life (e.g., in elections),
where we often have an incumbent that people are disengaging from, but more than one potential new leader vying to take over.

The context for this study was similar to that of Program 1, where a fictitious (but presented as real) election of a student representative for the University Council, ostensibly took place at a time when the University was considering changing its admissions policy. In order to test the effects of contest on leader influence, the presence (vs. absence) of leader contest was used. In the no contest condition, only one candidate who emphasized community participation (Pro-community) was presented in isolation, while in conditions where contest was present, this Pro-community candidate’s message was contrasted with a competing alternative candidate who argued for stricter academic-based admissions criteria (Pro-academic).

In order to vary the extent to which the candidates expressed views that reflected the group’s normative trajectory (aligned vs. non-aligned), we manipulated the content of the group normative trajectory. Normative content was explicitly manipulated to have an academic or community focus—so that each of the alternative leaders (Pro-community or Pro-academic) was aligned with the norms in one condition but not the other.

First, in relation to questions examining whether support for the target leader changes as a function of contest, it was hypothesized that, a pro-change leader who is aligned with the group’s normative trajectory should be more influential and mobilize more support in the presence of competition compared to its absence (H1a). The opposite pattern should appear for a pro-change leader who is non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, where they should be more influential and mobilize more support in the absence compared to presence of competition (H1b).

In relation to the second question examining which new pro-change leader would be preferred in a contest for influence, we expect to replicate Program 1 findings.
As such, it was hypothesized that pro-change leaders who are normatively aligned with changing group norms should also secure more votes and mobilize more support than those who are non-aligned (H2).

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were recruited at the University libraries and student spaces on campus. Two cases were deleted for incomplete (more than 50%) questionnaires and an additional 34 for failing manipulation checks (9 in the Academic Normative Trajectory + Contest condition, 10 in the Academic + No Contest condition, 8 in the Community + Contest condition, and 7 in the Community + No Contest condition). The final sample of 165 participants, including 64 male, 98 female and 1 unknown, were predominantly undergraduate students (72.9%). They ranged in age from 17 to 55 (M = 20.99, S.D = 3.89) and 74.7% were domestic students.

**Design, Procedure and Materials**

This study employed a 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (Contest: No Contest/Contest) factorial design, with an additional repeated measures factor (Target of Response: Pro-community/Pro-academic) in the Contest condition only. After providing consent (see Appendix A for form), participants were randomly allocated to one of four between-subjects experimental conditions and directed to the appropriate questionnaire.

**Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory.** Participants then read a vignette which outlined the University’s focus (i.e., the group norm). Normative content was manipulated so that the University was described as being focused on either academic and research excellence, which stated that the University needed to enhance
its academic rigor, and to offer an unparalleled experience for its students across a broad spectrum of academic environments, or as focused on leadership and community involvement, which stated that the University needed to focus more on enhancing community spirit, leadership and involvement. To emphasise the relevant group norms further, each vignette also stated that many students believe in this movement for growth and that it is an important goal for the University.

At the end of this section, all participants rated (on a 7-point scale) two items assessing agreement with the group norm (e.g., “As a [University] student, valuing academic and research excellence at an increasingly higher standard [leadership and community involvement] is important for [University]”) to assess and enhance their agreement with this particular group norm (α=.80).

**Manipulation of presence (or absence) of contest (and leader normative alignment).** Participants then read the information about the student representative candidates for the University council. The debate about changing the admissions criteria was described first. Then, speeches by the candidates outlining their position regarding the issue were presented. All participants read a candidate statement by a Pro-Community new candidate (referred to as ‘target leader’). While the message remained constant, this statement paired with the University’s Community normative trajectory signalled alignment while the same statement paired with the Academic normative trajectory signalled non-alignment).

Participants in the Contest condition read an additional speech by a competing pro-change new candidate, which emphasized the need to attract undergraduates who show academic excellence (Pro-academic; this information was omitted under No Contest conditions). Though this statement also remained constant, the extent to which this message was aligned or not shifted according to the content of the normative
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trajectory (non-aligned when norm content is community-focused, while aligned when norm content is academic-oriented). See Appendix G for manipulations.

**Measures. Voting Intentions.** Participants indicated the extent to which they were likely to vote for each candidate to represent the student body in the University council. Under Contest conditions, this item was completed twice, once regarding each of the pro-change new leadership candidate.

**Vote Choice.** Under contest conditions, one item assessed which candidate (the target leader or the competitor) participants were most likely to vote for (Vote Choice): “If I had to choose, which candidate am I most likely to place a vote for (please select one)?”

**Collective Action Intentions.** Participants indicated how likely they would be to participate in collective action for each of the candidates (e.g., “Get together with other University students to try and do something about this issue as a group”). Five items reliably measured collective mobilization (adapted from Subašić, Schmitt et al., 2011) in response to messages by the two pro-change new candidates ($\alpha$s=.81, .84, respectively). See Appendix H for all dependent measures.

**Manipulation checks.** At the end of the survey, three (four in the Contest condition) questions were included to check that the information presented was understood in line with manipulations. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale the accuracy of each of the five statements in terms of what they had read in the beginning of the survey.

The first and second statements, “(a) to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on increasing its academic standards and research excellence, and (b) to remain competitive internationally, the [University] needs to focus on increasing its leadership and community involvement”, assessed whether participants correctly identified the content of the group normative trajectory.
The next items assessed participants’ understanding of the relevant leader positions. The third statement, “(c) student representative candidate (“candidate A” in the Contest condition) holds that to enhance its standards, ANU needs to change its admission criteria to focus on community involvement”, checked whether participants correctly identified the target pro-change leader’s position as Pro-community. In the Contest condition, an additional statement, “(d) candidate B holds that to enhance its standards, ANU needs to change its admission criteria to increase its academic rigour” checked whether participants correctly identified the competing pro-change leader’s position as Pro-academic.

We did not check whether participants were able to correctly identify whether there was a competition or not, as this would have been apparent for them as they indicated their views and support for one vs. two candidates depending on which condition they were in.

Finally, participants were asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student (domestic, international) and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.

Results

Manipulation checks. Participants in the Academic normative trajectory ($M = 5.59, SD = 1.45$) were significantly more likely than those in the Community normative trajectory ($M = 4.32, SD = 1.95$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing academic standards and research excellence, $F(1, 194) = 27.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$. Similarly, participants in the Community normative trajectory ($M = 5.34, SD = 1.37$) were significantly more likely than those in the Academic normative trajectory ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.75$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing leadership and community involvement, $F(1, 194) = 18.01, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .09$. 

No significant effects were found for the target pro-change leader’s position (which was Pro-community in all conditions). Furthermore, in the Contest condition, no significant effects were found for the competing pro-change leader’s position either (which was Pro-academic in all conditions). Overall, findings suggest independent variables were manipulated successfully.

Main Analyses

Analytical strategy. Two different types of analyses were performed corresponding to the two key research questions. First, in order to examine whether support for a pro-change leader (in terms of voting and collective action intentions) would change as a function of contest (presence or absence of an alternative leader), we performed a $2 \times 2$ between-participants analyses of variance (ANOVA) on voting intentions and collective action intentions regarding the Pro-community pro-change leader.

Second, in order to directly compare support for two competing pro-change leaders and examine which new leader for change would be more effective at mobilizing participants, we conducted a $2 \times 2$ repeated-measures ANOVA in the Contest condition on voting and collective action intentions. We also performed a chi-square test of goodness of fit to measure preferential support for one leader over the other.

Descriptive statistics and correlations between key variables are presented in Table 8.1. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 8.2.
Table 8.1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pearson correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting Intentions for Pro-community Leader</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voting Intentions for Pro-academic Leader</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective Action Intentions for Pro-community Leader</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective Action Intentions for Pro-academic Leader</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.*
Table 8.2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of New Leader Position and Threat. (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Normative Trajectory</th>
<th>Contest</th>
<th>Target New Leader (Pro-community)</th>
<th>Competing New Leader (Pro-academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>5.32(_a)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Contest</td>
<td>4.37(_b)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>2.98(_{b,c})</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Contest</td>
<td>3.76(_{a,b,c})</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>4.22(_a)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Contest</td>
<td>3.56(_b)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>3.22(_{b,c})</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Contest</td>
<td>3.36(_{a,b,c})</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Comparing support for the Pro-community target leader in different conditions: Means for Target New Leader (left column) that do not share the same sub scripted letter differ at the \( p < .05 \) level. Comparing two pro-change leaders: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the \( p < .05 \) level. +95\% Confidence interval.
Does support for the target leader change as a function of contest?

**Voting Intentions.** A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (Contest: Contest/No Contest) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Normative Trajectory, $F(1, 161) = 37.34, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .19$, and a significant interaction between Normative Trajectory and Contest, $F(1, 161) = 12.89, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .07$. In line with H1a, when the Pro-community candidate was aligned with group norms (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory) they secured more support from voters in the presence rather than absence of competition, $F(1, 79) = 10.96, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .12$. The opposite pattern can be seen for pro-change leaders who are non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory. In line with H1b, when the normative trajectory was Academic-oriented, voting intentions for the Pro-Community candidate were higher in the absence rather than presence of competition, $F(1, 82) = 4.11, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .06$.

Furthermore, in conditions of contest, voting intentions for the Pro-community candidate were higher when they were aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory) than non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory), $F(1, 81) = 44.55, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .36$. This difference between aligned and non-aligned new leaders reached marginal significance in the No-contest conditions, $F(1, 80) = 3.37, p = .07, \eta_p^2 = .04$ (see Figure 8.1).
**Collective Action Intentions.** A 2 × 2 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Normative Trajectory, $F(1, 161) = 9.04, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .05$, and a significant interaction between Normative Trajectory and Contest, $F(1, 160) = 4.09, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .03$. In line with H1a, and replicating results for voting intentions, when the Pro-community leader was normatively aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory), they elicited higher collective action intentions under conditions of contest than when contest was absent, $F(1,78) = 7.42, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .09$. However, there was no support for H1b as collective action intentions for the Pro-community leader when they were non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory) did not vary as a function of contest, $F(1,82) = .20, p = .66$.

Further, simple effects revealed that under conditions of contest, participants were more likely to engage in collective action in support of the Pro-community leader when the leader was aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory), than when the leader was non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory), $F(1,80) = 10.66, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .12$. This difference disappeared when contest was absent, $F(1,80) = .60, p = .44$ (see Figure 8.2).
To summarise, in line with our predictions, the same pro-change leader received differing levels of support in terms of voting and collective action intentions depending on whether there was an alternative voice competing for a leadership position. Particularly, a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions when their statement was read in the presence of competition compared to its absence. On the other hand, when the pro-change leader is non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they secured more votes (but not collective action intentions) in the absence than presence of competition. Furthermore, while the pro-change leader received more support when they were aligned than non-aligned when comparing the two contest conditions, there was no difference in voting intentions or collective action intentions for the pro-change leader regardless of whether they were aligned or not, in the absence of contest. This adds to our argument that it is important to consider leadership and influence as a contrastive process.
Which of the multiple alternatives for change will be most supported?

**Voting Intentions.** A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a significant two-way interaction, $F(1, 80) = 36.8, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .32$. In line with H2, when the new leadership candidate was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group, that leader secured more support from voters than when they were non-aligned. More specifically, in the Community Normative Trajectory, voting intentions for the Pro-community leader were higher than for the Pro-academic pro-change leader, $F(1, 38) = 28.15, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .43$, while in the Academic Normative Trajectory, the Pro-academic new leader secured more support than the Pro-community leader, $F(1, 42) = 13.31, p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .24$ (see Figure 8.3).

![Figure 8.3](image)

**Figure 8.3.** Voting intentions for competing new candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 3).

**Vote Choice.** The vote choice was between the Pro-community and the Pro-academic new leader candidates. A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed with 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (New Leader Position: Pro-academic/Pro-community) with repeated measures on the last factor. There was a
significant association between normative alignment of new pro-change candidates and vote choice, $\chi^2 (1) = 22.18, p < .001$. In line with H2, the new leader who was aligned with the changing group norms received more votes than the new leader who was non-aligned. In terms of odds, the odds of participants voting for the Pro-community new candidate were 10.62 times higher when that candidate aligned with norms (in the Community Normative Trajectory) than when they were non-aligned (in the Academic Normative Trajectory). Further, the odds of participants voting for the Pro-academic new candidate were 10.50 times higher when that candidate aligned with norms (in the Academic Normative Trajectory) than when they were non-aligned (in the Community Normative Trajectory; see Figure 8.4).

**Figure 8.4.** Number of votes for competing new candidates (frequency of responses) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 3).

**Collective Action Intentions.** A $2 \times 2$ ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a significant two-way interaction, $F(1, 80) = 17.79, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .18$. In line with H2, when the new leadership candidate was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group, that leader engendered greater support for collective action than when they were non-aligned (Community Normative Trajectory: $F(1,38) = 23.56, p <$
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.001, $\eta_p^2 = .38$; Academic Normative Trajectory: $F(1,42) = 5.62, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .12$; see Figure 8.5).

**Figure 8.5.** Collective Action intentions for competing new candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and New Leader Position (Pro-academic vs. Pro-community; Study 3).

**Discussion**

The findings of Study 3 supported the idea that in order to be successful, leaders for change need to embody ‘who we want to be’ in the future—and, centrally, they need to do so better than the available pro-change alternatives. A clear pattern demonstrated that, when the rhetoric of those leading for change reflects or aligns with ‘who we want to be’ they will be successful in securing votes and mobilize group members than those who are non-aligned, supporting H2. These results replicate findings of Program 1 (but with a comparison between two new leaders), and shows that it is alignment (i.e., a leaders’ ability to redefine reality in a way that captures the group’s momentum), and not incumbency, that is central in determining who will be successful in mobilizing the group for their cause.

We also tested the interesting and novel question of whether support for a leader can change as a function of presence or absence of competition. Overall, the results
supported the hypotheses (H1). A pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions when their statement was read in the presence of competition compared to its absence. On the other hand, when the pro-change leader is non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they secured more votes (but not collective action intentions) in the absence than presence of competition. This might be due to the nature of the two variables. Despite both being measures of intentions, participants might find it harder to commit to participating in collective action for a leader—whereas not a lot of effort is required to vote.

Furthermore, it was interesting that there was no difference in support for aligned vs. non-aligned in the absence of contest. It seems that in the absence of comparison with an alternative, people find it more difficult to tell whether these leaders are ‘our’ leaders or not. This is likely because both sets of norms used in this study (i.e., academic-oriented and community oriented) are ‘plausible’ given the university context. Until leaders are pitted against one another, participants have difficulty distinguishing whether a leader is aligned or not with particular norms. We would most likely observe a difference here if we had a non-aligned statement that was clearly counter-normative (for e.g., advocating that paying someone to write your assignments is okay). When a leader statement is clearly going against the group norms and aspirations, it would have been easier for participants to tell whether a leader is ‘our’ leader or not, in terms how well that leader embodied the group prototype.

Apart from seeing little value in including an anti-normative position that would clearly be rejected, we opted for these statements for their external validity. In reality, despite differences, opposing positions are often both plausible given the group context rather than being clearly counter-normative. That is, despite multiple would be leaders all trying to define a group’s identity in different and often contradictory ways, in order
to gain the allegiance of the same electorate it becomes important for them to seem legitimate in the eyes of group members, and offer a version of identity that is tied to group experiences (such as collective rituals; see Falasca-Zamponi, 1997; Ozouf, 1988) and future aspirations (Reicher, 2004). To put it simply, while a leader’s agenda might differ considerably from that of other competing leaders, they do not stray too far from the group norms and ideals.

In this study, we tested whether the presence of another pro-change alternative will affect support for a pro-change leader. That is, the competition (when present) was between two pro-change leader candidates. In the next study we aimed to elucidate whether the nature of that contrast (alternative leader being either pro-change or pro-status quo) will affect support for a particular leader, that is, whether support for a pro-change leader would differ as a function of whether the competition argues to maintain the status quo, or offers an alternative change proposal. In other words, does it matter whether the contest is between two new pro-change leaders (investigated in Study 3), or between a pro-change leader and a pro-status quo incumbent (as investigated in Program 1)?

**Study 4**

As in Study 3, we manipulated the presence vs. absence of leader contest to directly test the effects of contest on leader influence. This study also aimed to find out whether contest matters more with certain competitors (e.g., new pro-change candidates) than others (e.g., pro-status quo incumbents). That is, does support for a pro-change leader change as a function of whether their competition is pro-status quo or pro-change?

As we have discussed, leadership is a contest for influence, and, how well a leader is able to capture the group’s attention also depends on what the other available leaders are saying and doing. The processes involved in a contest for leadership
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between a leader for change and a leader for continuity will be quite different to those involved in a contest for influence between two leaders for change. The former involves an interdependent but asymmetrical power struggle between maintaining the status quo and mobilizing challenge to the status quo, where social change becomes possible once people start to question whether existing dominant-subordinate relations are legitimate and in ‘our’ best interests, and importantly, when the change offered is one ‘we can believe in’ (e.g., Subašić et al, 2008; Subašić et al, 2012; Turner & Reynolds, 2010; Turner et al., 2008).

On the other hand, the latter involves a contest among different alternatives for change. In such cases, mobilization of change does not involve the severing of pre-existing allegiances and existing group realities, but rather the symmetrical consideration of new visions for who ‘we’ are—where some will emerge as viable leaders who shares ‘our’ values and goals, while others will be dismissed for not being able to capture who ‘we’ want to be.

In relation to the first question examining whether support for a pro-change target leader changes as a function of contest, as in Study 3, it was hypothesized that when a pro-change target leader is aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they should be more influential and mobilize more support in the presence of competition (whether it is non-aligned new leaders or pro-status quo incumbents), compared to its absence (H1a). The opposite pattern should emerge for pro-change leaders non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, who should be more influential and mobilize more support in the absence than presence of competing alternatives (aligned pro-change leaders or pro-status quo incumbents; H1b).

In addition, examining whether support for a target leader changes as a function of who the competition is, it was hypothesized that support for an aligned pro-change target leader will be higher when they are competing with a (non-aligned) new
candidate than a pro-status quo incumbent (H2a). On the other hand, when target
leaders are non-aligned, there will be no difference in support for the target leader
regardless of who the competitor is (H2b).

Further, in relation to questions examining which leader would be preferred
(Target leader, pro-change vs. Competitor, either pro-change or pro-status quo), it was
hypothesized that when pro-change leaders are normatively aligned with changing
group norms, they should secure more votes and mobilize more support than competing
non-aligned new candidates as well as out of step incumbents in a contest for influence
(H3a). On the other hand, when new candidates are non-aligned with the normative
trajectory of the group, they should secure less support from voters and mobilize less
support than the aligned new candidates, as well as incumbents (H3b).

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited at the University libraries and student spaces on
campus. Three cases were deleted for incomplete questionnaires and an additional 10
for failing manipulation checks (4 in the Academic Normative Trajectory + No
Competition condition, 2 in the Academic + Incumbent condition, 3 in the Community
+ New Candidate condition, and 1 in the Community + Incumbent condition). The final
sample of 146 participants, including 56 male and 91 female participants, were
predominantly undergraduate students (42.6%). They ranged in age from 17 to 55 (M =
20.22, S.D = 3.86) and 84.5% were domestic students.

Design, Procedure and Materials

This study employed a 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 3
(Competition: No Competition/Pro-Change New Candidate/Status Quo Incumbent)
factorial design, with an additional repeated measures factor (Target of Response: Target/Competitor) in the two contest conditions. After providing consent (see Appendix A for form), participants were randomly allocated to one of six between-subjects experimental conditions and directed to the appropriate questionnaire.

**Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory.** Normative content was manipulated so that the University was described as being focused on either academic and research excellence or leadership and community involvement (same as Study 3; \( \alpha = 0.76 \)).

**Manipulation of Competition.** Participants then read the information about the student representative candidates for the University council, and the debate about changing the admissions criteria. All participants read a speech by the Pro-community target candidate which was the same as Study 3.

Then, depending on which competition condition participants were assigned to, they either did not read an additional candidate speech (No Competition condition), or read an additional speech by either a competing new candidate who was also pro-change (New Candidate condition) or a pro-status quo incumbent (Incumbent condition). The new candidate speech emphasized the need to attract undergraduates who show academic excellence (Pro-academic), which was the same as Study 3. Participants in the Incumbent condition read a different speech by a competing incumbent who proposed to maintain current standards and be relaxed about the whole issue. See Appendix I for manipulations.

**Measures.** Measures of Voting Intentions, Vote Choice, and Collective Action Intentions (\( \alpha = 0.92 \) and \( \alpha = 0.93 \), for the Target leader and competing candidate respectively) were identical to Study 3 (See Appendix H).

**Manipulation checks.** At the end of the survey, three (five in the two Competition conditions) questions were included to check that the information
presented was understood in line with manipulations. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale the accuracy of each of the five statements in terms of what they had read at the beginning of the survey.

The first and second statements assessed whether participants correctly identified the content of the group normative trajectory and were the same as those used in Study 3. The next three items assessed participants’ understanding of the relevant leader positions. The third and fourth statements were the same as in Study 3. The fifth item, “(e) candidate B holds that the [University] is doing well currently and proposed maintaining current standards”, was added in line with the pro-status quo incumbent as a condition new to this Study.

Participants were then asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.

Results

Manipulation checks. Participants in the Academic normative trajectory ($M = 5.95$, $SD = 1.14$) were significantly more likely than those in the Community normative trajectory ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.86$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing academic standards and research excellence, $F(1, 146) = 122.34, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .46$. Similarly, participants in the Community normative trajectory ($M = 5.64$, $SD = 1.50$) were significantly more likely than those in the Academic normative trajectory ($M = 2.27$, $SD = 1.55$) to indicate that the University needed to focus on increasing leadership and community involvement, $F(1, 148) = 180.43, p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .55$.

No significant effects were found for the target pro-change leader’s position (which was Pro-community in all conditions). Participants in the Pro-academic New Candidate competition condition ($M = 6.34$, $SD = .65$) were significantly more likely than those in the Incumbent competition condition ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.35$) to indicate
that Candidate B advocated for an increase in academic standards, $F(1, 96) = 354.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .79$. Similarly, participants in the Incumbent competition condition ($M = 5.65$, $SD = 1.30$) were significantly more likely than those in the New Candidate competition condition ($M = 1.72$, $SD = .88$) to indicate that Candidate B advocated to relax and maintain current admission criteria, $F(1, 96) = 309.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .76$. Overall, findings suggest independent variables were manipulated successfully.

Main Analyses

**Analytical strategy.** As in Study 3, two different types of analyses were performed corresponding to the two key research questions. First, in order to examine whether support for a pro-change leader (in terms of voting and collective action intentions) would vary as a function of contest, we performed a $2 \times 3$ between-participants analyses of variance (ANOVA) on voting intentions and collective action intentions regarding the Pro-community pro-change leader.

Second, in order to directly compare support for two competing leaders (pro-change target leader vs. either pro-change or pro-status quo alternative) and examine which leader would be more effective at mobilizing participants, we conducted a $2 \times 2$ repeated-measures ANOVA in the Contest conditions on voting and collective action intentions. We also performed a chi-square test of goodness of fit to measure preferential support for one leader over the other.

Descriptive statistics and correlations between key variables are presented in Table 8.3. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 8.4.
Table 8.3. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pearson correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting Intentions for Pro-community Leader (Target)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voting Intentions for Pro-academic Leader (Competitor)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-0.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective Action Intentions for Pro-community Leader (Target)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.71** -0.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective Action Intentions for Pro-academic Leader (Competitor)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-0.47** 0.48** -0.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 8.4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of New Leader Position and Threat. (Study 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Normative Trajectory</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Target New Leader (Pro-community)</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>4.00$_a$</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Leader (Pro-academic)</td>
<td>6.32$_b$</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-status quo Incumbent</td>
<td>5.04$_c$</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>3.68$_a$</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Leader (Pro-academic)</td>
<td>2.40$_d$</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-status quo Incumbent</td>
<td>2.92$_d$</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective Action Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>4.09$_a$</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Leader (Pro-academic)</td>
<td>5.34$_b$</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-status quo Incumbent</td>
<td>4.84$_b$</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>No Competition</td>
<td>3.75$_a$</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Leader (Pro-academic)</td>
<td>2.46$_c$</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-status quo Incumbent</td>
<td>3.02$_c$</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Comparing support for the Pro-community target leader in different conditions: Means for Target New Leader (left column) that do not share the same subscripted letter, within each level of Group Normative Trajectory variable, differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing two pro-change leaders: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. +95% Confidence interval.
Does support for the target leader change as a function of contest?

**Voting Intentions.** A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 3 (Competition: No Competition/Pro-Change New Candidate/Status Quo Incumbent) ANOVA on voting intentions for the target leader revealed a significant main effect of Normative Trajectory, \( F(1, 142) = 86.93, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .38 \), such that participants’ voting intentions for the target leader (who was always Pro-community) were higher when they were aligned (in the Community norm) than non-aligned (in the Academic norm). The two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and Competition was significant, \( F(2, 142) = 21.17, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .23 \). In line with H1a, planned comparisons revealed that when the target leader was aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory), they secured more support from voters when in competition with a non-aligned pro-change candidate \( (p < .001) \), or pro-status quo incumbent \( (p < .01) \) than in isolation. The opposite pattern can be seen for a pro-change target leader who is non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory), where, in line with H1b, they secured more support from voters in the absence compared to the presence of competing aligned pro-change leaders \( (p < .001) \) or pro-status quo incumbents \( (p = .05) \).

Further, examining whether support for a target leader differs as a function of who the competitor is, planned comparisons revealed that (in line with H1a) when the target leader was aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory), they secured more support from voters when in competition with a non-aligned pro-change new candidate than when in competition with a pro-status quo incumbent \( (p < .01) \). On the other hand, when the target leader was non-aligned, there was no difference in support for the target leader as a function of who the competitor was.

Then comparing the conditions of contest, planned comparisons revealed that under conditions of competition (with both pro-change leader as well as pro-status quo incumbent), voting intentions for the target leader were higher when the leader was
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aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory) than non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory; \( ps < .001 \)). On the other hand, in the absence of contest, there was no difference in support for the target leader whether they were aligned or non-aligned (\( p = .42 \); see Figure 8.6).

![Figure 8.6. Voting intentions for the Pro-community Target Leader as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and Competition (No Competition vs. Pro-academic Pro-change Leader vs. Pro-status quo Incumbent; Study 4).](image)

**Collective Action Intentions.** A 2 × 3 ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Normative Trajectory, \( F(1, 142) = 60.12, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .30, \) such that collective action intentions for the Pro-community target leader were higher when they were aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory) than non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory). The two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and Competition was significant, \( F(2, 142) = 13.07, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .16. \) In line with H1a, and replicating results for voting intentions, planned comparisons revealed that when the Pro-community target leader was aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory), they elicited higher collective action intentions when in competition with both a non-aligned pro-change candidate (\( p < .001 \)), and a pro-status
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quo incumbent \( (p < .05) \) than in isolation. The opposite pattern can be seen for pro-change leaders who were non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory), where, consistent with H1b, collective action intentions for the Pro-Community target leader were higher in the \textit{absence} than presence of competition, either a non-aligned pro-change candidate \( (p < .001) \), or a pro-status quo incumbent \( (p < .05) \).

Further, examining whether support for a target leader differs as a function of \textit{who} the competitor is, planned comparisons did not replicate findings for Voting Intentions. There was no difference in support for the target leader as a function of who the competitor was regardless of whether the target leader was aligned or not.

Additionally, comparing the conditions of contest, planned comparisons revealed that under conditions of competition (with both pro-change alternative as well as pro-status quo incumbent), collective action intentions for the Pro-community target leader were higher when the leader was aligned (i.e., in the Community normative trajectory) than non-aligned (i.e., in the Academic normative trajectory; \( ps < .001 \)). On the other hand, in the absence of contest, there was no difference in support for the target leader whether the leader was aligned or non-aligned \( (p = .36; \text{see Figure 8.7}) \).
To summarise, in line with our predictions, the same pro-change leader received differing levels of support in terms of voting and collective action intentions depending on whether there was an alternative voice competing for a leadership position. Particularly, a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions when their statement was read in the presence of competition compared to its absence. On the other hand, when the pro-change leader is non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they secured more votes and mobilized higher collective action intentions in the absence than presence of competition. Again, in the absence of contest, there was no difference in voting intentions or collective intentions for the pro-change leader regardless of whether they were aligned or not with the
group’s normative trajectory. Furthermore, looking at whether support for a target leader differs as a function of who the competitor is, a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes (but not collective action intentions) when in competition with a non-aligned pro-change new candidate compared to when in competition with a pro-status quo incumbent.

**Which of the multiple alternatives will be most supported?**

**Voting Intentions.** Using only the contest conditions, a 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (Competition: Pro-Change New Candidate/Status Quo Incumbent) × 2 (Target of Response: Target/Competition) ANOVA design, with repeated measures on the last factor, revealed a two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and Target of Response, \( F(1,94)=140.77, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.60 \), such that when target leaders were aligned (in the Community normative trajectory), they secured more support from voters than the competitor, regardless of whether the competitor was a new leader or an incumbent, \( F(1,46)=56.57, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.55 \). On the other hand, when the target candidate was non-aligned (in the Academic normative trajectory), voting intentions were lower for the target leader than the competitor, regardless of whether the competitor was a new leader or an incumbent, \( F(1,48)=87.39, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.65 \).

These findings were qualified, however, by a significant three-way interaction, \( F(1,94)=12.93, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.12 \). Examining this interaction further, looking at aligned versus non-aligned conditions separately, there was a significant interaction between Competition and the repeated measures factor when the target leader was normatively aligned with group aspirations, \( F(1,46)=9.76, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.18 \), as well as non-aligned, \( F(1,48)=3.59, p=.06, \eta_p^2=.07 \). In line with H3a, analyses of simple effects revealed that when the new candidate was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group (i.e.,
Community normative trajectory), they secured more support from voters than the non-aligned new candidate, $F(1, 24) = 126.32, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .84$, as well as the Incumbent, $F(1, 22) = 5.87, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .21$. On the other hand, in line with H3b, when the new candidate was non-aligned with the normative trajectory of the group (i.e., Academic normative trajectory), they secured less support from voters than the aligned new candidate, $F(1, 24) = 43.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .65$, as well as the Incumbent, $F(1, 24) = 49.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .68$. Main effects and other two-way interactions were non-significant (see Figure 8.8).

We also tested the magnitude of the difference between the competing leaders to see who will polarize ‘us’ more. A 2 (Normative Trajectory: Academic/Community) × 2 (Competition: Pro-Change New Candidate/Status Quo Incumbent) ANOVA was conducted on difference scores for Voting Intentions (Voting Intentions for Competitor – Voting Intentions for Target leader). The two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and Competition was significant, $F(1, 94) = 12.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12$, such that the difference in voting intentions between the two candidates was greater when the competitor was a pro-change leader than a pro-status quo incumbent, both in the Academic, $F(1, 48) = 3.59, p = .06, \eta_p^2 = .07$, and the Community normative trajectories, $F(1, 46) = 9.76, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .18$ (see Figure 8). That is, the same pro-change message compared with another pro-change new leader was more polarizing than when compared with a pro-status quo incumbent.
Figure 8.8. Voting intentions for competing candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and Competitor (Pro-academic New Leader vs. Pro-status quo Incumbent; Study 4).

**Collective Action Intentions.** A $2 \times 2 \times 2$ ANOVA design, with repeated measures on the last factor, revealed a two-way interaction between Normative Trajectory and Target of Response, $F(1,93)=183.88, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.66$, such that collective action intentions were higher for the Pro-community target leader when they were aligned (in the Community normative trajectory) than the competitor regardless of whether they were a new leader or an incumbent, $F(1,46)=91.87, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.67$. On the other hand, the opposite was true when the Pro-community target candidate was non-aligned (in the Academic normative trajectory), $F(1,47)=91.99, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.66$.

The three-way interaction also was significant, $F(1,93)=5.31, p<.05, \eta_p^2=.05$. There was a significant interaction between Competition and the repeated measures factor under conditions when the target leader was normatively aligned with group aspirations, $F(1,46)=6.23, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.12$, but not when non-aligned, $F(1,47)=.55$. 

$p = .46$. In line with H3a, analyses of simple effects revealed that when the Pro-community new candidate was aligned with the normative trajectory of the group (i.e., Community normative trajectory), they engendered greater support for collective action compared to the Pro-academic new candidate, $F(1, 24) = 114.21, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .83$, as well as the Incumbent, $F(1, 22) = 6.11, p < .05, \eta_p^2 = .22$. In line with H3b, when the Pro-community pro-change target leader was non-aligned with the normative trajectory of the group (i.e., Academic normative trajectory), they engendered less support for collective action compared to the aligned pro-change alternative, $F(1, 23) = 50.18, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .69$, as well as the pro-status quo incumbent, $F(1, 24) = 41.47, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .63$. Main effects and other two-way interactions were non-significant (see Figure 8.9).

Again, we tested the magnitude of difference between the competing leaders to see who will polarize ‘us’ more. A $2 \times 2$ ANOVA on difference scores for Collective Action Intentions also revealed a significant two-way interaction, $F(1, 93) = 9.23, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .09$. Difference in collective action intentions between the two candidates was greater when the competitor was a pro-change leader than a pro-status quo incumbent in the Community normative trajectory, $F(1, 46) = 10.34, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .18$, but not in the Academic normative trajectory, $F(1, 47) = 3.59, p = .37$ (see Figure 8.9).
Figure 8.9. Collective Action intentions for competing candidates (measured) as a function of Normative Trajectory (Academic vs. Community) and Competitor (Pro-academic New Leader vs. Pro-status quo Incumbent; Study 4).

Discussion

Study 4 further tested the idea that support for a leader will differ depending on presence or absence of contest, and also the nature of the competition. Overall, the results supported the hypotheses. Replicating results of Study 3, we found that a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory was more successful in securing votes as well as in mobilizing collective action intentions in the presence of competition compared to its absence. On the other hand, when the pro-change leader is non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they secured more votes as well as mobilize collective action intentions in the absence than presence of competition.

Furthermore, we also found support for our novel proposal that contest mattered more with certain competitors than others. The same pro-change message compared
with another pro-change new leader was more polarizing than when compared with a pro-status quo incumbent. This demonstrates that depending on who the competitor is, the magnitude of difference in support between leader candidates can differ. That is, how far ahead or how far behind a leader is can depend on who the competitor is. For a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory, status quo becomes more of a challenge, while the other (non-aligned) pro-change leaders represent less of a problem in terms of voter support.

**General Discussion**

In the social identity leadership literature much of the work focuses on a single leader or a single group of followers, and overlooks that who will be able to mobilize ‘us’ centres not only upon aligning oneself with a given constituency, but doing so *better than* the available alternatives. That is, rather than pitting two leadership positions of interest to the study (e.g., prototypical vs. non-prototypical) against each other, the leadership options are presented to participants in a between-participants design so that participants are not able to compare and contrast the alternatives that would have been available to them in reality. The two studies presented in this chapter are the first empirical test of whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest and the nature of that contrast. The design used in these studies enabled us to compare support for a target candidate in conditions of absence and presence of competition, when they are either aligned or non-aligned (in between-participants analyses). It also enabled a comparison in terms of support for competing aligned vs. non-aligned pro-change leaders (in within-participants analyses).

These studies showed that a new, pro-change leader who is able to redefine followers’ understandings of intergroup relations and bring about change ‘we believe in’ (i.e., who is aligned with the group’s normative trajectory) will be more
successful in mobilizing collective efforts for change in the presence (compared to absence) of competition—be it leaders advancing other forms of change (Studies 3 & 4), or existing leaders vying to maintain the status quo (Study 4). On the other hand, when new leadership candidates are not aligned with the group’s future aspirations, they will mobilise more support (e.g., voting and collective action intentions) in the absence of competition (Studies 3 & 4).

The results of both studies showed that the same target leader message can lead to different reactions from group members depending on whether an alternative is present or not, and who the alternative is. In both studies in this program, the target leader message was identical across conditions, advocating for a change in admission criteria with a larger emphasis on community involvement. However, the amount of support they received depended on whether the target leader was being judged in isolation or in the presence of another competing candidate, and whether that competing candidate advocated for change or maintaining the status quo.

From the results of these studies, we can see the importance of examining leadership as a contest for influence. It seems that contest signals further the extent to which a leader is ‘one of us’ and only under those conditions they become mobilizing of action. Because being aligned or not with group norms per se (that is, in the absence of contest) made no difference to voting or collective action intentions. In this case then, to make a judgment about alignment, a comparative contrast seems necessary.

Further, these studies also demonstrated the importance of the nature of the contrast. We know from the social identity perspective that the nature of comparisons we make can lead to flexibility in the type of social action that we can achieve as social groups (Reicher, 2004). That is, the others with whom we compare ourselves can shift who ‘we’ are and who best represents ‘us’, and therefore the leader that we follow. Indeed, leaders are often seen to act as “entrepreneurs of identity” seeking to shape the
meaning of the group identity in order to appear as the most representative and influence the ingroup. Building on this idea, and the results of this study, a useful strategy for leaders advocating a change to group norms and ideals will be to make strategic use of choosing or making salient an appropriate comparison (alternative candidate) to gain support and mobilise the in-group. For example, leading up to the 2016 Presidential elections in America, it might be beneficial for Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton to make references to her Republican opponent, Donald Trump, whose reform plans have been deemed quite ‘out of touch’ and controversial, than comparing herself to the incumbent, Barack Obama, when introducing her change agendas.

Another interesting finding was the success of the non-aligned leader in the absence of competition, speaking to the idea that it is under such conditions that there may well be support for ‘innovative’ leaders proposing as yet unexplored directions for the group. Similarly, then, a useful strategy for leaders advocating for a direction that is mis-aligned with group norms and ideals would be to stay away from making references to their opponents or engaging in debate with them—so that their audience is making judgements about them in the absence of other (possibly better-aligned) alternatives.

However, while this may be a useful tip, leaders might not always be practically able to prevent such comparisons, given the competitive nature of leadership in reality. A worthwhile future research direction would be to investigate more precisely the conditions in which leaders are given leeway to innovate in ways that challenge the current normative trajectory. To be more precise, how can a leader actively come to be in a position to shape “our” views, values, and behaviour, and gain support for different or novel practices? In Chapter 9, we present evidence from two studies designed to address this question.
Conclusion

Overall, the findings presented in this chapter support the view that how well a leader is able to capture the group’s attention depends on what the other available leaders are saying and doing. A new, pro-change leader who is able to redefine followers’ understandings of intergroup relations and bring about change ‘we believe in’ (i.e., who is aligned with the group’s normative trajectory) will be more successful in mobilizing collective efforts for change in the presence (compared to absence) of competition—be it leaders advancing other forms of change, or existing leaders vying to maintain the status quo. On the other hand, when new leadership candidates are not aligned with the group’s future aspirations, they will mobilise more support (e.g., voting and collective action intentions) in the absence of competition. That is, as the comparative context changes (i.e., whether or not there is a competing leader and who the competing leader is), so do perceptions of a leader’s representativeness, and as a result, leader influence. In conclusion, contest does matter.
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Abstract

While innovation is seen as being critical for organisational success, and political leaders vying to bring about change in structure or policies in government, seeking support for innovative or non-normative types of change policies is particularly challenging. Given that the notion of innovation implies a departure from normative expectations that seems functionally opposed to conformity, we aimed to explore what shapes a leader’s capacity to push a non-aligned agenda or novel project. We propose that it is possible for leaders to spearhead and gain support for non-aligned or innovative change if they are seen to be prototypical of 'us'. Studies 5 and 6 investigated precisely the conditions in which leaders are given leeway to innovate in ways that challenge the current normative trajectory. The findings demonstrated that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’, they will be successful in securing votes and mobilising collective action (Study 5), but also gaining latitude to suggest change and also affect who ‘we’ are (Studies 5 & 6).
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Leadership and Social Change: Support for Innovative Change Proposals

Leaders of organisations and governments often propose and enact change that is innovative or outside of normative expectations. Innovation is seen as being critical for organisational success as it can help them stay ahead of the competitive curve as markets, technologies and trends shift (Pettigrew, Woodman, & Cameron, 2001; Yukl, 2012). Even in politics, change is desirable, as competing political leaders vie to bring about change in structure or policies in government, and eventually societal change (Grindle, 1996; Reicher, Haslam & Platow, 2014).

However, seeking support for innovative or non-normative types of change policies is particularly challenging (cf. Coser, 1962; Homans, 1974). Leaders of such novel change must not only get people to accept and get on board with something that is outside of their normative thinking and perceptions, but also convince followers that their change proposal is the right choice of action—amidst other ways of thinking and other directions for change (Subašić et al., 2015; Subašić et al., 2012).

In the leadership literature, it has been argued that leaders’ accrual of psychological credit with other group members is the *sine qua non* of outstanding and innovative leadership (Hollander, 1958; Hollander & Julian, 1970). The idea that interpersonal exchange and idiosyncrasy credits may give leaders latitude to deviate or act in idiosyncratic ways is supported by numerous research studies (e.g., Hollander, 1961; Hollander, 2006; Hollander & Julian, 1970). But what makes one leader more effective than another? Indeed, empirical research that sheds light on when and why idiosyncrasy credits are effective is scarce (Haslam & Platow, 2010).

In light of this, more research is needed that systematically examines support for innovation—or *non*-aligned change. To address these lacunae, the studies presented in this chapter examine three inter-related questions: 1) Whether support for a leader proposing an innovative change agenda differs as a function of their accrued
Leaders as ingroup veterans or prototypes?

Many different factors have been proposed to enhance support for innovative leadership. One idea that has been particularly influential in the field of leadership research is Hollander’s idiosyncrasy credit model (1958; Hollander & Julian, 1970). Hollander proposed that support for innovation arises from a leader’s pre-existing connection with his or her followers, whereby an individual leader (or group member) builds up psychological credit with other group members through interpersonal exchange. Once sufficient credits have been gained the leader is allowed to engage in idiosyncratic ways. A central notion here is trust. That is, Hollander argued that before followers can allow a leader to act in ways that are not conducive of normative or expected group behavior, they need to be able to trust that the leader is going to act in the group's best interests and take them on the right path.

Through the years, Hollander has pointed to many factors that could have an effect on the accumulation of idiosyncrasy credits. One factor that has been explored is how long a leader has been a member of the group. According to Hollander, an individual needs to have been a group member for some time before they are able to deviate from prevailing group norms (Hollander, 2006). Indeed, in this regard, a new member of a group would be in a poor position to build any credits and, as a result, assert influence, especially in the direction of change. Hollander (1961) tested the effect
of how long a leader has been a member of the group and their status in their ability to suggest change.

In his 1961 study, 151 undergraduate students were asked to think of a group they belonged to, and imagine in it a person who fit the description provided and state how willing they were to have this person in a position of authority (this served as an index of accorded status). The description, consisting of four terms, included one of four competence levels (“extremely capable performer”, “capable performer”, “average performer” or “poor performer”), one of two levels of time in group (“been in group for a while” or new to group”), and two constant terms, “interested” and “generally liked”. Subsequently, participants were asked to evaluate the stimulus person (positively or negatively) in relation to eight possible ways he might behave in the group. In line with predictions, Hollander found that accorded status increased with competence as well as time in group, and two behaviors reflecting innovative action (“suggests changes from group plans” and “discusses group concerns with outsiders”) were found to be disapproved significantly less the higher the status attributed to the innovator. Hollander concluded that the longer a person has belonged to the group, and the higher the status attributed to them, the less they are disapproved of in suggesting changes to group plans.

However, in this study, similar to other empirical work by Hollander, the phenomenon of idiosyncrasy credit is not examined directly and is confounded with other potentially important factors such as status, authority, and involvement. Indeed, one critical limitation of Hollander’s work is the lack of theoretical specificity about the precise nature and source of idiosyncrasy credit. While it could be descriptively true that the longer a person has belonged to the group, the higher the status attributed to them and the less they are disapproved of, what is the explanatory logic behind this statement?
One answer to this question can be found in the social identity approach to leadership. According to this perspective, leaders' capacity to influence and mobilise support stems from their capacity to present themselves, and be perceived, as prototypical representatives of a salient group membership that is shared with followers. While there are many parallels between the two approaches, the critical difference is that the social identity analysis argues that the underlying process is not one of interpersonal exchange, but a higher order sense of group identity that leaders and followers share. This can also help explain how leaders are able to gain support for novel projects even under conditions where interpersonal exchange is not possible, and where they have no established credit with the group (Haslam & Platow, 2010).

As such, one of the aims of this study is to examine whether support for innovative change is based on idiosyncratic leader factors (e.g., length of group membership or acts of independence) or a sense of shared group identity between leaders and followers.

**Followers’ relational identification with leader**

Resonating with Hollander’s argument that support for innovation arises from a leader’s interpersonal connection with his or her followers, another factor that has also been argued to shape follower behavior is a special and enduring sense of personal connection between followers and their leaders. Here, the leadership literature, particularly transformational leadership theory (within which these ideas have been articulated most clearly), proposes that leaders' impact on followers depend upon the extent to which followers identify with a leader in relational terms (e.g., Kark & Shamir, 2002; Kark, Waismel-Manor, & Shamir, 2012; Yaffe & Kark, 2011).

In line with this idea, there is evidence that followers’ personal identification with the leader plays an important role in transformational leaders' ability to affect
followers' supervisor-rated performance (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011) as well as actual performance and empowerment (Wang & Howell, 2012). Similarly, Kark, Shamir, and Chen (2003), found that followers’ personal identification with the leader mediated the relationship between transformational behaviors of leaders and followers’ dependence on the leader.

The social identity approach to leadership also shows that followers' personal bond with a leader is a critical variable in the leadership process. Here, it is argued that perception of a sense of personal connection to a leader depends further on followers’ social identification with a group and also the group leader’s relative position within the group (i.e., their perceived prototypicality). In line with this, Steffens, Haslam and Reicher (2014) examined the effects of followers' social identification with a group on their relational identification with leaders. The researchers theorized that when leaders are seen to be highly prototypical of a social category to which leaders and followers belonged, highly identified followers would feel a stronger relational identification with leaders. The results supported these ideas—with highly identified followers (compared to low-identified followers) found to perceive themselves to share relational identity with a leader when that leader is representative of their ingroup (Steffens et al., 2014).

In sum, previous transformational and social identity research clearly shows that followers' personal bond with a leader plays a critical role in the leadership process. Furthermore, these ideas contradict Hollander’s arguments, and show that a personal interaction with a leader is not necessary for a sense of strong personal bond between follower and leader to develop. On the other hand, it is followers' sense of shared group membership with leaders that lead to a relational identification with leaders. We further propose that it is through a relational identification with leaders that shared social identity influences support for leaders’ innovative behaviours.
Current Research

According to the social identity approach, being representative of a salient group identity, and conforming to the group norms and ideals have been the epitome of leadership and influence (e.g., Fielding, & Hogg, 1997; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008; Hains et al., 1997; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Platow et al., 2006). However, the notion of innovation implies a departure from normative expectations that seems functionally opposed to conformity. Centrally, then, what shapes a leader’s capacity to push a non-aligned agenda or novel project?

Indeed, it is the paradox itself that provides a solution to the problem. As two social identity researchers have observed, “deviation tends to be driven by those who are not seen as deviant” (Haslam & Platow, 2010, p. 422). Here we would like to point out the distinction between ‘deviation’, that is, the alignment of the change project itself (non-aligned/in a new direction from normative expectations of interest to this study) and ‘those who are not seen as deviant’, that is, the alignment of the leader (i.e., prototypicality of leader). This is an important distinction to make, as it is precisely what solves this paradoxical problem.

We propose that it is possible for leaders to spearhead and gain support for non-aligned or innovative change if they are seen to be prototypical of ‘us’. Someone who represents and embodies what it means to be ‘us’ is trusted to have the group's best interest and therefore should be given latitude to suggest innovative change agendas, and also change who ‘we’ are. A central feature of leadership for change is capacity to influence change in who ‘we’ are (i.e., identity content). In this program of research, we include a novel measure that tests change in participants’ identity content in line with leaders’ change proposals. This change is a particularly powerful leader outcome as it is change in identity that should drive support for innovation as well as behaviors such as collective mobilization in support of the new change proposal.
Below, we report findings from two experiments that test these predictions in more detail.

**Study 5**

The context for this study was a fictitious (but presented as real) election of a student representative position on the executive committee of the School of Psychology. Two candidates ostensibly running for the position differed in terms of their prototypicality (prototypical or non-prototypical), how long they had been a member of the group for (for a while or new to group), and the content of their change proposal (either aligned with group norms or not). Based on what we know about the Research School of Psychology, where the current focus is on being a research intensive department, the content of the aligned change proposal was set to be research-oriented, while the content of the non-aligned change proposal was set to be applied-oriented—previously unchartered direction for the department.

A key dependent variable in this study is a new measure of identity content, where we assessed change (using a pre-post design) in participants’ identity content as a function of leader statements. Here the content of the identity measure was in line with the content of the leader proposals (research-oriented and applied-oriented) to test which leader is able to change the content of the group identity.

Namely, it was hypothesized that, in a contest for influence, leaders that propose non-aligned (or innovative) change agendas will be able to secure votes, mobilise collective action, gain latitude to suggest change and also successfully change ‘us’ (group identity content) when they are prototypical of group norms (regardless of how long they have been in the group; H1). We also hypothesize that identification with leader and trusting that the leader represents group’s best interests will mediate the relationship between prototypicality and key dependent measures (H2).
Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the School of Psychology electronic student participant recruitment system. All participants were first year Psychology students and received course credit. One participant was deleted for having an incomplete survey (in the ‘Prot=New member’ + ‘Prot=Research’ condition). One participant was excluded for completing the survey under 300 seconds (5 minutes; in the ‘Prot=Old member’ + ‘Prot=Research’ condition). The final sample of 166 participants included 59 male and 106 female students. They ranged in age from 17 to 43 (M = 19.49, S.D = 3.19) and 84.2% were domestic students.

Design, Procedure and Materials

This study employed a 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) × 2 (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) factorial design, with an additional repeated measures factor (Target of Response: Prototypical candidate/Non-prototypical candidate) for voting and collective action intentions, and change credit. After indicating consent (see Appendix A for form), participants were randomly allocated to one of four between-participants experimental conditions and directed to the appropriate questionnaire.

Pre-manipulation measures. Unless noted otherwise, participants’ responses on all items were measured on 7-point rating scales (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

Identity content - pre-manipulation. Participants were then presented with 15 attributes and asked to choose 5 which seemed most typical of Psychology students at their University (adapted from Haslam, Oakes, Turner, & McGarty, 1995). The attributes relating to leader statements (5 characterised as research-oriented, 5 as applied-oriented and 5 as neutral) were obtained from a pilot study with 15 participants.
drawn from the same population of first year Psychology students (see Appendix J for pilot study analyses). This constituted a pre-measure and was contrasted with a post-manipulation measure of the same variable. In this way, we were able to assess a shift in identity content as a function of leader statements.

**Prototypicality information.** Participants then read a vignette that outlined the information about the two candidates running for the student representative position on the executive committee of the School of Psychology. First they read information about the candidates’ prototypicality.

Participants read about a recent survey undertaken by the University to gauge students’ attitudes towards various important university matters (e.g., welfare, degree programs, staff availability, etc). They were then presented with a summary profile on one of the issues of interest, student welfare, for Psychology students, including where Psychology students’ attitudes sit as an average along with the individual ratings of the two candidates.

Participants saw graphically and also read that Candidate A’s score fell close to the average score of other Psychology students. The text also pointed out that this was evident in the overall summary profile including attitudes towards all the issues, where Candidate A was exemplary of and captured very well the values and attitudes of other Psychology students. We will refer to this candidate as the Prototypical candidate. On the other hand, the graphical information and text outlined that Candidate B’s score fell on the far left side of the profile, showing that Candidate B did not capture what the other Psychology students believe and wants for the future. We will refer to this candidate as the Non-prototypical candidate.

To check that participants were following the information, participants then were asked to answer two questions regarding the extent to which each of the
candidates embodied the attitudes of other Psychology students. See Appendix K for pre-manipulation measures and information.

**Manipulation of Time in Group.** Participants then read information about how long each candidate had been a student in the School of Psychology. Time in group was manipulated so that in one condition, the Prototypical candidate was presented to have been a student in the school for three years while the Non-prototypical candidate was new to the school transferred from another University (‘Prot=Old member’ condition), while in the second condition, the Non-prototypical candidate was presented to have been a student in the school for three years while the Prototypical candidate was new to the school (‘Prot=New member’ condition).

Again, to check that participants were following the information, participants then were asked to answer two questions regarding how long each of the candidates had been a student at the school.

**Manipulation of Change Content.** Participants then read information outlining one of the key issues in debate which was the direction the department should head in terms of what its main focus should be. Then, speeches by the candidates outlining their position regarding the issue were presented.

In one condition, the Prototypical candidate was presented to be arguing for a move to include more applied psychology teaching with a focus on equipping students with skills to practice and make a real difference in the lives of others, while the Non-prototypical candidate was presented to be advocating for a research-intensive move,

---

6 For ease and simplicity of presenting information, manipulation conditions will be referred to by the Prototypical leader’s information. Please note, in each condition, the competing leader—Non-prototypical candidate, is the opposite. So for example, in ‘Prot=Old member’ condition the Prototypical candidate is an old member of the group, while the Non-prototypical candidate is a new member, and vice versa for ‘Prot=New member’ condition.
where students would be taught to do independent research and given opportunity to follow their intellectual curiosity (‘Prot=Applied’ condition).

In the second condition, participants read the opposite information where the Prototypical candidate argued for a more research-intensive focus, while the Non-prototypical candidate advocated for a move to include more applied psychology teaching (‘Prot=Research’ condition).

Again, to check that participants were following the information, participants then were asked to answer two questions regarding the change agenda advocated for by each candidate. See Appendix L for manipulations.

**Post-manipulation measures**

*Perceived leader prototypicality.* Participants indicated the extent to which they thought each of the candidates were prototypical of ANU students (e.g., “Represents what is characteristic about Psychology students”). Four items reliably measured perceived prototypicality (adapted from Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001) for each of the candidates, the Prototypical candidate and the Non-prototypical candidate ($\alpha$s=.90, .89, respectively).

*Identification with leader.* Participants indicated the extent to which they identified with each of the candidates (e.g., “Feel strong ties with this candidate”). Three items reliably measured perceived identification (adapted from Subašić, Reynolds, Turner, Veenstra, & Haslam, 2011) with each of the candidates, the Prototypical candidate and the Non-prototypical candidate ($\alpha$s=.87, .89, respectively).

*Trust.* Two items assessed the extent to which participants thought each candidate had the group’s best interests (“Trust that the candidate has the group’s best

---

7 Again, please note that while manipulation conditions will be referred to by the Prototypical candidate’s information, the competing, Non-prototypical candidate is the opposite. So, in ‘Prot=Applied’ condition, the Prototypical candidate proposes an applied-oriented change while Non-prototypical candidate advocates for a more research-oriented change, and vice versa for ‘Prot=Research’ condition.
interests” and “Have confidence that the candidate will advance the group’s interests”; αs=.92, .90, respectively).

**Voting Intentions.** Participants indicated the extent to which they were likely to vote for each candidate to represent the student body in the executive committee.

**Vote Choice.** One item assessed which candidate (the Prototypical candidate or the Non-prototypical candidate) participants were most likely to vote for (Vote Choice): “If I had to choose, which candidate am I most likely to place a vote for (please select one)?”

**Collective Action Intentions.** Participants indicated how likely they would be to participate in collective action for each of the candidates (e.g., “Get together with other University students to try and do something about this issue as a group”). Five items reliably measured collective mobilization (adapted from Subašić, Schmitt, et al., 2011) in response to messages by the Prototypical candidate and the Non-prototypical candidate (αs=.84, .84, respectively).

**Change Credit.** Two items assessed the extent to which participants were likely to support change proposed by each of the candidate (“Give the candidate latitude to suggest change” and “Seriously consider a new idea proposed by the candidate”; αs=.85, .83, respectively).

**Identity content - post-manipulation.** This item was identical to the item presented prior to manipulations. It was included to assess the extent to which participants’ perceptions of identity content changed as a function of the candidates’ change agendas in relation to their perceived identity content prior to manipulations. See Appendix M for all dependent measures.

Finally, participants were asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student (domestic, international) and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.
Results

Manipulation checks. Participants correctly identified how long each candidate had been in the group. There was a significant association between Time in group and time check for the Prototypical candidate, $\chi^2 (1) = 74.07, p < .000$. Participants indicated that the Prototypical candidate had been in the group for 3 years (as opposed to 2 months) in the Prot=Old member condition. On the other hand, they indicated the Prototypical candidate had been in group for 2 months (as opposed to 3 years) in the Prot=New member condition. There was also a significant association between Time in group and time check for the Non-prototypical candidate, $\chi^2 (1) = 61.82, p < .000$. Participants indicated that the Non-prototypical candidate had been in group for 2 months (as opposed to 3 years) in the Prot=Old member condition. On the other hand, they indicated the Non-prototypical candidate had been in the group for 3 years (as opposed to 2 months) in the Prot=New member condition. These findings suggest time in group was manipulated successfully.

Participants also correctly identified which candidate was advocating for which change agenda. Participants in the the Prot=Applied condition indicated the Prototypical candidate (compared to the Non-prototypical candidate) advocated for an applied-oriented change, while participants in the the Prot=Research condition indicated the Non-prototypical candidate (compared to the Prototypical candidate) advocated for an applied-oriented change, $\chi^2 (1) = 124.70, p < .000$. Overall, the experimental manipulations were successful.

Main Analyses

Analytical strategy. Three different types of analyses were performed corresponding to the three key research questions. First, in order to directly compare support for two competing pro-change leaders and examine which new leader for
change would be more effective at mobilizing participants, we conducted a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ repeated-measures ANOVA on voting and collective action intentions, and change credit. We also performed a chi-square test of goodness of fit to measure preferential support for one leader over the other.

Second, in order to assess whether the relationship between prototypicality and leader outcome measures were mediated by how much followers identified with candidates or the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests we performed a mediation using the bootstrapping method with bias-corrected confidence estimates (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

Third, to test whether leader candidates were able to successfully shape who ‘we’ are, we conducted a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ repeated-measures ANOVA on participants’ pre- and post-manipulation identity attribute scores.

Descriptive statistics and correlations between key variables are presented in Table 9.1. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 9.2.
Table 9.1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Voting Intentions for Prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Voting Intentions for Non-prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective Action Intentions for Prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.346*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective Action Intentions for Non-prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Change Credit for Prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.349**</td>
<td>.535**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Change Credit for Non-prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Prototypicality of Prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived Prototypicality of Non-prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.619**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perceived Identification with Prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.666**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.505**</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.592**</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perceived Identification with Non-prototypical Candidate</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.489**</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.209**</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>-.233*</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived extent to which Prototypical Candidate has the group's best interests</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Perceived extent to which Non-prototypical Candidate has the group's best interests</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-.176*</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.670**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>-.162*</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. $N = 166$.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. 
Table 9.2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of Change Agenda and Time in Group. (Study 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agenda</th>
<th>Time in Group</th>
<th>Prototypical Candidate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-prototypical Candidate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
<td>Prototypically Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td>Lower*</td>
<td>Upper*</td>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot=Research</td>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot=Applied</td>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot=Research</td>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot=Applied</td>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prot=Research</th>
<th>Old Member</th>
<th>New Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-manipulation</td>
<td>Post-manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Lower$^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prot=Applied</th>
<th>Old Member</th>
<th>New Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-manipulation</td>
<td>Post-manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Lower$^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.06a</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Agenda</th>
<th>Time in Group</th>
<th>Pre-manipulation</th>
<th>Post-manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Lower$^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Member</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1.59a</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Member</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Comparing the Prototypical and Non-prototypical Candidate: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing Pre-manipulation and Post-manipulation Identity Content: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing the Post-manipulation Identity Content: Means in the right column that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. +95% Confidence interval.
Which of the multiple alternatives for change will be most supported?

**Voting Intentions.** A 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) × 2 (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) × 2 (Target of Response: Prototypical candidate/Non-prototypical candidate) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a main effect of Target of Response, $F(1,162)=14.42$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.08$, where voting intentions for the prototypical candidate ($M=4.84$, $SD=1.51$) were higher than those for the non-prototypical leader ($M=4.04$, $SD=1.51$). A two-way interaction between Change Agenda and Target of Response also emerged, $F(1,162)=6.03$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.04$. This interaction is represented in Figure 9.1. In line with H1, voting intentions for the prototypical leader were significantly higher compared to those for the non-prototypical leader in the condition where the prototypical leader advocated for a non-aligned (applied-oriented) change (while non-prototypical leader proposed aligned, research-oriented change), $F(1,86)=22.86$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2_p=.21$. Unexpectedly, there was no difference in voting intentions for prototypical and non-prototypical candidates in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned (research-oriented) change (and non-prototypical leader advocated for non-aligned, applied-oriented change), $F(1,76)=.77$, $p=.38$. 

![Voting Intentions Chart](image)
**Figure 9.1.** Voting intentions for prototypical and non-prototypical candidate
(measured) as a function of Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical candidate (Research vs. Applied; Study 5).

We further examined whether the perceived identification with candidates mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on participants’ voting intentions. In line with H2, a bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations (Preacher & Hayes, 2004, 2008) showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .18 to .42, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.2).

**Figure 9.2.** Perceived identification with leader mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and voting intentions (Study 5).

We also examined whether the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on participants’ voting intentions. In line with H2, a bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .09 to .32, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.3).
**Figure 9.3.** Participants’ trust that candidate has the group’s best interests mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and voting intentions (Study 5).

**Collective Action Intentions.** A 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) \(\times 2\) (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) \(\times 2\) (Target of Response: Prototypical candidate/Non-prototypical candidate) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a main effect of Target of Response, \(F(1,162)=5.55, p<.05, \eta_p^2=.03\), where collective action intentions for the prototypical candidate \((M=3.99, SD=1.38)\) was higher than that for the non-prototypical leader \((M=3.72, SD=1.42)\). A marginal two-way interaction between Change Agenda and Target of Response also emerged, \(F(1,162)=2.77, p=.09, \eta_p^2=.04\). This interaction is represented in Figure 9.4. In line with H1, collective action intentions for the prototypical leader were significantly higher compared to those for the non-prototypical leader in the condition where the prototypical leader advocated for non-aligned change (while non-prototypical leader proposed an aligned change), \(F(1,86)=8.50, p<.01, \eta_p^2=.09\). Unexpectedly, there was no difference in collective action intentions for prototypical and non-prototypical candidate in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned...
SUPPORT FOR INNOVATIVE CHANGE

(research-oriented) change (and non-prototypical leader advocated for non-aligned, applied-oriented change), $F(1,76)=.23, p=.38$.

Figure 9.4. Collective Action intentions for prototypical and non-prototypical candidate (measured) as a function of Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical candidate (Research vs. Applied; Study 5).

We further examined whether the perceived identification with candidates mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on participants’ collective action intentions. In line with H2, a bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .09 to .27, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.5).
Figure 9.5. Perceived identification with leader mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and collective action intentions (Study 5).

We also examined whether the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on participants’ collective action intentions. In line with H2, a bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .11 to .31, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.6).

Figure 9.6. Participants’ trust that candidate has the group’s best interests mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and collective action intentions (Study 5).
Change Credit. A 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) × 2 (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) × 2 (Target of Response: Prototypical candidate/Non-prototypical candidate) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a main effect of Target of Response, $F(1,162)=5.19$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2_p=.03$, where change credit granted to the prototypical candidate ($M=5.00, SD=1.23$) was higher than that for the non-prototypical leader ($M=4.68, SD=1.40$). A two-way interaction between Change Agenda and Target of Response also emerged, $F(1,162)=5.43$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2_p=.03$. This interaction is represented in Figure 9.7. In line with H1, change credit granted to the prototypical leader was significantly higher compared to that for the non-prototypical leader in the condition where the prototypical leader advocated for a non-aligned (applied-oriented) change (while non-prototypical leader proposed aligned, research-oriented change), $F(1,86)=9.62$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2_p=.10$.

Unexpectedly, there was no difference in change credit granted to prototypical and non-prototypical candidate in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned (research-oriented) change (and non-prototypical leader advocated for non-aligned, applied-oriented change), $F(1,76)=.002$, $p=.98$. It seems that followers support change that is in line with normative trajectory (research-oriented), regardless of source (i.e., leader). On the other hand, only prototypical leaders are ‘allowed’ to push for innovative change.
Figure 9.7. Change credit for prototypical and non-prototypical candidate (measured) as a function of Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical candidate (Research vs. Applied; Study 5).

We further examined whether the perceived identification with candidates mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on change credit rewarded to candidates. A bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .14 to .35, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.8).
Figure 9.8. Perceived identification with leader mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and change credit awarded to candidate (Study 5).

We also examined whether the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on change credit rewarded to candidates. A bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .15 to .49, suggesting a significant indirect effect (see Figure 9.9).

Figure 9.9. Participants’ trust that candidate has the group’s best interests mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and change credit awarded to candidate (Study 5).

When will leaders for change be able to change ‘us’?

An overall ‘identity content’ score was computed for the five attributes chosen by each participant to be typical of students at the School of Psychology. This was obtained by scoring +1 for each Applied-oriented attribute, -1 for each Research-oriented attribute and 0 for each neutral attribute (each score thus having a value between - 5 and + 5 with negative values representing research-oriented identity and positive values representing applied-oriented identity). Means and standard deviations
for identity content scores are presented by condition in Table 3\textsuperscript{8}. As can be seen in Table 3, participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores were all negative indicating a research-focused initial identity.

A 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) × 2 (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) × 2 (Identity Content: Pre-manipulation/Post-manipulation) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a significant two-way interaction between Change Agenda and Identity Content, $F(1,162)=5.88$, $p<.05$, $\eta_p^2=.04$. This interaction is represented in Figure 10. Analysis of simple main effects revealed that in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned (research-oriented) change (and non-prototypical leader advocated for non-aligned, applied-oriented change), participants’ post-manipulation identity content was significantly lower (more research) than their pre-manipulation identity content in line with the change agenda advocated for by the prototypical leader, $F(1,87)=7.76$, $p<.05$, $\eta_p^2=.09$. In the condition where the prototypical leader advocated for a non-aligned (applied-oriented) change (while non-prototypical leader proposed an aligned, research-oriented change) participants’ post-manipulation identity content was higher than their pre-manipulation identity content in line with the change agenda advocated for by the prototypical leader. However, this difference was not significant, $F(1,87)=.39$, $p=.53$.

A one-way ANCOVA on post-manipulation identity scores\textsuperscript{9} controlling for pre-manipulation identity scores revealed a significant main effect of Change Agenda, $F(1,165)=8.25$, $p<.01$, $\eta_p^2=.05$. Participants’ post-manipulation identity score was significantly higher in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for a non-aligned (applied-oriented) change (and non-prototypical leader advocated for an aligned, research-oriented change) compared to that in the condition where the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned (research-oriented) change (and non-

\textsuperscript{8} See Appendix N for frequency of chosen attributes, overall and by condition.
\textsuperscript{9} Participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores did not significantly differ according to manipulations. See Appendix O for analysis.
prototypical leader advocated for applied-oriented change), in line with the prototypical leader’s change agenda in each condition (see Figure 9.10).

So it seems that when a pro-change leader is prototypical they are in a position to affect what it means to be ‘us’ as seen by the difference in post-manipulation identity scores (in line with the prototypical leader’s change agenda in each condition). In addition to this, when the change proposed by the prototypical leader is in line with current definitions of ‘who we are’ (i.e., research-oriented condition), we also see a shift in participant’s identity towards the research end of the scale. However, when the prototypical leader advocated for something novel in terms of group norms (i.e., applied-oriented condition), participant’s identity scores did not shift. Rather than concluding this as an inability of prototypical leaders to get followers on board with their non-aligned or innovative ideas, we need to consider the other factors in the design that might have led to this result (discussed below).

![Figure 9.10](image)

**Figure 9.10.** Pre-manipulation and Post-manipulation identity content scores (measured) as a function of Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical leader (Applied-oriented Change vs. Research-oriented Change; Study 5).
Discussion

The findings of this study supported the idea that in order to be successful with innovative change, leaders need to embody the group prototype. A clear pattern demonstrated that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is prototypical, they will be successful in securing votes, mobilising collective action, gaining latitude to suggest change and also affect who ‘we’ are, supporting H1. It is interesting that we did not find the usual advantage for prototypical leaders when the prototypical candidate advocated for an aligned (research-oriented) change. It seems that followers support change that is in line with normative trajectory, regardless of source (i.e., leader prototypicality). On the other hand, only prototypical leaders are ‘allowed’ to push for innovative change.

We also found support for H2, whereby participants’ identification with the leader and trusting that the leader has the group’s best interest mediates the relationship between prototypicality and other DVs. These findings are consistent with research that demonstrated that followers' relational identification with leaders plays a critical role in determining responses to a person's leadership (e.g., Kark & Shamir, 2002; Kark et al., 2012; Steffens et al., 2014). Moreover, contrasting with Hollander’s suggestions that an interpersonal relation or exchange with the leader is a vital aspect of support for innovation, the present findings demonstrate that self-categorisation processes feed into leaders' ability to influence and suggest change by building followers' relational identification.

The findings for identity content show that when a pro-change leader is prototypical they are in a position to affect definitions of who ‘we’ are, which is reflected in the post-manipulation identity scores being in line with the prototypical leader’s change agenda. Furthermore, we also observed a shift in identity when the change proposed by the prototypical leader is in line with current definitions of ‘who we
are’ (i.e., research-oriented condition). That is, when ‘one of us’ proposes a change that is in line with ‘who we are’, it is more likely to be taken on board as ‘our’ agenda, especially when the alternative is a radical change proposed by someone who shares little in terms of identity and values.

However, the shift in identity is not significant in the second condition, where the prototypical leader advocated for something novel in terms of group norms (i.e., applied-oriented). Rather than concluding this as an inability of prototypical leaders to get followers on board with their radical ideas (as they were with ideas that were already in line with group identity), we have to consider other factors in this condition, namely a competing leader with an alternative change agenda. In this condition, the prototypical leaders’ novel change proposal was competing with one that was in line with their current normative trajectory. On the one hand, group members had a leader who embodied what it meant to be ‘us’ albeit advocating a non-aligned change agenda, while on the other hand, they had a leader who was non-prototypical of who ‘we’ are but advocating a proposal for change that is aligned with the normative trajectory of the group. So it is likely that the availability of an aligned change alternative played a role in preventing a shift in participants’ identity content towards the opposite direction (in line with the prototypical candidate’s agenda). These results are in line with our previous studies where leaders with non-aligned change agendas were unable to secure votes and collective action intentions when there was a competing leader alternative with a more aligned change agenda. It was when innovative ideas did not face such competition that they fared better.\(^\text{10}\)

Still, there are some indications in the data that suggest that when a pro-change leader is prototypical, they are in a position to affect what it means to be ‘us’. First, comparing participants’ post-manipulation identity scores in the two conditions, we can

\(^{10}\) See Chapter 8
see that they differ significantly according to the change agenda advocated for by the prototypical leader (between-participants comparison). This shows that participants have taken on board the leader’s cause as their own and this is reflected in their new understanding of ‘who we are’. Moreover, even though the means were not significantly different in the condition where prototypical leader advocated for something non-aligned (i.e., applied-oriented condition), participants seem to be less sure about their identity content post-manipulation (compared to pre-manipulation) as seen by increase in the standard deviation.

Given that we manipulated both leader prototypicality and alignment of change proposal as within-participant factors, in each condition we had two leaders who differed in terms of prototypicality as well as alignment of change agenda. Therefore, as we discussed above, in one condition, we had two competing candidates who were both aligned—one in terms of leader alignment, and the other in terms of the change agenda they proposed. In Study 6, in order to uncouple these dimensions, we compared support for innovative leadership (either prototypical or not) against a fixed change agenda position.

**Study 6**

This study aimed to extend findings and address the design limitation of Study 5. As in Study 5, we contrasted two leadership positions with different change proposals—a change agenda that was aligned with group norms (i.e., research-oriented change proposal—Candidate A) and one that was non-aligned (i.e., applied-oriented change proposal—Candidate B). However, in contrast to Study 5, we did not manipulate this variable. Since we wanted to test the proposition that it is by positioning themselves as one of 'us' that leaders can spearhead and gain support for non-aligned or

---

11 See Table 9.2
innovative change, we kept the content of the change agenda constant, and only manipulated the leader alignment of Candidate B—who was always proposing a non-aligned change agenda.

Another departure from Study 5 was the way we manipulated leader alignment. Instead of directly manipulating leader prototypicality, we manipulated how the novel change was framed by the innovative leader. In reality, leaders have to actively work to position themselves in a way that promotes the formation of shared identity in order to gain support for their novel change proposals. One way that leaders appear to share social identity with followers is by acting for ‘us’ (Haslam et al., 2011; Steffens, Schuh, Haslam, Perez, & Dick, 2015). When leaders are seen to act for us, followers come to understand that the leader has the group’s best interest at heart. In this study, we manipulated leader alignment so that Candidate B—proposing an innovative agenda (i.e., applied-oriented)—either presented their innovative change proposal as ‘our’ idea (where the leader will be seen to be acting for the group), leader’s own idea (where the leader will be seen to go their own way) or neither (in the control condition). The condition where the leader is seen to ‘go their own way’ is also akin to Hollander’s idea of acting in an idiosyncratic fashion, which enables us to again compare social identity factors with Hollander’s idiosyncratic credit factors in enabling support for innovative change.

We further manipulated the contrast available to the leader proposing an innovative agenda. In this study, Candidate A always proposed an agenda that is aligned with the group (i.e., research-oriented). We manipulated the nature of the contrast, so that Candidate A was either pro-change, pro-status quo or absent (no contrast condition). Here, we aimed to extend findings of Study 4 in the previous chapter, where we found that non-aligned leaders secured votes and collective action intentions in the absence of contest, and not when there was a more aligned candidate who was either
pro-change or pro-status quo. However, as we discussed in the previous chapter, leaders might not always be practically able to prevent such comparisons, given the competitive nature of leadership in reality. As such, we aimed to investigate more precisely the conditions that there may well be support for ‘innovative’ leaders proposing as yet unexplored directions for the group. In this study, in addition to the contrast manipulation, we further manipulated how the non-aligned change was framed by the candidate. We propose that leaders spearheading non-aligned or innovative change might fare better (or do worse) by positioning themselves as one of ‘us’ (or going their own way).

We hypothesised that leaders advocating a novel or non-aligned change agenda will gain more latitude to advance change and also successfully change ‘us’ (group identity content) compared to their competition who propose an agenda that is aligned with group norms, when that competition is pro-status quo than pro-change. We also hypothesised that this difference will only occur when leaders frame change that is not aligned with current norms as ‘our’ idea (and not as ‘my’ idea; H1). We also expected to replicate findings of Study 5 that showed that identification with leader and trusting that the leader represents group’s best interests mediate the relationship between perceived prototypicality of the innovative candidate and the latitude awarded to them to suggest change (H2).

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through the School of Psychology electronic student participant recruitment system. All participants were first year Psychology students and received course credit. Two participants were deleted for incomplete surveys (in the No Contrast + ‘Our’ idea condition, and Pro-status quo Aligned Contrast + ‘My’ idea condition). Three participant were excluded for completing the survey under 300
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seconds (5 minutes; in the No Contrast + ‘My’ idea condition, and two in the and Pro-
status quo Aligned Contrast + ‘My’ idea condition). The final sample of 216
participants included 64 male and 148 female students. They ranged in age from 17 to
49 (M = 20.13, S.D = 3.16) and 79.6% were domestic students.

Design, Procedure and Materials

This study employed a 3 (Change Framing by Candidate B (leader alignment):
‘Our’ idea/’My’ idea/No framing) × 3 (Contrast: No Contrast/Aligned + Pro-status
quo/Aligned + Pro-change) factorial design. After indicating consent (see Appendix A
for form), participants were randomly allocated to one of six between-participants
experimental conditions and directed to the appropriate questionnaire.

Pre-manipulation measures. Unless noted otherwise, participants’ responses
on all items were measured on 7-point rating scales (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

Identity content - pre-manipulation. As in Study 5, participants were then
presented with the same 15 attributes and asked to choose 5 which seemed most typical
of Psychology students at their University (adapted from Haslam et al., 1995). The
attributes relating to leader statements (5 characterised as research-oriented, 5 as
applied-oriented and 5 as neutral) were obtained from a pilot study with 15 participants
drawn from the same population of first year Psychology students (see Appendix J for
pilot study analyses). This constituted a pre-measure and was contrasted with a post-
manipulation measure of the same variable. In this way, we were able to assess a shift in
identity content as a function of leader statements (see Appendix P).

Manipulation of Contrast. Participants then read information outlining that one
of the key issues under debate was the direction the department should head in terms of
its main focus. Then, speeches by the candidates outlining their position regarding the
issue were presented. First, they read the statement by Candidate A who proposed a
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research-oriented agenda (one that is aligned with group norms). This statement varied, so that they were pro-status quo, arguing to maintain the current model focused on teaching and doing research and being relaxed about the whole issue, or pro-change, arguing to change in trying their best in becoming an outstanding research intensive department.

In the no contrast condition, there was no statement by Candidate A. Instead, only Candidate B (presented as ‘Candidate’) statement was presented.

**Manipulation of Change Framing by Candidate B.** Then, participants read the statement by Candidate B, which was focused on a novel model for the Department of Psychology, arguing for a move to include more applied psychology teaching with a focus on equipping students with skills to practice and make a real difference in the lives of others. Candidate B statements varied so that they were either framed as ‘our’ idea, where emphasis was made on what ‘we’ the students would like to see, or ‘my’ idea, where emphasis was made on what ‘I’ (the leader candidate) would like to see in terms of a new direction for the Department. In the no framing condition, neither of the framings were used. See Appendix Q for manipulations.

**Post-manipulation measures.** **Leader Proposal seen as group project (vs. leader’s own project).** One item measured the extent to which participants thought the leader proposal was the group’s project (vs. leader’s own project).

**Perceived leader prototypicality.** Participants indicated the extent to which they thought each of the candidates were prototypical of ANU students (e.g., “Represents what is characteristic about Psychology students”). Four items reliably measured perceived prototypicality (adapted from Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001) for each of the candidates, Candidate A and B (α=.90, .89, respectively).

**Identification with leader.** Participants indicated the extent to which they identified with each of the candidates (e.g., “Feel strong ties with this candidate”).
Three items reliably measured perceived identification (adapted from Subašić, Reynolds, et al., 2011) with each of the candidates, Candidate A and B (αs=.87, .89, respectively).

**Trust.** Two items assessed the extent to which participants thought each candidate had the group’s best interests (“Trust that the candidate has the group’s best interests” and “Have confidence that the candidate will advance the group’s interests”; αs=.92, .90, respectively).

**Change Credit.** Two items assessed the extent to which participants were likely to support change proposed by each of the candidate (“Give the candidate latitude to suggest change” and “Seriously consider a new idea proposed by the candidate”; αs=.85, .83, respectively).

**Identity content - post-manipulation.** This item was identical to the item presented prior to manipulations. It was included to assess the extent to which participants’ perceptions of identity content changed as a function of the candidates’ change agendas in relation to their perceived identity content prior to manipulations. See Appendix R for all dependent measures.

Finally, participants were asked for demographic information relating to gender, age, type of student (domestic, international) and year of study at the University before being thanked and debriefed.

**Results**

**Manipulation checks.** Participants correctly identified change framing of Candidate B. There was a significant association between Change framing and frame check, χ² (1) = 45.32, p < .000. Participants indicated that the change was both the candidate’s and Psychology students’ idea (as opposed to the candidate’s own idea) in the ‘our’ idea condition. On the other hand, they indicated the change was the
candidate’s own idea (as opposed to the candidate and Psychology students’ idea) in the ‘my’ idea condition.

Participants also correctly identified the nature of the Contrast. There was a significant association between Contrast and contrast check for Candidate A, \( \chi^2 (1) = 16.82, p < .000 \). Participants indicated that Candidate A’s proposal focused on change and improvement (as opposed to staying the same) in the Pro-Change Candidate A condition. On the other hand, they indicated that Candidate A’s proposal focused on staying the same (as opposed to change and improvement) in the Pro-Status Quo Candidate A condition.

We further tested whether framing the innovative change proposal as ‘our’ idea vs. leader’s own idea would affect participants’ perceptions of leader alignment through the extent to which participants thought of the leader proposal as a group project (vs. leader’s own project) and the perceived prototypicality of leader candidate.

**Leader Proposal seen as group project (vs. leader’s own project).** A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/’Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 2 (Contest: Aligned + Pro-status quo/Aligned + Pro-change) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Novel change framing, \( F(1, 197) = 6.27, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .06 \). Planned comparisons revealed that when novel change is proposed as ‘our’ idea, leader proposal was more likely to be seen as the group’s project (\( M=4.81, SD=.90 \)) compared to no framing condition (\( M=4.34, SD=1.03 \)) as well as when change is proposed as candidate’s own idea (\( M=3.96, SD=.84 \)).

**Perceived Prototypicality.** A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/’Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 2 (Contest: Aligned + Pro-status quo/Aligned + Pro-change) ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Novel change framing, \( F(1, 206) = 4.61, p < .05, \eta^2_p = .04 \). When the novel change is proposed as ‘our’ idea, the candidate was seen to be significantly more prototypical (\( M=5.07, SD=.84 \)) compared to no framing
condition \( (M=4.73, SD=.84) \) as well as the condition when change is proposed as the candidate’s own idea \( (M=4.66, SD=.84) \).

**Main Analyses**

**Analytical strategy.** Three different types of analyses were performed corresponding to the three key research questions. First, in order to directly compare support for two competing pro-change leaders and examine which new leader for change would be more effective at mobilizing participants, we conducted a \( 2 \times 2 \times 2 \) repeated-measures ANOVA on change credit.

Second, in order to assess whether the relationship between prototypicality and leader change credit was mediated by how much followers identified with candidates or the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests we performed a mediation using the bootstrapping method with bias-corrected confidence estimates (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004; Preacher & Hayes, 2004).

Descriptive statistics and correlations between key variables are presented in Table 9.3. Means and standard deviations for dependent variables are presented in Table 9.4.
### Table 9.3. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations for the Dependent Variables. (Study 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Change Credit for Candidate A (proposing aligned change)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change Credit for Candidate B (proposing novel change)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. 

### Table 9.4. Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Intervals for all DVs as a Function of Change Agenda and Time in Group. (Study 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novel Change Framing</th>
<th>Contest</th>
<th>Candidate A (proposing Aligned change)</th>
<th>Candidate B (proposing Novel change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Credit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Aligned-SQ</td>
<td>3.80$_{a}$</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-Change</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel Change Framing</td>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>Post-manipulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>No Contrast</td>
<td>- .96(^{a})</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-SQ</td>
<td>-1.05(^{a})</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-Change</td>
<td>-1.98(^{b})</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Our' Idea</td>
<td>No Contrast</td>
<td>-1.01(^{a})</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-SQ</td>
<td>-1.85(^{b})</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-Change</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader's own Idea</td>
<td>No Contrast</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-SQ</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned-Change</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Note.** Comparing Candidate A and Candidate B: Means in the same row that do not share the same subscripted letter differ at the $p < .05$ level. Comparing the Post-manipulation Identity Content: Means in the left column that do not share the same subscripted letter, within each level of Novel Change Framing variable, differ at the $p < .05$ level. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre-manipulation identity attribute score = -1.24. +95% Confidence interval.
Which of the multiple alternatives for change will be most supported?

**Change Credit.** A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/’Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 2 (Contest: Aligned + Pro-status quo/Aligned + Pro-change) × 2 (Target of Response: Candidate A/Candidate B) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed a main effect of Target of Response, F(1,137)=47.34, p<.01, η^2_p=.26, where change credit granted to Candidate B who proposed a novel change (M=5.26, SD=1.05) was higher than that for Candidate A who proposed an aligned change (M=4.39, SD=1.26), regardless of whether Candidate A was pro-change or pro-status quo.

A marginally significant three-way interaction also emerged, F(1,137)=2.67, p=.07, η^2_p=.07 (see Figure 9.11). Simple effects were significant only at the control (no framing) and ‘our’ idea novel change framing conditions, and only in the aligned + pro-status quo contest condition. In line with H1, when Candidate A proposed to stay the same, change credit granted to Candidate B (who proposed a novel change) was significantly higher compared to that for Candidate A (who proposed an aligned change) but only when Candidate B’s novel change was framed as ‘our’ idea or there was no framing. This difference was not significant when Candidate B’s novel change was framed as ‘my’ idea.

So it seems that the candidate who proposed a novel change always got awarded higher change credit compared to the candidate who proposed an aligned or non-innovative change. This is likely to be attributed to the fact that they proposed an innovative agenda. What is meaningful here is the difference in change credit granted towards the two candidates. It seems that when innovative change is framed as ‘our’ idea compared to ‘my’ idea, innovative leader is granted more change credit than the alternative, particularly when the alternative available is not change oriented.
Figure 9.11. Change credit for Candidate A and B (measured) as a function of Change Framing by Candidate B (‘Our’ idea vs. ‘My’ idea vs. No framing) and nature of Contrast (Candidate A: Aligned + Pro-status quo vs. Aligned + Pro-change; Study 6).

We further examined whether the perceived identification with candidates mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on change credit rewarded to candidates. A bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations (Preacher & Hayes, 2004, 2008) showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .19 to .41, suggesting a significant indirect effect (in line with H2; see Figure 9.12).
Figure 9.12. Perceived identification with leader mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and change credit awarded to candidate (Study 6).

We also examined whether the extent to which followers trusted that the candidates had the group’s best interests mediated the effect of perceived prototypicality of candidates on change credit rewarded to candidates. A bootstrapping analysis with 5000 iterations showed that the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval was .27 to .50, suggesting a significant indirect effect (in line with H2; see Figure 9.13).

Figure 9.13. Participants’ trust that candidate has the group’s best interests mediates the relationship between perceived prototypicality and change credit awarded to candidate (Study 6).
**When will leaders for change be able to change ‘us’?**

An overall ‘identity content’ score was computed for the five attributes chosen by each participant to be typical of students at the School of Psychology. This was obtained by scoring +1 for each Applied-oriented attribute, -1 for each Research-oriented attribute and 0 for each neutral attribute (each score thus having a value between - 5 and + 5 with negative values representing research-oriented identity and positive values representing applied-oriented identity). Means and standard deviations for identity content scores are presented by condition in Table 4. As can be seen in Table 4, participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores were all negative indicating a research-focused initial identity.

A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/’Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 3 (Contrast: No contrast/Aligned-SQ/Aligned-Change) × 2 (Identity Content: Pre-manipulation/Post-manipulation) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor revealed no significant effects.

A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/’Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 3 (Contrast: No contrast/Aligned-SQ/Aligned-Change) ANCOVA on post-manipulation identity content scores controlling for pre-manipulation identity content score revealed a significant interaction effect, $F(4,216)=2.69, p<.05, \eta^2_p=.05$. This interaction is represented in Figure 9. Simple effects analysis is presented in Table 9.5.

It seems that in the absence of contest, leaders advocating a novel or non-aligned change agenda gained more latitude to advance change when leaders frame change that is not aligned with current norms as ‘our’ idea (and not as ‘my’ idea), in line with H1. When a pro-change leader frames their innovative proposal as ‘our’ idea, they are in a position to affect what it means to be ‘us’ as seen by the higher post-manipulation identity scores.

---

12 See Appendix S for frequency of chosen attributes, overall and by condition.
13 Participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores did not significantly differ according to manipulations. See Appendix T for analysis.
identity content scores (in line with the innovative change agenda), compared to when their innovative proposal is framed as ‘my’ idea. However, the results are not so straightforward in the presence of contest. When there is another competing leader with a more aligned rhetoric for change, participant’s identity scores remained more negative (in line with the aligned change agenda). These results further supports the idea that how well a leader is able to capture the group’s attention depends on what the other available leaders are saying and doing (discussed below).

**Figure 9.14.** Post-manipulation identity content scores (measured) as a function of Change Framing by innovative candidate (‘Our’ idea vs. ‘My’ idea vs. No framing) and nature of Contrast (No contrast vs. Pro-status quo Aligned vs. Pro-change Aligned; Study 6).
Table 9.5. Main Effects, Interaction Terms and Simple Analyses of Novel Change Framing and Contrast on Post-manipulation Identity Content Score. (Study 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numerator df</th>
<th>Denominator df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel change framing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way Interaction Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel change framing x Contrast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple effects analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control x Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.2*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Our’ idea x Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.63*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s own idea x Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contrast x Novel change framing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned-SQ x Novel change framing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned-Change x Novel change framing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, + p = .08.

**Discussion**

The findings of this study further supported the idea that in order to be successful with innovative change, leaders need to embody the group prototype. A clear pattern demonstrated that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be acting for ‘us’, they will be successful in gaining latitude to suggest change, supporting H1. We also found support for H2, whereby participants’ identification with the leader and trusting that the leader has the group’s best interest mediates the relationship between prototypicality and the latitude given to suggest change. These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g., Kark & Shamir, 2002; Kark et al., 2012; Steffens et al., 2014) and replicate findings of Study 5.

We also found that the candidate who proposed a novel change always got awarded higher change credit compared to the candidate who proposed an aligned or non-innovative change. It is striking that there is overall support for innovation over the
‘aligned’ proposal, as opposed to some ingrained tendency to support the status quo as the default. This shows that in contrast to arguments by social dominance approaches such as social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and system justification theory (e.g. Jost et al., 2004), people do not always support or act to bolster the status quo.

In this study, the findings for identity content is less straightforward than Study 5. However, there are tendencies in the data that suggest leaders making ‘own’ decisions are less mobilising than leaders carving out ‘our’ path towards change (in line with H1). When there is no contrast made, the results seem straightforward. The results showed that post-manipulation identity content scores were more negative (towards research) when innovative proposal is framed as ‘my’ idea compared to no framing as well as framed as ‘our’ idea. This shows that, an innovative leader has more pull in changing identity content in line with their novel change proposal when change is framed as ‘our’ idea compared to ‘my’ idea.

However, when the innovative leader is competing with a pro-status quo leader who proposes something that is in line with current norms, innovative leader is doing worst in relation to changing identity content when they frame change as ‘our’ idea. Perhaps this reflects an opposition towards change in general while group is in favour for social continuity. And, change that is proposed as ‘our’ idea (when we are clearly favouring continuity) is particularly rejected.

Again, we also found support for our proposal that contest mattered more with certain competitors than others. The same non-aligned or innovative message compared with an aligned alternative who was pro-status quo was more polarizing than when compared with another pro-change aligned alternative. This demonstrates that depending on who the competitor is, the magnitude of difference in support between leader candidates can differ. That is, how far ahead or how far behind a leader is can
depend on who the competitor is. For a pro-change leader whose rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, other (more aligned) pro-change becomes more of a challenge, while status quo leaders represent less of a problem in terms of how much latitude is granted to them to suggest change.

**General Discussion**

While innovation is seen as being critical for organisational success (Pettigrew et al., 2001; Yukl, 2012), and for political leaders vying to bring about change in structure or policies in government, and eventually societal change (Grindle, 1996; Reicher et al., 2014), seeking support for innovative or non-normative types of change policies is particularly challenging (cf. Coser, 1962; Homans, 1974). Leaders of such novel change must not only get people to accept and get on board with something that is outside of their normative thinking and perceptions, but also convince them that their change proposal is the right choice of action—amidst other ways of thinking and other directions for change. The two studies presented in this chapter investigated precisely the conditions in which leaders are given leeway to innovate in ways that challenge the current normative trajectory. The findings demonstrated that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’, they will be successful in securing votes and mobilising collective action (Study 5), but also gaining latitude to suggest change and also affect who ‘we’ are (Studies 5 & 6).

The findings reported in this chapter demonstrate that ingroup leaders who are one of ‘us’ and acting for ‘us’ with a rhetoric for innovative change can gain more latitude to suggest change and also bring about change in the group identity content. It not only shows that change can be achieved in relation to identity content, but also that the leader would have more capacity to suggest and implement more change in the
future without resistance. If the group identity has shifted along with the leader’s change imperative, other change proposals in line with that imperative will be more readily accepted, because as argued by the social identity approach to group processes, behaviour depends upon the way in which identities are defined. This is an important contrast to Hollander’s idiosyncratic credit model, where it is argued that leaders are able to act in idiosyncratic or innovative ways only until accrued credit is used up.

Furthermore, these studies make an interesting and novel point in demonstrating that even if a leader’s agenda may not be aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, the leader can be, and as such, can be supported in terms of their agenda for change. This has important implications for leaders spearheading innovative change—to make the distinction between who he or she is and the change they propose in terms of alignment with the group’s normative aspirations in their political rhetoric as discussed further in Chapter 10.

**Limitations and future directions**

While the data from both studies are convincing in terms of the main hypotheses, it is nevertheless important to address a number of potential limitations stemming from the nature of the study design and operationalization. It is important to note that given such a brief ‘intervention’, it is perhaps too much to expect a complete change in who ‘we’ are. In these studies, information about the leaders were presented in a brief written statement. In reality, leadership is an active process enacted by leaders over time. In future research, it will be useful to manipulate leader information using actors as leader candidates, or real leader candidates, across a prolonged time period.

As predicted, how long the leader candidate had been a member of the group did not have an effect on any of the outcome variables, showing that, rather than leaders’ ability to gain idiosyncrasy credits, it is shared identity with followers (leader
prototypicality) that drives support for pro-change leaders with innovative change proposals. Indeed, as we outlined in the beginning of this chapter, Hollander’s arguments do not fully explain the underlying process of support for innovation, but is explained by shared social identity.

Another limitation of Hollander’s work is that despite the transaction between leader and followers that implies the reciprocal influence process is argued to be important for the personal exchange/transactional behaviour to take place (Hollander & Julian, 1978), it is not measured or explored in his research. While in this study we used the time in group variable to replicate Hollander’s iconic study (Hollander, 1961), in future research in will be useful to provide example of reciprocal or interpersonal exchange rather than other confounding factors.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it seems that even if a leader’s agenda may not be aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, the leader can be—and as a result, can mobilise change in line with their vision. The findings reported in this chapter support the idea that people are willing to place a vote and engage in collective action for a leader with an innovative idea if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’. People are also willing to grant such leaders more latitude to suggest change, as well as being open to changing the very essence of who ‘we’ are. Leaders’ capacity to change ‘us’ is pivotal in giving the leader more capacity to suggest and implement more change in the future without resistance.
Chapter 10. Conclusion

As discussed in this thesis, analyses of social change and discussions of leadership within psychology have been completely separate. This is because within social psychological research, leadership and social influence have been studied as an intragroup process, with the focus on a single leader and a single group of followers (e.g., De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002; Fielding & Hogg, 1997; Giessner et al., 2009; Hains et al., 1997; Haslam & Platow, 2001; Yukl, 2008), while social change has been studied as an intergroup process, with the focus being on intergroup relations between ‘ingroups’ and ‘outgroups’ (for recent reviews, see Dovidio et al., 2009; Subašić et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2009; van Zomeren et al., 2012).

Studying leadership and social change as distinct phenomena has served the fields well given the scope and depth of research on each phenomenon (Haslam, et al., 2011; van Knippenberg, 2011; van Zomeren et al., 2012). However, given that leaders are quite prevalent in the social change context, contemporary understandings of both topics will be thoroughly enhanced when they are considered in an integrated way (Subašić et al., 2009; Subašić et al., 2012). As such, the focus of this thesis was on the role of leadership in bringing about social change. We aimed to elucidate when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence. Empirical findings from six studies (within three empirical programs) in this thesis, focusing on leadership as a contest for influence and mobilization of participants for change, illustrate one promising way of considering leadership and social change as interdependent processes.

Central to this idea is how competing leaders’ capacity to influence and mobilize a group for change being dependent on their ability to capture the group’s normative trajectory and do so better than other leaders vying for influence of the same electorate. This research conceptualized social influence and change as tripolar relations involving
a contest between two or more competing sources of influence and a third party of ‘followers’ being mobilized for (or against) change in social relations. By studying leadership as a contest for influence—by pitting two opposing and different leaders who might be pro- or against change together—we not only gained a deeper understanding of when change can occur but also when change can fail, where the status quo is maintained or other forms of change prevails.

Overview of Research Findings

Program 1. In the first program of studies we aimed to find out when a leader candidate is successfully able to mobilize the public for change in competition with an existing leader defending the status quo. Here, we pitted a pro-change leader and a pro-status quo leader together in the same electoral context, and were able to find out when a pro-change leader would be successful, but also when he or she might fail allowing the status quo to prevail.

Given that within change contexts, emerging leaders not only have to be vigilant about the direction their group is heading towards but also of their competition, we proposed that in such contexts, leaders need to make sure that their change proposals are normatively aligned with ‘who we want to be’ in the future to be successful in mobilizing the collective for change. In the first two experiments, participants evaluated two student leaders, an incumbent and an alternative candidate with a change agenda either normatively aligned or ‘non-aligned’ with the new direction of the group, within the presence or absence of threat in Study 1, and two different types of norm content in Study 2.

As predicted, we found that the alternative leader candidate succeeded in influencing attitude change, securing votes and mobilizing collective efforts for change over an incumbent—who was unable to keep up with the momentum for change, only
when they were *aligned* with the group’s change trajectory. When alternative leader candidates were ‘non-aligned’ with the group’s normative trajectory, the incumbent retained their influence. This shows that emerging leaders need to be responsive to future aspirations of groups, as changing groups look for a leader to bring about not just any change but change ‘we believe in’.

**Program 2.** In the second program of studies we aimed to examine the intersection of leadership and social change, and explore leadership as a competitive (and contrastive) process, looking at whether support for a leader change as a function of contest, and also the nature of that contrast. To our knowledge, this is the first empirical test of whether support for a leader changes as a function of contest and the nature of the competition.

As we have discussed, according to the social identity perspective, as the comparative context changes (i.e., whether or not there is a competing leader and who the competing leader is), so does perceptions of a leader’s representativeness, and as a result, their influence. We proposed that the same pro-change leader will receive differing levels of support depending on whether there is competing voices for leadership as well as the characteristics that define the competing leader.

In these two experiments, in order to test the effects of contest on leader influence, the presence (vs. absence) of leader contest was manipulated. In the no contest condition, only one pro-change candidate was presented in isolation, while in conditions where contest was present, this target candidate’s pro-change message was contrasted with a competing alternative candidate who argued for an alternative form of change (Study 3 & 4), or an incumbent candidate with a pro-status quo message (Study 4).

As predicted, we found that when a pro-change leader was aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, they were more influential and mobilize more support in
the presence of competition than its absence. While the opposite pattern appeared when pro-change leaders were non-aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, where they were more influential and mobilized more support in the absence than presence of competing alternatives. Furthermore, the difference in support for the two candidates varied depending on the characteristics of the competing leader. For a pro-change leader whose agenda embodied the group’s normative trajectory, status quo becomes more of a challenge, while the other (non-aligned) pro-change leaders represent less of a problem in terms of voter support. That is, the same pro-change message compared with another pro-change new leader was more polarizing than when compared with a pro-status quo incumbent.

**Program 3.** The final empirical chapter outlining Studies 5 and 6 explored support for leaders with innovative change agendas. Given that in the first two programs of studies, it was demonstrated that change proposals that are aligned (vs. non-aligned) with the group’s normative trajectory are more likely to be supported, in this program, we aimed to find out how leaders can enhance support for their innovative or non-normative change proposals.

Here, we made the novel point of disentangling alignment of the leader with that of their rhetoric or change proposal (the latter of which is traditionally studied in change research). We proposed that it is possible for leaders to spearhead and gain support for non-aligned or innovative change when they are seen to be prototypical of 'us'. This research also contrasted shared social identity between leader and followers and leaders’ ability to gain idiosyncrasy credits (Hollander) to see which factor allows a leader to innovate.

A key focus of this chapter also included its focus on identity content change as an outcome. This was a novel and powerful outcome to measure, as it is leaders’
capacity to change ‘us’ that gives the leader more capacity to suggest and implement change in the future without resistance.

As predicted, we found that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’, they will be successful in securing votes and mobilising collective action (Study 5), but also gaining latitude to suggest change and also affect who ‘we’ are (Studies 5 & 6). These findings were in contrast to Hollander’s idiosyncratic credit model, which argued that leaders are given leeway to act in idiosyncratic or innovative ways only through interpersonal exchange and enough accrued credit, showing that rather than leaders’ ability to gain idiosyncrasy credits it is shared identity with followers that drives support for pro-change leaders with innovative change proposals.

Implications of Findings

The present research has several important conceptual, methodological, theoretical and practical implications. First, this research makes an important conceptual contribution to the leadership literature in conceptualizing innovation as a process of collective mobilisation—where the focus is on finding out how leaders can spearhead societal or group-level change, in contrast to focusing on how much leaders can get away with non-compliance or deviance.

In research so far, innovation has been conceptualized as deviance (e.g., Abrams et al., 2008) or non-compliance (e.g., Hollander, 1960; Hollander, 1961; Hollander & Julian, 1970). Rather than looking explicitly at when leaders can suggest or propose change without resistance, past research has focused on deviance or non-compliance and when deviant behaviour will be accepted. However, as we have discussed, deviance and non-compliance are not a good platform to explore how social change is achieved.
We are not interested in the notion of a deviant or non-compliant leader or finding out what happens when a leader simply resists the mode of opinion within a group. What we are interested in is a much more active leadership process that enables leaders to spearhead and enact change. This research’s conceptualization of innovation as suggestion of novel change for the group helps us find out when and how a leader is able to influence and mobilize a group to support his or her proposal for change, and embrace a new way of defining their social reality.

It has important implications for future research on innovation and change that can elucidate the precise processes involved in leaders suggesting novel change and expecting not only lack of resistance towards change but also mobilisation in terms of active support for their change initiatives. Such conceptualisation can help further research study innovation in organisations aiming to stay ahead of the competition as well as political leaders vying to bring about innovating change in policies.

Second, closely related to the previous point, the findings of this research show the need to improve how leadership and change is studied in another way as well. In the social identity leadership literature, much of the work focuses on a single leader or a single group of followers. That is, rather than pitting two leadership positions of interest to the study (e.g., prototypical vs. non-prototypical) against each other, the leadership options are usually presented to participants in a between-participants design so that participants are not able to compare and contrast the alternatives that would have been available to them in reality. This model is investigated despite the fact that in reality, leadership is inherently and (often) explicitly competitive, where, in electoral contexts, emerging leaders advocating an agenda for change may be confronted with other visions for the ‘change we need’, or even incumbents seeking to preserve the status quo. As such, an analysis of leadership and change that does not reflect this contrastive process is incomplete (Subašić, et al., 2012; Subašić, et al., 2015).
The findings of current research demonstrated the importance of the nature of contrast being made, and thus studying leadership as a contest for influence. The results of five studies showed that the same target leader message can lead to different reactions from group members depending on the available alternative. Furthermore, two studies that tested the effect of contest for the first time in the leadership literature, demonstrated that the amount of support leaders received depended on whether the target leader was being judged in isolation or in the presence of another competing candidate.

These results demonstrate the importance of examining leadership as a contest for influence. They show that contest signals further the extent to which a leader is ‘one of us’ and only under those conditions they become mobilizing of action. Therefore, it is by studying leadership as a contest for influence—by pitting two opposing and different leaders who might be pro- or against change together—that we can gain a deeper understanding of when change can occur and also when change can fail, where the status quo is maintained or other forms of change prevails.

Third, the current findings make an important theoretical contribution as well. Whereas previous theorizing suggests that what drives support for change and innovation is being visionary and offering a compelling future for the group (Bass, 2008; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Halevy et al., 2011), or being a future leader (Abrams et al., 2008), or interpersonal exchange with followers (Hollander, 1960; Hollander, 1961; Hollander and Julian, 1970), the current findings show that the underlying psychological process that allows a leader to bring about social change is a sense of shared social identity with followers.

The findings of this research show that it is not just being visionary (e.g., Halevy et al., 2011) that gives a leader capacity to mobilise the group for change, but by offering a vision for the future that resonates with followers’ understandings of ‘who we
are’ and ‘who we want to be’. Further, it is not just by being new or a potential future leader (e.g., Abrams et al., 2008; Randsley de Moura et al., 2011) that new leaders are able to secure a followership and allowed to ‘innovate’, but by offering a change that is normatively aligned with follower aspirations. And finally, it is not interpersonal exchange and leaders’ ability to gain idiosyncrasy credits (e.g., Hollander, 1960; Hollander, 1961; Hollander & Julian, 1970; 1978) that drives support for pro-change leaders with innovative change proposals, but a sense of shared identity with followers—by being one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’. In other words, any of these factors only really matters for followers if they are defined within a sense of shared identity, which creates a sense of relational identification with the leader and knowledge that the leader has the group’s best interest.

These findings also have a range of implications of a practical nature. Leading on from the previous point, the present findings suggest that a useful strategy for pro-change new leaders vying to mobilize support for their cause is for them to position their message and vision as normatively aligned with ‘who we want to be’. However, in crafting a vision that is shared by group members leaders are constrained by the social reality of intergroup relations (Reicher et al., 2005; Reicher & Hopkins, 2003), and often, leaders propose and enact change that is innovative or outside of normative expectations.

We can draw practical implications in relation to leaders seeking support for innovative or non-normative types of change policies as well. In particular, the success of the non-aligned leader in the absence of competition speaks to the idea that it is under such conditions that there may well be support for ‘innovative’ leaders proposing as yet unexplored directions for the group. Building from this, a useful strategy for leaders advocating for a direction that is mis-aligned with group norms and ideals would be to stay away from making references to their opponents or engaging in debate with them—
so that their audience is making judgements about them in the absence of other (possibly better-aligned) alternatives. Another related finding that showed the importance of the nature of contrast being made suggests that leaders advocating a change to group norms and ideals should make strategic use of choosing or making salient an appropriate comparison (alternative candidate) to gain support and mobilise the in-group.

Further speaking to practical implications that allows a leader to innovate, it is important for leaders to demonstrate that even if a leader’s agenda may not be aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, the leader can be—by making the distinction between who he or she is and the change they propose in terms of alignment with the group’s normative aspirations in their political rhetoric. The present research suggests that leaders with a rhetoric for innovative change can be successful in securing votes and mobilising collective action, and also bringing about change in the group identity content by showing to the group that they are one of ‘us’ and that they act for ‘us’.

Given that leaders might not always be practically able to prevent comparisons to their contenders, given the competitive nature of leadership in reality, this is a useful strategy that shows how a leader can actively come to be in a position to shape “our” views, values, and behaviour, and gain support for different or novel practices.

Finally, closely related to the previous point, the findings of current research also demonstrated the importance of bringing about identity content change in leaders coming to be in a position to shape “our” values and ideals and gain capacity to suggest and implement more change in the future without resistance. Leaders seeking support for innovative or non-normative types of change policies can gain more latitude to suggest change and also bring about change in the group identity content by being one of ‘us’ and acting for ‘us’. This can be useful strategy as change in identity content can be a particularly powerful leader outcome as it is change in identity that should drive
support for innovation as well as behaviors such as collective mobilization in support of the new change proposal.

**Limitations and Further Research**

This research makes a number of novel contributions and has important implications for the leadership literature as well as the field of leadership in general. Nevertheless, given the limited scope of a PhD research, there are a number of potential limitations that need to be addressed and future research directions that arise from the current research and findings.¹⁴

One such limitation was not taking into account the extent of dis-identification or disengagement with particular leadership alternatives (e.g., existing authorities). A useful future direction would be to measure this disengagement directly, as it may be an important predictor of engagement with and support for new alternatives. Established leaders often start with an existing connection with followers that new or potential leaders will not have, which would serve as a basis for legitimate power and authority. Such existing shared identity would make it hard for new leaders to emerge and make that connection with followers. To understand the dynamics of social influence and change within tripolar relations involving a contest between two or more competing sources of influence then, it would be informative to explore whether or not there is a shift away from the status quo for a movement towards social change to take place.

Also, another limitation of current research is its focus on scenario-based contexts to investigate the role of leadership in bringing about social change. While the scenarios seemed to be engaging and meaningful to the participants, it would be useful to explore these questions using evidence from real groups and real leaders and

---

¹⁴ Please note that limitations and future directions specific to studies are discussed within each empirical chapter. Here, we will discuss limitations and future directions relating to the empirical program as a whole.

¹⁵ It should be noted though, rather than completely imagined scenarios, the contexts for the current studies were based on real groups and ostensibly ‘real’ student leaders.
with observational and unobtrusive data collection. A further direction extending on current work would be to replicate these findings in real life settings. For example, such a study could make use of a real electoral context where emerging leader candidates are advocating different agendas for change, or competing with incumbents seeking to preserve the status quo to gain a deeper understanding of when and how leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence.

Furthermore, current findings are also limited by its cross-sectional design. The findings reported in the last empirical chapter are pivotal in demonstrating that ingroup leaders who are one of ‘us’ and acting for ‘us’ with a rhetoric for innovative change can gain more latitude to suggest change but importantly, also bring about change in the group identity content. If the group identity has shifted along with the leader’s change imperative, the leader would have more capacity to suggest and implement more change in the future without resistance because other change proposals in line with that imperative should be more readily accepted. Future research investigating the present dynamics across a longer time frame will be useful to extend the current findings and understand the precise processes involved in identity change and resulting support for additional novel proposals further along a leader’s candidacy.

Related to this, a further direction for future research would be to explore the limits of support for innovation—or non-aligned change. In our third empirical program, we found that even when the rhetoric of those leading for change is novel or does not align with norms, if the leader is seen to be one of ‘us’ or acting for ‘us’, they will be successful in securing votes and mobilizing collective action, but also gaining latitude to suggest change and also affect who ‘we’ are. However, it is possible that there is tension between the normative trajectory and plans that move too far outside of this range, despite the leader being one of ‘us’. Indeed, in order to seem legitimate in the
eyes of group members, it is important for leaders to offer a version of identity that is tied to group experiences (such as collective rituals; see Falasca-Zamponi, 1997; Ozouf, 1988) and future aspirations (Reicher, 2004). Future research will be useful to investigate how far outside of followers’ normative thinking and perceptions leaders are able to successfully take the group without resistance. Findings of such research would be valuable for leaders of both organisations and governments who often propose and enact change that is innovative or outside of normative expectations to stay ahead of competition or bring about societal change.

Conclusion

This thesis proposed a need to explore the interdependence and intersection of leadership and social change within a tripolar context in which multiple leadership alternatives vie for influence over the same electorate, and investigated leadership as a contest for influence. The findings of this thesis make novel contributions to the leadership literature by demonstrating that in a contest for influence, how well a leader is able to influence and mobilize followers for change depends on how well he or she is able not only to represent ‘who we are’ but also ‘who we want to be’ in the future, and doing so better than the available alternatives. They further demonstrated that it is important to take into account competing leadership alternatives because as the comparative context changes (i.e., whether or not there is a competing leader and who the competing leader is), so does perceptions of a leader’s representativeness, and as a result, their influence. And importantly, these results demonstrate that even if a leader’s agenda may not be aligned with the group’s normative trajectory, if they are seen to be one of ‘us’, leaders for change will be able to successfully mobilize support for their change proposals in a contest for influence.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a study being conducted by Shaistha Mohamed at the Australian National University. This study is part of research looking at leadership and group dynamics. Completion of the questionnaire should take about 10-15 minutes and all your responses will be completely anonymous. First year psychology students at the Australian National University will receive half an hour of research participation credit for taking part in this study. Your participation will be most appreciated and will contribute to a larger research programme.

The responses will be accessed only by researchers involved in this project and will be stored in a secure place. The data will be averaged across responses, statistically analysed and may appear in academic research reports, presentations, journal articles and chapters.

I, ............................................ give my consent for participation in this study. I understand that I am able to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason (in which instance the responses will not be saved).

SIGNED: .................................. DATE:......................................

If you have any questions about this research please contact either:

- Miss Shaistha Mohamed, School of Psychology,
  The Australian National University, ACT 0200
  Email: Shaistha.Mohamed@anu.edu.au

- Dr. Emina Subašić, School of Psychology,
  The Australian National University, ACT 0200
  Email: Emina.Subašić@anu.edu.au

If you have any ethical concerns please contact:

- Human Ethics Officer, Research Services Office,
  The Australian National University, ACT 0200
  Ph: 61257945 Email: Human.Ethics.Officer@anu.edu.au
Appendix B

Study 1 Pre-manipulation Measures

1. Social Identification

We would like to start by asking you to take a minute to consider what it is like being an ANU student.

To what extent do you agree with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, I am glad to be an ANU student..........</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often regret that I am an ANU student...............</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being an ANU student is an important reflection of who I am.................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a lot in common with other ANU students......</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel strong ties to other ANU students.............</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Preferred ATAR Score (Pre-manipulation)

As you may know the current admission criterion for undergraduate programs is based on applicants’ ATAR (previously called UAI) score, which is currently set at 80. Do you think it should stay the same? Or should it be increased (to e.g., 90) or decreased (to e.g., 70)? Circle the UAI/ATAR score you think should be the standard entry score for undergraduate courses:

65 70 75 80 85 90 95
Appendix C

Study 1 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Threat: No Threat Context

ANU as a world class University

**Please read the following carefully:**

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. Academic excellence is of course important, but it has become more **important for graduates to display leadership skills and involvement in the community**. Top universities, like Stanford and Oxford, are preparing their students develop such skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To remain competitive internationally, ANU needs to follow suit. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that **increasing leadership and community involvement** is an important goal for ANU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you agree:

1. As an ANU student, valuing leadership and community involvement should be **important for ANU**?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on community involvement and leadership attributes?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. Academic excellence is of course important, but it has become more important for graduates to display leadership skills and involvement in the community. Top universities, like Stanford and Oxford, are preparing their students develop such skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To remain competitive internationally, ANU needs to follow suit. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing leadership and community involvement is an important goal for ANU.

This has become particularly important since 2011, when ANU dropped six spots on the QS World University Rankings, falling from 20th to 26th; its lowest since being included on the list. Furthermore, while ANU has been on this downward trajectory, University of Melbourne had climbed 7 spots up the ranking ladder and had been singled out for getting stronger in preparing its graduates for important leadership and other roles in the community.

To what extent do you agree:

1. As an ANU student, valuing leadership and community involvement should be important for ANU?.............................. 1     2     3     4     5     6     7

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on community involvement and leadership attributes?........................................ 1     2     3     4     5     6     7
3. Manipulation of Leader Normative Alignment: Pro-academic

University Council Elections 2011/12

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the UAI/ATAR entrance score for undergraduate students, (currently set at 80) should change or not. (The University council is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates. You will see that candidate A is the current representative on the University council, while candidate B is a new candidate for the year 2011/12.

Candidate A

Current student representative on the University council. Elected in 2010.

“I know the international competition is tough. I personally think we should relax a bit about this whole issue. I know there are people who want to continue to strive to do well, but, I really don’t see why. I believe we should relax and not worry so much. ANU should continue to base its admission criteria on academic performance but the UAI/ATAR score should stay the same at 80.”

Candidate B

New candidate for student representative for 2011/2012

“In order to maintain and improve our high academic standards and get in rank with top universities internationally, we need to ensure that students who get admitted into ANU are absolutely the best academically. In line with this, I propose that ANU increases the UAI/ATAR score to 90 or at the very least make sure that applicants demonstrate excellent academic ability in other ways, for example through extra-curricular academic activities.”
4. Manipulation of Candidate B position: Pro-community

**University Council Elections 2011/12**

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the UAI/ATAR entrance score for undergraduate students, (currently set at 80) should change or not. (The University council is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates. You will see that candidate A is the current representative on the University council, while candidate B is a new candidate for the year 2011/12.

**Candidate A**

Current student representative on the University council. Elected in 2010.

“I know the international competition is tough. I personally think we should relax a bit about this whole issue. I know there are people who want to continue to strive to do well, but, I really don’t see why. I believe we should relax and not worry so much. ANU should continue to base its admission criteria on academic performance but the UAI/ATAR score should stay the same at 80.”

**Candidate B**

New candidate for student representative for 2011/2012

“In today’s changing world, academic excellence alone is not enough. To compete as a top university internationally, we should be encouraging students who are taking leadership roles and engaging in the community. Increasingly, graduates of top universities are expected to be leaders in the community and outstanding citizens. And to that extent, we should be willing to admit applicants with a slightly lower UAI/ATAR of 70, provided the applicants demonstrate leadership and community involvement through extra-curricular activities.”
Appendix D

Study 1 Dependent Measures

1. Preferred ATAR Score (Pre-manipulation)

As you may know the current admission criterion for undergraduate programs is based on applicants’ ATAR (previously called UAI) score, which is currently set at 80. Do you think it should stay the same? Or should it be increased (to e.g., 90) or decreased (to e.g., 70)? Circle the UAI/ATAR score you think should be the standard entry score for undergraduate courses:

65  70  75  80  85  90  95

2. Voting Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How likely are you to vote for each candidate to represent the ANU student body at the University council?...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Collective Action Intentions

Imagine either of these candidates asked for your support to help promote their position.

To what extent are you likely to take the following actions for each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Find our more information about this issue</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk to friends and colleagues to increase awareness about this</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sign a petition</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Write a letter to the relevant authority</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Get together with other ANU students to try and do something about this issue as a group</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Study 2 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Academic

ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. How do we give our students an edge over graduates from other institutions? To remain competitive internationally and to keep up with top universities like Stanford and Oxford, ANU needs to enhance its academic rigour, to offer an unparalleled experience for its students across a broad spectrum of academic environments. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing academic and research excellence is an important goal for the University.

To what extent do you agree:

Not at all Very much

1. As an ANU student, valuing academic and research excellence should be important for ANU?

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on academic and research excellence?
APPENDICES

2. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Community

ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. Academic excellence is of course important, but it has become more important for graduates to display leadership skills and involvement in the community. Top universities, like Stanford and Oxford, are preparing their students develop such skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To remain competitive internationally, ANU needs to follow suit. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing leadership and community involvement is an important goal for ANU.

To what extent do you agree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. As an ANU student, valuing leadership and community involvement should be important for ANU?

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on community involvement and leadership attributes?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
3. Manipulation of Leader Normative Alignment: Pro-academic

**University Council Elections 2013/14**

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates. You will see that candidate A is the current representative on the University council, while candidate B is a new candidate for the year 2013/14.

**Candidate A**

Current student representative on the University council. Elected in 2012.

“I personally think we should relax about this whole issue. I do not see the need to make any changes to how we have done things in the past. We should just focus on keeping on doing what we are doing. I propose ANU to stick to its current admission criteria that is based on academic performance.”

**Candidate B**

New candidate for student representative for 2013/2014

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. In order to keep being the best we can be, we need to be willing to make the necessary changes to enhance our academic standards. In line with this, I propose ANU to change its admission criteria to increase its academic cut-off and consider applicants that demonstrate academic excellence in other ways as well.”
4. Manipulation of Leader Normative Alignment: Pro-community

University Council Elections 2013/14

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates. You will see that candidate A is the current representative on the University council, while candidate B is a new candidate for the year 2013/14.

Candidate A

Current student representative on the University council. Elected in 2012.

“I personally think we should relax about this whole issue. I do not see the need to make any changes to how we have done things in the past. We should just focus on keeping on doing what we are doing. I propose ANU to stick to its current admission criteria that is based on academic performance.”

Candidate B

New candidate for student representative for 2013/2014

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are taking leadership roles and engaging in the community as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering 'well-rounded' applicants and add demonstration of leadership and community involvement to the current admission criteria.”
Appendix F

Study 2 Dependent Measures

1. Vote Choice

Which candidate are you most likely to place a vote for (please select one):

Candidate A
Candidate B

2. Voting Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely are you to vote for each candidate to represent the ANU student body at the University council?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Collective Action Intentions

Imagine either of these candidates asked for your support to help promote their position.

To what extent are you likely to take the following actions for each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Find our more information about this issue

2. Talk to friends and colleagues to increase awareness about this issue

3. Sign a petition
4. Write a letter to the relevant authority…………………..

5. Get together with other ANU students to try and do something about this issue as a group………………….

4. Number of Flyers

Volunteering Opportunities in the ACT

You may be interested in volunteering opportunities in the ACT. There are a number of flyers by ‘Volunteering ACT’ attached to this questionnaire. If you would like one for yourself or distribute some flyers, some are available for you. Take as many as you need and leave the rest in the envelope.

The ‘Volunteering ACT’ Flyer:

1. VOLUNTEERING ACT

Ring Volunteering ACT on 6235 4060 to make a time for an informal and friendly interview in Belconnen.

Make a difference… Volunteer!
- We will look at what kind of job you would like to do,
- We will then talk to you about a range of jobs that suit your preferences and discuss them with you.
- We will give you contact details for whichever job you choose.
- You will visit the job location to choose your preferred job and be sure you really want to work in that place.

2. Go Volunteer

GoVolunteer.com.au - Using the Internet to help Australians volunteer

Around 2 million Australians make a difference in their local community by volunteering with a wide range of non-profit organisations. GoVolunteer makes it easy to find suitable opportunities.
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Study 3 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Academic ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. How do we give our students an edge over graduates from other institutions? To remain competitive internationally and to keep up with top universities like Stanford and Oxford, ANU needs to enhance its academic rigour, to offer an unparalleled experience for its students across a broad spectrum of academic environments. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing academic and research excellence is an important goal for the University.

To what extent do you agree:

Not at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. As an ANU student, valuing academic and research excellence should be important for ANU?.........................

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on academic and research excellence?.........................
2. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Community

ANU as a world class University

**Please read the following carefully:**

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. Academic excellence is of course important, but it has become more important for graduates to display leadership skills and involvement in the community. Top universities, like Stanford and Oxford, are preparing their students develop such skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To remain competitive internationally, ANU needs to follow suit. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing leadership and community involvement is an important goal for ANU.

To what extent do you agree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. As an ANU student, valuing leadership and community involvement should be important for ANU?.............

4. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on community involvement and leadership attributes?..
University Council Elections 2014/15

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

Candidate A

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are engaging in the community as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering 'well-rounded' applicants and add demonstration of community involvement to the current admission criteria-rather than just focusing on academic merit.”

Candidate B

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU is one of the foremost research universities in the world. Current cut offs for admission are no longer adequate if we want to maintain our high standards. We need to be willing to make the necessary changes to enhance our academic standards. And to do that we need to focus primarily on academic merit rather than participation in 'extracurricular' activities. I propose ANU to change its admission criteria to increase its academic cut-off and consider applicants that demonstrate academic excellence.”
4. Manipulation of Contest: No Contest

**University Council Elections 2014/15**

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

In a recent debate the new student representative candidate expressed their opinion, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for the candidate.

**Candidate Speech**

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are engaging in the community as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering ‘well-rounded’ applicants and add demonstration of community involvement to the current admission criteria-rather than just focusing on academic merit.”
Appendix H

Study 3 & Study 4 Dependent Measures

1. Vote Choice

Which candidate are you most likely to place a vote for (please select one):

- Candidate A
- Candidate B

2. Voting Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely are you to vote for each candidate to represent the ANU student body at the University council?...</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Collective Action Intentions

Imagine either of these candidates asked for your support to help promote their position.

To what extent are you likely to take the following actions for each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Find our more information about this issue

7. Talk to friends and colleagues to increase awareness about this issue
8. Sign a petition

9. Write a letter to the relevant authority

10. Get together with other ANU students to try and do something about this issue as a group
Appendix I

Study 4 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Academic

ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent do you agree:

1. As an ANU student, valuing academic and research excellence should be important for ANU? .......................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on academic and research excellence? .......................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Manipulation of Group Normative Trajectory: Community

ANU as a world class University

Please read the following carefully:

The ANU has an outstanding reputation for quality, and we often discuss the kinds of attributes that are valued for someone who graduates from a top university like the ANU. Academic excellence is of course important, but it has become more important for graduates to display leadership skills and involvement in the community. Top universities, like Stanford and Oxford, are preparing their students develop such skills and focusing more on the community-oriented side of student life. To remain competitive internationally, ANU needs to follow suit. Based on prior research, we know that ANU students believe in this movement for growth and that increasing leadership and community involvement is an important goal for ANU.

To what extent do you agree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. As an ANU student, valuing leadership and community involvement should be important for ANU?

2. It would be detrimental for ANU if we ignored the need to focus on community involvement and leadership attributes?
3. Manipulation of Competition: No Competition

**University Council Elections 2014/15**

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

In a recent debate the new student representative candidate expressed their opinion, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for the candidate.

**Candidate Speech**

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are **engaging in the community** as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering 'well-rounded' applicants and add demonstration of **community involvement** to the current admission criteria-rather than just focusing on academic merit.”
4. Manipulation of Competition: Pro-Change New Candidate

University Council Elections 2014/15

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

Candidate A

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are engaging in the community as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering 'well-rounded' applicants and add demonstration of community involvement to the current admission criteria-rather than just focusing on academic merit.”

Candidate B

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU is one of the foremost research universities in the world. Current cut offs for admission are no longer adequate if we want to maintain our high standards. We need to be willing to make the necessary changes to enhance our academic standards. And to do that we need to focus primarily on academic merit rather than participation in 'extracurricular' activities. I propose ANU to change its admission criteria to increase its academic cut-off and consider applicants that demonstrate academic excellence.”
University Council Elections 2014/15

As you may know, one way students have a voice in the University decision making is by having a student representative on the University council. Each year, we elect a student leader to represent the students in important issues like establishment of policies and procedures. This year, one of the key issues currently in debate is whether the current admission criteria for undergraduate students should change or not.

The two student representative candidates for this year (names withheld at this stage) have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

Candidate A

New candidate for student representative for 2014/2015

“ANU has always had an enduring dedication to the pursuit of excellence. I know academic merit is important, but in order to keep being the best we can be, we should start encouraging students who are engaging in the community as well. In line with this, I think it is time ANU start considering 'well-rounded' applicants and add demonstration of community involvement to the current admission criteria-rather than just focusing on academic merit.”

Candidate B

Current student representative on the University council. Elected in 2013.

“I personally think we should relax about this whole issue. I do not see the need to make any changes to how we have done things in the past. We should just focus on keeping on doing what we are doing. I propose ANU to stick to its current admission criteria that is based on academic performance.”
Appendix J

Study 5 & 6: Pilot Study to determine attributes for Identity Content Analyses

Before Study 5, a pilot study was run in order to find out which identity content attributes participants (from the same population of interest for the main study) attributed with being research-oriented, applied-oriented or neutral. Fifteen Research School of Psychology students assigned each attribute to research-oriented, applied-oriented or neutral categories.

A chi-square test of goodness of fit was performed to determine whether each identity content attribute was assigned to each category (research, applied, neutral) equally.

*Intellectual Curiosity.* Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2) = 8.4$, $p < .05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Research category than other categories.

*Need for Discovery.* Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2) = 6.4$, $p < .05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Research category than other categories.

*Empathetic.* Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2) = 14.6$, $p < .05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Applied category than other categories.

*Compassionate.* Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2) = 11.2$, $p < .05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Applied category than other categories.

*Non-judgemental.* Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2) = 5.2$, $p = .07$. More participants assigned this attribute to Applied category than other categories.
Approachable. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=14.8, p<.05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Applied category than other categories.

Playful. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=6.4, p<.05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Neutral category than other categories.

Sporty. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=8.07, p<.05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Neutral category than other categories.

Artistic. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=6.60, p=.08$. More participants assigned this attribute to Neutral category than other categories.

Whimsical. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=10.8, p<.05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Neutral category than other categories.

Rebellious. Assignment to categories was not equally distributed in the population, $\chi^2(2)=11.2, p<.05$. More participants assigned this attribute to Neutral category than other categories.

There were no significant effects for the remaining attributes. Given that this is expected of such a small sample size, we then assigned attributes based on frequency comparisons (see Table 1).
**Table 1. Category Assigned by Observed N. (Pilot Study)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Content Attribute</th>
<th>Category Assigned to</th>
<th>Observed N in each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Systematic</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Theoretical</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Patient</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix K

Study 5 Pre-manipulation Measures & Information

1. Identity Content – Pre-manipulation

Read through the following list of words and select *five* words which seem most typical of Psychology students at ANU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compassionate</th>
<th>Empathetic</th>
<th>Need for discovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whimsical</td>
<td>Non-judgemental</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>Playful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Leader Prototypicality Information

As you may know we have a new head of department. One of the aims in his 100-day plan is to give more voice to the students - that is to include your opinions and voice in important decisions taken at the school.

In line with this, a position has been created on the executive committee for a student representative. The student representative will be your voice and advocate for the things that matter most to you in the School of Psychology.

We want to know your views and support for these candidates.

Recently, the ANU undertook a survey to gauge its students' attitudes towards various important university matters (e.g., welfare, degree programs, staff availability). On the following page is a summary profile on one of the issues of interest, student welfare, for Psychology students. On the profile you can see where Psychology students' attitudes sit as an average along with the individual ratings of the two candidates.

Distribution of scores on Student Welfare for students attending the School of Psychology:

![Graph showing distribution of scores for two candidates, Candidate A and Candidate B, with average scores.]
Appendix L

Study 5 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Time in Group: Prot=Old Member

- **Candidate A** is a third year Psychology student who has been a student at this school for three years.

- **Candidate B** is also a third year Psychology student, but is new to the school (transferred from another University this year).

2. Manipulation of Time in Group: Prot=New Member

- **Candidate A** is a third year Psychology student who is new to the school (transferred from another University this year).

- **Candidate B** is also a third year Psychology student, but has been a student at this school for three years.
One of the key issues currently in debate is the direction the department should head in terms of what its main focus should be. (The executive committee is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

**Candidate A**

“This department should move to include more applied psychology teaching, including courses such as counselling, coaching, social sciences, social work, case management, market research and psychology of organisations to name a few. And focusing on equipping students with the necessary skills to practice and make a real difference in the lives of others.”

**Candidate B**

“This department should do their best in becoming an outstanding research intensive department - teaching students to do independent research and providing students the opportunity to follow their intellectual curiosity. Research skills such as critical thinking, organising information systematically and analysing knowledge are in short supply and a psychology degree gives you these capabilities.”
4. Manipulation of Change Content: Prot=Research

One of the key issues currently in debate is the direction the department should head in terms of what its main focus should be. (The executive committee is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

**Candidate A**

“This department should do their best in becoming an outstanding research intensive department - teaching students to do independent research and providing students the opportunity to follow their intellectual curiosity. Research skills such as critical thinking, organising information systematically and analysing knowledge are in short supply and a psychology degree gives you these capabilities.”

**Candidate B**

“This department should move to include more applied psychology teaching, including courses such as counselling, coaching, social sciences, social work, case management, market research and psychology of organisations to name a few. And focusing on equipping students with the necessary skills to practice and make a real difference in the lives of others.”
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Study 5 Dependent Measures

1. Perceived Leader Prototypicality

To what extent do you think each candidate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represents what is characteristic about Psychology students at ANU</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good example of the kind of people who study Psychology at ANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands for what people who study Psychology at ANU have in common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not representative of the kind of people who study Psychology at ANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Identification with Leader

Having read information about each of the candidates, to what extent do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify with this candidate</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel strong ties with this candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are pleased with this candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Trust

To what extent are you likely to support change proposed by each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust that the candidate has the group's best interests</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have confidence that the candidate will advance the group's interests</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Voting Intentions

How likely are you to vote for each candidate to represent Psychology students on the School of Psychology executive committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat Unlikely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Vote Count

Which candidate would you place your vote for (please select one):

- Candidate A
- Candidate B
6. Collective Action Intentions

Imagine either of these candidates asked for your support to help promote their position. To what extent are you likely to take the following actions for each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find our more information about this issue</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to friends and colleagues to increase awareness about this issue</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign a petition</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a letter to the relevant authority</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get together with other ANU students to try and do something about this issue as a group</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Change Credit

To what extent are you likely to support change proposed by each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the candidate latitude to suggest change</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously consider a new idea proposed by the candidate</td>
<td>· · · · ·</td>
<td></td>
<td>· · ·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to know more about your thoughts on who Psychology students at ANU are.

Read through the following list of words and select *five* words which seem most typical of Psychology students at ANU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebellious</th>
<th>Approachable</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Need for discovery</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Non-judgemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>Whimsical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Study 5: Frequency of Identity Content Attributes

**Figure 1.** Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants: pre-manipulation (Study 5).

**Figure 2.** Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants pre- and post-manipulation when Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical leader was Applied-oriented (Study 5).
**Figure 3.** Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants pre- and post-manipulation when Change Agenda proposed by the prototypical leader was Research-oriented (Study 5).
A 2 (Time in Group: Old member/New member) × 2 (Change Agenda: Applied/Research) ANOVA on pre-manipulation identity scores revealed no significant main effects, $F(1,162)=.24, p=.62$ (for Time in Group), $F(1,162)=.36, p=.55$ (for Change Agenda), or two-way interactions, $F(1,162)=.03, p=.86$. These results demonstrate that participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores did not significantly differ according to manipulations.
Appendix P

Study 6 Pre-manipulation Measures

1. Identity Content – Pre-manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compassionate</th>
<th>Empathetic</th>
<th>Need for discovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whimsical</td>
<td>Non-judgemental</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>Playful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read through the following list of words and select five words which seem most typical of Psychology students at ANU.
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Study 6 Manipulations

1. Manipulation of Contrast: Aligned + Pro-status quo

One of the key issues currently in debate is the direction the department should head in terms of what its main focus should be. (The executive committee is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

Candidate A

"There is no need for change and planning like this. It just takes time and energy away from doing independent research and teaching. I propose the department to stick to its current model that is focused on teaching and doing research."

2. Manipulation of Contrast: Aligned + Pro-change

One of the key issues currently in debate is the direction the department should head in terms of what its main focus should be. (The executive committee is interested in input from the interested parties including the students and staff. They are open to all views.)

The two student representative candidates have different positions on this issue. In a recent debate they have expressed their opinions, which are summarized below. We would like to know your views and support for each of the candidates.

Candidate A

"This department should keep planning to do better in ensuring they are an outstanding research intensive department - teaching students to do independent research and providing students the opportunity to follow their intellectual curiosity. Research skills such as critical thinking, organising information systematically and analysing knowledge are in short supply and a psychology degree gives you these capabilities."
3. Manipulation of Change Framing by Candidate B (leader alignment): No framing

**Candidate B**

“This department should move to include more applied psychology teaching, including courses such as counselling and coaching, and skills such as interpersonal, communication and people management skills to name a few. So that students will be equipped with the necessary skills to help individuals and communities reach their full potential, and make a real difference in the lives of others...”

4. Manipulation of Change Framing by Candidate B (leader alignment): ‘Our’ idea

**Candidate B**

“This proposal has come to fruition after talking to a lot of psychology students about the direction we would like to see this department head. We think the department should move to include more applied psychology teaching, including courses such as counselling and coaching, and skills such as interpersonal, communication and people management skills to name a few. We, the students would like to see a move to focus on equipping students with the necessary skills to help individuals and communities reach their full potential, and make a real difference in the lives of others.”

5. Manipulation of Change Framing by Candidate B (leader alignment): ‘My’ idea

**Candidate B**

“I have thought about the direction I would like to see this department head long and hard for a while now. And I think this department should move to include more applied psychology teaching, including courses such as counselling and coaching, and skills such as interpersonal, communication and people management skills to name a few. I want to see a move to focus on equipping students with the necessary skills to help individuals and communities reach their full potential, and make a real difference in the lives of others.”
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Study 6 Dependent Measures

1. Leader Proposal seen as group project (vs. leader’s own project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leader's own project</th>
<th>The group's project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you think the proposal is:

2. Perceived Leader Prototypicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represents what is characteristic about Psychology students at ANU</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good example of the kind of people who study Psychology at ANU</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands for what people who study Psychology at ANU have in common</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not representative of the kind of people who study Psychology at ANU</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Identification with Leader
### 4. Trust

To what extent are you likely to support change proposed by each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust that the candidate has the group's best interests</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have confidence that the candidate will advance the group's interests</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Change Credit

To what extent are you likely to support change proposed by each of the candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>Candidate B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the candidate latitude to suggest change</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously consider a new idea proposed by the candidate</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to know more about your thoughts on who Psychology students at ANU are.

Read through the following list of words and select *five* words which seem most typical of Psychology students at ANU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rebellious</th>
<th>Approachable</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Need for discovery</td>
<td>Empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Non-judgemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity</td>
<td>Sporty</td>
<td>Whimsical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Study 6: Frequency of Identity Content Attributes

**Figure 1.** Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants: pre-manipulation (Study 6).

**Figure 2.** Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants pre- and post-manipulation when there was no framing by Candidate B (Study 6).
Figure 3. Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants pre- and post-manipulation when Candidate B’s novel change was framed as ‘our’ idea (Study 6).

Figure 4. Frequency of identity content attributes chosen by participants pre- and post-manipulation when Candidate B’s novel change was framed as ‘my’ idea (Study 6).
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Study 6: Analyses for Pre-manipulation Identity Scores

A 3 (Novel change framing: Control/‘Our’ idea/Leader’s own idea) × 3 (Contrast: No contrast/Aligned-SQ/Aligned-Change) ANOVA on pre-manipulation identity scores revealed no significant main effects, $F(1,207)=.72, p=.50$ (for Novel change framing), $F(1,207)=.08, p=.92$ (for Contrast), or two-way interactions, $F(1,207)=.91, p=.46$. These results demonstrate that participants’ pre-manipulation identity scores did not significantly differ according to manipulations.