

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research

An Integrative Review

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of the present paper is to review the social identity theory of leadership, and to summarize the theoretical developments and empirical findings related to the theory that occurred between 1997 and 2009. Moreover, some of the research areas that may be topics for future studies are introduced and discussed along with a number of propositions.

Key words: Leadership, prototypicality, social identification, self-concept, leadership endorsement, leadership effectiveness.

Introduction

Without followers, there are plainly no leaders or leadership. (Hollander, 1993; p. 29.)

As stated by Hollander (1993) and Hogg, Hains and Mason (1998), when groups exist so do leaders. Leadership has been a broad area of research in social psychology, as well as in other disciplines such as industrial and organizational psychology, sociology, and management. The early social psychological research on leadership mainly focused on individual characteristics or traits that contribute to the emergence of a leader in a variety of contexts (e.g., Yukl, 1981). In today's literature, rather than being described as an individual characteristic, leadership is defined as a dyadic process and as a complex social dynamic process. Consistently, Hogg et al. (2006) who proposed that leadership was often the key for effective group functioning, asserted that intrinsic properties of the leader have received too much attention, while the larger social systems in which leadership was embedded has been focus of a small number of empirical research studies. In line with these propositions, social psychology literature witnessed a growing interest in recent research which focused on the role of follower self-concept and identification processes on leadership (e.g., Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 2004). Recently, Pastor, Mayo and Shamir (2007) called for future studies which would examine the effects of follower identities, interactions and implicit theories on the emergence of leadership as well as on the acceptance of leader and leader cognitions and behaviors.

One of the main theories that emphasize the dyadic and group identification-based nature of leadership is derived from social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (SCT; Turner, 1985; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). The aim of the present paper is to update and extend Hogg's (2001) review of the SIT of leadership and to provide a comprehensive framework of the theory that includes a summary of the research findings along with possible directions for future research. Consistent with Hogg's (2001) paper, this review starts with a description of self-categorization (Hogg, 1996) or with its

more recent name, social identity theory of leadership (Hogg et al., 2006) and of the theoretical developments and empirical studies which have tested the propositions of the SIT of leadership effectiveness between 1997 and 2011. Moreover, some of the untouched research areas that may be subject to future investigations are introduced and discussed along with a number of propositions.

Social Identity Theory of Leadership, Theoretical Developments and Empirical Studies Testing the Propositions: From 1997 to 2009

The Role of Prototypicality and Stereotypicality on Leadership Endorsement and Evaluation of Leadership Effectiveness

Since the core assumption of the SIT of leadership was that the prototypicality affects leadership as much as the stereotypicality (or implicit leadership schemas), and that social identification moderated the relationship between the leader's group-prototypicality and leadership effectiveness, Hains et al. (1997) proposed that one of the first empirical tasks should have been to test the hypothesis that, to the extent that people identify with a social group, their perceptions of leader effectiveness would be influenced by the leader's group prototypicality. In an attempt to do this, the authors manipulated three independent variables which were group salience, group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality in an experimental study. As predicted, participants expected stereotypical leaders to be more effective than non-stereotypical leaders and prototypical leaders to be more effective, relevant, appropriate and similar to themselves than non-prototypical leaders. This effect was significant for those in the high-salience condition. Moreover, in the high-salience condition, the participants felt that non-stereotypical leaders were significantly less representative of the group than those in the high-salience/stereotypical condition, the low-salience/non-stereotypical condition and in the low-salience/stereotypical condition.

Fielding and Hogg (1997) partially replicated and extended Hogg's (1996) study with a longitudinal field research in which enduring groups that had real leaders were recruited as the participants. In line with the expectations, identification with the group was significantly increased over time along with the perceptions of leader effectiveness, group-prototypicality of the leader, leader schema typicality of the leader, and with the increased social and personal attraction for the leader. The regression analyses showed that, both at the low and high levels of identification, the more prototypical leaders were perceived to be more effective than the less prototypical leaders, but the effect was stronger at the high levels of identification. At Time 1 and Time 2, leader typicality was predictive of the leadership effectiveness and this effect was independent of the identification level which was increased at Time 2. These results overall confirmed the predictions of both leader categorization theory and of social identity perspective which suggested that leader schemas were independent of group-membership based self-categorization dynamics.

In a subsequent study, Hogg et al. (1998) reexamined the relationship between identification level and association of stereotypicality and leadership and they experimentally manipulated the perceptions of the leader's prototypicality and effectiveness relative to the other members of the group. The results showed that both leadership and leadership potential perceptions were affected by the perceived prototypicality of the leader as well as by the stereotypicality of the leader. Moreover, when relative prototypicality information was available, enhanced identification of the participants with the group increased the perceived similarity between leaders and non-leaders, which in turn, weakened the leadership-prototypicality relationship to non-significance.

In a more recent study, Hogg et al. (2006) investigated leadership effectiveness in a natural group and in a situation in which no prototype information other than the gender of the leader was available to the participants. Specifically, the authors found that even single and simple demographic information such as gender might be used as a clue for the leader's group-prototypicality. Supporting the SIT of leadership, in the absence of other information about the leader, individuals' psychological salience of group membership interacted with the congruence of the stereotype based impressions of the leader (such as demographic information like gender, age or race) with the local group norm and the prototype.

Specific Leadership Qualities and Social Identity Analysis of Leadership

In a recent analysis, Platow, Haslam, Foddy, and Grace (2003) outlined four leadership qualities that followers seek to perceive certain individuals as leaders. First, leaders are those who have the ability to influence others. Second, individuals have a need to trust their leaders, they expect that the leader will act in a manner that facilitates the group's well-being and not harm them. Moreover, leaders are expected to behave in a fair manner toward group members in order to be followed. Finally, the authors suggested that charisma, which refers to the ability to inspire followers to transcend their personal interests in pursuit of collective goals, is another quality that makes certain individuals the leaders in the eyes of the followers. In the following sections, empirical studies which examined the specific leadership qualities mentioned above (i.e., charisma, fairness, trust, and ability to influence) along with self-sacrifice, another important leadership behavior from the perspective of the SIT of leadership, are summarized and theoretical developments in the field are introduced.

The Role of Prototypicality on the Perceptions of Leadership and Evaluation of Leadership Charisma

Unlike the theories which attempt to explain leadership effectiveness by focusing on the individual properties of leaders, of followers, or both (e.g., LMX; Graen & Scandura, 1987), the SIT of leadership approaches the issue in group terms by focusing on "the situational features that may enable leaders to draw on their followers' sense of shared identity" (Ellemers, De Gilder, & Haslam, 2004, p. 467). One of the propositions raised from this analysis is associated with attributions of negative or positive leadership behaviors to dispositional or situational factors and with perceived charisma of the leader. It is obvious that leaders cannot always act in ways that all followers would appreciate or consider rewarding. However, individuals have an identity-enhancing tendency to evaluate acts and characteristics of in-group members more positively than those of out-group members. According to the SIT of leadership, this tendency directs followers to hold positive expectations regarding the underlying motivations and intentions of the leader's behavior to the extent that they perceive the leader as an in-group member. As a consequence of this process, in the case of a leader who is perceived as an in-group member, (or group-prototypical) possible negative leadership behaviors are more likely to be attributed to situational or external factors, whereas positive or even neutral leadership behaviors are likely to be attributed to dispositional factors or personality. In line with these propositions, Ellemers, van Rijswijk, Bruins, and De Gilder (1998) found that the participants who were in the role of the followers agreed to remain loyal to an in-group leader regardless of negative or undesirable leadership behaviors, whereas they showed willingness to cooperate with an out-group leader only when the leader had treated them positively in the past.

Haslam et al. (2001) argued that leaders' successes would be associated with perceived charisma only when followers were convinced that the leader was acting for the in-group rather

than for himself or for the out-group. The authors showed that the leader was perceived as most charismatic when he was even-handed, and as least charismatic when he was identity-negating, while charisma ratings in identity-affirming conditions fell between these two scores.

In more recent research, Platow, van Knippenberg, Haslam, van Knippenberg, and Spears (2006) showed that in-group prototypical leaders were perceived to be more charismatic than non-prototypical leaders. Moreover, social identification with the group was positively associated with perceptions of charisma. As hypothesized, in-group prototypical leaders were perceived to be more persuasive than non-prototypical leaders regardless of their rhetorical style; however, this effect was not moderated by social identification with the group. The out-group stereotypical leaders were perceived as charismatic only when they used a group-oriented (vs. exchange-oriented) rhetorical style. The authors concluded that prototypicality had a profound effect on the perceived charisma of the leader independent of rhetorical style, at least in their sample, and that non-prototypical leaders might benefit from conveying their messages by using a group-oriented rhetorical style.

The Role of Fairness in the Social Identity Analysis of Leadership: Distributive Fairness Studies

One of the important propositions of the SIT of leadership is that although fair leaders generally render more endorsement by followers than unfair leaders, leaders who make unfair, in-group favoring allocation decisions in intergroup contexts are more likely to be endorsed by their followers than leaders who make fair, even-handed allocation decisions due to their role in providing social identity enhancement (Platow, Hoar, Reid, Harley, & Morrison, 1997). This effect is also suggested to be enhanced by the social identification level of followers. In a series of studies, Platow et al. (1997) and Platow, Reid, and Andrew (1998) examined the interaction effects of leader distributive behavior (fair vs. unfair) and social context (interpersonal vs. intergroup) on leadership endorsement. Overall, the results showed that although participants in both contexts perceived distributively or procedurally fair leaders as fairer than unfair leaders, those in the intergroup context endorsed an unfair (in-group favoring) leader over a fair leader. These results were also supported in more recent research (Haslam & Platow, 2001; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001).

In a subsequent study, Platow, Mills, and Morrison (2000) suggested that those who found themselves more similar to an individual (as an indicator of self-categorization) would be more likely to be persuaded by him or her when his or her decisions were fair in an intra-group context and when they were unfair (i.e., in-group favoring) in an intergroup condition. The results showed that only when the participants self-categorized themselves with the experimenter, were they likely to conform to him when he made fair intra-group decision or unfair intergroup decision. In contrast, when the experimenter made an unfair intra-group decision or a fair intergroup decision, he had no influence on the participants' opinions regardless of the perceived similarity (self-categorization).

Procedural and Interactive Fairness Studies

Procedural justice is defined as the fairness of the procedures used to derive outcomes (Thibout & Walker, 1975). Based on SIT, several researchers suggest that the leader's procedural justice conveys the information that followers are valued members of the group and that the leader can be trusted (e.g., Hogg & Abrams, 1988) and in this way, it enhances identification with the group. Moreover, in two different studies, Lind, Kray, and Thompson (2001) and Tyler and De Cremer (2005) showed that the leader's procedural fairness was more likely to be

positively associated with the followers' endorsement of the leader, motivation and acceptance of change among highly identified followers rather than low identifiers.

Van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, and De Cremer (2005; cited in van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & van Knippenberg, 2007) suggested that prototypical leaders also enhanced the trust in the leaders and that followers' trust in them rendered perceived leadership effectiveness less contingent upon leader's procedural fairness than it was in the case of non-prototypical leaders. The authors conducted three studies in which they employed experimental, field study and scenario study designs. The results consistently revealed that the effects of procedural justice on leadership effectiveness and followers' cooperative behavior were stronger in the case of a non-prototypical leader than it was in the case of a prototypical leader.

Along with authority figures' procedural justice, interactional justice, which is defined as fairness of perceived interpersonal treatment, conveys the information that followers are respected and valued members of the group. Consistently, Lipponen, Koivisto, and Olkkonen (2005) asserted that the prototypical group leader was the most informed member about the group and that his or her fair treatment could be more likely to get attention from the followers and be associated with judgments of status in the group than fairness of other members of the group. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the relationship between interactional justice and followers' judgments of self-status in the group (i.e., pride and respect) would be moderated by leader group prototypicality. The results revealed that interactional justice was more strongly associated with followers' pride and respect judgments regarding their status in a work group when the leader was high on prototypicality than when the leader was low on prototypicality. Although the findings of this study seemed to contradict with van Knippenberg, et al.'s (2005; cited in van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & van Knippenberg, 2007) study results, the authors asserted that the outcome variables of these studies were different and that prototypicality might moderate the relationship of fairness and leadership endorsement in a different way than it moderated the link between fairness and followers' self-status judgments.

In a more recent study, van Dijke and De Cremer (2008) proposed that since prototypical leaders were considered legitimate and that legitimacy was likely to be used as heuristic social information to form fairness judgments, especially among highly identified group members, prototypical leaders were more likely to be perceived as procedurally fair. The authors asserted that procedural fairness was likely to enhance followers' self-perceptions of their status within the group (especially among high identifiers) which suggested a mediating role of procedural fairness in the relationship between leader prototypicality and followers' self-perceived status. The findings revealed that when followers were highly identified with their group, leaders' prototypicality was significantly and positively related to perceived procedural fairness but it was not when followers' identification with their group was low. The same interaction pattern was also found for followers' self-perceived status within the group. Moreover, prototypicality was positively associated with procedural fairness which, in turn, was related to self-perceptions of status among high identifiers but not among low identifiers. Identification level did not moderate the relationship between procedural fairness and status perceptions. The authors asserted that the previous research on the SIT of leadership was exclusively focused on leadership endorsement and effectiveness and that their study was particularly important since it revealed positive effects of leader prototypicality on followers' own position in the group via enhanced procedural fairness perceptions at least among high identifiers.

Ulrich, Christ, and van Dick (2009) suggested that just like leader prototypicality substituted for distributive fairness in predicting leadership endorsement in Platow and van Knippenberg's (2001) study, it might do so for procedural fairness by interacting with follower identification. The authors showed that leader prototypicality enhanced endorsement among high

identifiers but not among low identifiers. Moreover, fairness information and perception were more likely to be positively associated with leadership endorsement when the leader was low on prototypicality and when the followers were low identifiers. In summary, the findings of the empirical research consistently showed that leader prototypicality moderated the relationship of distributive, procedural and interactional justice with leadership effectiveness (Table 1).

Followers' Trust, Reactions to Leader's Failure and Anti-Norm Behaviors, and Leadership Effectiveness: The Effects of Leader Prototypicality and Followers' Social Identification

Giessner and van Knippenberg (2008) asserted that failure to achieve group-based goals was an important factor that decreased follower endorsement of leaders since, in general, such failures were often attributed to leaders. Building on the SIT of leadership and insights from research on goal definition, the authors suggested that there might be some conditions under which leaders had a "license to fail" and did not suffer bad outcomes after failures. Giessner and van Knippenberg proposed that group-prototypical leaders would be more trusted by their followers, which in turn, would be positively associated with perceptions of leadership effectiveness even under failure condition. The results of a series of four studies showed that prototypical leaders were evaluated as more effective than non-prototypical leaders. As hypothesized, prototypical leaders were more trusted than non-prototypical leaders. Under success conditions, prototypical leaders received higher effectiveness ratings than non-prototypical leaders. The prototypical leaders were given more credit than non-prototypical leaders under failure to achieve maximal goals conditions, but there was no difference in effectiveness ratings under failure to achieve minimal goals conditions. Trust in the leader mediated the relationship between prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. The relationship between trust in the leader and leadership effectiveness was moderated by goal definition in such a way that indirect effects were significant only in maximal but not in minimal goal conditions. Finally, leader group-prototypicality was more strongly associated with trust in the leader for high identifiers than for low identifiers.

Giessner and van Knippenberg (2008) suggested that an interesting line for future research might be examining the change in trust in leadership, which had been a key variable in their research, as a result of performance outcomes. It might be the case that prototypical leaders might lose more credit in the case of continuous failure than non-prototypical leaders who had less idiosyncrasy credit to lose than prototypical leaders anyway. Indeed, in very recent research, Giessner, van Knippenberg, and Sleebos (2009) found that successful performance increased perceived prototypicality of the leader whereas failure decreased prototypicality perceptions among followers. Nevertheless, perceived prototypicality of the prototypical leader was still stronger than the prototypicality ratings of the non-prototypical leaders after failure information. The authors asserted that one important and positive implication of this finding might be that non-prototypical leaders might increase perceptions of group-prototypicality among their followers as a consequence of successful performance. On the negative side, however, the findings point to a dark side of leader group prototypicality in that highly prototypical leader may still be endorsed by followers even in cases in which they are the actual causes of failure.

In summary, the previous research showed that leader group prototypicality may have a buffering effect for leaders under conditions of failure. Another related issue is whether or not prototypicality can protect leaders from negative follower evaluations when they seem to oppose group norms or when they attempt to make innovative changes within the group context. Abrams, Randsley de Moura, Marquez, and Hutchison (2008) examined this issue in a study that included the phase of the leadership as one of the variables. Specifically, in a series of five

Table 1. The summary of the findings of the empirical studies that tested the propositions of social identity analysis of leadership: From 1997 to 2009

Empirical Findings	References
Both leader group-prototypicality and implicit leadership theories are associated with leader effectiveness perceptions and endorsement of the leader.	
The association of leader group-prototypicality with leader effectiveness perceptions and endorsement of the leader is moderated by social identification with the group such that leader group-prototypicality is more likely to be associated with effectiveness perceptions and endorsement of the leader for those who have high identification with the group than for individuals who have low identification with the group.	Lord et al. (1984)
The association of implicit leadership theories with leader effectiveness perceptions and endorsement of the leader is moderated by social identification with the group such that implicit leadership theories are more likely to be associated with effectiveness perceptions and endorsement of the leader for those who have low identification with the group than for individuals who have high identification with the group.	
The association of transformational leadership with the endorsement of the leader and the leadership effectiveness is moderated by collective identity salience in such a way that transformational leadership is more likely to be related to the endorsement of the leader and perceptions of leadership effectiveness for those who have high identification with the group than for those who have low identification with the group.	Martin & Epitropaki (2001)
The association of the LMX with the endorsement of the leader and the leadership effectiveness is moderated by collective identity salience such that individualized leadership style or high level of LMX is more likely to be related to the endorsement of the leader and perceptions of leadership effectiveness for those who have low identification with the group than for those who have high identification with the group.	Hogg & Martin (2003)
Leader group prototypicality is positively associated with follower perceptions of interactional and procedural fairness.	
The relationship between leader group prototypicality and follower perceptions of interactional and procedural fairness will be moderated by followers' social identification levels in such a way that the relationship between prototypicality and fairness will be stronger for high identifiers than it will be for low identifiers.	Ulrich et al. (2009), van Dijke & De Cremer (2008), van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, & De Cremer (2005)
Follower perceptions of interactional and procedural fairness will be positively associated with leadership effectiveness. The relationship between follower perceptions of interactional and procedural fairness and leadership effectiveness will be moderated by followers' social identification levels and by leader group prototypicality in such a way that the relationship between fairness and leadership effectiveness will be stronger for low identifiers and for less prototypical leaders than it will be for high identifiers and for more prototypical leaders.	
Prototypicality and leader performance information interact in predicting leadership effectiveness in such a way that prototypicality is positively associated with positive evaluations of leadership effectiveness under failure conditions but not under success conditions.	Abrams et al. (2008), Giessner & van Knippenberg (2008), Giessner, van Knippenberg, & Sleebos (2009)
The relationship between leader prototypicality and leadership effectiveness will be moderated by the phase of leadership in such a way that prototypicality will be more strongly associated with leadership effectiveness for a current leader or ex-	

leader than it will be for a future leader.

Leader prototypicality is positively associated with followers' efforts to enhance group performance, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with the leader, and is negatively associated with turnover intentions, intentions to leave the group, resistance to organizational change and other change efforts.

Cicero et al. (2007), De Cremer & van Vugt (2002), Hirst et al. (2009), Pierro et al. (2005), Pierro et al. (2009)

The relationship between leader self-sacrificing behavior and leadership effectiveness, perceived charisma and positive follower outcomes (i.e. commitment to the group, support for the leader) will be moderated by leader prototypicality in such a way that the leader's self-sacrificing behavior will be more strongly associated with these outcomes when the leader is low on prototypicality than when the leader is high on prototypicality.

van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg (2005)

studies Abrams and colleagues revealed that the participants perceived an in-group anti-norm target as less typical and less favorable when they were informed that the target was the leader than when there was no information about leadership position. This pattern was reversed when the target was from the out-group. When the target's future status was defined as the leader the anti-norm targets were perceived as significantly more typical than in the unknown condition (i.e., no information about the identity of the leader). Specifically, current anti-norm leaders were evaluated less favorably than non-leaders; however, future leaders might not be rejected and might be granted license to be independent even though they are low on prototypicality.

Leaders' Ability to Influence: Social Identity Theory of Leadership and Follower Outcomes, Motivation and Performance

Up to now, the studies which mostly focused on leadership endorsement and effectiveness from the perspective of social identity analysis of leadership were summarized. However, a number of studies attempted to adapt this perspective by also examining the leaders' ability to influence their followers and the positive effects of leader group prototypicality on group motivation and performance. Before we move to the suggested directions for future research of the SIT of leadership, these studies are introduced and summarized.

Based on the SIT of leadership, De Cremer and van Vugt (2002) suggested that when social identity was salient in a group situation, individuals would be more likely to cooperate with a leader than when personal identity was salient. They also suggested a positive association between leaders' commitment to the group, fairness, and followers' cooperation and contribution to the group since committed leaders convey the information that group membership is important and that followers are valued members of the group. Finally, they suggested that the relationships predicted above would be enhanced under the social identity salience condition but not under the personal identity salience condition. It was also proposed that, when social identity was salient, individuals would be more likely to cooperate with a committed leader because of their relational needs, whereas individuals under the personal identity salience condition would be likely to cooperate with a leader with traditional leadership skills. Although generally individuals cooperated and contributed to their groups when their leader was a skilled one rather than a committed one, identity condition and leader type interacted in predicting contribution to the group. When personal identity was salient the participants cooperated with a skilled leader and when social identity was salient they cooperated with a committed leader. The authors concluded that effective leadership that elicited follower cooperation and contribution motives might depend on the follower's identity level as suggested by the SIT of leadership.

Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg and Krulanski (2005) argued that effective leadership did not lie only in the leaders' ability to influence and to be endorsed, but also in their ability to positively affect followers' well-being and satisfaction. It was suggested that leader prototypicality was not only associated with leadership endorsement but also with positive follower outcomes such as job satisfaction in an organizational context. They introduced "need for closure" as a dispositional variable, defined as the desire for closure and reduced uncertainty, and suggested that "need for closure" might moderate the relationship between prototypicality and job satisfaction. Since a desire to reduce uncertainty leads people to turn to their group memberships, which as a shared social reality may decrease uncertainty, prototypical leadership is suggested to be more effective for those who are high on "need for closure" than for individuals who are low on "need for closure." The results of the survey study revealed that the relationship between leader prototypicality and perceived leadership effectiveness, job satisfaction, self-rated performance and the negative relationship of prototypicality with turnover intentions was stronger for high "need for closure" employees than low "need for closure" employees. In subsequent studies, other authors showed that employees who were high on "need for closure" and on promotion focus, who had high levels of job stress, and who were high on team identification were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs (Cicero, Pierro, & van Knippenberg, 2007; Pierro, Cicero, & Higgins, 2009) and were less likely to resist organizational change when they had a leader who was high on prototypicality than when they had a leader who was low on prototypicality (Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2007).

Finally, in relation to the effect of leader prototypicality and follower motivation and performance, Hirst, van Dick, and van Knippenberg (2009) examined the impact of identification on creative effort, and performance and leadership characteristics that would enhance this impact. The authors suggested that identification with the group would be likely to result in creative effort to enhance group performance and this relationship would be stronger when the leader was high on prototypicality and inspirational motivation than it would be when the leader was low on these leadership characteristics. The results of the survey study showed that identification was significantly related to creative effort which predicted creative performance only under the condition of a highly prototypical leader. Moreover, the leader's inspirational motivation characteristic was related to the followers' creative effort only when the leader was high in prototypicality and not when the leader was low in prototypicality. Therefore, the authors concluded that the study contributed to the theory not only by examining the effects of identification on creative effort and performance but also by presenting integrative findings for transformational leadership theory and the SIT of leadership.

Suggestions for Future Research and Conclusion

Many researchers agree that leadership effectiveness does not lie only in the ability to influence others but also in the ability to create positive outcomes for individuals such as satisfaction with one's status in the group or with one's position (e.g., Cicero et al., 2007). Therefore, along with the studies which showed the positive relationship between prototypicality and overall leadership effectiveness, the studies that focused on various follower outcomes indicated that leaders' representativeness of their group's identity, values, and mission is predictive of effective leadership at least for highly identified followers. However, there is a clear void of research investigating the conditions under which leader prototypicality may be associated with negative outcomes. As mentioned above, the finding that, even under failure conditions, prototypical leaders are endorsed and supported more than non-prototypical leaders is especially important in that leaders who are actually responsible for ill outcomes for the group

may still be endorsed by followers. The implications of this finding are particularly important in political contexts where lives of many people can be very easily affected by decisions of a single leader or a small group of leaders. Therefore, one of the directions for future research should be investigating the boundary conditions that may prevent unquestioned obedience to highly prototypical authority figures in cases of failure. To illustrate, Giessner and van Knippenberg (2008) showed that goal definition moderated the relationship between leader prototypicality and effectiveness under failure condition. Prototypical leaders were protected from negative evaluations when they failed to achieve maximal goals but not when they failed to accomplish minimal goals. Other boundary conditions may include type of explanations for the reasons of failure. To illustrate, Platow et al. (2006) found that in-group prototypical leaders were perceived as more charismatic and persuasive by followers regardless of their rhetorical style (i.e. exchange-oriented vs. collective oriented). However, the study was conducted in an experimental design in which the participants rated the charisma and persuasiveness of a hypothetical student leader whose written ad was presented to them. Moreover, the situation did not include a condition of actual failure. In real life, however, it is very likely that leaders who blame the collective and especially the in-group members for failure may not be protected from negative evaluations regardless of their prototypicality. For instance, a prime minister who makes excuses for political or economical failures by blaming the public may elicit negative emotions as well as resentment from the public even if he or she is high on prototypicality. This effect is likely to be increased over time if the leader continuously explains the reasons of unpleasant outcomes by referring to the public. Moreover, prototypical leaders may be more likely to be perceived as betraying the in-group when they make responsibility attributions for in-group members in cases of failure than non-prototypical leaders since they are figural against the group. Therefore, another future direction for researchers should be examining the possible conditions that may prevent leader prototypicality to shadow actual failures and mistakes of leaders in the eyes of members of small groups as well as in the eyes of broader groups such as the public. The first proposition of the present review is as follows:

Proposition 1: Under the conditions of failure, prototypical leaders who make responsibility attributions for in-group members will be perceived as less effective than non-prototypical leaders who make the same type of attributions.

Another suggested future direction focuses on an attribution hypothesis which states that prototypical leaders are excused from negative evaluations for failure since followers are likely to attribute desirable behaviors to dispositional factors whereas they attribute undesirable behaviors to external factors. It is also suggested that the attribution process together with social attraction may be the basis for perceived charisma along with trust, loyalty and willingness to cooperate with the leader. These propositions were raised by some researchers; however, they have not been directly tested yet. It is important for scholars to provide empirical evidence especially about the attribution processes since they are useful for us to understand underlying psychological processes involved in the relationship of leader prototypicality with perceptions of charisma and followers' loyalty and trust. Moreover, research should extend follower motivations predicted by leader group prototypicality in organizational settings to broader contexts. To illustrate, effects of leader prototypicality as well as follower social identification on, general satisfaction with the group leader, intentions to leave the group, and resistance to broader change efforts in group norms or procedures, should be among the research topics for future social psychological studies. Therefore, additional propositions of the present paper are as follows:

Proposition 2a: The relationship of leader prototypicality with followers' loyalty, trust, perceptions of charisma, and leadership effectiveness will be partially mediated by followers'

attribution processes and social attraction. Followers' internal attributions for positive leader behaviors, external attributions for negative leader behaviors, and social attraction will be positively related to followers' loyalty, trust, perceptions of charisma, and leadership effectiveness. Moreover, the relationships of leader prototypicality with followers' loyalty, trust, perceptions of charisma, and leadership effectiveness will be enhanced by followers' social identification level.

Proposition 2b: The relationship of leader prototypicality with followers' intentions to leave the group and resistance to change will be partially mediated by followers' attribution processes and social attraction. Followers' internal attributions for positive leader behaviors, external attributions for negative leader behaviors, and social attraction will be negatively related to followers' intentions to leave the group and resistance to change. Moreover, the relationships of leader prototypicality with followers' intentions to leave the group and resistance to change will be inhibited by followers' social identification level.

The final issue related to future research in the social identity analysis of leadership, and raised in the present review, is associated with leader group prototypicality and its relation to more general types of leadership. It is likely that some of the leadership styles may reflect a group prototype in certain organizational climates and cultural contexts. To illustrate, paternalistic leadership which is defined as a hierarchical relationship in which the role of the leader is to provide care, protection, and guidance in work and non-work areas of employees' lives and the role of the subordinate is to be loyal and deferent towards the leader, is welcomed in cultures in which collectivism and power distance are high and is an effective leadership style for motivating employees and enhancing organizational effectiveness (e.g., Aycan, 2006; Kim, 1994). Collectivism and individualism are cultural value systems that reflect shared norms, roles, and attitudes as well as the relative emphasis people give to personal interests and to shared benefits (Triandis, Chan, Bhawuk, Iwao, & Sinha, 1995). Collectivism represents a condition in which priority is given to the needs and interests of the group rather than personal interests and demands of individuals. Individualism, on the other hand, is the condition whereby the needs of the individuals are given greater importance than those of the group. A paternalistic leadership style may be perceived as more prototypical in a cultural context shaped by high collectivism and high power distance whereas a transactional or exchange-oriented leadership style may be associated with perceived leader prototypicality in a cultural context with high individualism and low power distance. Moreover, the moderating effect of followers' social identification on the relationship between leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness may be enhanced by the cultural orientation of collectivism. Up to now, the relationship between leader group prototypicality and a specific leadership style has been examined in a few studies. To illustrate, Hirst et al. (2009) showed that leader group prototypicality was positively associated with inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership in their sample ($r = .50, p < .01$). Researchers are strongly encouraged to examine other types of leadership styles and group prototypicality of leaders in specific groups and cultural contexts. This line of research may contribute to the literature by revealing how specific leadership styles are associated with certain groups' identities and how effects of followers' social identifications in leadership process are enhanced or attenuated by cultural norms and values. Therefore, the final propositions of the present paper are as follows:

Proposition 3: The relationship between different leadership styles and followers' perceptions of leader prototypicality will be moderated by the followers' cultural orientations of collectivism and individualism. Paternalistic and relationship-oriented leaders will be more likely to be perceived as prototypical leaders by those with a high collectivism orientation

(allocentrism) whereas transactional and task-oriented leaders will more likely be perceived as prototypical leaders by those with a high individualism orientation. (idiocentrism).

Proposition 4: The relationship between followers' perceptions of leader prototypicality and leadership effectiveness will be moderated by followers' cultural orientation of collectivism and individualism in such a way that the effect of leader prototypicality on followers' perceptions of leadership effectiveness will be stronger for those with a high collectivism orientation (allocentrism) than it will be for those with a high individualism orientation (idiocentrism).

Since the late 1990s, social psychology researchers increasingly pronounced that leadership is strongly tied to group membership and, therefore, an inevitable study topic in social psychology (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). The present review is a humble attempt to define the SIT of leadership and to summarize theoretical developments and empirical research that aimed to examine the suggestions raised by the theory. The SIT of leadership presents a fruitful research area by combining the effects of both leader and follower characteristics, cognitions and perceptions on the leadership process. The theory asserts that not only the characteristics or behaviors of an effective leader, but also the identities of followers, affect leadership effectiveness. The SIT of leadership suggests that by espousing attitudes consistent with group prototypes, by directing followers to contribute to the achievement of collective goals, and by fostering and deploying the material and psychological resources of the group, leaders can build credibility and status, which in turn, is associated with the establishment of influence and effective leadership (van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). It is hoped that both researchers and practitioners benefit from the present review which aimed to provide a comprehensive analysis of the SIT of leadership, theoretical links and developments, empirical findings, and untouched research areas.

References

- Abrams, D., Randsley de Moura, G., Marques, J. M., & Hutchison, P. (2008). Innovation credit: When can leaders oppose their group's norms? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(3), 662-678.
- Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization. In K. S. Yang, K. K. Hwang & U. Kim (Eds.), *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, and Cultural Contributions* (pp. 445-466). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Cicero, L., Pierro, A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2007). Leader group prototypicality and job satisfaction: The moderating role of job stress and team identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 11*(3), 165-175.
- De Cremer, D., & van Vugt, M. (2002). Intergroup and intragroup aspects of leadership in social dilemmas: A relational model of cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 126-136.
- Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management Review, 29* (3), 459-478.
- Ellemers, N., Van Rijswijk, W., Bruins, J., & de Gilder, D. (1998). Group commitment as a moderator of attributional and behavioral responses to power use. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 555-573.

- Fielding, K. S., & Hogg, M. A. (1997). Social identity, self-categorization, and leadership: A field study of small interactive groups. *Group dynamics: Theory, research, and practice, 1*, 39–51.
- Giessner, S. R., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). “License to fail”: Goal definition, leader group prototypicality, and perceptions of leadership effectiveness after leader failure. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 105*, 14–35.
- Giessner, S. R., van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2009). License to fail? How leader group prototypicality moderates the effects of leader performance on perceptions of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly, 434-451*.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 9*, 175 – 208.
- Hains, S. C., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1997). Self-categorization and leadership: Effects of group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1087–1099.
- Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2001). The link between leadership and followership: How affirming social identity translates vision into action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11*, 1469–1479.
- Haslam, S. A., Platow, M. J., Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J., McGarty, C., Oakes, P. J., ... Veenstra, K. (2001). Social identity and the romance of leadership: The importance of being seen to be doing it for us. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 4*, 191–205.
- Hirst, G., Van Dick, R., & van Knippenberg, D. (2009). A social identity perspective on leadership and employee creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*, 963-982.
- Hogg, M. A. (1996). Intragroup processes, group structure, and social identity. In W. P. Robinson (Ed.), *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel* (pp. 65-93). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 184–200.
- Hogg, M. A. (2003). Social identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 462-479). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.
- Hogg, M. A., Fielding, K. S., Johnson, D., Masser, B., Russell, E., & Svensson, A. (2006). Demographic category membership and leadership in small groups: A social identity analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 335-350.
- Hogg, M. A., Hains, S. C., & Mason, I. (1998). Identification and leadership in small groups: Salience, frame of reference, and leader stereotypicality effects on leader evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1248–1263.
- Hogg, M. A., & van Knippenberg, D. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-52). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Hollander, E. P. (1993). Legitimacy, power and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 29–48). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Kim, U. M. (1994). Significance of paternalism and communalism in the occupational welfare system of Korean firms. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural research and methodology series: Vol.18. Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp.251-266). California, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lind, E. A., Kray, L., & Thompson, L. (2001). Primacy effects in justice judgments: Testing predictions from fairness heuristic theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 85, 189 – 210.
- Lipponen, J., Koivisto, S., & Olkkonen, M. E. (2005). Procedural justice and status judgments: The moderating role of leader ingroup prototypicality. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 517 – 528.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 78, 167–203.
- Pastor, J. C., Mayo, M., & Shamir, B. (2007). Adding fuel to fire: The impact of followers' arousal on ratings of charisma. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1584-1596.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., Bonaiuto, M., van Knippenberg, D., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2005). Leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of need for cognitive closure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 503–516.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., Bonaiuto, M., van Knippenberg, D., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2007). Leader group prototypicality and resistance to organizational change: The moderating role of need for cognitive closure and team identification. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 14(1), 27-40.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., & Higgins, E. T. (2009). Followers' satisfaction from working with group-prototypic leaders: Promotion focus as a moderator. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 1105-1110.
- Platow, M. J., Haslam, S. A., Foddy, M., & Grace, D. M. (2003). Leadership as the outcome of self-categorization process. In D. van Knippenberg & M.A. Hogg (Eds.), *Leadership and power: Identity processes in groups and organizations* (pp. 34–47). London: Sage.
- Platow, M. J., Hoar, S., Reid, S. A., Harley, K., & Morrison, D. (1997). Endorsement of distributively fair and unfair leaders in interpersonal and intergroup situations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 465–494.
- Platow, M. J., Mills, D., & Morrison, D. (2000). The effects of social context, source fairness, and perceived self-source similarity on social influence: A self-categorization analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 69 – 81.
- Platow, M. J., Reid, S., & Andrew, S. (1998). Leadership endorsement: The role of distributive and procedural behavior in interpersonal and intergroup contexts. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1, 35–47.
- Platow, M. J., & van Knippenberg, D. (2001). A social identity analysis of leadership endorsement: The effects of leader ingroup prototypicality and distributive intergroup fairness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1508–1519.
- Platow, M. J., van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., van Knippenberg, B., & Spears, R. (2006). A special gift we bestow on you for being representative of us: Considering leader charisma from a self-categorization perspective. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 303–320.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Triandis, H. C., Chan, D. K. S., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Iwao, S., & Sinha, J. B. P. (1995). Multimethod probes of allocentrism and idiocentrism. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30(4), 461-480.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 77–122). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Tyler, T. R., & De Cremer, D. (2005). Process-based leadership: Fair procedures and reactions to organizational change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 529-545.
- Ulrich, J., Christ, O., & van Dick, R. (2009). Substitutes for procedural fairness: Prototypical leaders are endorsed whether they are fair or not. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 235-244.
- van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2008). How leader prototypicality affects followers' status: The role of procedural fairness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(2), 226-250.
- van Knippenberg, D., De Cremer, D., & van Knippenberg, B. (2007). Leadership and fairness: The state of the art. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16, 113–140.
- van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 243 – 295.
- Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

English Abstract

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research

An Integrative Review

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Turkey
e-mail: agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of the present paper is to review the social identity theory of leadership, and to summarize the theoretical developments and empirical findings related to the theory that occurred between 1997 and 2009. Moreover, some of the research areas that may be topics for future studies are introduced and discussed along with a number of propositions.

Key words: Leadership, prototypicality, social identification, self-concept, leadership endorsement, leadership effectiveness.

French Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

La théorie sur l'identité sociale du leadership et propositions pour des recherches futures

Une revue intégrative

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Résumé

Le but de cet article est de passer en revue la théorie de l'identité sociale du leadership et de récapituler les développements théoriques et résultats empiriques qui se sont produits entre 1997 et 2009. En outre, certains sujets, qui peuvent être des sujets de recherche future, sont développés de manière à aboutir sur des propositions de recherche.

Mots clés: Leadership, prototypicality, identification sociale, image de soi, approbation du leadership, efficacité du leadership.

*Translated by: Johannes Schaaper, Senior professor in International Management, BEM Bordeaux Management School

Spanish Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

Análisis de la Identidad Social del Liderazgo y Propuestas para Futuras Investigaciones

Un Enfoque Integrador

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Resumen

El objetivo de esta investigación es revisar la teoría de la identidad social del liderazgo y resumir los avances teóricos y los hallazgos empíricos relacionados con ella ocurridos entre 1997 y 2009. Además, se introducen y discuten algunas de las áreas temáticas que pueden ser temas de interés para futuras investigaciones y se realizan una serie de propuestas.

Palabras clave: Liderazgo, prototipo, identificación social, auto concepto, respaldo del liderazgo, efectividad del liderazgo.

*Translated by: María Avello. Ph.D. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. mavello@emp.ucm.es

German Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

Eine Analyse der sozialen Identität von Führung und Vorschläge für zukünftige Forschung

Eine integrative Betrachtung

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Zusammenfassung

Ziel des vorliegenden Beitrags ist einen Rückblick auf die Theorien der “Social Identity of Leadership” zu geben und eine Zusammenfassung der theoretischen Strömungen und Entwicklungen aufzuzeigen. Auch die empirische Forschung und Erkenntnisse zu diesem Themengebiet werden im Zeitraum von 1997 bis 2009 zusammengefasst. Des Weiteren werden der zukünftige Forschungsbedarf auf dieser Basis identifiziert und eine Reihe von Propositionen abgeleitet.

*Translated by: Anja Schulz, PD Dr., TU Dortmund, Dortmund, Deutschland, Anja.Schulz@tu-dortmund.de

Italian Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

L'analisi dell'identità sociale della leadership e propositi per ricerca futura

Una prospettiva Integrata

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Abstract

Lo scopo del presente studio e' quello di analizzare varie teorie sull'identità sociale della leadership e di riassumere gli sviluppi teorici e dati empirici riguardanti studi fatti fra il 1997 e 2009. Inoltre sono presentate alcuni temi e proposte di ricerca per studi futuri.

Parole chiave: leadership, teoria dei modelli prototipo, identificazione sociale, concezione di se, supporto alla leadership, efficacia della leadership

*Translated by: Riccardo Paterni founder of Professione Lavoro ® by Knowledge for Action & Action for Knowledge - riccardo@sapereperfare.it

Arabic Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

تحليل الهوية الاجتماعية للقيادة و مقترحات : لأبحاث مستقبلية نقد تكاملي

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@ankaya.edu.tr

خلاصة

ان الهدف الرئيسي من طرح هذه الورقة، هو إستعراض نظرية الهوية الاجتماعية في القيادة ومن أجل تلخيص التطورات النظرية والنتائج التجريبية المتعلقة بالنظرية التي وقعت بين الاعوام 1997-2009. تم تقديم ومناقشة البعض من مجالات البحث التي من الممكن ان تطرح من أجل أن تكون موضوعا لدراسات مستقبلية.

الكلمات الرئيسية: القيادة؛ النمطية؛ تحديد الهوية الاجتماعية؛ مفهوم الذات؛ تأييد القيادة؛ فعالية القيادة.

*Translated by: Zu'bi M. F. Al-Zu'bi, Ph.D., FHEA, Assistant Dean of the Faculty of Business, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan, Email: zoz55jo@yahoo.com , z.alzubi@ju.edu.jo

Turkish Abstract*

The Social Identity Analysis of Leadership, and Propositions for Future Research:
An Integrative Review

Liderliğin Sosyal Benlik Kuramı ve Gelecek Araştırmalar için Öneriler

Bütünleştirici bir İnceleme

Aslı Göncü

Department of Psychology, Çankaya University, Ankara, Turkey. agoncu@cankaya.edu.tr

Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı liderliğin sosyal benlik kuramını ve alanda 1997 ve 2009 yılları arasında gerçekleşen kuramsal gelişmeler ile bilimsel bulguları özetlemektir. Ayrıca, gelecek çalışmalara konu olabilecek bazı başlıklar farklı önermeler eşliğinde sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Liderlik, temsilcilik, sosyal aidiyet, benlik, liderliğin benimsenmesi, etkin liderlik.

*Translated by: The author, Aslı Göncü