TEN YEARS OF THE LEADERSHIP QUARTERLY: CONTRIBUTIONS AND CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

By: Kevin B. Lowe and William L. Gardner

Lowe, K. B. & Gardner, B. (2000) Ten years of Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. The Leadership Quarterly, 11(4), 1-56.

Made available courtesy of Elsevier Publications: http://www.elsevier.com/

***** Note: Figures may be missing from this format of the document**

Abstract:
This article reviews the founding of The Leadership Quarterly (LQ) and the 188 articles published in its first decade. Multiple methods were used to prepare this review including interviews with former and current LQ editors; quantitative techniques; and qualitative analysis to examine the themes, methods, and contributions of the journal during its first decade. Directions for future research are provided, which integrate a decade of LQ author directives with interviews of prominent leadership scholars and the current authors' opinions grounded in the literature review.

Article:
The modern significance of the decade can be traced back as far as the early Greeks. The current English word decade, meaning a period of ten years, is derived from Germanic roots. Its lineage, however, can be traced back from the Latin deca (ten) or deni (by tens) to the Greek deka (Agnes, 1995). A related word with similar roots is decay, a phenomenon typically requiring the passage of time before changes in physical or spiritual attributes can be observed. Consistent with the notion of a decade as a significant period of human experience, the purpose of this article is to review the first decade of The Leadership Quarterly (LQ). We then build on this review to suggest directions for future leadership research.

Multiple methods were used to prepare this review including interviews[1], quantitative techniques, and qualitative analysis. We first discuss the impetus for the journal, the vision of its founding fathers, and attributes of its sustainability. Next, we provide a qualitative and quantitative analysis to determine the themes, methods, and contributions of the journal during the first decade. We conclude with directions for future research by synthesizing a decade of LQ author directives with interviews of prominent scholars and our own observations.

THE FOUNDING STORY
The Leadership Quarterly was conceived over a dinner in 1988. Bernard Bass, Bob House, and Henry Tosi were sharing a meal on the final night of a Canadian conference on charismatic leadership. Bass observed that it was unfortunate that leadership research was scattered across so many different journals and that no one venue brought together leadership scholars from diverse disciplines. He suggested that the creation of such a journal would be timely. House and Tosi agreed, noting that in contrast to journals started in reaction to unresponsive traditional outlets, the theme of leadership was well treated by high quality journals. Instead, the impetus for this journal was the perceived need of a journal that advanced the field by being multi-disciplinary, open to multiple methods, and innovative. In short, the field appeared robust enough to warrant a dedicated high quality outlet.

Though each of these scholars agreed that such a journal was needed, not one felt they had the time and energy to get it started. The possibility that this need might not be met loomed. By the end of the meal a compromise had been reached that kept the idea of a new journal alive and the dinner participants' commitment intact. Bernie Bass would act as a Founding Editor with a one-year commitment. Following Bass, Robert House and Henry Tosi would serve as co-editors for a period of approximately two years to maintain sufficient momentum.

The plan also addressed the grooming of future editors. John Jermier and Fran Yammarino were identified as viable successors and brought on as Editors (functionally, as associate editors) (Yammarino, 1998a). When the time for succession was at hand, Jermier's increased responsibilities with Administrative Science Quarterly and stronger sponsorship from Yammarino's institution resulted in Yammarino's being selected to succeed House and Tosi. While Yammarino initially signed on for three years, the journal's progress under his leadership and the American Psychological Association norm of six-year editorships resulted in his agreeing to serve a second three-year term.

In 1998, James G. (Jerry) Hunt succeeded Fran Yammarino following a process of independent balloting that yielded his name at the top of each former editor's list. While they each described Hunt as a first rate scholar, Yammarino (personal communication, 2000) noted that "Jerry Hunt is not my twin" and hence would bring a fresh perspective to LQ. This combination suggests that he is the right person at the right time to sustain and enhance LQ's emphasis on scholarship and innovation.

SURVIVAL AND GROWTH

While many variables impact journal survival and growth (e.g., publisher, actions of other journals, research fads and fashions), we have chosen to focus on professional body sponsorship, quality scholarship, and innovation as three variables important to the sustainability of new journals. These three variables are viewed as interacting in a compensatory model with minimum threshold levels for each. Said another way, a journal that is high in professional body sponsorship but low on scholarship level and innovation is likely to survive longer than a journal low on all three because the sponsorship or novelty may "pull" subscriptions to the journal. Commensurately, a journal that is innovative and high in the quality of the scholarship it prints may be able to survive and grow without professional body sponsorship because the novelty and scholarship pull readers and publishers to the journal.

We argue that the latter case is representative of the reasons LQ has survived and prospered. The founders and succeeding editors attended to each of these variables. Without a sponsoring professional body, it was important to find some level of sponsorship, ensure high quality scholarship, and endeavor to set the journal apart through innovation. In our view, the journal succeeded to a large extent on all three fronts. Along the way, its reputation was enhanced.

Professional Body Sponsorship

Several successful journals are sponsored at varying levels by professional bodies. The Journal of Management has a long-standing relationship with the Southern Management Association, the Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, and Academy of Management Executive with the Academy of Management, and the Journal of International Business Studies with the Academy of International Business, to name but a few. External body sponsorship in the early years of a journal is especially important because it ensures both a base of subscribers and enhances the likelihood of readership by putting the journal in the hands of potential readers. A base of subscribers enhances the chance that the journal will survive early subscription rate goals and funding hurdles imposed by the publisher. Enhancing the likelihood of readership improves the chances of a journal being cited, thereby gaining prestige, which in turn further enhances the likelihood of readership. A current analogy might be to think of the professional body members as venture capitalists. They agree to include the cost of the journal in their membership dues, which increases the journal's chance of gaining enough momentum to reach critical mass, become self-sustaining, and become prestigious. The payoff to the professional body members (venture capitalists) is through the journal becoming prestigious, thereby enhancing the prestige of the professional body and improving its chances of continued survival and growth.
In the absence of professional body sponsorship, LQ found a friend in the Center for Leadership Studies at Binghamton University (then SUNY-Binghamton). To supplement this support, the journal found a patient publisher in JAI Press. While there were occasional disagreements regarding the amount (that is, lack) of promotional efforts directed toward the journal, JAI and the editors shared a philosophical agreement about the importance of building a high quality outlet. As Yammarino (personal communication, 2000) remarked, "They

understood what I was trying to do.... Sometimes we were a little behind on deadlines ... but that was always to make sure the quality was there.... They knew my approach was to build the

quality and then let that pull the subscriptions through.... They agreed with that approach.” In his farewell address, Yammarino (1998a) states that the journal continues to have no subscription goals, only quality of scholarship goals.

High Quality Scholarship

A challenge for any new journal is to attract high quality manuscripts. The experience of LQ is no exception. University reward systems are tightly linked to journal reputations. Journal reputations, like financial statements, are oriented toward the past rather than the future. Authors typically respond to such incentives by sending their best manuscripts to those journals that have been high performers in the past, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy and an inertia that enhances the probability that the past will repeat itself. To overcome this phenomenon and become a viable competitor, a new journal must have a method for attracting high scholarship until its reputation can be developed.

The founders of LQ focused on building a high quality editorial board to signal journal quality. Care was taken to select board members from a variety of disciplines and nationalities to facilitate LQ’s founding mission of serving as an interdisciplinary and international outlet for leadership research. Implicit in these selections was an assumption that board members would give strong consideration to sending their best manuscripts to the journal. The recruitment efforts and credibility of the founding editors, combined with a relatively focused target market (leadership), resulted in a very strong editorial board. As one of the founding editors noted, “We had just about the whole leadership world on that founding board.... Sure we were missing some names ... like Vecchio, Keller to name a few ... but we had most of them” (Yammarino, personal communication, 2000).
A second strategy to attract high quality manuscripts early was by direct and personal solicitation. House (personal communication, 2000) recalls reading a book on the Pygmalion effect and contacting Dov Eden to suggest he write something for LQ. Yammarino (personal communication, 2000) would regularly scour the Best Paper Proceedings of the Academy of Management, its regional affiliates, and the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology to find quality manuscripts. He would then contact the authors before they were committed to another journal and ask them to consider LQ.

The editors also noted that in a journal’s early years, authors tend to “test for where the bottom lies” in terms of quality by “recycling” manuscripts rejected elsewhere. To avoid burdening reviewers with sub-standard manuscripts, LQ’s editors took a “hands on” approach by issuing desk rejections where appropriate. This reinforced the signal that manuscript quality was required.

Innovation

Innovation is also important to the survival of a new journal. Over its first decade, LQ has implemented a number of innovations. One early innovation was an alliance with the Center for Creative Leadership to sponsor an awards program around leadership research. The most visible of these awards is the annual “Best Paper” award for the manuscript judged to be the best article published in the journal for the preceding year. The winning paper is selected by the LQ editorial board, and the Center for Creative Leadership provides a $1,000 prize plus an all expenses paid trip to Greensboro, North Carolina, for the authors to deliver a colloquium and receive the prize. The subjects of the award-winning papers highlight the diversity of leadership topics valued by the journal, and include Pygmalion effects in leadership (Eden, 1992), cognitive interpretations of transformational and transactional leadership (Wofford & Goodwin, 1994), charismatic leadership and destructiveness (O’Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995), transformational/transactional leadership behavior and effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996), leadership in Western and Asian countries (Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, & Bautista, 1997), levels of analysis in leadership research (Yammarino, Spangler, & Dubinsky, 1998), and leader-member exchange (Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). These award-winning papers also reflect diverse methodologies, including LISREL, historiometrics, multiple regression, WABA, ANOVA and meta-analysis. Such diversity illustrates that LQ embraces multiple schools of leadership thought and methodological approaches.

Another innovation was an aggressive approach to sponsoring special issues that would allow for a critical mass of scholarship on a particular topic. These special issues often in fact spanned two successive issues and were the venue for a variety of topics, including diversity, environmental and social change, political leadership, multiple levels analysis, charismatic leadership, international and cross-cultural leadership, and individual differences. Importantly these special issues blended both quantitative and qualitative focuses to provide the full range of approaches to a particular topic. Though other journals have become increasingly aggressive in sponsoring special issues in recent years (e.g. Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review), LQ was early to market in taking such an approach, albeit for different reasons.

Yet another innovation is the Leadership Classics series and related features, which were designed to consolidate, update, and rejuvenate classic leadership works for a contemporary audience. To date, this innovation has included reviews of publications that gave birth to such landmark leadership theories as House's (1971) path goal theory, Kerr and Jermier's (1978) substitutes for leadership theory, House's (1977) charismatic leadership theory, and the transformational leadership theories of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). In one instance, the Leadership Classics review of path goal theory resulted in a refinement of the theory with the specification of 26 new propositions (House, 1996).

By addressing lack of sponsorship, focusing on high quality scholarship, and seeking to innovate, LQ made it past the critical five year window when most small businesses—including unsponsored journals—fail. As a result of the lack of professional body sponsorship, however, constant vigilance to publishing high quality manuscripts in innovative research forums is required to build LQ's reputation and ensure that it continue to will survive and prosper.

JOURNAL REPUTATION

Yammarino (1998a) provided a number of anecdotal and "semi-hard" indicators of the journal's quality. These include:

1. Being added to the Social Science Citation index in 1995;

2. Author reports that their LQ articles get cited as much as their articles in other leading journals;

3. A decline in leadership submissions at other journals;

4. LQ's placement on the "A" list at an increasing number of U.S. universities (it was already there for many non-U.S. universities);[2] and

5. The cross pollination of other leading journal editors with LQ editors.

Table 1. 1996 and 1997 Journal Rankings for the Strategy Content Area by Anbar Electronic Intelligence

	Research Implications		*Practical Implications*		*Readibility*		*Originality*	
Journal	*1996*	*1997*	*1996*	*1997*	*1996*	*1997*	*1996*	*1997*
Leadership Quarterly	5	1	11	14	5	17	16	23
Academy of Management Journal	7	8	8	9	7	21	28	28
Academy of Management Review	17	19	19	36	17	34	8	36
Journal of International Business Studies	41	20	31	26	41	12	34	32
Strategic Management Journal	20	3	50	53	20	19	51	50
Organization Science	8	4	49	51	8	5	50	48

Source: Anbar. (1996, 1997).

Empirical evidence of LQ's quality is provided by Anbar Electronic Intelligence (1996, 1997). Anbar is an independent organization that evaluates scholarly and practitioner oriented journals. Journals are rated on the three dimensions of research implications, practical implications, readability, and originality. Table 1 provides a summary of the 1996 and 1997 rankings for LQ and other selected journals for the content area of strategy. A review of Table 1 reveals that LQ was often rated ahead of such prominent journals as the Academy of Management Journal, the Academy of Management Review, Strategic Management Journal, and the Journal of International Business Studies. Collectively, these indicators suggest that in just one decade LQ has made substantial progress toward its meta-goal of being the leading scholarly journal for leadership theory and research.

We have reviewed the impetus for the journal and how the approach taken by its editors and review board facilitated its survival. We now review the content themes, methodologies, and trends of ten years of LQ publications. We conclude by identifying directions for future leadership research.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF LQ PUBLICATIONS: 1990–1999

The content analysis was performed in four stages. First, complete references including abstracts for all LQ publications were imported into the Endnote citation software package (ResearchSoft,1999). Second, the authors supplemented the End-note references by adding information on each publication's purpose, primary theoretical bases, publication type (theoretical, empirical, methodological, commentary, leadership classic, book review, etc.), levels of analysis, and the future research directions identified by the author(s). For empirical articles, additional fields were developed to record descriptions of the method, sample, independent measures, criterion measures, and data analysis techniques.

In the third stage, the information from the Endnote database was used to identify appropriate categories for a secondary coding of each. Additional fields coded in a spreadsheet during this stage included the first author's academic/professional discipline and country of residence, LQ board membership for any of the authors (yes/no), special issue (yes/no), and section/special issue introduction (yes/no). Moreover, supplemental coding of the empirical articles was conducted to specify their general methodological approach (quantitative, qualitative, or both); research setting (field/laboratory); time horizon (cross-sectional/longitudinal); data collection methods (questionnaire, interview, observation, secondary sources, or other); and analytical procedure, which was subdivided into quantitative (descriptive statistics, simple inferential statistics, and multivariate statistics) and qualitative (case study, grounded theory, content analysis) methods. The classification schemes suggested by House and Aditya (1997) and Dansereau, Yammarino, and Markham (1995) for classifying leadership theories were also refined at this stage and applied to code each publication (excluding book reviews and a few section/special issue introductions where theory contribution was low) with regard to its primary theoretical foci. In the fourth and final stage, the coded data for each article were aggregated across the ten LQ volumes and summarized in the tables presented below.

In the sections that follow, we highlight the major results of the content analysis. We supplement our discussion with pertinent insights from the interviews with LQ's editors. Finally, we provide a context for these findings by integrating them with the larger body of leadership literature, while interjecting our own personal observations.

LQ Publications: What is Published and by Whom

As we approached this 10 year review, two basic questions quickly emerged: What is published in LQ? Who is publishing in LQ? Partial answers can be discerned from Table 2, which provides a summary of the editorship, numbers and types of publications, and the authors' academic discipline and residence by volume.

Number and Type of Publications

As Table 2 indicates, the number of publications appearing in LQ has steadily increased from a low of 17 in the founding year of 1990 to a high of 37 in volume 10. With regard to the type of publication, a distinction was made between theoretical, empirical, and methodological articles, and other publications, including (1) book and film reviews, (2) section introductions, (3) theory development reflections by renowned theorists (Bass, 1995; Dansereau,1995; Fiedler, 1995), and (4) Leadership Classics retrospectives. As was the case for the publications in general, the number of articles rose steadily from a low of 13 in volume 1, to highs of 24 in volumes 9 and 10. The number of articles published in special issues likewise increased from zero in volume 1, and 4 in volume 2, to highs of 14 in volumes 7 and 10. Finally, Table 3 reveals slightly higher numbers of empirical (55%) as opposed to theoretical (46%) articles during LQ's first decade, although in some volumes (2, 3, 10) the majority of articles were theoretical. Thus, a healthy balance of conceptual and empirical articles was achieved.

Table 2. Editors, Number, and Type of Publication, and Author Information by *LQ* Volume

		Editors		*Number of Publications*			*Author Discipline*		*Author Residence*		
Year	*Volume*	*Senior*	*Guest*	*Articles*	*Other*	*Total*	*Management/ Business*	*Other Disciplines*	*USA*	*Other Nationality*	*Board Member*
1990	1	Bass, Tosi, and House	None	13 (76%)	4 (24%) Book Reviews	17	14 (82%)	3 (18%) Education (2), Psychology	14 (82%)	3 (18%) Canada (2), Scotland	5 (29%)
1991	2	House and Tosi	Fleishman, Zaccaro, and Mumford (Individual Differences: Part 1)	14 (61%)	9 (29%) Book Reviews	23	9 (50%)	9 (50%) Psychology (7), Sociology/ Anthropology, Political Science	20 (91%)	2 (9%) France, Israel	10 (43%)
1992	3	House and Tosi, Issues 1&2; Yammarino, Issues 3&4	Fleishman, Zaccaro, and Mumford (Individual Differences: Part 2)	17 (59%)	12 (41%) Book Reviews	29	14 (54%)	12 (46%) Psychology (10), Education, Professional Studies	26 (90%)	3 (10%) England, Finland, Israel	13 (45%)
1993	4	Yammarino	Jermier, Issues 3&4 (Charismatic Leadership: Neo-Weberian Views)	16 (57%)	12 (43%) Book Reviews (7), Classics Retro. (4), Film Review	28	15 (68%)	7 (32%) Psychology (4), Philosophy, Sociology, Social Sciences	25 (89%)	3 (11%) Canada, England, Netherlands	8 (29%)

(continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

		Editors		*Number of Publications*			*Author Discipline*		*Author Residence*		
Year	*Volume*	*Senior*	*Guest*	*Articles*	*Other*	*Total*	*Management/ Business*	*Other Disciplines*	*USA*	*Other Nationality*	*Board Member*
1994	5	Yammarino	Egri and Flannery, Issues 3&4 (Environment & Social Change)	17 (74%)	6 (26%) Book Review (4), Special Issue/ Section Intro (2)	23	13 (72%)	5 (28%) Psychology (4), Sociology/ Anthropology	16 (73%)	6 (27%) Canada (3), Australia, Israel, New Zealand	5 (22%)
1995	6	Yammarino	Dansereau, Issues 2&3 (Multiple Level Approach)	22 (73%)	8 (27%) Book Review (4), Theory Development (4), Special Issue/Section Intro (2)	30	21 (70%)	9 (30%) Psychology (5), Leadership Studies, Sociology/ Anthropology, Social Sciences, Urban Studies	26 (80%)	7 (20%) England (3), Denmark, Israel, Korea, Saudi Arab	24 (80%)
1996	7	Yammarino	VanVelser and DiTomaso, Issues 1&2 (Leadership & Diversity)	23 (77%)	8 (27%) Book Review (4), Classics Retrospective (4)	30	20 (67%)	10 (33%) Psychology (2), Consulting (2), Education, Business and Public Administration, MIS, Public Service, Speech/ Theater/Journalism, Social Science	24 (80%)	6 (20%) Canada (2), England, Ireland, Israel, Sweden	12 (40%)

(continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

		Editors		Number of Publications			Author Discipline		Author Residence		
Year	*Volume*	*Senior*	*Guest*	*Articles*	*Other*	*Total*	*Management/ Business*	*Other Disciplines*	*USA*	*Other Nationality*	*Board Member*
1997	8	Yammarino	Hunt and Peterson/ Peterson and Hunt, Issues 3&4 (International Leadership: Parts 1&2)	18 (60%)	12 (40%) Book Reviews (4), Classics Retrospective (6), Special Issue Intro (2)	30	25 (81%)	6 (19%) International Studies (2), Consulting, Psychology, Social Sciences, Lead/Law/ Ethics	25 (81%)	6 (19%) Australia, England, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand, The Netherlands	11 (37%)
1998	9	Yammarino	Simonton, Issue 3 (Political Leadership), Atwater and Waldman, Issue 4 (360-degree Feedbeek)	24 (75%)	8 (25%) Book Reviews (5), Special Issue Intro (2), Editorial	32	15 (49%)	16 (51%) Psychology (7), Political Science (2), Business and Economic Development, Consulting (2), Human Services, Religion, Sociology/ Anthropology, Social Sciences	27 (84%)	5 (16%) Israel (2), Australia, Canada, South Korea	8 (25%)

(continued)

Table 2. Continued)

		Editors		Number of Publications			Author Discipline		Author Residence		
Year	*Volume*	*Senior*	*Guest*	*Articles*	*Other*	*Total*	*Management/ Business*	*Other Disciplines*	*USA*	*Other Nationality*	*Board Member*
1999	10	Hunt	Conger and Hunt/ Hunt and Conger, Issues 2&3 (Charismatic and Transformational Lead: Parts 1&2)	24 (65%)	17 (46%) Book Reviews (1), Commentary (6), Classics Retrospective (5), Special Issue Intro (3), LQ Interviews (2)	37	28 (78%)	8 (22%) Psychology (3), Sociology/ Anthropology (2), Consulting, Education, Leaders Studies	32 (76%)	10 (24%) GLOBE, Israel (2), Australia, Canada, England, Jordan, Hong Kong, The Netherlands, New Zealand	22 (59%)
Total		4 Editorial Teams/ 5 Senior Editors	16 out of 40 (40%) issues with Guest Editors	188 (67%) (M = 4.7 per issue)	96 (33%) (M = 2.4 per issue) Book Reviews (54); Classic (19); Intros (10); Commentary (6); Theatrical Development (4)	280 (M = 7 per issue)	174 (67%) (M = 4.4 per issue)	84 (23%) (M = 2.1 per issue) Psychology (44/16% of total publications; M = 1.1 per issue)	235 (82%)	50 (18%) (M = 1.3 per issue) Canada (10); England (9); Israel (9), Australia (4); The Netherlands (3), New Zealand (3)	118 (42%)

Note: Numbers in individual cells may not add up to the totals due to missing information and non-mutually exclusive categories.

Table 3. Type of Articles by *LQ* Volume

Year	*Volume*	*Empirical*	*Theoretical*	*Methods*	*Special Issue*	*Total*[a]
1990	1	11 (85%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13
1991	2	3 (21%)	11 (79%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%) (All Theoretical)	14
1992	3	5 (29%)	13 (76%)	1 (6%)	9 (5%) (8 Theoretical/ 1 Methods)	17
1993	4	10 (63%)	8 (50%)	0 (0%)	8 (50%) (3 Empirical/ 6 Theoretical)	16
1994	5	11 (65%)	11 (65%)	1 (6%)	9 (5%) (5 Empirical/ All Theoretical)	17
1995	6	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	3 (14%)	13 (59%) (5 Empirical/ 9 Theory/1 Methods)	22
1996	7	11 (48%)	11 (48%)	4 (17%)	14 (61%) (7 Empirical/ 7 Theory)	23
1997	8	12 (67%)	5 (28%)	1 (6%)	12 (67%) (3 Empircal/ 9 Theoretical)	18
1998	9	17 (71%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	11 (46%) (10 Empirical/ 1 Theoretical)	24
1999	10	12 (50%)	13 (54%)	3 (13%)	14 (58%) (8 Empirical/ 7 Theoretical)	24
Total		103 (55%)	88 (46%)	19 (10%)	94 (50%) (34 Empirical/ 60 Theoretical/ 2 Methods)	188

Note: [a]The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.

Author Information

As the founding story indicated, two of LQ’s primary goals were to publish manuscripts from a wide variety of disciplines with an interest in leadership and to serve as an international outlet for leadership theory and research. The information on the academic discipline and residence of the first authors reported in Table 2 suggests that LQ’s success in achieving these goals was limited. Indeed, the first author’s academic discipline for two-thirds of the publications was management/ business, while psychology was a distant second with 16%. The remaining fields (e.g., education, sociology, political science) combined were represented in only 7% of the articles published. Similarly, the vast majority (n = 235; 81%) of the first authors were U.S. residents, while only 50 (18%) publications appeared by first authors from other nations, with Canada (n = 10), England (n = 9), and Israel (n = 9) being best represented. In our interviews with LQ’s editors, each described the difficulties involved in getting authors from a broader array of disciplines and nationalities to submit their work, and our data bear this out. Commenting on this challenge, Bass (personal communication, 2000) observed that, despite the editors' and board members' best efforts, journals quickly become associated with a particular discipline and home country. As a result, most authors from other disciplines and nations continue to submit their work to journals to which they have become accustomed; changing these habits by breaking down preconceived notions about LQ's content and biases remains an on-going challenge.

As previously noted, a theme that consistently emerged from our interviews with the editors was the importance of selecting distinguished board members. Doing so was critical for the obvious reason of securing outstanding expertise and guidance across a broad range of disciplines and methodologies, as well as the less obvious reason of supplying a dedicated cadre of scholars to serve as a source of quality manuscripts for the journal. Strong evidence of the crucial role that board members have played throughout the journal's formative years in generating manuscripts, coordinating special issues, and providing book reviews and reflections on classic publications, is readily apparent from Table 2. Indeed, board members accounted for 42% of the publications appearing in LQ over its first decade. The proportions of publications authored or co-authored by board members ranged from a low of 22% in 1994 to a high of 80% in 1995. While the importance of having a strong, extensive, and committed board is readily apparent from these numbers, they also underscore the aforementioned need to generate additional manuscripts from a broader circle of authors who represent more diverse disciplines and nationalities.

Special Issues

Further insight into the focus of LQ and the identities of key persons who shaped its content can be gained by considering the guest editors and topics for special issues.

Individual Differences and Leadership

The first, three-part special issue, guest edited by Edwin Fleishman, Steven Zaccaro, and Michael Mumford (1992a, 1992b), appeared in volumes 2 and 3 and included theoretical and empirical articles that examine the influence of individual differences on leadership processes. The key contribution of this special issue was to highlight the multi-faceted effects individual difference variables—ranging from leader intelligence and experience (Fiedler, 1992), to creativity (Mumford & Connelly, 1991) and social intelligence (Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor, & Mumford, 1991), to the personality correlates of charismatic leadership (House & Howell, 1992)—exert when leaders, followers, and situational forces interact.

Neo-Weberian Perspectives on Charismatic Leadership

The second, two-part special issue was the first under Fran Yammarino's editorship; John Jermier (1993) served as the guest editor. Focusing on charismatic leadership, this issue included an eclectic mix of theoretical frameworks (Bryman, 1993; Conger, 1993; DiTomaso,1993; Turner, 1993) and qualitative empirical approaches (Calas, 1993; Gaines, 1993; Weed, 1993) that were labeled "neo-Weberian". Part of the meaning of the phrase neo-Weberian involves re-examining Weber's classic analysis of charisma and social change to enrich the construct, and to consider how Weber's ideas are applied, and misapplied, in the literature. Another facet of the word's meaning is to focus on areas in which Weber's theory was misconceptualized or left incomplete. The common goal of these neo-Weberian approaches was to stimulate critical thought on the nature of charisma by re-evaluating Weber's work as well as new developments in Weberian writings on charismatic leadership (Jermier, 1993).

Environmental and Social Change

The third special issue was guest edited by Carolyn P. Egri and Peter Frost (1994) and focused on the leadership required to facilitate environmental and social change. The articles range from several that show how current leadership theories can be applied to better understand change advocacy leadership in the public and private sectors, to others that advance original models (Carlopio, 1994; Dyck, 1994; Feyerherm, 1994; Flannery & May, 1994; Selsky & Smith, 1994). In addition to these empirical articles, several authors (Bolman & Deal, 1994; Moore,1994; Portugal & Yukl,1994; Shrivastava,1994) were invited to write short "Voices for Change" essays to provide strong statements about the role that progressive leadership must play in the development of sustainable environments and cultures.

Multiple-level Approaches

In the fourth special issue, guest edited by Fred Dansereau (1995), a variety of distinguished authors explore the implications of the multiple-level perspective (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984) for prominent leadership theories that they have been intimately involved in developing, testing, and/or refining. The multi-level approach emphasizes the need to examine leadership processes at the individual (leaders, followers), dyad, group, and organizational levels. Dansereau (1995) assigns the 13 contributions included in this special issue to categories based on the research roots that anchor them. The first category is labeled the Classical Approach because it includes articles that revisit and build upon the Ohio State Leader Behavior Approach (OSU) (Schriesheim, Cogliser, & Neider, 1995), the Contingency Approach (Ayman, Chemers, & Fiedler, 1995), and Decision Processes Theory (DPT) (Vroom & Jago, 1995). The second category is called Contemporary Approaches and includes articles focusing on Charismatic Leadership (CL) (Klein & House, 1995), Transformational Leadership (TL) (Avolio & Bass, 1995), and Leader-member Exchange (LMX) (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The Alternative Approaches found in the third category include articles on Leadership and Information Processing (Hall & Lord, 1995), Substitutes for Leadership (SFL) (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1995), and the Romance of Leadership (ROL) (Meindl, 1995). The final category, labeled New Wave, approaches and includes articles on Self-Leadership (SL) (Markham & Markham, 1995), a Multiple-Linkage Model (MLM) (Kim & Yukl, 1995), Multi-Level Theory (MLT) (Hunt & Ropo, 1995), and Individualized Leadership (IL) (Dansereau, Yammarino, Markham, Alutto, et al., 1995). As noted earlier, we use this taxonomy in conjunction with that offered by House and Aditya (1997) to develop a scheme for classifying the theories reflected in LQ articles.

Leadership and Diversity

Ellen Van Velsor and Nancy DiTomaso served as guest editors for the fifth special issue, which focused on leadership and diversity (volume 7, numbers 1 and 2). In the introductory sections of each issue, DiTomaso and Robert Hooijberg (DiTomaso & Hooijberg, 1996; Hooijberg & DiTomaso, 1996) explore the demands, challenges, and opportunities that demographically diverse organizations present to their leaders, and identify gaps in the leadership and diversity literatures that limit our understanding of these issues. An agenda (Hooijberg & DiTomaso, 1996) and conceptual framework (DiTomaso & Hooijberg, 1996) are advanced for the purpose of guiding and stimulating theory and research intended to fill these gaps. The eclectic set of articles in this special issue take initial steps in this direction. They include an experimental study of the adverse effects of preferential selection of a female leader (DeMatteo, Dobbins, Myers, & Facteau, 1996), a field study of the contrasting influence tactics of Asian-American and Caucasian-American managers (Xin & Tsui, 1996), an historical analysis of the paths to power and achievements of 25 global women who have lead modern nations or governments (Adler, 1996), a conceptual model of the leadership strategies used by African-American Women executives (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996), and an extension of the LMX model to consider the role which race and gender relations may play in the LMX development process (Scandura & Lankau, 1996). Articles such as these combine to shed new light on the relationships between leadership and diversity and a wide array of organizational settings.

International and Cross-cultural Leadership

For the sixth special issue, Jerry Hunt and Mark Peterson served as guest editors for a two-part issue on international and cross-cultural leadership research (Hunt & Peterson, 1997a, b; Peterson & Hunt, 1997b). Conceptual articles in this special issue include a review of key leadership themes in the history of international studies and international management, as well as the evolution of leadership theory within the field of organizational studies (Peterson & Hunt, 1997a); and theoretical reflections on effective leadership processes in Sino-American joint ventures in China. Den Hartog and Verburg (1997) apply discourse analysis to examine how charismatic CEOs rhetorically construct message content in their speeches, with an emphasis on their attitude towards internationalization and international business strategy. The remaining articles involve empirical studies of leadership across cultural contexts, including Japan (Dorfman et al., 1997; Rao, Hashimoto, & Rao, 1997; Vaelikangas & Okumura, 1997), New Zealand (Ah Chong & Thomas, 1997), China (Smith, Wang, & Leung,1997), Mexico (Dorfman et al., 1997; Pelled & Xin, 1997), the United States (Dorfman et al., 1997; Vaelikangas & Okumura, 1997), Taiwan (Dorfman et al., 1997), and Korea (Dorfman et al., 1997). In their integration and synthesis, Hunt and Peterson (1997b) make a favorable observation that all of the articles reflect both emic (concepts that are highly pertinent to a specific society) and etic (concepts that fall within the larger domain of theory that may or may not be relevant to a particular culture) perspectives. Thus, “this special issue demonstrates neither the unmodified application of U.S-based (or any other) theories to another country nor a leadership approach so unique to a given country or culture that it has no broader relevance” (Hunt & Peterson, 1997b, p. 346). Such a balanced approach is essential to advancing our knowledge of both the universal and unique aspects of cross-cultural leadership.

Political Leadership

A seventh special issue on political leadership, for which Dean Keith Simonton (1998a, b) was the guest editor, included articles focusing on world heads of state (Deluga, 1998; Kaarbo & Hermann, 1998; Nice, 1998; Schmitt & Winter, 1998; Simonton, 1998c), and the 1996 U.S. presidential elections (Immelman,1998; Pillai & Williams, 1998; Renshon,1998; Winter, 1998). The theoretical perspectives adopted range from the Leader Motive Profile (LMP) theory (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; McClelland, 1985; Winter, 1991) as investigated by Deluga (1998), and Schmitt and Winter (1998) to a warrior model of leadership developed by Nice (1998). The empirical approaches applied range from histriometric procedures (Deluga, 1998) to a field survey of voters’ perceptions of presidential candidates’ charismatic and transformational leadership qualities that used a logistic regression analysis. Thus, a broad range of theories and analytical methods are applied to the study of political leadership to provide useful and timely insights for an area House and Aditya (1997) identify as being in dire need of scholarly attention.

360-Degree Feedback in Leadership Research

Leanne Atwater and David Waldman (1998) guest edited an eighth, two-article special issue on 360-degree feedback in leadership research. The articles focused on leader reactions to 360-degree feedback from subordinates and peers (Facteau, Facteau, Schoel, Russell, & Poteet,1998) and the relationship between self-monitoring and 360-degree feedback (Warech, Smither, Reilly, Millsap, & Reilly, 1998). Avenues for future inquires are also identified.

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

The ninth and final, two-part special issue was the first under Jerry Hunt’s editorship; Jerry and Jay Conger served as the guest editors. Part I (Conger & Hunt, 1999) had a conceptual focus and included articles by scholars known for their sizeable contributions to the “neo-charismatic” paradigm (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Conger, 1999; Shamir, 1999a), as well as evaluations of that paradigm by other renowned leadership scholars (Beyer, 1999a; Hunt, 1999; Yukl & Howell, 1999). Also included was a report on the initial phases of the 60 nation GLOBE study conducted by Deanne den Hartog, Robert House, Paul Hanges, and over 170 coordinating team members and country co-investigators (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999). The results provide evidence of both culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories. In addition, the notion that charismatic/transformational leadership is universally endorsed as a contributor to exceptional leadership is supported. Jan Beyer’s critique of the “taming and promoting of charisma” by proponents of this “so-called” paradigm, lead to a lively debate which spilled over into two subsequent issues including the first issue of 2000 (Bass, 1999; Beyer, 1999b; House, 1999; Shamir, 1999b).

As a complement to Part I’s conceptual focus, Part II is entirely empirical with the exception of Hunt and Conger’s (1999b) introduction, assessment, and synthesis. Four articles describe laboratory experiments on charismatic leadership (Awamleh & Gardner,1999; Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999; Hunt, Boal, & Boal,1999; Shea & Howell, 1999), while Fiol, Harris, and House (1999) and Beyer and Browning(1999) demonstrate the utility of the semiotics and case study approaches, respectively, to studying charismatic and cultural leadership. Together, these issues generate important theoretical advances, empirical findings, and a heated intellectual debate. We suspect that the effects of this special issue will reverberate throughout the field and shape the ways we think about and study charismatic and transformational leadership in the future.

Theoretical Focus

Coding Scheme

To categorize the theoretical foundations and foci for the empirical and theoretical LQ articles, we used a coding scheme derived from the previously described taxonomy by Dansereau, Yammarino, and Markham (1995) and one proposed by House and Aditya (1997). The latter authors describe the Trait Theories, Behavioral Approaches such as the Ohio State studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957), and Contingency Theories as three distinct paradigms developed during prior eras of leadership study. They also identified Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) (Lord & Maher, 1991), and the Neo-charismatic Leadership Paradigm as Recently Introduced Approaches. Representative theories encompassed by the neo-charismatic paradigm include House's (1977) 1976 theory of Charismatic Leadership (CL), Bass' (1985) Theory of Transformational Leadership (TL), and Conger and Kanungo's (1987) Attributional Theory of Leadership.

We adopted this basic classification scheme with some refinements. Specifically, we broadened the LMX category and labeled it Multiple-Level Approaches to encompass the related but distinct approaches of Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975) and the Individualized Leadership (IL) approach advanced by Dansereau, Yammarino, Markham, Alutto, et al., (1995). We also broadened the ILT category and labeled it Leadership and Information Processing to include articles that apply principles of information processing to the study of leadership, but do not necessarily focus on ILTs. Finally, we added a category under the Recently Introduced Approaches category labeled, Other Prominent Approaches (established theories that do not fall within any of the other categories), as well as the more general categories of New Directions (less established but promising new directions for leadership theory, such as strategic leadership and political leadership), and Other Approaches (established theories from other fields that can be applied to study leadership, such as operant conditioning and institutional theory, or established leadership theories that do not fall within any other category, such as Hollander's (1978) idiosyncratic leadership theory.

A summary, by volume, of the frequencies with which particular leadership theories provided the conceptual focus for articles is presented in Table 4. In addition, an overall summary of the number and percentage of articles reflecting alternative theoretical foci over the course of the decade is provided in Table 5. In the sections that follow, we discuss the number and proportions of articles subsumed by each category in order of their chronological development.

Trait Theories

Roughly 8% (n = 17) of the LQ articles were classified as falling within the Trait Theories domain. This is the fifth highest percentage out of the eight major categories. Consistent with the growing interest in charismatic leadership, however, the Leader Motive Profile (LMP) theory (McClelland, 1975,1985)—which has been tied to the motives of such leaders (House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, Jafidian, Dickson, et al., 1991)—gained most of this attention (n = 8; 4%) (Deluga, 1998; Schmitt & Winter, 1998; Winter, 1991, 1998).

Behavioral Theories

The Behavioral Approaches received the least amount of attention from LQ authors (n = 5; 2.5%). Moreover, the fact that several articles (Fleishman, Mumford, Zaccaro, Levin, et al., 1991; Schneider, Paul, White, & Holcombe,1999; Schriesheim et al., 1995) in this category, while focusing on leader behavior, display differences in focus and methodology from the classical behavioral approaches, provides further evidence that interest in this once dominant paradigm has fallen off markedly.

Contingency Theories

The fourth highest category in terms of frequencies of LQ articles encompassed the Contingency Theories of leadership (n = 25;12%). Garnering the most attention were the Substitutes-for-Leadership theory (SFL; n = 9; 4.5%) (Howell, 1997; Jermier & Kerr, 1997; Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997; Scandura & Lankau, 1996; Schriesheim, 1997; Tosi & Kiker, 1997), Cognitive Resource Theory (CRT; n = 7; 3.5%) (Ayman et al., 1995; Fiedler, 1992, 1995; Fiedler & Garcia, 1987; Gibson, Fiedler, & Barrett, 1993; Murphy, Blyth, & Fiedler, 1992), and House's (1971, 1996) Path-Goal Theory (PGT; n = 5; 2.5%) (Evans, 1996; Jermier, 1996; Schriesheim & Neider, 1996), although most of the SFL and PGT articles were included as classic retrospectives. Other prominent contingency theories that secured relatively little attention include Fiedler's (1967,1995) Contingency Theory (n = 3; 1.5%), the Decision Processes Theory (DPT; n = 2; 1%) (Vroom & Jago, 1988, 1995; Vroom & Yetton, 1973), and Hersey and Blanchard's (1969) Situational Leadership Theory (SLT; , n = 2; 1%) (Fernandez & Vecchio, 1997; Graeff, 1997). Thus, it appears that the appeal and influence of the contingency approaches, which combined to provide the dominant paradigm for studying leadership research in the 1960s and 1970s, are waning.

Table 4. Leadership Paradigms and Theories reflected in *LQ* Articles

				Recently Introduced Theories						
Year/ Volume	*Trait Theories*	*Behavioral Theories*	*Contingency Theories*	*Multiple-level Approaches*	*Leadership and Info. Proc. (Imp. Ld. Th.)*	*Neo-charismatic Approaches*	*Other Prominent Approaches*	*New Directions*	*Other Approaches*	*Total*[a]
1990/1			1 (8%) DPT	1 (15%) LMX	1 (8%)	5 (38%) TL (3) CL (3)	4 (31%) LRPB (1) Inf. Tactics(1) TMT (1) ROL (1)		2 (15%) Operant Cond. (1) Institutional Theory (1)	13
1991/2	3 (21%) LMP (1) Social Intel. (1); Creativity (1)	1 (7%) LBD Tax. (1)	2 (14%) CRT (1) EOP Cont. Model (1)		1 (7%)	2 (14%) CL (2)	4 (29%) ROL (2) Power (2)	1 (7%) Servant Leadership	2 (14%) Institutional Theory (1) Liberalism (1)	14
1992/3	1 (6%) LMP(1)	1 (6%) Develop-mental Dimensions of Leadership	2 (13%) CRT (2)		2 (13%)	5 (31%) CL (3) TL (4)	1 (6%) LRPB (1)	3 (19%) Followership (1); Pygmalion Leader Style (1); Strategic Leadership (1)	3 (19%) Idiosyncratic Credits (1); Miscellaneous Other Theories (2)	16
1993/4	2 (13%) Dominance (1); Traits linked to Destructive Leader Acts (1)		2 (13%) CRT (1); SFL (1)	1 (6%) LMX		13 (81%) CL (9) TL (4)	2 (13%) Influence (1); LRPB (1)		1 (6%) Operant Conditions (1)	16

(continued)

Table 4. (Continued)

Year/ Volume	Trait Theories	Behavioral Theories	Contingency Theories	*Recently Introduced Theories*: Multiple-level Approaches	Leadership and Info. Proc. (Imp. Ld. Th.)	Neo-charismatic Approaches	Other Prominent Approaches	New Directions	Other Approaches	Total[a]
1994/5				1 (6%) Multi-Level Theory of Teams	3 (18%)	4 (24%) TL (3) CL (1)		1 (6%) Superleader-ship (1)	10 (59%) Leadership, Environment Social Change (9); Motivation to Manage (1)	17
1995/6	1 (4%) Traits linked to Destructive Leader Acts	1 (4%) Leader, Behavior (OSU)	4 (17%) FCT (2); CRT (2); DPT (1); PGT (1); SFL (1)	7 (29%) LMX (3); Individual Leadership (2); VDL (1); Multi-Org. Lev. Link. Mod (Hunt) (1); MLM (Yukl) (1)	2 (8%)	4 (17%) CL (3) TL (1)	2 (8%) LRPB (1) ROL (1)	1 (4%) Self-Leader-ship (1)	2 (8%) Corporate Governance (1); Leader Succession (2)	24
1996/7		1 (4%) Leader Behavior (OSU)	4 (16%) PGT (4)	2 (8%) LMX (2)	3 (12%)	3 (12%) TL (4) CL (2)	4 (16%) Influence Tactics (3); ROL (1)	2 (8%) Strategic Leadership (1); Political Leadership (1)	14 (56%) Diversity (7), Gender (6), and Culture (3)	25

(continued)

Table 4. (Continued)

				Recently Introduced Theories						
Year/ Volume	Trait Theories	Behavioral Theories	Contingency Theories	Multiple-level Approaches	Leadership and Info. Proc. (Imp. Ld. Th.)	Neo-charismatic Approaches	Other Prominent Approaches	New Directions	Other Approaches	Total[a]
1997/8	1 (4%) LMP		8 (35%) SFL (6); SLT (Hersey and Blanchard) (2)	3 (13%) LMX (2); MLM (1)	2 (9%)	6 (26%) CL (6)	6 (26%) LRPB (2); ROL (2); Influence Tactics (1); TMT (1)	3 (13%) Strategic Leadership (3)	11 (48%) Culture (6) and Cross-Cultural Leadership (5)	23
1998/9	7 (29%) LMP (3); Millon's Personality Theory (1); Self-Concept (1); Intelligence Dom./ Generalized Self-Efficacy (1)			2 (8%) LMX (2)	2 (8%)	7 (29%) TL (5); CL (4)	2 (8%) Inf. Tactics (1); ROL (1)	15 (63%) Political Leadership (11); 360-degree Feedback (2); Self-sacrificial Leadership (1); Leader Integrity (1)	1 (4%) Quality Improvement (1)	24
1999/10	2 (7%) LMP (2); Corr. of Adult Lead (Yukl and Van Fleet) (1)	1 (3%) LdrBeh (Yukl)	3 (10%) Fied. Cont. Th. (1); CRT (1); SFL (1)	2 (7%) LMX (2); VDL (1); IL (1); Leader Making (1)		19 (66%) CL (19) TL (13)	3 (10%) Power/ Politics (3)	3 (10%) Interim Leaders (1); Leadership Couple (1); Self-Sacrificial Leadership (1)	4 (14%) Sayles Managerial Behavior (4)	29
Total	17 (8%)	5 (2%)	25 (12%)	19 (9%)	16 (8%)	68 (34%)	28 (14%)	29 (14%)	50 (25%)	201

Note: The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.
[a] Totals include empirical, theoretical, and leadership classics articles.
Abbreviations: CL = Charismatic Leadership; CRT = Cognitive Research Theory; DPT = Decision Processes Theory; EOP = Environment/Organization/Personality; FCT = Fiedler's Cont. Theory; LBD = Leadership Behavior Dimension; LMP = Leader Most Proficient Theory; LMX = Leader-Member Exchange; LRPB = Leader Punish and Reward Behavior; MLM = Multiple Linkages Model; OSU = Ohio State Leader Behavior Approach; PGT = Path Goal Theory; ROL = Romance of Leadership; SFL = Substitute for Leadership; SLT = Situational Leadership Theory; TL = Transformational Leadership; TMT = Top Management Team.

Table 5. Prominent Leadership Theories Reflected in *LQ* Publications

Leadership Theories	*Publications Reflecting Theory* *Number*	*Percentage of Total Articles*
Trait Theories		
Leader Motive Profile (LMP) Theory	8	4
Other Trait Approaches	9	4.5
Total Publications	17	8.5
Behavioral Theories		
Leader Behavior Approach of the Ohio State Studies	2	1
Other Behavioral Approaches	3	1.5
Total Publications	5	2.5
Contingency Theories		
Substitutes-for-Leadership (SFL)	9	4.5
Cognitive Resource Theory (CRT)	7	3.5
Path-Goal Theory (PGT)	5	2.5
Fiedler's Contingency Theory (FCT)	3	1.5
Decision Process Theory (DPT)	2	1
Situational Leadership Theory (SLT)	2	1
Other Contingency Theories	3	1.5
Total Publications	25	12
Multiple-Level Approaches		
Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)	13	6.5
Individualized Leadership (IL)	3	1.5
Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL)	2	1
Multiple-Linkage Model (MLM)	2	1
Other Multiple-Level Approaches	2	1
Total Publications	19	9
Leadership and Information Processing	16	8
Neo-Charismatic Approaches		
Charismatic Leadership (CL)	52	26
Transformational Leadership (TL)	37	18
Total Publications	68	34
Other Prominent Approaches		
Romance of Leadership (ROL)	8	4
Influence Tactics	7	3.5
Leader Reward and Punishment Behavior (LRPB)	6	3
Power/Politics	5	2.5
Top Management Teams (TMT)	2	1
Total Publications	28	14
New Directions		
Political Leadership	12	6
Strategic Leadership	5	2.5
Self-Sacrificial Leadership	2	1
Other New Direction Approaches	9	4.5
Total Publications	29	14

Note: Totals do not equal the sum of the theories in a category, and category percentages do not sum to 100%, due to non-mutually exclusive coding.

Multiple-level Approaches

Articles pertaining to the multiple-level approaches were published with the sixth highest frequency (n = 19; 8%). The LMX approach accounted for most of this attention (Boyd & Taylor, 1998; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Graen, Wakabayashi, Graen, & Graen, 1990; Scandura, 1999; Scandura & Lankau, 1996; Schriesheim et al., 1999) with the fourth highest number of articles of any single theory (n = 13; 6.5%). Moreover, most of the other articles (Dansereau, 1995; Dansereau, Yammarino, Markham, Alutto, et al., 1995) pertain to the related IL (n = 3; 1.5%) and VDL (n = 2; 1 %) approaches. While several of these articles appeared in the special issue on multiple-level approaches, it is clear that these theories received consistent attention throughout the decade.

Neo-charismatic Approaches

As Tables 4 and 5 indicate, the neo-charismatic approaches of CL (n = 52 articles; 26%) and TL (n = 37 articles; 18%) are by far the most prominent theories represented in LQ, with over a third of the articles published falling in this category. Moreover, the lowest proportion of articles from the neo-charismatic paradigm for any given year was 12 percent (volume 7:1996), while this proportion reached highs of 66 (volume 10: 1999) and 81 percent (volume 4:1993) during years in which there was a special issue focusing on charismatic/transformational leadership. Clearly, the neo-charismatic approaches have generated considerable enthusiasm and been the subject for a substantial amount of theory and research.

Leadership and Information Processing

Although the number of articles (Foti & Luch, 1992; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hall & Lord, 1995; Keller, 1999; Lord & Maher, 1991; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994; Smith & Foti, 1998) included in this category represented the second smallest (n = 16; 8%), we should note that the category includes only one theory— the information processing perspective developed by Lord and his colleagues. Moreover, this number constitutes the third largest group of articles for any single leadership theory. It is also noteworthy that the information processing perspective of leadership was by far the best represented theory among those that were not highlighted in a special issue. Given the apparent interest of leadership scholars in this approach, perhaps this would be a worthy topic for a special issue in the future.

Other Prominent Approaches

For the Other Prominent Approaches (n = 28;14%) category, the most common theories include the Romance of Leadership (ROL; n = 8; 4%) (Meindl, 1990, 1995), influence tactics, Leader Reward and Punishment Behavior (LRPB; n = 6; 3%) (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1995; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982), and power/ politics (n = 5; 2.5%) (House, 1991). Given the increased attention that these theories have received, including their explicit inclusion in Organizational Behavior textbooks (Greenberg & Baron, 2000; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 1994), it is surprising to find that they have not garnered greater interest within the pages of LQ.

New Directions

The second highest number of leadership theories reflected in LQ fell within the New Directions (n = 29; 14%) category, suggesting that the journal devotes substantial attention to emerging leadership approaches. While the best-represented theories under the new directions category focused on political leadership (n = 12; 6%), nearly all of these articles appeared in volume 9 (Simonton, 1998a, c) as part of the special issue on the topic. Because political leadership constitutes an under-researched area within the field (House & Aditya, 1997), these numbers show the key role a special issue in LQ can play in focusing theoretical and empirical attention on such areas of need. Nevertheless, the lack of attention devoted to this topic in prior and subsequent LQ issues, as well as the relatively low numbers of articles focusing on another area identified by House and Aditya as being in dire need of study—strategic leadership—suggests that the capacity for the journal to generate at-large submissions on particular topics is limited.

Conclusion

Together, the relatively low frequencies for the trait, behavioral, and contingency theories and the high numbers of neo-charismatic articles provide dramatic evidence of a paradigm shift. They also reinforce the observation of Hunt (1999) and others (Hunt & Conger, 1999a, 1999b) that the neo-charismatic paradigm has captured the imagination of many leadership scholars and served to re-invigorate the field.

Research Design

Quantitative versus Qualitative Methods

A summary of the research designs used in the empirical articles published in LQ is presented in Table 6. We make a distinction between articles that used quantitative (Podsakoff, 1994) versus qualitative (Bryman, 1996; Conger, 1998; Tierney, 1996; Waldman, Lituchy, Gopalakrishnan, Laframboise, Galperin, & Kaltsounakis, 1998) methods; because some studies adopted both types of methods (e.g., Den Hartog et al., 1999; Ehrlich, Meindl, & Viellieu,1990), a category labeled "both" was included. As the table indicates, studies published in

LQ employed a healthy mix of quantitative (n = 73; 71%) and qualitative (n = 40; 39%) methods; a small subset of studies adopted both approaches (n = 13;13 %). For most volumes, the ratio of quantitative to qualitative studies is at least 2 to 1. The lone exception to this rule is volume 5 (1994), which published more qualitative (n = 6; 55%) than quantitative (n = 5; 45%) studies; most of these qualitative studies appeared in numbers 3 and 4 of the 2 part special issue on environmental and social change. Thus, although quantitative methods were used with greater frequency than qualitative methods, the later were published at higher rates than is typically the case at other outlets for leadership research (e.g., Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Applied Psychology, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes). As such, we believe the goal of LQ's founders to create a journal that was receptive to a broad array of methods for studying leadership has been achieved.

Table 6. Research Design

		Methodological Approach			*Research Setting*		*Time Horizon*			
Year	*Volume*	*Quantity*	*Quality*	*Both*	*Field*	*Laboratory*	*Cross-sectional*	*Longi-tudinal*	*Total*[a]	*Subjects*
1990	1	8 (73%)	4 (36%)	2 (18%)	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	11	Manager/Leader (8), Subordinates/Followers (4), Students (3), Employees (1)
1991	2	3[b] (100%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3	Manager/Leader (3)
1992	3	4[b] (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	5	Manager/Leader (4), Subordinates/Followers (4)
1993	4	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	10	Manager/Leader (7), Subordinates/Followers (5), Students (3), Chapter of Bass (1990)
1994	5	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	0 (0%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	11	Manager/Leader(8), Subordinates/Followers (3), Students (3), Employees (2), Published and Unpublished Data Sets (1)
1995	6	9[b] (82%)	5 (45%)	3 (27%)	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	11	Manager/Leader (10), Subordinates/Followers (4), Peers (1), Students (2)
1996	7	10 (91%)	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	11	Manager/Leader (9), Subordinates/Followers (3), Superiors (3), Students (1), Published and Unpublished Data Sets (1)
1997	8	9 (75%)	4 (33%)	1 (8%)	12 (10%)	0 (0%)	11 (92%)	1 (9%)	12	Manager/Leader (6), Subordinates/Followers (2), Employees (2) Top Management Team (TMT; 1), Organization (1)
1998	9	15 (88%)	4 (24%)	2 (12%)	16 (94%)	2 (12%)	15 (88%)	2 (12%)	17	Manager/Leader (10), Subordinates/Followers (3), Students (3), 360-Feedback Team (2), Employees (1), Soldiers (1), Organization (1)
1999	10	8 (67%)	5 (42%)	2 (17%)	6 (55%)	5 (45%)	7 (58%)	5 (45%)	12	Manager/Leader (5), Students (5), Employees (1), Organization (1), LQ Volume 10/ Issues 2&3 articles (1)
Total		73 (71%)	40 (39%)	13 (13%)	82 (0%)	21 (20%)	82 (80%)	19 (18%)	103	Mgrs/Ldrs (70), Subordinates/Followers (31), Students (20), Emp. (6), Org. (3), 360-Fdbk Team (1), Peers (1), TMT (1), MS/Study Data Sets (3), Bass (1)

Notes: [a] The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.
[b] Data presented in some of these studies had been previously published and was reproduced for illustrative purposes.

Research Setting

A surprisingly high proportion (n = 82; 80%) of LQ studies took place in field settings, while the number of studies conducted as part of a laboratory experiment (n = 21; 20%) was relatively low. Thus, most of LQ's empirical articles are not open to charges of suspect external validity resulting from an overreliance on experimental research in "artificial" settings (Campbell, 1986; Campbell & Stanley, 1967). Of course, the extent to which the findings obtained in certain field settings will generalize to other field settings remains an open question. Moreover, as Locke (1986), Henshel (1980) and several LQ authors (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Brown & Lord, 1999; Hunt, Boal, & Dodge, 1999; Wofford, 1999) argue, such external validity criticisms are often misplaced. Laboratory research clearly has its place in the social sciences, not necessarily to show what does occur, but to illustrate what could occur under certain circumstances (Mook,1983). In other words, laboratory studies can provide insights into basic social processes, such as leadership, that might never be revealed in the field. To the extent that such insights nevertheless shed light on processes that arise in natural settings, they have real practical value. For this reason, one might wonder if experimental methods have been underutilized by LQ authors. Interestingly, the current editor of LQ, Jerry Hunt (1999b), has come to precisely this conclusion and has encouraged leadership scholars to make more extensive use of this methodology.

Time Horizon

As is the case in most social science journals, relatively few longitudinal studies (n = 19; 18%), in comparison to cross-sectional studies (n = 82; 80%), were published in LQ. An obvious explanation for this finding is that university reward structures, which require yearly evaluations and a steady output of publications, discourage faculty from initiating long-term projects, especially during the initial phases of their academic careers. Thus, the low proportion of longitudinal studies in LQ is hardly surprising. Still, the inclusion of a report on the initial findings of the longitudinal GLOBE study (Den Hartog et al., 1999), which is entering its 6th year of data collection, is encouraging. Perhaps other established researchers will follow Bob House's lead and embark on more long-term cooperative investigations of leadership.

Participants

Given the predominance of LQ studies conducted in field settings, it is not surprising that the most common participants were practicing managers/leaders (n = 70; 68%). In contrast to other disciplines and journals, the proportion of studies using student samples (n = 20; 19%) is relatively low. Thus, the common criticism of other journals that they reflect the "science of the college sophomore" does not apply to LQ. Unfortunately, another criticism of the field is warranted for many of these studies. Specifically, many sample managers to study leadership, under the implicit but fallacious assumption that all managers are leaders (Zaleznik, 1977). Similarly, the studies that sample subordinates (n = 31) to learn about leadership often assume that they are followers. Obviously, this assumption is subject to question, since the reasons why subordinates perform assigned duties may stem solely from job and role requirements, as opposed to anything the leader may or may not do. While Kerr and Jermier (1978) eloquently made this point in advancing Substitutes for Leadership theory, many researchers continue to equate management with leadership and select their samples accordingly.

Data Collection Methods

A summary of the data collection methods adopted in LQ studies is presented in Table 7. The relatively high proportions of studies using questionnaires (n = 66; 64%) and, to a lesser extent, interviews (n = 21; 20%), suggest that survey research is the preferred mode of data collection. Secondary sources (n = 28; 27%), such as archival records and biographical data, were also used at relatively high rates. Less common approaches include observational methods (n = 8; 8%), experimental measures (e.g., performance on problem solving tasks), and projective tests (e.g., the Thematic Apperception Test) (McClelland, 1985). Given the relatively narrow range of data collection methods reflected in LQ studies, we suspect that both the journal and the field of leadership in general could benefit from an influx of alternative measures.

Analytical Methods

Coding Scheme

Table 8 provides a year-by-year summary of the analytical methods adopted by empirical LQ articles. These methods are grouped into two broad categories: quantitative and qualitative. Consistent with common texts on statistical methods (Kerlinger, 1986; Stevens, 1992), the quantitative methods category is divided into the subcategories of descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, mode, standard deviation, frequencies), simple inferential statistics (e.g., t-tests, correlations, X^2), and multivariate statistics. The latter sub-category is further divided to distinguish between specific techniques, including regression analysis, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)/ Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and Structural Equations Modeling (SEM). Given the growing recognition of the need to study leadership at multiple levels of analysis, a category for Within- and Between-Analysis (WABA) (Dansereau et al., 1984) and the within-group agreement coefficient, $_{rWG}$ (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984) was created. An "other" category was also used to capture methods that do not fall under the above categories. With regard to the qualitative methods, categories were created for case analysis, grounded theory (Parry, 1998), and content analysis (Insch, Moore, & Murphy, 1997). Because these categories are not mutually exclusive, and many studies use more than one method, multiple categories were often coded for a single study.

Quantitative Methods

Not surprisingly, most of the LQ studies that used quantitative methods reported descriptive statistics (n = 68; 87%) and simple inferential statistics (n = 54; 69%). With regard to multivariate statistics, regression analysis (n = 25; 32%), ANOVA/ MANOVA (n = 22; 28%), and EFA (n = 28%) were used most often. While the use of Confirmatory Factor Analysis and other forms of Structural Equation Modeling increased dramatically in the social sciences over the course of the decade, these methods were only used by 11 (14%) and 10 (13%) LQ studies, respectively. Only 10 studies (13%) reported using WABA and/or the within-group agreement coefficient (rWG)—several of which were primarily published to illustrate these techniques (Schriesheim, 1995; Schriesheim et al., 1999; Schriesheim et al., 1995; Yammarino, 1998b; Yammarino & Bass, 1991).

Moreover, only two meta-analyses were performed during the decade. These findings suggest that the potential exists for contributors to LQ to better capitalize on the wealth of sophisticated statistical techniques, such as WABA, that have been developed over the past 25 years. Of course, there is always a real danger that more powerful statistics, if misapplied or applied to data of questionable validity, can do more harm than good by adding confusion and spurious findings to the literature. Still, as Schriesheim and his colleagues (Schriesheim,1995; Schriesheim et al., 1999) and Yammarino (1998b) have shown, there is considerable room for improvement in the field with regard to the statistical techniques we use and the manner in which they are applied.

Qualitative Methods

As Table 8 indicates, qualitative methods (n = 40) were used with roughly half the frequency of quantitative methods (n = 78), with content analysis being applied most often (n = 20; 53%), followed by case studies (n = 17; 45%), and grounded theory (n = 9; 24%). Because some disciplines, such as sociology and political science, favor qualitative methods, they were more common in special issues pertinent to these fields (e.g., leadership for environmental and social change, leadership and diversity, political leadership). These findings suggest that special issues are an effective means of inducing scholars from a wider range of disciplines—with fresh theoretical perspectives and alternative methodologies—to publish in LQ.

Table 7. Data Collection Methods

Year	Volume	Questionnaire	Interview	Observation	Secondary Sources	Experimental Measures	Other	Total
1990	1	8 (73%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11
1991	2	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%) Assess. Ctr and Themat. App. Test (TAT)	3
1992	3	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	5
1993	4	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	10
1994	5	8 (73%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11
1995	6	5 (45%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11
1996	7	8 (73%)	3 (27%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	11
1997	8	9 (75%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	12
1998	9	11 (65%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	9 (53%)	0 (0%)	2 (12%) Assess. Ctr (1); TAT (1)	17
1999	10	7 (58%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	12
Total		66 (64%)	21 (20%)	8 (8%)	28 (27%)	7 (7%)	4 (4%)	103

Note: The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.

Table 8. Analytical Methods used in Empirical *LQ* Articles

	Quantitative Methods										*Qualitative Methods*			
	Simple		*Multivariate Statistics*											
Year/ Volume	*Desc. Stat.*	*Inf. Stat.*	*Regres- sion*	*ANOVA MANOVA*	*EFA*	*CFA*	*SEM*	*WABA (r_{WG})*	*Other*	*Total Quantity*	*Case*	*Grounded Theory*	*Content Analysis*	*Total Quality*
1990/1	6 (75%)	4 (50%)	3 (28%)	2 (25%) 2 (M) 1 (A&M)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%) Discrim. Analysis	8	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4
1991/2	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%) Utility Analysis	3	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1
1992/3	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (A) (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1
1993/4	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)	2 (A) (29%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%) Discourse Analysis	3
1994/5	5 (100%)	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	2 (A) (40%)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (40%) Meta-Analysis (1); Multi-Dim. Scale (1)	5	5 (83%) Action Res. (1)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	6

(continued)

Table 8. Continued)

	Quantitative Methods										Qualitative Methods			
		Simple		Multivariate Statistics										
Year/ Volume	*Desc. Stat.*	*Inf. Stat.*	*Regres-sion*	*ANOVA MANOVA*	*EFA*	*CFA*	*SEM*	*WABA (r_{WG})*	*Other*	*Total Quantity*	*Case*	*Grounded Theory*	*Content Analysis*	*Total Quality*
1995/6	5 (56%)	5 (56%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%) 3 (A) 1 (A&M)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%) Discrim. Analysis	9	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%) Histriometry (1)	5
1996/7	9 (90%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	6 (60%) 6 (A) 4 (A&M)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%) Meta-analysis	10	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%) Histriometry (1)	5
1997/8	9 (100%)	7 (78%)	6 (67%)	2 (A) (22%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	9	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%) Critical Incid. (1); Discourse Analysis (1); Histri-ometry (1)	4
1998/9	15 (100%)	14 (93%)	6 (40%)	3 (A) (20%)	5 (33%)	3 (20%)	4 (27%) PLS (2)	3 (20%)	2 (13%) MULTI-LOG (1); Psycho-diagnostic Meta-analysis (1)	15	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%) Histriometry (1)	4
1999/10	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	2 (25%)	4 (50%) 1 (A) 1 (M) 3 (A&M)	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%) Semiotics	8	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	4 (80%) Semiotics (1)	5
Total	68 (87%)	54 (69%)	27 (35%)	25 (32%)	22 (28%)	11 (14%)	10 (13%)	10 (13%)	9 (12%)	78	17 (45%)	9 (24%)	20 (53%)	40

Note: The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.

Table 9. Levels of Analysis: Theoretical/Methodological *LQ* Articles

		Individual								
Year	*Volume*	*Leader/ Manager*	*Follower/ Subordinate*	*Other Individuals*	*Dyad*	*Group*	*Organization*	*Multiple*	*Other Levels*	*Total*
1990	1	1 (50%)						1 (50%)		2
1991	2	9 (69%)					1 (8%)	3 (23%)		13
1992	3	12 (86%)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)			14
1993	4	1 (13%)	1 (13%)					5 (63%)	1 (13%) Collective	8
1994	5	6 (50%)	2 (17%)			1 (8%)	4 (33%)	1 (17%)		12
1995	6	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)			3 (21%)	3 (21%) (collective, situation, relationship)	14
1996	7	6 (40%)		1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)		4 (27%)		15
1997	8	3 (50%)	3 (50%)		3 (50%)	2 (33%)				6
1998	9	2 (29%)			1 (14%)			4 (57%)		7
1999	10	5 (31%)	1 (6%)		1 (6%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	8 (50%)		16
Total		46 (43%)	13 (12%)	3 (3%)	10 (9%)	7 (7%)	7 (7%)	29 (27%)	4 (4%)	107

The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.

Table 10. Levels of Analysis: Empirical *LQ* Articles

		Individual								
Year	*Volume*	*Leader/ Manager*	*Follower/ Subordinate*	*General Individual*	*Dyad*	*Group*	*Organization*	*Multiple*	*Other Levels*	*Total*
1990	1	9 (82%)			2 (18%)	1 (9%)				11
1991	2	3 (100%)					2 (67%)			3
1992	3	5 (100%)	1 (20%)		1 (20%)	1 (20%)				5
1993	4	6 (60%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)		2 (20%)		1 (10%)		10
1994	5	3 (27%)	2 (18%)			1 (9%)				11
1995	6	5 (45%)		2 (18%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)		3 (27%)		11
1996	7	9 (82%)	3 (27%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)				11
1997	8	10 (83%)	4 (33%)		2 (17%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)			12
1998	9	15 (88%)	3 (18%)					2 (12%)		17
1999	10	6 (50%)	3 (25%)		2 (17%)		4 (33%)	3 (25%)		12
Total		71 (70%)	18 (17%)	4 (4%)	10 (10%)	11 (11%)	7 (7%)	9 (7%)		103

Note: The category percentages may not total to 100 due to missing data and non-mutually exclusive coding.

Levels of Analysis

Summaries by volume of the levels of analysis examined for theoretical/ methodological and empirical articles are provided in Tables 9 and 10, respectively. Because most LQ articles fail explicitly to specify the level of analysis (Hunt & Conger, 1999b), we were often required to use our subjective judgment to do so. As emphasized in the special issue on multi-level approaches (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Dansereau, 1995; Dansereau, Yammarino, & Markham, 1995; Dansereau, Yammarino, Markham, Alutto, et al., 1995; Hall & Lord, 1995; Hunt & Ropo, 1995; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1995; Schriesheim, 1995) and elsewhere in LQ (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Hunt & Conger, 1999b; Yammarino, 1998b; Yammarino & Bass, 1991), greater attention to the levels of analysis is needed if we are to discern the complexities with which, and the levels at which, leadership phenomena occur.

As the tables indicate, the individual level of analysis (leader/manager, follower/ subordinate, or individuals in general) was most prevalent. More specifically, for both the theoretical/methodological (n = 46; 43%) and empirical (n = 71; 70%) articles, the tables suggest that the leader/ manager most often served as the focal point for the analysis, followed by followers/subordinates with 18 (17%) and 13 (12%) articles, respectively.

Analyses conducted at the dyad (10% for both categories of articles), group (7% of the theoretical/ methodological articles/11% of the empirical articles), and organization (7% for both categories of articles) levels were less common. Most striking is the finding that the proportion of conceptual/ methodological (n = 29; 27%) to empirical (n = 29; 27%) articles that were framed at multiple levels of analysis is approximately 3 to 1. Thus, we appear to do a better job of conceiving of leadership at multiple levels, and describing methodological approaches for investigating leadership at multiple levels, than we do of actually studying leadership at multiple levels. While there are certainly challenges that must be overcome to conduct leadership research at multiple levels of analysis, such research is essential to advancing the field (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Dansereau, Yammarino, & Markham, 1995; Hunt & Conger, 1999b) and to avoiding what have been shown to be spurious results (Schriesheim et al., 1995). Thus, we need to do a better job as a discipline of conceptualizing and investigating leadership at the individual (leader and follower), dyad, group, and collective levels.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

In the preceding sections we discussed the founding of LQ, the extent to which it has achieved its vision, and the variety of contributions made in its first decade. We now turn our attention to directions for future research. By highlighting promising avenues for research, we hope to illuminate the excitement that this time holds for leadership researchers.

Strategic Leadership

There is a great need for theory and research at the top management level. House (1996) notes that we still lack theories of leadership as it relates to major organizational change, political behavior, or strategic competitive organizational performance. Some studies in journals such as Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Management, and Strategic Management Journal focus on the content of top management level decision making (matching strategy to performance). Few studies, however, focus on those processes that result in leaders (mis)appropriately making decisions and their attending consequences for organizational performance (House & Aditya, 1997). Much of the existing research is small sample qualitative summaries, secondary data studies, or limited variable cross-sectional research (Hitt, Gimeno, & Hoskinsson, 1998).

Each of these approaches has significant limitations for understanding process. Secondary data studies often make the questionable assumption that bibliographic demographic variables can be used as proxies for cognitive style and worldviews (Lowe & Kroeck,1998; Rodriguez, 1998). Cross-sectional studies provide a snapshot from which many authors infer causality that is open to alternative conjectures. For example, Scully, Sims, Olian, Schnell, et al. (1994) provide a snapshot of CEOs in poor performing firms and suggest that they are more likely to exhibit tougher (strongmen) behaviors in subsequent periods, inferring a relationship between CEO behavior and firm performance. The cross-sectional design, however, allows for the alternative conjecture that the poor performing firms were characterized by strongmen in the first place. This example is not intended as a critique of the Scully et al. (1994) study; they make the requisite acknowledgment of competing influences such as culture and strategy. The point is to indicate what we are missing with current designs that fail to explore the processes that shape top management behaviors. Implicit leadership theorists (ILT) might take a process approach to this study and explore the ILTs of leaders before and after poor performance feedback. It would be interesting to know if negative feedback caused leaders to change their ILTs or if they hold different ILTs for different performance scenarios. Alternatively, it may be that powerful constituents such as Boards of Directors, large shareholders, and strong top management team (TMT) members hold ILTs for poor performance contexts and that CEOs take the role that appears most consistent with constituent ILTs to enhance job tenure. Taking a process oriented approach with different theoretical lenses (e.g., agency theory, institutional theory, resource dependence theory) is likely to result in a much richer understanding of strategic leadership.

A process approach also enhances the potential for collaboration between strategy and leadership researchers. Leavy (1996) provides a contextualist model of leadership that incorporates a process focus to propose new priorities for future leadership research. The framework calls for an examination of the changing effectiveness of leadership performance over time and tenure, a relatively new focus for the strategy field. Leavy argues that as strategy begins to shift from the traditional deterministic emphasis on strategy-structure-systems relationships, toward a more contextual emphasis on purpose-people-process linkages (cf. Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1994, 1995; Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1995), a more sociological treatment of leadership in the strategy field is required. Such a model might be extended to explore process differences in domestic and multinational firms. Elron (1997) found that cultural heterogeneity affects both TMT processes and performance, and the performance of the organization for which the TMT is responsible—the overseas subsidiary. Cultural heterogeneity of TMTs was positively related to both the level of issue-based conflict and TMT performance. Elron concludes by calling for a more refined measure of TMT's cultural values and culturally based cognitive resources that would result in a deeper understanding of the differential effect of values and cognitions on group processes and performance.

Given that we know very little about the processes that result in top management decision choices, a number of research questions can be proposed for which there are partial answers in the literature. What leadership approaches are required to galvanize TMTs to achieve high levels of performance? How do transformational or transactional leadership impact the range of strategic choice or executive compensation levels? What information processing approaches do effective top managers and their executive teams employ? How do organizational and environmental factors influence these processes? How does the process of interaction between top management and the board of directors impact organizational performance? Are the processes required for short-term performance the same as or different from those required for gaining long-term competitive advantage? What is the influence of top management behaviors on the meaning making processes of lower organizational levels?

Balancing this call for research is a contrarian view that this could be much ado about nothing. The view embedded in such theories as population ecology and advanced by Knights and Morgan (1992) is that an emphasis on Corporate Strategic Leadership (CSL) may be a temporal phenomenon. While CSL enjoys a high profile and public legitimacy, scholars must be vigilant to ascertain when and where it applies.

Levels of Analysis

LQ has made a key contribution to the field of leadership by elevating awareness of the need to be more rigorous in identifying and testing for appropriate levels of analysis. This effort produced two clear themes. First, theorists must increase clarity about the levels of analysis at which their theories hold. Second, researchers must be careful to collect and test data at the levels of analysis specified by the theory. The combination of incompletely specified theories and tests of theories at inappropriate levels may in part explain the sometimes troubling disparities in research findings.

Levels-of-analysis research has resulted in a healthy call to reexamine many of our popular leadership theories. Schriesheim (1997) and Gronn (1999) call for a refinement of SFL theory and encourage theorists and researchers to adopt a levels-of-analysis perspective in this examination. Vroom and Jago (1995) advocate research designs that focus on multiple levels of analysis including person effects, situational effects, person-by-situation effects, and group-by-situation effects, to better understand the influence that autocratic and participative behaviors exert on leadership effectiveness. Ayman et al. (1995) argue that after 30 years the contingency model is still viable in part due to the addition of individual and dyadic levels to the traditional group focus. Shamir (1999a) and Klein and House (1995) make a case for replacing the dyadic perspective that permeates charismatic/transformational leadership theories with a set of distinct yet interrelated influence processes that operate at the dyadic, group, and organizational levels. Schriesheim et al. (1999) implicate the tendencies of LMX researchers to not specify the level of analysis, focus on an inappropriate level of analysis, or use inappropriate data-analytic techniques for the level of analysis, in their call for improved LMX theory. Schriesheim et al. (1995) conclude that given the measurement problems of prior studies and their failure to specify and/or test the level(s) of analysis, past findings and their utility for developing theory are suspect. We agree that more research is needed to determine the proportions of variance that can be attributed to individual, group, and organization levels. However, we are less pessimistic about the value of prior research. Where tests of theory have yielded mixed results, a meta-analysis that treats the levels of analysis as a moderator might yield useful and more specific findings. Overall, we concur with Schriesheim et al.'s (1995) assessment. The bad news is considerable research is required before we can be confident about leadership at different levels of analysis while the good news is that the multiple levels perspective has called attention to issues that will enhance future theory building and testing.

Leadership Development and Leadership Systems

We do not know enough about how organizational systems develop leaders (Conger, 1998) or how organizational conditions enhance the efficiency of leadership development efforts (House & Howell, 1992). Day (2000) notes that there is considerable interest among leadership development practitioners but surprising little scholarly interest in the topic. Gronn (1999) points out that leadership scholars tend to overstate the role of individual leaders. He offers the alternative notion of a "leadership regime" that encompasses the range from a solo leader to dyads, triads, and even quartets, to top management groups, to entourages of advisers, and more opaque institutional entities such as an "administration" or even "the establishment." We know little about how leadership regimes form or what makes them effective. Research might explore what factors enhance leadership development at General Electric that are more or less present in Whirlpool or Proctor & Gamble.[3] Is it the choice of rotational assignments? Timing of these assignments? Formal leadership development programs? Job variables such as scope and autonomy? Are the variables different across these organizations or are they the same constellation of variables with differential configurations?

The preceding questions focus on the understudied processes by which organizational systems can enhance development. Though we know little about these processes, the literature strongly suggests that experience impacts behavior (Lord & Hall, 1992), and that the required leadership qualities and their relative contribution vary by organizational level (Card, 1997; Hunt, 1991; Lindell & Rosenqvist, 1992; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz,1988). By learning more about systematic developmental processes, researchers can strengthen the link between leadership development systems and required managerial competencies and thereby enhance practice. Eden (1992), in a study of Pygmalion effects, developed a seven-component model that shows how self-fulfilling prophecies arise. Noting that leaders and followers with high self-efficacy tend to perform at higher levels, Eden states that organizational culture impacts self-efficacy and that too many of such cultures foster negative self-efficacy. Collectively these findings suggest that leadership development systems may be a source of competitive advantage that is difficult to duplicate. Yet how leadership systems are constructed for competitive advantage, or if this is an intentional process, is not well understood.

Within the organization are specific leadership developmental programs such as in-house and out-sourced educational programs, rotation systems, and training initiatives. Yet there are few if any studies that document the content of such programs or their impact on leadership development (Conger, 1998). Murphy, Blyth, and Fiedler (1992) found no training programs whose content included the relatively central concept of when leaders should, and should not, be directive. Russell and Kuhnert (1992) noted that despite evidence that a transformational leadership style might result in higher levels of effectiveness (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996), most training focuses on transactional behaviors because they are easier to train.

With respect to impact, many leadership development programs are characterized by one-off experiences where the sole assessment is a short survey that primarily measures participant affective reaction. What is less well understood is what parts of a program "stick" with participants and why. To what extent is retention and practice impacted by training expectations, stage of individual development, mix of participants, the setting, trainer attributes or more macro factors such as industry and general economic conditions? What are the organizational enablers and derailers of implementing learned techniques? How can the organization better support individuals following a developmental experience?

The role of time in evaluating and understanding the impacts of leadership development programs deserves more rigorous attention. Is leadership performance following a developmental program most enhanced immediately after the program, 3 months later, or 2 years later? What is the "payback period" for leadership development programs? Does it differ for non-leadership behavioral training and why? Do other organizational members adjust their expectations for leadership and non-leadership training and development? If the answer is no, what are the consequences, and if it is yes, how did the organization learn to expect these time differentials? As a corollary, should the organization expect short-term performance decrements as leaders struggle to implement new behaviors learned in developmental programs? Should "soft landing" systems be put in place following developmental experiences to tolerate short-term decrements for long term payoffs? It is far easier to ask questions in this arena than to find empirical answers. Leadership development processes and outcomes would appear to be an especially fertile area for the fusion of multiple and interdisciplinary approaches.

Leadership Context

Our review suggests that context, in both its social and temporal form, has been understudied. Indeed, this theme echoes throughout the pages of LQ. Yukl (1998) argues that leadership theory and research should not only reflect the leaders' attributes and behaviors but also contextual determinants of leader emergence and effectiveness. Bryman (1996) defines leadership as relationships embedded in a social setting at a given moment. By implication, he argues, leadership strategies should consider the normative basis of the relationship, the setting for the interaction, and the attributes of the individuals involved. Leadership researchers, in turn, should incorporate into their studies the same variables to which their subjects attend. Although contextual variables are explicitly identified in several leadership theories, they are often absent or subjugated to other variables in theory testing. Tosi and Kiker (1997), in a discussion of the contributions of Substitutes for Leadership theory, advanced the simple (in retrospect) notion that organizational context, personal characteristics, and group processes can produce hierarchical leadership effects. Yet much of the research on Substitutes for Leadership treats context as background rather than foreground. Despite Meindl's (1993) praise that Kerr and Jermier's (1978) classic is one of four key articles severely to question conventional leadership wisdom, an over-reliance on cross-sectional designs has left us knowing relatively little about how substitutes exert their effects.

As a complement to the traditional context as background approach, future leadership research might consider treating context as the independent variable and leadership behavior as a moderator. The impetus for this approach stems from several authors. Jermier and Kerr (1997) contend that the Substitutes for Leadership framework should be viewed less as a contingency model than a screen to determine whether interpersonal leadership should be part of a particular study. In a similar vein, Shamir (1999a) expresses dismay with the dyadic perspective that permeates charismatic and transformational leadership theories, and argues that the literature has overextended the theory to suggest nearly universal applicability of these forms of leadership. He also notes that much greater attention needs to be directed toward identifying the facilitating and limiting context for charismatic and transformational leadership, including conditions where it is either unnecessary or likely to have negative effects. Consistent with these views, Yukl (1999) proposes that charismatic leadership is more likely to be effective when unique, dynamic, exceptional, or otherwise "weak" behavioral guidelines exist and where congruent shared values are the primary means of coordination. Future research might consider investigating two theories simultaneously to determine how context determines, moderates, mediates, or neutralizes the relationship between leadership behavior and leadership outcomes. The work of Howell (1997) on the "need for leadership" may be useful in testing for the existence and importance of substitution effects.

The literature provides some guidance on how context might be expected to impact leadership behavior and effectiveness. Tosi and Kiker (1997) argued that the configuration and results of substitutes are likely to vary by organization type. For example, substitutes in organic organizations are more likely to include social controls, norms, values, and professional socialization than in mechanistic organizations. Substitutes may also vary by organizational level as a function of managers' role requirements and responsibilities. Jermier (1997) suggests that we need to clarify how substitutes develop, how leadership interactions change when substitutes are introduced, and how organizational actors across levels respond to various substitutes.

Finally, the absence of context as an explanatory variable cannot be attributed to its recent discovery. Osborn (1999), in a review of Leonard Sayles' (1964) classic, Managerial Behavior, notes that Sayles described managers as filling a set of roles that fall squarely in the middle of a stream of relationships rather than a neatly bounded job. This stream of relationships is defined in part by the interface among organizational environments, organizational design, and managerial roles. Writing 35 years later, Osborn found Sayles' earlier discussion of the shifting balances among environmental forces, organizational pressures, and individual initiative to be both provocative and understudied. He concludes that as modern leadership scholars return to pursue a more integrated view of the world, Sayles' ideas about the interplay of leadership with the environmental and organizational context still have much to offer. We agree.

A wide range of settings and contexts deserve more attention from leadership researchers. We name but a few here for illustrative purposes. We have relatively little systematic knowledge about leadership in social movements. We need to know more about political leadership not only at the national level but also at the international level. We need to know more about leadership in not-for-profit and community service organizations. How does the absence of monetary metrics of performance determinants impact the role of leaders? What is the process whereby community service leaders manage by influence and galvanize multiple constituencies to sanction and fund their endeavors? Clearly, management by influence rather than hierarchy is becoming increasingly important in for-profit organizations. Yet some writers cast the requirement to manage by influence rather than by hierarchy as a new technology-driven phenomenon. Though it may be relatively new to for-profit organizations, community organizations possessing decades of experience in managing through influence would appear to be an especially attractive avenue for research in this area.

Females as Leaders

Though research on females as leaders has been increasing, the topic remains understudied. Whether this results from uneven interest in male and female leadership or subtle pressure to take the politically correct view that gender does not matter is unclear. The literature, however, suggests gender differences in leadership styles, and some authors (Atwater, Camobreco, Dionne, Avolio, & Lau, 1997) call for replications to explore potential gender effects. We believe the topic has both theoretical and practical utility.

Several gender-based differences in leadership are suggested by LQ authors. Offermann et al. (1994) posit that ILTs differ as a function of experience. Consequently, the differential experiences both within and across roles for male and female leaders may impact their ILTs and hence their leadership styles (Adler, 1996). Druskat's (1994) study of gender segregated units of the Roman Catholic Church offers further evidence of gender-based and gender composition effects on leader behaviors and their interpretations. She found women to be more transformational than transactional in general and more transformational than men in comparison. Further, women subordinates prefer less active monitoring and tolerate passive leadership behaviors more than men. Eagly, Karau, Miner, and Johnson (1994) found females to score lower on the Motivation to Manage scale, but emphasize that the scale was developed for male dominated hierarchical roles. They suggest that an analog scale, based on organizations dominated by sharing and collaboration, should be constructed to assess the validity of prior findings. Research is needed to explore how gender composition, in terms of both absolute numbers and relationships to the power infrastructure, impacts the effectiveness of leadership styles. To the extent the leadership process involves reciprocity, it may also be useful to explore how gender differences impact follower expectations, and by extension, leadership effectiveness.

Gender-based differences in leader motives, expectations, and the exercise of influence are also suggested by several LQ studies. Berdahl (1996) demonstrated that all-male groups show more agentic (self-oriented) behavior than all-female groups, which show more communal behavior. Similarly, Lauterbach and Weiner (1996) found that female managers' upward influence processes reflect interdependency and social connection, while male managers' influence processes reflect more independence and autonomy. Their results also imply that females are more likely to act out of organizational interest, consider others' viewpoints, involve others in planning, and focus on both task and interpersonal aspects. By contrast, males were more likely to act out of self-interest, show less concern for others' feelings, plan alone, and focus primarily on task aspects. Watson and Hoffman (1996) showed that managerial women express less confidence and satisfaction with their performance than managerial men, but do not differ in their behavior or the outcomes achieved. These latter findings suggest that despite equivalent performance, women may feel less entitlement to future promotions and have lower self-efficacy in subsequent situations.

Future research should also provide a more complete study of the extent to which culture and norms determine the range of acceptable behaviors. DiTomaso and Hooijberg (1996) assert that most of our leadership models reinforce the dominant paradigm of white male leadership. They call for a revisiting of our social structures to better understand how these forces exert their influence as a precursor to redefining leadership in a world of increasing diversity.

Organizations such as the armed forces, where strong social structures and norms heavily determine acceptable behavior, might be an interesting setting for exploring institutional pressures on diversity. While some researchers would suggest that we have a relatively rich sample of studies of leadership in military settings, women as leaders in the military is a new and unstudied phenomenon. Better explication of these influences might define how organizational context enables or closets the innate leadership preferences of fe(male) leaders. Research might also investigate the interpersonal and emotional stress incurred when innate leadership preferences must be suppressed to conform to the norms of the organization's culture. Does this increase in emotional labor result in higher burnout, job stress, and reduced tenure? Might this explain why fewer women than would be expected by chance have risen to high executive levels? What training, communications, and other initiatives might be used to reshape organizational culture to be more accepting of female leadership styles? In what organizational contexts are these styles most appropriate?

We know little about leadership in the context of female dominated organizations. One promising industry for this line of research is the Internet and Internet related companies. The popular press has highlighted the high-level roles and influence of women in such firms, many of which were founded by women and are heavily populated by women. The success of such women has been attributed in part to the leader being invisible to outside parties who care only if the technology they provide is effective and easy to use. How does being "invisible" contribute to smashing the glass ceiling and subsequent emergence of female leadership at higher levels in these organizations? In what ways are the managerial requirements of "invisible" leaders altered?

International Leadership

We need to know more about leadership in international settings and in cross-cultural teams. While we have seen some research in these areas (c.f., House et al., 1999; Scandura, Von Glinow, & Lowe, 1999), including the 1997 LQ special issue on international leadership (Hunt & Peterson, 1997a, b; Peterson & Hunt, 1997a), we have relatively little theory building effort devoted to the topic of international leadership. Exacerbating the dearth of international leadership theory is that we have even fewer theories and tests of theory that do not reflect a Western business practice lens.

Peterson and Hunt (1997a), based on an extensive review, made four meta-level conclusions about the state of international leadership research and theory. We revisit three here. The first was that leadership is a global idea due to semi-global institutional influences and the functional commonalities of organizations and social relationships. A study by Dorfman et al. (1997) provides evidence that leadership is both a universal (etic) and culture specific (emic) phenomenon. The results of their structural equations analysis offer evidence of cultural universality and positive effects for three leader behaviors (contingent rewards, supportive behavior, and charisma) across five cultures. On the other hand, cultural specificity was found for three leader behaviors (participative, contingent punishment, and directive) and these had positive effects in only two cultures.

Second, there is utility in studying international leadership as a process for increasing awareness. Enhanced awareness may be manifested as a search for processes consistent with MNC strategies, an opportunity for cross-cultural learning, or a search to better understand intercultural negotiation and cooperation processes. Yet there has been little systematic study of these ideas and the extant research findings are mixed. For instance, in a small convenience sample study, Gerstner and Day (1994) confirmed that leadership prototypes differ as a function of country. In contrast, Xin and Tsui (1996) found virtually no differences in a study of the influence tactics of 141 Asian-American managers and 196 Caucasian-American managers. They interpreted their results as suggesting that differences found in cross-cultural studies may not be generalizable to different ethnic groups within one country. Finally, Mayo, Pastor, and Meindl (1996) showed that group heterogeneity is negatively associated with group performance and results in lower leader self-efficacy. The effects on self-efficacy were greater in charismatic domains than for transactional leadership. Collectively, these results provide scarce evidence that leader prototypes, and other differences in cognitive orientations acquired through socialization processes, may impact leader self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness.

Future research might explore how leader reactions to such diversity impact effectiveness and how organizational interventions might ameliorate these effects.

Researchers could also explore whether leaders have higher turnover or reduced performance expectations after leading diverse groups and having their efficacy lowered. Another avenue of inquiry might investigate whether the tendency for leaders to experience lower efficacy could be offset by training on the challenges of managing diverse groups, or a commensurate reduction in organizational expectations of the leader.

A third conclusion was that leadership research has a technological, modern, and U.S. bias. Bass (1990) notes that though the concepts of leader and follower can be traced back to the ancient pharaohs of Egypt, the study of leadership as a discipline is a post-industrial revolution phenomenon—a period coinciding with the emergence and growing influence of the United States as a “first among equals” world power. Thus, international leadership theory and research has been shaped by the short history of leadership as a discipline, and the dominance of U.S. organizational studies over that period.

As Peterson and Hunt (1997a) emphasize, future leadership research must expand its focus to view leadership through the lens of global social thought and international management. Taking these alternative lenses may allow international leadership researchers to lead and inform practice, rather than be reactive and follow. Though the United States appears positioned to be the dominant world economic power for the first if not the second decade of the twenty-first century, many economists have long suggested that we have entered the Asian century. By improving our understanding of leadership in Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, African, and other forgotten locations for research, leadership researchers may proactively position themselves to add real value to the practice of management in multinational organizations (Thomas, 1996). We agree with Dorfman et al. (1997) and Peterson and Hunt (1997a) that there is room and a strong need for studies that can accommodate both the emic and the etic research perspectives.

Technology

We need to know more about the interaction of leadership and technology. A spring 2000 search of the citations/abstracts of the ABI-Inform database on the paired terms “technology” and “leadership” yielded zero articles in the highest quality journals (e.g., Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Science Quarterly, and Organization Science). Questions of interest include: How does the increased frequency and lower context of communications brought on by technologies such as e-mail impact leader-follower relationships? How do leadership demands differ when a large percentage of the workers are telecommuters? That is, what is leadership in the virtual organization? How is leadership impacted by the diffusion of information throughout the organization? How does increased information at all organizational levels decrease or increase the need for the leader to act as meaning maker? How does the form of meaning making change in computer and distance-mediated relationships? What about classroom leadership? How does distance education change the knowledge, skills, abilities, and behaviors required to be an effective classroom leader? How does geographic dispersion impact the leader's use of power? Is expert and referent power more or less required in dispersed teams? Are these power bases more or less difficult to obtain?

Clearly, in this area we have many questions and few answers. A study by Sosik, Avolio, and Kahai (1997) suggests that, with respect to the transformational/ transactional paradigm, electronic speech patterns can have some of the same differential effects as found in more proximate interactions. Work by Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge (2000) (see this issue of LQ), provides an important genesis in elevating e-leadership, a topic that will likely take decades to explore. As technological change increases at an unprecedented pace, scholars have a grand opportunity to make a significant contribution to leadership in managed organizations.

Transformational/Charismatic Leadership

For twenty-five years, leadership research was trapped in a two factor person and task orientation paradigm (House, 1996). This paradigm, in combination with prevailing wisdom on motivational processes, resulted in leadership theories that virtually ignored the unconscious and affective aspects of leader-follower interactions.

The seminal works of Burns (1978) and House (1977) rekindled an interest in the charismatic and affective aspects of leadership. The ensuing shift to the transformational/charismatic paradigm has rejuvenated the field of leadership, moving leadership research out of the doldrums and attracting new scholars and constructs to the field (House, personal communication, 2000; Hunt, 1999). The finding from our content analysis that a third of all LQ articles reflect the neo-charismatic paradigm certainly lends support to this argument. For us, this result documented our own personal experiences with this rejuvenation, and we believe the field has been well served. We assert that much of what remains to be learned will require fewer point-in-time cross-sectional research designs and more emphasis on time-lagged, qualitative, and longitudinal studies which emphasize process and context.

Bass (1995) called for more research on why transformational leadership generates follower commitment, loyalty, involvement, and performance and what thought processes are involved when a leader attempts to be more transformational. Five years have passed and the need for process-focused studies remains great. Further, we have made few advances in making predictions regarding specific dimensions of charismatic leadership such as personal liking, trust, and legitimacy, or in decomposing their effects into cognitive and rational responses. Finally, we have made little progress in matching the intentionality behind leader behavior with follower responses and reciprocal intentionality.

The transformational/charismatic paradigm also offers a platform for exploring the role of various intelligences in determining leader effectiveness. Lord and Hall (1992) state that social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility are perhaps more critical determinants of leadership than the notion of a leader style that is consistent across situations. What types of intelligence matter and when? How do impression management skills (Gardner & Avolio, 1998) combine with fluid and crystallized intelligence to explain the attainment and ability to sustain a leadership position? Are social perceptiveness and emotional intelligence important factors underlying the restraint in the use of power (activity inhibition) shown by socialized and benevolent charismatic leaders?

Attention to symbolic frames and meaning making is another understudied aspect of the transformational/ charismatic leadership paradigm (Neumann, 1992; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). This approach may be more important to understanding the impact of leadership because followers have other means, such as organizational reporting systems, by which to make instrumental observations. Since transactional leadership is more focused on these tangible and proximate goals, it may be more likely to be duplicated by leadership substitutes. Shamir et al. (1994), in a review of a famous and effective speech by Jesse Jackson, identify the transformational components that provide meaning to followers in a manner not possible with instrumental approaches. In the speech, Jackson referred to the group's collective history, the continuity of his proposals to that history, the group as a collective, follower worth and self-efficacy, his similarity to followers, morals and values more than tangible outcomes, distal goals more than proximate goals, and hope and faith. Portugal and Yukl (1994) remind us that transformational behaviors can also take the form of tangible actions, as they describe leaders who drive electric cars or fly commercial rather than private jets, to provide strong symbols of commitment to values such as environmentalism. Lord and Hall (1992) describe the organizational climate as knowledge structures that support the processing of information in certain ways. Perhaps future research will explore how effective leaders come to understand the knowledge structures in use and utilize this information to appeal to (un)conscious affective and cognitive needs to achieve performance beyond expectations.

The transformational-charismatic-values based leadership paradigm is the current poster child of the "new paradigm" theories (Beyer, 1999a). We are reminded by House (1996) in his explanation of how the path goal theory led him to develop the charismatic leadership theory that the test of a good theory is that it holds you over until you can get to a better one. Thus, the excitement around this vein of research should not be limited to the theory as currently articulated but expanded to include what the theory may become. Given that the emotional side of human behavior and leadership interactions is perhaps much richer than the rational aspects, the future for leadership research appears quite bright indeed.

CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS

We have discussed the founding of LQ and highlighted a decade of its contributions through a qualitative and content analysis approach. We then provided some directions for future study that build on the existing literature and appear especially promising for leadership researchers in the next decade. We must acknowledge that in any field of study as rich as leadership, space limitations require tradeoffs that prohibit an exhaustive review of all or even most promising leadership research venues. For example, we have failed to give adequate attention to the many different statistical methodologies that have been used or could be used as part of applied leadership research. Conger (1998) notes that the relative absence of qualitative leadership research is a paradox given that qualitative research is, quite possibly, the methodology of choice for topics as contextually rich as leadership. The pages of LQ have seen a wide range of techniques brought to bear on the topic of leadership, and we would welcome a dedicated review of methodologies in leadership research and suggestions for where and when those methodologies are appropriate (cf. Hollenbeck, Ilgen, & Sego, 1994; Schriesheim et al., 1999).

We have failed to discuss a number of promising new measures, such as the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (Craig & Gustafson, 1998) and Howell's (1997) Need for Leadership measure. We also have not discussed the rich potential for genetic science and positive psychology (Gillham & Seligman, 1999) to explain variance in leadership.[4] We are aware that there are many other omissions and regret the extent to which readers are besmirched by the absence of their favorite topic. Still, we believe our review has effectively shown the important contributions LQ has made to the leadership literature and has simultaneously provided a fruitful, if not exhaustive, set of important directions for future research.

We hold the view that LQ has accomplished the remarkable feat of moving from a new journal to achieving its founders' vision of being the leading outlet for leadership research. We anticipate that the second decade of LQ will solidify this position and eliminate any remaining ambiguity surrounding where to publish and obtain the best in leadership research.

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to Jerry Hunt, current senior editor, for his encouragement, guidance, and mentorship in the preparation of this manuscript. We are also grateful to former senior editors Bernie Bass, Bob House, Henry Tosi, and Fran Yammarino who each consented to be interviewed for this article. We wish to thank the Robert M. Hearin Support Foundation, the Trent Lott Leadership Institute at the University of Mississippi for generously supporting the presentation of an earlier version of this manuscript at the LQ Frontiers in Leadership Symposium. We received many helpful comments at that symposium from a number of scholars including Bruce Avolio, Bob House, Boas Shamir, and Rosemary Stewart.

NOTES

1. The authors are indebted to Bernard Bass, Robert House, James G. (Jerry) Hunt, Henry Tosi, and Fran Yammarino for generous contributions of their time and insights.

2. One of our interviewees pointed out that more focused journals such as LQ, SMJ, and JIBS may never make the “A” list at his school. The explanation was the greater ease of reaching consensus on the quality of a journal that everyone in the department views as a publication outlet. Faculty may resist expending the effort required to evaluate more specialized journals. Even when effort is not an issue, rating some specialized journals as high in quality may be construed as tipping the reward scales toward faculty doing research in those areas. Consequently, high quality broad appeal journals are more likely to achieve “A” status than high quality focused journals as a function of consensus and distributive justice processes rather than acceptance rates. Another barrier to focused journals being designated as an “A” publication is that some hold the perception that it is easier to get articles published in high quality specialized journals than in high quality broad appeal journals. The veracity of this legend is of course an empirical question that remains unanswered by sophisticated analysis.

3. This example is entirely expositional. It is not intended to be an evaluative statement of the relative quality of these organizational systems.

4. We wish to thank Bernie Bass for suggesting during our interview these directions for future research.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. J. (1996). Global women political leaders: An invisible history, an increasingly important future. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 133–161.
Agnes, M. (Ed.). (1995). Webster’s New World Dictionary and Thesaurus. New York: Macmillan.
Ah Chong, L. M., & Thomas, D. C. (1997). Leadership perceptions in cross-cultural context: Pakeha and Pacific Islanders in New Zealand. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 275–293. Anbar Electronic Intelligence. (1996). The 1996 management journal content guide. Bradford, UK: Anbar Electronic Intelligence.
Anbar Electronic Intelligence. (1997). The 1997 management journal content guide. Bradford, UK: Anbar Electronic Intelligence.
Atwater, L. E., Camobreco, J. F., Dionne, S. D., Avolio, B. J., & Lau, A. N. (1997). Effects of rewards and punishments on leader charisma, leader effectiveness and follower reactions. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 133–152.
Atwater, L. E., & Waldman, D. (1998). 360 degree feedback and leadership development. Leadership Quarterly, 9(4), 423–426.
Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multilevel framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 199–218.
Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S., & Dodge, G. (2000). E-leading in organizations and its implications for theory, research, and practice. Leadership Quarterly, 11(4).
Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Operational charismatic leadership using a levels of-analysis framework. Leadership Quarterly, 1(3), 193–208.
Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 345–74.
Ayman, R., Chemers, M. M., & Fiedler, F. (1995). The contingency model of leadership effectiveness: Its level of analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 147–167.
Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(6), 827–832.
Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1994). Changing the role of top management: Beyond strategy to purpose. Harvard Business Review, 72(6), 79–88.
Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1995). Rebuilding behavior context: Turn process reengineering into people rejuvenation. Sloan Management Review, 37(1), 11–24.
Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press. Bass, B. M. (1990). Editorial: An ancient subject. Leadership Quarterly, 1(3), 145–146. Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 463–478.
Bass, B. M. (1999). On the taming of charisma: A reply to Janice Beyer. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 541–553.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 181–217.
Berdahl, J. L. (1996). Gender and leadership in work groups: Six alternative models. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 21–40.
Beyer, J. M. (1999a). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 307–330.
Beyer, J. M. (1999b). Two approaches to studying charismatic leadership: Competing or complementary? Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 575–588.
Beyer, J. M., & Browning, (1999). Transforming an industry in crisis: Charisma, routinization, and supportive cultural leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 483–522.
Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1994). Spirited Leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 5, 309–312. Boyd, N. G., & Taylor, R. R. (1998). A developmental approach to the examination of friendship in leader-follower relationships. Leadership Quarterly, 9(1), 1–26.
Brown, D. J., & Lord, R. G. (1999). The utility of experimental research in the study of transformational/ charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 531–539.
Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 289–304.
Bryman, A. S. (1996). The importance of context: Qualitative research and the study of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 353–370.
Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
Calas, M. B. (1993). Deconstructing charismatic leadership: Re-reading Weber from the darker side. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 305–328.
Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1967). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally.
Campbell, J. T. (1986). Labs, fields, and straw issues. In E. Locke (Ed.), Generalizing from laboratory to field (pp. 269–279). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/Heath & Co.
Card, M. A. (1997). Toward a middle-range theory of individual-level strategic leadership transitions. Leadership Quarterly, 8(1), 27–48.
Carlopio, J. R. (1994). Holism: A philosophy of organizational leadership for the future. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 297–307.
Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1999). The model of followers' responses to self-sacrificial leadership: An empirical test. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 397–421.
Conger, J., & Hunt, J. G. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Taking stock of the present and the future. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 121–127.
Conger, J. A. (1993). Max Weber's conceptualization of charismatic authority: Its influence on organizational research. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 277–288.
Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 9(1), 107–122.
Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 145–169.
Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12, 637–647.
Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived Leader Integrity Scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. Leadership Quarterly, 9(2),127–146. Dansereau, F. (1995). A dyadic approach to leadership: Creating and nurturing this approach under fire. Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 479–490.
Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1984). Theory testing in organizational behavior: The varient approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 46–78.
Dansereau, F., Yammarino, F. J., & Markham, S. E. (1995). Leadership: The multiple-level approaches. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 97–109.

Dansereau, F., Yammarino, F. J., Markham, S. E., Alutto, J. A., & Newman, J. (1995). Individualized leadership: A new multiple-level approach. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 413–450.
Day, D. (2000). Leadership development in the context of on-going work. Leadership Quarterly, 11(4).
Deluga, R. J. (1998). American presidential proactivity, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 265–291.
DeMatteo, J. S., Dobbins, G. H., Myers, S. D., & Facteau, C. L. (1996). Evaluations of leadership in preferential and merit-based leader selection situations. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 41–62.
Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 219–256.
Den Hartog, D. N. D., & Verburg, R. M. (1997). Charisma and rhetoric: Communicative techniques of international business leaders. Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 355–391.
DiTomaso, N. (1993). Weber's social history and Etzioni's structural theory of charisma in organizations: Implications for thinking about charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 257–275.
DiTomaso, N., & Hooijberg, R. (1996). Diversity and the demands of leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 7(2), 163–187.
Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 233–274.
Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. Leadership Quarterly, 5(2), 99–119.
Dyck, B. (1994). From airy-fairy ideas to concrete realities: The case of shared farming. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 223–226.
Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., Miner, J. B., & Johnson, B. T. (1994). Gender and motivation to manage in hierarchic organizations: A meta-analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 5(2), 135–159.
Eden, D. (1992). Leadership and expectations: Pygmalion effects and other self-fulfilling prophecies in organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 3(4), 271–305.
Egri, C. A. P., & Frost, P. J. (1994). Introduction: Leadership for Environmental and Social Change. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4),195–200.
Ehrlich, S. B., Meindl, J. R., & Viellieu, B. (1990). The charismatic appeal of a transformational leader: An empirical case study of a small, high-technology contractor. Leadership Quarterly, 1(4), 229–247.
Elron, E. (1997). Top management teams within multinational corporations: Effects of cultural heterogeneity. Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 393–412.
Evans, M. G. (1996). R. J. House's "A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness." Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 305–309.
Facteau, C. L., Facteau, J. D., Schoel, L. C., Russell, J. E. A., & Poteet, M. L. (1998). Reactions of leaders to 360-degree feedback from subordinates and peers. Leadership Quarterly, 9(4), 427–448.
Fernandez, C. F., & Vecchio, R. P. (1997). Situational leadership theory revisited: A test of an across-jobs perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 8(1), 67–84.
Feyerherm, A. E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two interorganizational rule-making groups. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 253–270.
Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Fiedler, F. E. (1992). Time-based measures of leadership experience and organizational performance: A review of research and a preliminary model. Leadership Quarterly, 3(1),5–23.
Fiedler, F. E. (1995). Reflections by an accidental theorist. Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 453– 461.
Fiedler, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). New approach to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance. New York: Wiley.
Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (1999). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 449–482.
Flannery, B. L., & May, D. R. (1994). Prominent factors influencing environmental activities: Application of the Environmental Leadership Model (ELM). Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 201–221.

Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Korotkin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. Leadership Quarterly, 2(4), 245–287.
Fleishman, E. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Mumford, M. D. (1992a). Individual differences and leadership. II: An Overview. Leadership Quarterly, 3(1), 5–23.
Fleishman, E. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Mumford, M. D. (1992b). Individual differences and leadership. III: An Overview. Leadership Quarterly, 3(2), 77–80.
Foti, R. J., & Luch, C. H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. Leadership Quarterly, 3(1), 55–66.
Gaines, J. (1993). "You don't necessarily have to be charismatic ...;" An interview with Anita Roddick and reflections on charismatic processes in the Body Shop International. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 347–359.
Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. Academy of Management Review, 23, 32–58.
Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. Leadership Quarterly, 5(2), 121–134.
Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C. A. (1995). Changing the role of management. Harvard Business Review,73 (1), 86–97.
Gibson, F. W., Fiedler, F. E., & Barrett, K. M. (1993). Stress, babble, and the utilization of the leader's intellectual abilities. Leadership Quarterly, 4(2), 189–208.
Gillham, J. E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1999). Footsteps on the road to a positive psychology. Behaviour Research & Therapy, 37(7), 163–173.
Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 153–170.
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(2), 219–247.
Graen, G. B., Wakabayashi, M., Graen, M. R., & Graen, M. G. (1990). International generalizability of American hypotheses about Japanese management progress: A strong inference investigation. Leadership Quarterly, 1(1), 1–24.
Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2000). Behavior in organizations (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Gronn, P. (1999). Substituting for leadership: The neglected role of the leadership couple. Leadership Quarterly, 10(1), 41–62.
Hall, R. J., & Lord, R. G. (1995). Multi-level information-processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 265–287.
Henshel, R. L. (1980). The purposes of laboratory experimentation and the virtues of deliberate artificiality. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 16, 466–478.
Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal, 23, 26–34.
Hitt, M. A., Gimeno, J., & Hoskinsson, R. E. (1998). Current and future research methods in strategic management. Organizational Research Methods, 1, 6–44.
Hollander, E. P. (1978). Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships. New York: Free Press.
Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., & Sego, D. J. (1994). Repeated measures regression and mediational tests: Enhancing the power of leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 5(1),3–23.
Hooijberg, R., & DiTomaso, N. (1996). Leadership in and of demographically diverse organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 1–19.
House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321–338.
House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
House, R. J. (1991). The distribution and exercise of power in complex organizations: A MESO theory. Leadership Quarterly, 2(1), 23–58.

House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 323–352.
House, R. J. (1999). Weber and the neo-charismatic leadership paradigm: A response to Beyer. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 563–575.
House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23(3), 409–473.
House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidian, M., Dickson, M., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), Advances in global leadership (vol. 1; pp.171–233). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 3(2), 81–108.
House, R. J., Spangler, D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. Presidency: A psychological theory if leadership effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36, 364–396.
Howell, J. P. (1997). "Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement"—An historical assessment. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 113–116.
Hunt, J. G. (1991). Leadership: A new synthesis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 129–144.
Hunt, J. G., Boal, K., & Dodge, G. (1999). The effects of visionary and crisis-responsive charisma on followers: An experimental examination of two kinds of charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 423–448.
Hunt, J. G., & Conger, J. A. (1999a). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Taking stock of the present and future (part II). Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 331–334.
Hunt, J. G., & Conger, J. A. (1999b). From where we sit: An assessment of transformational and charismatic leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 335–343.
Hunt, J. G., & Peterson, M. F. (1997a). Overview: International perspectives on international leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 201–202.
Hunt, J. G., & Peterson, M. F. (1997b). Two scholars' views of some nooks and crannies in cross-cultural leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 343–354.
Hunt, J. G., & Ropo, A. (1995). Multilevel leadership: Grounded theory and mainstream theory applied to the case of General Motors. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 379–412. Immelman, A. (1998). The political personalities of 1996 U.S. presidential candidates Bill Clinton and Bob Dole. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 335–366.
Insch, G. S., Moore, J. E., & Murphy, L. D. (1997). Content analysis in leadership research: Examples, procedures, and suggestions for future use. Leadership Quarterly, 8(1),1–25. James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without bias. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 85–98.
Jermier, J. M. (1993). Introduction: Charismatic leadership: Neo-Weberian perspectives. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 217–233.
Jermier, J. M. (1996). The path-goal theory of leadership: A subtextual analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 311–316.
Jermier, J. M., & Kerr, S. (1997). "Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement"—Contextual recollections and observations. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 95–101. Kaarbo, J., & Hermann, M. G. (1998). Leadership styles of prime ministers: How individual differences affect the foreign policymaking process. Leadership Quarterly, 9, 243–263. Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 589–607.
Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 375–403.
Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of managerial effectiveness and advancement to self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors from the multiple-linkage model. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 361–377.

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 183–198.
Knights, D., & Morgan, G. (1992). Leadership and corporate strategy: Toward a critical analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 3(3), 171–190.
Lauterbach, K. E., & Weiner, B. J. (1996). Dynamics of upward influence: How male and female managers get their way. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 87–107.
Leavy, B. (1996). On studying leadership in the strategy field. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 435–454.
Lindell, M., & Rosenqvist, G. (1992). Management behavior dimensions and development orientation. Leadership Quarterly, 3(4), 355–377.
Locke, E. (1986). Generalizing from laboratory to field: Ecological validity or abstraction of essential elements? In E. Locke (Ed.), Generalizing from laboratory to field (pp. 3–9). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/Heath & Co.
Lord, R. G., & Hall, R. J. (1992). Contemporary views of leadership and individual differences. Leadership Quarterly, 3(2), 137–157.
Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). Leadership and information processing; Linking perception and performance. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
Lowe, K. B., & Kroeck, K. G. (1998). Leading diverse teams: The impact of demographic diversity, cognitive diversity and leadership on team processes and outcomes. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformation and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 385–425.
Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R., & Rosenkrantz, S. (1988). Real managers. New York: Ballinger.
Markham, S. E., & Markham, I. S. (1995). Self-management and self-leadership reexamined: A levels-of-analysis perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 343–359.
Mayo, M., Pastor, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (1996). The effects of group heterogeneity on the self-perceived efficacy of group leaders. Leadership Quarterly, 7(2), 265–284. McClelland, D. C. (1975). Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington. McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, IL:Scott, Foresman.
Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. M.
Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (vol. 12; pp. 159–204). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Meindl, J. R. (1993). Reinventing leadership: A radical, social psychological approach. In J. K. Murningham (Ed.), Social psychology in organizations: advances in theory and research (pp. 89–118). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 329–341.
Mook, D. G. (1983). In defense of external invalidity. American Psychologist, 38, 379–387. Moore, P. (1994). Hard choices for the environmental movement. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 247–252.
Mumford, M. D., & Connelly, M. S. (1991). Leaders as creators: Leader performance and problem solving in ill-defined domains. Leadership Quarterly, 2(4), 289–315.
Murphy, S. E., Blyth, D., & Fiedler, F. E. (1992). Cognitive resource theory and the utilization of the leader's and group members' technical competence. Leadership Quarterly, 3(3), 237–255.
Neumann, A. (1992). Colleges under pressure: Budgeting, presidential competence, and faculty uncertainty. Leadership Quarterly, 3(3), 191–215.
Nice, D. C. (1998). The warrior model of leadership: Classic perspectives and contemporary relevance. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 321–332.
O'Connor, J., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L., & Connelly, M. S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: An historiometric study. Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 529–555.
Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. Leadership Quarterly, 5(1), 43–58.
Osborn, R. N. (1999). Sayles' Managerial Behavior: Its impact on understanding leadership and nuclear power safety. Leadership Quarterly, 10(1), 13–15.

Parker, P. S., & Ogilvie, D. (1996). Gender, culture, and leadership: Toward a culturally distinct model of African-American women executives' leadership strategies. Leadership Quarterly, 7(2), 189–214.
Parry, K. W. (1998). Grounded theory and social process: A new direction for leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 9(1), 85–106.
Pelled, L. H., & Xin, K. R. (1997). Birds of a feather: Leader-member demographic similarity and organizational attachment in Mexico. Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 433–450.
Peterson, M. F., & Hunt, J. G. (1997a). International perspectives on international leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 203–231.
Peterson, M. F., & Hunt, J. G. (1997b). Overview: International perspectives on international leadership (Part II). Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 339–341.
Pillai, R., & Williams, E. A. (1998). Does leadership matter in the political arena? Voter perceptions of candidates' transformational and charismatic leadership and the 1996 U.S. presidential vote. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 397–416.
Podsakoff, P. M. (1994). Quantitative methods in leadership research: Introduction of a new section. Leadership Quarterly, 5(1), 1–2.
Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1995). An examination of substitutes for leadership within a levels-of-analysis framework. Leadership Quarterly, 6(3), 289–328.
Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership model: Background, empirical assessment, and suggestions for future research. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 117–132.
Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., & Skov, R. (1982). Effects of leader contingent reward and punishment behaviors on subordinate performance and satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 25, 810–821.
Portugal, E., & Yukl, G. (1994). Perspectives on environmental leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3/4), 271–276.
Rao, A., Hashimoto, K., & Rao, A. (1997). Universal and culturally specific aspects of managerial influence: A study of Japanese managers. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 295– 312.
Renshon, S. A. (1998). Analyzing the psychology and performance of presidential candidates at a distance: Bob Dole and the 1996 presidential campaign. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 377–395. ResearchSoft. (1999). EndNote. Berkeley, CA.
Rodriguez, R. A. (1998). Challenging demographic reductionism. Small Group Research, 29(6), 744–758.
Russell, C. J., & Kuhnert, K. W. (1992). Integrating skill acquisition and perspective taking capacity in the development of leaders. Leadership Quarterly, 3(4), 335–353.
Sayles, L. (1964). Managerial behavior: Administration in complex organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Scandura, T. A. (1999). Rethinking Leader-Member Exchange: An organizational Justice Perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 10(1), 25–40.
Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. J. (1996). Developing diverse leaders: A leader-member exchange approach. Leadership Quarterly, 7(2), 243–263.
Scandura, T. A., Von Glinow, M. A., & Lowe, K. B. (1999). When East meets West: Leadership "best practices" in the U.S. and Middle East. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), Advances in global leadership (vol. 1; pp. 235–248). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1994). Managing organizational behavior.New York: Wiley.
Schmitt, D. P., & Winter, D. G. (1998). Measuring the motives of Soviet leadership and Soviet society: Congruence reflected or congruence created? Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 293–307.
Schneider, B., Paul, M. C., White, S. S., & Holcombe, K. M. (1999). Understanding high school student leaders, I: Predicting teacher ratings of leader behavior. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 609–636.
Schriesheim, C. A. (1995). Multivariate and moderated within- and between-entity analysis (WABA) using hierarchical linear multiple regression. Leadership Quarterly, 6(1), 1–18.
Schriesheim, C. A. (1997). Substitutes-for-leadership theory: Development and basic concepts. Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 103–108.
Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. Leadership Quarterly, 10(1), 63–113.

Schriesheim, C. A., Cogliser, C. C., & Neider, L. L. (1995). Is it "trustworthy?" A multiple levels-of-analysis reexamination of an Ohio state leadership study, with implications for future research. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 111–145.
Schriesheim, C. A., & Neider, L. L. (1996). Path-goal leadership theory: The long and winding road. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 317–321.
Scully, J. A., Sims, H. P., Olian, J. D., Schnell, E. R., & Smith, K. A. (1994). Tough times make tough bosses: A meso analysis of CEO leader behavior. Leadership Quarterly, 5(1), 59–83.
Selsky, J. W., & Smith, A. E. (1994). Community entrepreneurship: A framework for social change leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3–4), 277–296.
Shamir, B. (1999a). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 285–305.
Shamir, B. (1999b). Taming charisma for better understanding and greater usefulness: A response to Beyer. Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 555–562.
Shamir, B., Arthur, M. B., & House, R. J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. Leadership Quarterly, 5(1), 25–42.
Shea, C. M., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Charismatic leadership and task feedback: A laboratory study of their effects on self-efficacy and task performance. Leadership Quarterly, 10(3), 375–396.
Shrivastava, P. (1994). Ecocentric leadership in the 21st century. Leadership Quarterly, 5(3/ 4),223–226.
Simonton, D. K. (1998a). Introduction: Political Leadership Part I—World Heads of state. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 239–242.
Simonton, D. K. (1998b). Introduction: Political Leadership Part II—The U.S. Presidential Election. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 333–334.
Simonton, D. K. (1998c). Political leadership across the life span: Chronological versus career age in the British monarchy. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 309–320.
Smith, J. A., & Foti, R. J. (1998). A pattern approach to the study of leader emergence. Leadership Quarterly, 9(2), 147–160.
Smith, P. B., Wang, Z. M., & Leung, K. (1997). Leadership, decision-making and cultural context: Event management within Chinese joint ventures. Leadership Quarterly, 8(4), 413–431.
Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(1), 89–103.
Stevens, J. (1992). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press for Bureau of Business Research.
Thomas, A. S. (1996). A call for research in forgotten locations. In B. J. Punnett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), Handbook for international management research (pp. 485–506). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
Tierney, W. G. (1996). Leadership and postmodernism: On voice and the qualitative method. Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 371–383.
Tosi, H. L., & Kiker, S. (1997). Commentary on "Substitutes for Leadership". Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 109–112.
Turner, S. (1993). Charisma and obedience: A risk cognition approach. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 235–256.
Vaelikangas, L., & Okumura, A. (1997). Why do people follow leaders? A study of a U.S. and a Japanese change program. Leadership Quarterly, 8(3), 313–337.
Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hill.
Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1995). Situation effects and levels of analysis in the study of leader participation. Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 169–181.
Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Waldman, D. A., Lituchy, T., Gopalakrishnan, M., Laframboise, K., Galperin, B., & Kaltsounakis, Z. (1998). A qualitative analysis of leadership and quality improvement. Leadership Quarterly, 9(2), 177–202.

Warech, M. A., Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., & Reilly, S. P. (1998). Self-monitoring and 360-degree ratings. Leadership Quarterly, 9(4), 449–473.
Watson, C., & Hoffman, L. R. (1996). Managers as negotiators: A test of power versus gender as predictors of feelings, behavior, and outcomes. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 63–85.
Weed, F. J. (1993). The MADD queen: Charisma and the founder of Mothers Against Drunk Driving. Leadership Quarterly, 4(3–4), 329–346.
Winter, D. G. (1991). A motivational model of leadership: Predicting long-term management success from TAT measures of power motivation and responsibility. Leadership Quarterly, 2(2), 67–80.
Winter, D. G. (1998). A motivational analysis of the Clinton first term and the 1996 presidential campaign. Leadership Quarterly, 9(3), 367–376.
Wofford, J. C. (1999). Laboratory research on charismatic leadership: Fruitful or futile? Leadership Quarterly, 10(4), 523–529.
Wofford, J. C., & Goodwin, V. L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. Leadership Quarterly, 5(2), 161–186.
Xin, K. R., & Tsui, A. S. (1996). Different strokes for different folks? Influence tactics by Asian-American and Caucasian-American managers. Leadership Quarterly, 7(1), 109–132.
Yammarino, F. (1998a). Editorial: Hello, I must be going. Leadership Quarterly, 9(4),417–422. Yammarino, F. J. (1998b). Multivariate aspects of the varient/WABA approach: A discussion and leadership illustration. Leadership Quarterly, 9(2), 203–227.
Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Person and situation views of leadership: A multiple levels of analysis approach. Leadership Quarterly, 2(2), 121–139.
Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Dubinsky, A. J. (1998). Transformational and contingent reward leadership: Individual, dyad, and group levels of analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 9(1), 27–54.
Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Yukl, G., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence
and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 257–283. Zaccaro, S. J., Gilbert, J. A., Thor, K. K., & Mumford, M. D. (1991). Leadership and social
intelligence: Linking social perspectives and behavioral flexibility to leader effectiveness. Leadership Quarterly, 2(4), 317–342.
Zaleznik, A. (1977). Leaders and managers: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 44,67–78.