Diversity and Leadership in a Changing World

Alice H. Eagly   *Northwestern University*
Jean Lau Chin   *Adelphi University*

Scholars of leadership have infrequently addressed the diversity of leaders and followers in terms of culture, gender, race and ethnicity, or sexual orientation. This omission has weakened the ability of research and theory to address some of the most provocative aspects of contemporary leadership, including (a) the limited access of individuals from diverse identity groups to leadership roles; (b) the shaping of leaders' behavior by their dual identities as leaders and members of gender, racial, ethnic, or other identity groups; and (c) the potential of individuals from groups formerly excluded from leadership roles to provide excellent leadership because of their differences from traditional leaders. In addressing such issues, we argue that the joining of the two bodies of theory and research—one pertaining to leadership and the other to diversity—enriches both domains of knowledge and provides guidelines for optimizing leadership in contemporary organizations and nations.

Keywords: diversity, ethnicity, gender, leadership, sexual orientation

During the 2008 presidential race, public attention to the importance of gender and race for leadership escalated dramatically in the United States. When a White woman and a biracial man born to a White American mother and a Black Kenyan father emerged as the Democratic front-runners, and a White woman was selected as the Republican vice-presidential nominee, questions about how gender and race might affect the election and presidential leadership preoccupied journalists and dominated many conversations. Never before had Americans' public discussions about leadership been so intensely focused on the confluence of gender and race. To shed light on these issues, people might reasonably have been expected to turn to scholars of leadership. Given abundant theories and empirical research pertaining to leadership, it seems that its theorists and researchers might have become major contributors to the nation's conversations about these candidates.

Instead of shaping discussions about these issues, psychologists and other researchers specializing in leadership remained relatively silent. This silence was foreshadowed by the complete lack of attention to issues of diversity in the special issue on leadership that appeared in the January 2007 *American Psychologist*. This omission also emerged in a different mode in a recently published scholarly handbook on leadership (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004), in which two among the book's 14 chapters did address these concerns. One chapter pertained to culture (Den Hartog & Dickson, 2004), and another to gender (Eagly & Carli, 2004). Consideration of diversity was thereby segregated from the remainder of the volume and given scant, if any, attention in the chapters on leadership theories and key topics such as leader effectiveness and development. We and the other authors of this 2010 special issue on diversity and leadership are striving to reduce this troubling intellectual segregation.

When organizational and political leaders in the United States were homogeneously White men, mainly from elite backgrounds, their gender, race, and ethnicity were unremarkable. However, much is changing in the United States and globally. Although White men still predominate as leaders, the increasing representation of women and of racial and ethnic minorities is unmistakable in the United States. For example, among chief executives of all U.S. organizations in the public and private sectors, 23% are women, 4% are African American, 4% are Asian, and 5% are Hispanic (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Among the members of the 111th Congress, 17% are women, 8% are African American, 1% are Asian, and 6% are Hispanic (Infoplease, 2009). Although all of these groups have remained underrepresented in these and other leadership roles relative to their numbers in the U.S. population, members of these groups occupy considerably more of these leadership roles than in any earlier historical period (Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 2006). Simultaneously, the growing diversity among followers challenges all leaders to take into account the perspectives of people representing backgrounds, beliefs, and mores different from their own.

Despite the growing diversity among leaders, the still-present underrepresentation of women and of racial and ethnic minorities in leadership roles demands an explanation. Could this underrepresentation represent the lack of qualifications of members of these groups? Or could it represent discriminatory barriers whereby White men have preferential access to leadership roles compared with equally qualified women and racial/ethnic minorities? These questions have long been researched, often by economists and sociologists. These researchers have asked whether observable human capital variables (e.g., educa-

Alice H. Eagly, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University; Jean Lau Chin, Derner Institute for Advanced Psychological Studies, Adelphi University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alice H. Eagly, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, 2029 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208. E-mail: eagly@northwestern.edu

Alice H. Eagly

tion, training, job experience) and structural factors (e.g., occupational segregation) account for the lesser workplace advancement and lower wages among women and minorities. The nearly unanimous conclusions are that such variables account for only a portion of the gender and race gaps in wages and promotions and that discrimination is a contributing factor (e.g., Arrow, 1998; Blau & Kahn, 2006; Grodsky & Pager, 2001; Maume, 1999).

Adopting a different approach to detecting discrimination, other social scientists, including psychologists, have contributed experiments that equate job applicants in all respects other than the attribute (race or gender) that is suspected to trigger discrimination. Although many of these experiments involve presenting resumes to students and other participant groups, other experiments are far more naturalistic *audit* studies in which job applications or actual applicants are presented to employers (see Pager, 2007; Riach & Rich, 2002). Experiments of these varying types reveal discrimination harmful to women, although not in female-dominated jobs such as secretary, where this bias reverses to disadvantage men (see meta-analysis by Davison & Burke, 2000). Experimental studies have shown that discrimination is particularly potent against mothers (Correll, Benard, & Paik, 2007; Heilman & Okimoto, 2008) and African Americans (e.g., Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004).

Psychology of Discrimination Against Leaders From Diverse Groups

Why would people engage in discrimination that makes it difficult for individuals from certain groups to serve in positions of leadership? Employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin became illegal with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of

1964 (1988). Under many conditions, discrimination against workers with caregiving responsibilities is also unlawful (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2007). Most important, job discrimination violates the consensual American value of equality of opportunity. Despite these considerations, discrimination remains commonplace in large part because it continues to proceed in covert, subtle, and unintentional forms even when its more blatant expressions are restrained (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). People can unknowingly discriminate by means of "mindless" processes that operate beyond their conscious attentional focus, all the while thinking that they are merely choosing the best person for the job or otherwise acting in an unbiased manner (Bargh, 2007; Fazio, 2001; Lane, Kang, & Banaji, 2007).

How does this type of discrimination come about? Our beliefs about the attributes of social groups often bias our judgments of individual group members (von Hippel, Sekaquaptewa, & Vargas, 1995). The potential for prejudice is present when social perceivers hold a stereotype about a social group that is incongruent with the attributes that they believe are required for success in leadership roles. Regardless of whether an *individual* from such a social group actually fits the group's stereotype, people's subjective construals of the individual may lead them to believe that she or he does not "have what it takes" for success in a leadership role. This result constitutes prejudice—that is, a less favorable attitude toward persons who are stereotypically mismatched with the requirements of a leader role than toward those who are matched (Eagly & Diekman, 2005; Heilman, 2001). This less favorable attitude often results in discriminatory behaviors.

To understand who is at risk for this type of inequitable treatment in relation to leadership roles, it is first necessary to understand how people think about leaders. Although ideas about leadership are influenced by situations and organizational cultures (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001), people generally believe that leaders are ambitious, confident, self-sufficient, and dominant, that is, well endowed with agentic and competent qualities (Powell, Butterfield, & Parent, 2002; V. E. Schein, 2001). For example, the role of business executive is thought to require attributes such as being action-oriented, decisive, and competitive (e.g., Martell, Parker, Emrich, & Crawford, 1998). Management theorists have regarded behaviors such as competing with peers, imposing wishes on subordinates, and behaving assertively as prototypical of the managerial role (Miner, 1993). Despite the inclusion of some expectations about considerate and supportive qualities, most managerial roles are strongly infused with cultural masculinity, especially as these roles are construed by men (e.g., Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare, & Hayden, 2004; V. E. Schein, 2001).

And how do people think about the members of groups that have had limited access to leadership roles—in particular, women and members of minority groups based on race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation? In hegemonic American culture, such individuals are regarded as unlike leaders in some important respects. People perceive women

Jean Lau Chin

not as particularly agentic but as communal, possessing traits such as kindness, warmth, and gentleness, which seem especially tailored for subordinate and service roles (Kite, Deaux, & Haines, 2008; Newport, 2001). The gay male stereotype partially overlaps this female stereotype, since gay men are viewed as feminine in personality and behavior (Madon, 1997). Racial stereotypes also contain attributes disadvantageous for leadership: African Americans are stereotyped as antagonistic and lacking competence, Hispanics as uneducated and unambitious, and Asian Americans as quiet and unassertive (e.g., Madon et al., 2001; Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, & Sullivan, 1994). Note that stereotypical beliefs, such as the gentleness ascribed to women, need not be negative to be disqualifying in relation to leadership roles. In fact, as Pittinsky (2010, this issue) argues, positive and negative beliefs about outgroups often coexist. Such beliefs often lurk below the surface, so that a conscious denial of stereotypes can coexist with unconscious mental associations that affirm stereotypes (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004).

Given the prevalence of such stereotypes and their tendency to operate below conscious awareness, fully qualified individuals from "outsider" groups often appear to lack the "right stuff" for leadership. Perceived as deficient in essential qualities, they have reduced access to leadership roles (Heilman & Eagly, 2008; Leslie, King, Bradley, & Hebl, 2008). Racial and cultural stereotypes have other pernicious effects on diverse individuals' opportunities for leadership because they can act as self-fulfilling prophecies that undermine these individuals' willingness to put themselves forward as potential leaders. Research on *stereotype threat* has demonstrated such an effect. Specifically, when participants were presented with gender-stereotypical portrayals of women prior to being given a group task, the

women (but not the men) subsequently were less interested in being the group leader and more interested in being a follower (Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005). The activation of cultural stereotypes inconsistent with widely accepted ideals of leadership thus can undermine leadership opportunity not only by eliciting doubts about stereotyped individuals' leadership abilities but also by making them personally anxious about confirming these doubts and therefore wary about taking on leadership roles.

Tendencies to like and associate with others who are similar to oneself exacerbate the biases that flow from cultural stereotypes (e.g., Byrne & Neuman, 1992). Because similarity promotes liking, entrée to important networks can be diminished by ingroup preference even more than by outgroup suspicion. Yet access to influential social networks is essential to building the social capital that allows people to emerge as leaders and become effective in leadership roles (e.g., Brass, 2001). In addition, when women and members of racial or ethnic minority groups gain positions of leadership, some people resent and resist the overturning of the expected and usual hierarchical relations between groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). All of these factors lessen the access of women and of racial and ethnic minorities to leadership roles.

Questions About How Leaders From Diverse Groups Lead

In addition to the issue of access to positions of leadership, questions arise concerning how leaders from diverse identity groups lead—that is, whether their differences from the majority group make a difference in behavior. Others' expectations about how women or members of racial and ethnic minority groups should behave may constrain their leadership. Also, the social identities that represent people's psychological relationships to their social groups can constrain their behavior (Frable, 1997; Phinney, 1990). The influences of others' expectations and of personal identities are a frequent theme in the articles in this special issue. For example, Cheung and Halpern (2010) explain how some women import mothering metaphors into their understanding of leadership. Fassinger, Shullman, and Stevenson (2010) discuss whether the assumptions that leaders and followers make about sexuality constrain or enhance the capacities that lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgendered leaders bring to leadership. Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) suggest that identities pertaining to race and ethnicity affect the ways in which individuals lead.

Leader Behavior

The case of women's leadership has been extensively researched (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002). On the one hand, female leaders are expected to take charge and approach leadership in the same ways as their male colleagues. On the other hand, female leaders are expected to deliver the warmth and friendliness that is culturally prescribed for women. Simultaneously impressing others as a good leader and a good woman is an accomplishment that is not necessarily easy to achieve, and common pitfalls

involve seeming to be "too masculine" or "too feminine." Members of other "outsider" identity groups also encounter expectations that complicate their performance as leaders (see, e.g., Banks & Mona, 2007, for leaders with disabilities and Parker, 2005, for African American female executives).

Negotiating the masculine and feminine apparently tends to push women leaders toward a relatively androgynous style of leadership that incorporates culturally masculine and feminine elements. Research thus has demonstrated that women have a somewhat more democratic and participative leadership style than men, perhaps because people resist women who take charge in a particularly assertive manner. Female leaders are also somewhat more transformational in their leadership style than male leaders, especially in mentoring and developing workplace colleagues. And somewhat more than men, women adopt a positive managerial approach that trades on rewards rather than a negative approach that trades on reprimands. All of these tendencies have emerged in meta-analyses of studies of the leadership styles of women and men (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; van Engen & Willemsen, 2004).

Consistent with the power of leader roles to constrain leaders' behavior is the finding that typical differences in the leadership styles of women and men are quite small when they occupy the same managerial role. Moreover, despite stereotype-based suspicions that women might not be effective leaders, the ways in which women differ from men in leadership style are generally associated with good managerial practices in current-day organizations (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004). In most contexts, top-down, command-and-control leaders no longer provide the most effective or admired type of leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2004, 2007; Kanter, 1997). In response to these changes, scholars of leadership have increasingly emphasized that effective leadership emerges from inspiring, motivating, and mentoring followers. Such leadership is embedded in interpersonal exchanges and dialogues in organizations in which leadership is distributed throughout the organization, as both followers and leaders take responsibility for adapting to challenges (e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Spillane, 2006).

There has been little systematic investigation of how group memberships other than gender affect leaders' behavior. On the one hand, leaders and followers from diverse identity groups generally face some degree of pressure to behave like leaders from the majority group. On the other hand, leaders from diverse groups no doubt continue to express their own cultures to some extent. These issues have considerable complexity in the United States, where immigration has increased population diversity and created immigrant subcultures that differ both from the majority culture and the immigrants' cultures of origin (Deaux, 2006).

In the articles in this special issue and other accounts, hints of this cultural shaping of leadership abound—for example, in claims that African American women have an especially self-confident, assertive style (Sanchez-Hucles

& Davis, 2010) and that Asian leaders manifest a collectivistic orientation that emphasizes harmony among group members (Cheung & Halpern, 2010; Kawahara, Esnil, & Hsu, 2007) and benevolently paternalistic behaviors (Ayman & Korabik, 2010). In addition, persons of color who are leaders may be especially concerned about integrity and justice, especially as they relate to the inclusion and fair treatment of individuals from diverse identity groups. Executives from sexual minority groups might be especially adaptable and therefore embrace change (Fassinger et al., 2010). The complexities of these phenomena include the authenticity challenges that leaders from diverse identity groups may encounter when they feel pressure to conform to majority-group leadership styles (see Eagly, 2005) as well as the advantages that may accrue to them from their ability to modify and switch between minority and majority perspectives depending on their immediate cultural context (Molinsky, 2007).

Effectiveness of Leaders

Leaders from groups that have not typically had access to leadership positions encounter shifting beliefs about whether they can and do lead effectively. Others' doubts can emerge from the application of cultural stereotypes, their preferences to associate with ingroup members, and their lack of insight concerning the potential benefits of the leadership styles of individuals from diverse identity groups (e.g., Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Cheung & Halpern, 2010). In response to doubts about and resistance to their leadership, a strength-based rhetoric sometimes emerges among authors who write about leadership from the perspective of their own identity groups. Such rhetoric may involve explicit claims that their group's ways of leading are better than those of the heterosexual White men who traditionally have exercised leadership. For example, several female managerial writers have provided particularly laudatory descriptions of women's leadership styles as interactive and inclusive (e.g., Chin, Lott, Rice, & Sanchez-Hucles, 2007; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990). Related superiority claims have emerged concerning leadership by African American women (Parker, 2005; Parker & Ogilvie, 1996) and gay men (Snyder, 2006). Such claims can express the group pride that Pittinsky (2010) notes as well as a preference for one's cultural ingroup that emerges in some collectivistic cultures (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

It is also possible that these claims accurately reflect the superior performance that can emerge from having one's abilities challenged on the basis of membership in a group that has usually been excluded from leadership. For example, research has shown that women who are confident about their leadership ability are not deterred by statements that women have less leadership ability than men but instead react by exhibiting even more competence than they do in the absence of an explicit challenge (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2007). In addition, it is plausible that leaders belonging to diverse identity groups can perform especially well to the extent that they have had to meet a higher standard to attain leadership roles in the first place. In

support of this possibility, the requirement that women and racial minorities meet higher standards to be accorded competence and agency has been demonstrated in many contexts (see reviews by Biernat, 2005; Foschi, 2000).

Yet another rationale for thinking that individuals belonging to diverse identity groups are often good leaders is that the experiences that such individuals have had because of their differences from the majority group do confer special qualities. Individuals from racial and ethnic minority groups, in particular, generally have multicultural experience because they have learned to negotiate both minority and majority cultures. Multicultural competence can foster flexibility and openness to change (Musteen, Barker, & Baeten, 2006), an ability to shift one's thinking between contexts (Molinsky, 2007), and especially creative cognitive processes and problem-solving abilities (Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008).

Another consideration is that groups that bring together individuals from differing identity groups may outperform more homogeneous groups because they ordinarily include members with differing ways of representing and solving problems (Hong & Page, 2004; Page, 2007). These multiple perspectives can help deter groupthink and its attendant dangers (Baron, 2005). Also, selecting group members for diversity brings advantages compared with selecting group members exclusively for their high ability because the best solutions to complex problems generally result from teams that apply differing tools and skills. The challenge for organizations is to leverage this potential by lessening the conflict, communication barriers, and lack of mutual respect that can develop in identity-diverse groups (e.g., Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002; Rink & Ellemers, 2009; see review by van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Leaders who are themselves from groups traditionally excluded from leadership are likely to have more of the multicultural competence that can ease the challenges of managing diversity to reap its advantages.

Despite these possible advantages of leaders from diverse identity groups, their good performance is not necessarily recognized as outstanding (Eagly & Carli, 2007). For example, studies of female and male managers show that despite women's generally good managerial functioning, they tend to be judged as less effective than men in male-dominated roles and masculine settings (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995). Moreover, in controlled experiments in which female leaders are made equivalent to male leaders in their qualifications and behavior, the women receive somewhat lower evaluations than the men, especially if the women behave in culturally masculine ways or are portrayed in male-dominated roles (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Such findings demonstrate that leaders' behavior is only one determinant of their effectiveness. Because leadership is a transaction between leaders and followers, effectiveness also reflects followers' expectations and prejudices.

Finally, we note the linking of individuals and organizations to national and regional cultures that also influence the conduct and interpretation of leadership. As regional and global economic integration increase, many managers must become culturally knowledgeable to work effectively in the resulting multicultural environments. As shown by the GLOBE study of leadership in 62 societies (House et al., 2004), the aspects of leadership that are most valued vary across nations and regions. For example, participative leadership appears to be especially valued in the Anglo, Nordic European, and Germanic European regions but less valued in Eastern Europe, most of Asia, and the Middle East. Even among nations placing a high value on participative leadership, there are national differences in how participative leadership is enacted because leadership differs along many other dimensions as well (e.g., assertiveness, future orientation, performance orientation, gender egalitarianism). Achieving effective cross-cultural and multicultural leadership is one of the most critical challenges in the contemporary world (see Hunt et al., 2009).

Moving Toward Incorporating Diversity Considerations Into Theories of Leadership

There are many processes through which diversity can affect leadership. This multiplicity of influences is not surprising given that leadership involves many social and individual processes. As a social process, leadership comprises relationships at dyadic, group, and organizational levels. As individual cognitive and perceptual processes, leadership requires the recognition and approval of leadership in others and the acknowledgement of oneself as a leader. Given this complexity, it is not surprising that leadership theories address many different psychological and social processes, with distinctive theoretical families or schools focusing on parts of this large agenda. Because of the impressive collective reach of leadership theories, there are many possibilities for incorporating diversity issues into their explanatory frameworks. The article by Ayman and Korabik (2010) reviews several of these families of leadership theory and notes the potential for incorporating diversity into their frameworks.

We add only a few observations to their discussions. Specifically, with respect to trait theories, despite the popularity of the Big Five model of personality traits in leadership research (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002) and evidence for its cross-cultural generalizability (McCrae & Costa, 1997), the implications of culture-specific conceptions of personality for leadership deserve attention. For example, the cross-cultural study of personality has revealed the need to modify instruments developed in the United States to represent dimensions of personality in Mexico and other nations (e.g., Díaz-Loving, 1998; Díaz-Guerrero, Díaz-Loving, & Rodríguez de Díaz, 2001). Similarly, researchers have identified personality dimensions specific to Chinese culture, including harmony, *ren-qing* (interpersonal favor), face, Ah Q mentality (defensiveness), and family orientation (Cheung et al., 2001).

Both relational theories and contingency theories of leadership have considerable potential to illuminate diversity issues. In the context of relational theories such as the leader–member exchange approach (Graen & Uhl-Bien,

1995), gender, racial, and ethnic composition of dyads and groups can affect the quality of leader–follower relations. In a manner consistent with contingency theories' emphasis on the contexts and situations in which leadership is exercised (Ayman, 2004; Vroom & Jago, 2007), diversity provides context in many ways—for example, by means of beliefs about appropriate leader behavior that differ depending on the gender, race, and ethnicity of leaders. Also, in a multicultural workforce, the distribution of people along dimensions of race, culture, ethnicity, and gender shapes the organizational culture that provides a context for the exercise of leadership (E. H. Schein, 1992).

Information-processing theories have emphasized leader prototypes and the importance of leaders' matching followers' prototypical expectations for leaders (Lord & Maher, 1993). This emphasis is compatible with gender researchers' attention to the challenges that women face on account of the typical cultural masculinity of leadership roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002; V. E. Schein, 2001). Additional insights come from evidence that ideas about good leadership are culturally bound to some extent. In the cross-cultural GLOBE study (House et al., 2004), at an abstract level certain characteristics of leaders appeared to be universally endorsed (e.g., decisiveness, intelligence, skill at building teams, communicating, and coordinating) even though cultural contexts may have affected the ways in which such characteristics were enacted. However, cultural variability emerged in the value placed on other characteristics of leaders, such as the ability to express or control one's emotions, being domineering or egalitarian, and taking risks or showing caution.

These and other leadership theories illustrate the multiplicity of processes by which diversity can affect leadership. The traditional partitioning of knowledge of leadership into separate theoretical schools (e.g., trait, contingency, relational) calls out for more integrative theories that bridge levels of analysis (Avolio, 2007). Toward this end, Korabik and Ayman (2007; see also Ayman & Korabik, 2010) proposed a model that elucidates gender and culture by means of intrapsychic processes, social structural or contextual cues, and social interaction between leader and follower. In another effort, Hogue and Lord (2007) offered a multilevel theory of how individual, group, and organizational processes can have unfavorable effects on female leaders. Such efforts could be extended to encompass leaders' and followers' race, ethnicity, culture, and sexual orientation.

Conclusion

Changing demographics are fostering an examination of how leadership theories intersect with dimensions of diversity. Organizational researchers have begun to address these issues considerably more than in earlier decades (see Proudford & Nkomo, 2006). Yet, as other critics have maintained (e.g., Den Hartog & Dickson, 2004; Hofstede, 1993), leadership theories have had a North American bias, which brought an emphasis on market-type exchange processes and on individual traits and behaviors. A broader set of themes is emerging as the world becomes more globally

interconnected and leadership researchers themselves represent a wider range of nationalities and ethnicities. As leadership theories become more inclusive and integrative, they have more potential to take into account multiple dimensions of individual identities and contexts, organizational cultures and subcultures, and the relations between leaders and a wide range of followers. Theories should also consider organizational values, visions for transformational change, and ethical principles, all of which themselves reflect cultural values (Ciulla, 2004).

Given these demographic and intellectual changes, we ask whether expectations about good leaders are also changing. The answer is clearly yes: The complexity of leaders' tasks has escalated in many contexts so that leaders are much more dependent on others to provide them with the knowledge and support that enables effective performance (Kanter, 1997). Therefore, contemporary leaders often emphasize the empowerment of followers to achieve a common vision. These contemporary cultural models of good leadership are less masculine than earlier models and are at least partially consistent with feminist visions of good leadership (Chin et al., 2007). In fact, the transformational model of good leadership (Avolio, 1999) appears to be infused with a good deal of cultural femininity, especially in its inclusion of support and mentoring that leaders provide to followers (Duehr & Bono, 2006; Hackman, Furniss, Hills, & Patterson, 1992).

The increased complexity and interdependence of organizations and nations pose new questions about the future of leadership. As world cultures become more interconnected and immigration increases cultural and ethnic diversity within many nations, people observe many different enactments of leadership roles. And as yet underanalyzed, in this article and elsewhere, are the implications of leaders who differ in attributes such as religion, age, and handicap status. Whatever dimensions of diversity are considered, the entry of individuals from groups that once had little access to leadership roles expands definitions of leadership. In the more varied environments that result, the experiences of leaders and their followers are qualitatively different from the experiences of those in culturally homogeneous environments. The inclusion of individuals from diverse identity groups as leaders can thus change these roles to some extent, but so do rapid technological change and escalating organizational and global interdependence.

Finally, to understand the causes and consequences of this changing face of leadership, we advocate ending the intellectual segregation of considerations of gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and culture from mainstream leadership theory and their treatment as a separate domain of study. To counter this segregation, we have adopted an advocacy stance in this special issue. We recommend that scholars of leadership contemplate how their theories might better address diversity concerns and that they draw on research and theory that has addressed these concerns. In turn, we also recommend that scholars of diversity study the large, multidisciplinary body of knowledge that constitutes theory and research on leadership because this knowledge has considerable (but largely unrealized) potential to

illuminate issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and culture. As this special issue demonstrates, there is potential for rapprochement between these two bodies of research and theory.

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2004). *The nature of leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Arrow, K. J. (1998). What has economics to say about racial discrimination? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12,* 91–100.

Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., Waldman, D., DiMare, L., & Hayden, M. V. (2004). Men's and women's perceptions of the gender typing of management subroles. *Sex Roles, 50,* 191–199. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000015551.78544.35

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist, 62,* 25–33. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25

Ayman, R. (2004). Situational and contingency approaches to leadership. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 148–170). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist, 65,* 157–170. doi:10.1037/a0018806

Banks, M. E., & Mona, L. R. (2007). Leadership and collaboration among women with disabilities. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. K. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* (pp. 330–340). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bargh, J. A. (Ed.). (2007). S*ocial psychology and the unconscious: The automaticity of higher mental processes.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Baron, R. S. (2005). So right it's wrong: Groupthink and the ubiquitous nature of polarized group decision making. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37,* 219–253.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review, 94,* 991–1013.

Biernat, M. (2005). *Standards and expectancies: Contrast and assimilation in judgments of self and others.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2006). The gender pay gap: Going, going . . . but not gone. In F. D. Blau, M. C. Brinton, & D. B. Grusky (Eds.), *The declining significance of gender?* (pp. 37–66). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brass, D. J. (2001). Social capital and organizational leadership. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders* (pp. 132–152). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Byrne, D., & Neuman, J. (1992). The implications of attraction research for organizational issues. In K. Kelly (Ed.), *Issues, theory, and research in industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 29–70). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier Science.

Cheung, F. M., & Halpern, D. F. (2010). Women at the top: Powerful leaders define success as work + family in a culture of gender. *American Psychologist, 65,* 182–193. doi:10.1037/a0017309

Cheung, F. M., Leung, K., Zhang, J.-X., Sun, H.-F., Gan, Y.-Q., Song, W.-Z., & Xie, D. (2001). Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the five-factor model complete? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32,* 407–433. doi:10.1177/0022022101032004003

Chin, J. L., Lott, B., Rice, J. K., & Sanchez-Hucles, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Ethics and leadership effectiveness. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 302–327). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 1971 *et seq.* (1988).

Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology, 112,* 1297–1338. doi:10.1086/511799

Davies, P. G., Spencer, S. J., & Steele, C. M. (2005). Clearing the air: Identity safety moderates the effects of stereotype threat on women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88,* 276–287. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.276

Davison, H. K., & Burke, M. J. (2000). Sex discrimination in simulated employment contexts: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56,* 225–248. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1711

Deaux, K. (2006). *To be an immigrant.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Dickson, W. (2004). Leadership and culture. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 249–278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Díaz-Guerrero, R., Díaz-Loving, R., & Rodríguez de Díaz, M. L. (2001). Personality across cultures. In L. L. Adler & U. P. Gielen (Eds.), *Cross-cultural topics in psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 171–184). Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.

Díaz-Loving, R. (1998). Contributions of Mexican ethnopsychology to the resolution of the etic–emic dilemma in personality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29,* 104–118. doi:10.1177/0022022198291006

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 36,* 1–52.

Duehr, E. E., & Bono. J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 815–846. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00055.x

Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 459–474. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.007

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2004). Women and men as leaders. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 279–301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Diekman, A. B. (2005). What is the problem? Prejudice as an attitude-in-context. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 19–35). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 569–591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 233–256. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.233

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109,* 573–598. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 125–145. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.1.125

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 3–22. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.3

Fassinger, R. E., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist, 65,* 201–215. doi:10.1037/a0018597

Fazio, R. H. (2001). On the automatic activation of associated evaluations: An overview. *Cognition & Emotion, 15,* 115–141. doi:10.1080/02699930125908

Foschi, M. (2000). Double standards for competence: Theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26,* 21–42. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.21

Frable, D. E. S. (1997). Gender, racial, ethnic, sexual, and class identities. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48,* 139–162.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6,* 219–247. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Grodsky, E., & Pager, D. (2001). The structure of disadvantage: Individual and occupational determinants of the Black–White wage gap. *American Sociological Review, 66,* 542–567.

Hackman, M. Z., Furniss, A. H., Hills, M. J., & Patterson, T. J. (1992). Perceptions of gender-role characteristics and transformational and

transactional leadership behaviours. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 74,* 311–319. doi:10.2466/PMS.75.4.33-319

Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 657–674. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00234

Heilman, M. E., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Gender stereotypes are alive, well, and busy producing workplace discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1,* 393–398. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2008.00072.x

Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2008). Motherhood: A potential source of bias in employment decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 189–198. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.189

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership.* New York, NY: Currency/Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive, 7,* 81–94.

Hogue, M., & Lord, R. G. (2007). A multilevel, complexity theory approach to understanding gender bias in leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 18,* 370–390. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.006

Hong, L., & Page, S. E. (2004). Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101,* 16385–16389. doi:10.1073/pnas.0403723101

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

Hoyt, C. L., & Blascovich, J. (2007). Leadership efficacy and women leaders' responses to stereotype activation. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10,* 595–616. doi:10.1177/1368430207084718

Hunt, L., LaRoche, G., Blake-Beard, S., Chin, E., Arroyave, M., & Scully, M. (2009). Cross-cultural connections: Leveraging social networks for women's advancement. In M. Barreto, M. K. Ryan, & M. T. Schmitt (Eds.), *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality* (pp. 227–255). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Infoplease. (2009). *Minorities in the 111th Congress.* Retrieved from http://www.infoplease.com/us/government/111-congress-minorities.html

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 765–780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 901–910. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kanter, R. M. (1997). *Rosabeth Moss Kanter on the frontiers of management.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kawahara, D., Esnil, E. M., & Hsu, J. (2007). Asian American women leaders: The intersection of race, gender, and leadership. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. K. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* (pp. 297–313). Malden, MA: Blackwell

Kite, M. E., Deaux, K., & Haines, E. L. (2008). Gender stereotypes. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (2nd ed., pp. 205–236). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (2007). Gender and leadership in the corporate world: A multiperspective model. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. K. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* (pp. 106-124). Malden, MA; Blackwell.

Lane, K. A., Kang, J., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). Implicit social cognition and law. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 3,* 427–451. doi:10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112748

Leslie, L. M., King, E. B., Bradley, J. C., & Hebl, M. R. (2008). Triangulation across methodologies: All signs point to persistent stereotyping and discrimination in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 1,* 399–404. doi:10.1111/J.1754-9434.2008.00073.x

Leung, A. K., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how. *American Psychologist, 63,* 169–181. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.169

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly, 12,* 311–338. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00081-9

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Madon, S. (1997). What do people believe about gay males? A study of stereotype content and strength. *Sex Roles, 37,* 663–685. doi:10.1007/BF02936334

Madon, S., Guyll, M., Aboufadel, K., Montiel, E., Smith, A., Palumbo, P., & Jussim, L. (2001). Ethnic and national stereotypes: The Princeton trilogy revisited and revised. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 996–1010. doi:10.1177/0146167201278007

Martell, R. F., Parker, C., Emrich, C. G., & Crawford, M. S. (1998). Sex stereotyping in the executive suite: "Much ado about something." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13,* 127–138.

Maume, D. J., Jr. (1999). Occupational segregation and the career mobility of White men and women. *Social Forces, 77,* 1433–1459.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52,* 509–516. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509

Miner, J. B. (1993). *Role motivation theories.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Molinsky, A. (2007). Cross-cultural code switching: The psychological challenges of adapting behavior in foreign cultural interactions. *Academy of Management Review, 32,* 622–640.

Musteen, M., Barker, V. L., III, & Baeten, V. L. (2006). CEO attributes associated with attitude toward change: The direct and moderating effects of CEO tenure. *Journal of Business Research, 59,* 604–612. doi:10.1016/j.busres.2005.10.008

Newport, F. (2001, February 21). *Americans see women as emotional and affectionate, men as more aggressive: Gender specific stereotypes persist in recent Gallup poll.* Available from Gallup Brain website: http://brain.gallup.com

Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 379–390. doi:10.1177/0146167294204005

Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pager, D. (2007). The use of field experiments for studies of employment discrimination: Contributions, critiques, and directions for the future. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science, 609,* 104–133. doi:10.1177/0002716206294796

Parker, P. S. (2005). *Race, gender, and leadership: Re-envisioning organizational leadership from the perspectives of African American women executives.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Parker, P. S., & Ogilvie, D. T. (1996). Gender, culture, and leadership: Toward a culturally distinct model of African-American women executives' leadership strategies. *Leadership Quarterly, 7,* 189–214. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90040-5

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of the research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 499–514. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.499

Pittinsky, T. (2010). A two-dimensional theory of intergroup leadership: The case of national diversity. *American Psychologist, 65,* 194–200. doi:10.1037/a0017329

Polzer, J. T., Milton, L. P., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47,* 296–324.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28,* 177–193. doi:10.1177/014920630202800203

Proudford, K. L., & Nkomo, S. (2006). Race and ethnicity in organizations. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity* (pp. 323–344). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riach, P. A., & Rich, J. (2002). Field experiments of discrimination in the market place. *Economic Journal, 112,* F480–F518. doi:10.1111/1468-0297.00080

Rink, F., & Ellemers, N. (2009). Managing diversity in work groups: How identity processes affect diverse work groups. In M. Barreto, M. K. Ryan, & M. T. Schmitt (Eds.), *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality* (pp. 281–303). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6), 119–125.

Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist, 65,* 171–181. doi:10.1037/a0017459

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues, 57,* 675–688. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00235

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, K. (2006). *The G quotient: Why gay executives are excelling as leaders . . . and what every manager needs to know.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership* (Jossey-Bass Leadership Library in Education). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009, January). *Household data annual averages: Employed persons by detailed occupation, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.* Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.pdf

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2007, May 23). *Unlawful disparate treatment of workers with caregiving responsibilities* (EEOC Document No. 915.002). Retrieved from http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/caregiving.pdf

van Engen, M. L., & Willemsen, T. M. (2004). Sex and leadership styles: A meta-analysis of research published in the 1990s. *Psychological Reports, 94,* 3–18.

van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58,* 515–541. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085546

von Hippel, W., Sekaquaptewa, D., & Vargas, P. (1995). On the role of encoding processes in stereotype maintenance. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 27,* 177–254.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62,* 17–24. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17

Zweigenhaft, R. L., & Domhoff, G. W. (2006). *Diversity in the power elite: How it happened, why it matters.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.