

LEGITIMATION AND THE LEADER-FOLLOWER
RELATIONSHIP: A REVIEW

A Project Presented to the Faculty
of
California State University, Stanislaus

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Business Administration

By
Raymond R. Ott
November 2017

CERTIFICATION OF APPROVAL

LEGITIMATION AND THE LEADER-FOLLOWER RELATIONSHIP:

A REVIEW

by
Raymond R. Ott

Signed Certification of Approval page
is on file with the University Library

Dr. Andrew Hinrichs
Professor of Management – Human Resources

Date

Dr. Sophie Zong
Project Coordinator, Professor of Finance

Date

Ms. Katrina Kidd
Director of Executive MBA

Date

Dr. Thomas Gomez-Arias
Dean of College of Business Administration

Date

© 2017

Raymond R. Ott
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEDICATION

The thought of going back to college at the age of forty-three to finish a process I started thirty years ago was very daunting. As a single father and owner of a business, the concept of how I would make it through the process was just a concept. Now that I have finished I understand how an idea turns into a dream and how a dream turns into reality. Along the way I may have lost pieces of myself, however I now have a deeper understanding of legitimacy in the formation of leaders and organizations; the evolution of its birth, to its demise.

Today I stand stronger in principle than I did three years ago and knowingly I have the tools and ability to influence and help to elevate those I encounter to be better than their previous selves. I dedicate my work and sacrifice to all those I will have the privilege to come alongside in the future and be a guiding light of hope and encouragement.

Finally, I dedicate this project, a promise of hope and strength, to my family who have sacrificed alongside me. They gave of their time and strength to give me the ability to focus on this degree and its finality. Your sacrifice is greatly appreciated and will never go undeserving. I promise in all my efforts to not only support you but also demonstrate to others what love can do for the support for a family member in time of need.

Thank you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Whenever a significant endeavor is embarked upon and finally completed a time of reflection is needed to ponder on the obvious that a project like this was never accomplished alone. In this respect, I wish to acknowledge the guidance and direction given by Dr. Andrew Hinrichs. As my advisor, it was his focus that I narrowed down my interest of leadership to the perspective of legitimacy. The interest I had in the formation of leadership was in truth the development of legitimacy and the legitimation process. Thank you, Dr. H., for the positive encouragement when I hit the wall and could not give any more. Your direction lifted my spirits and gave light to the idea this could be accomplished. I will always be grateful.

Finally, I would like to thank and acknowledge with warmest love and affection my best friend. She is a pillar of hope and dedication of strong character for doing the right thing while standing for principles we both believe in. I cannot imagine going through this process without her smile, friendly laughter, and most of all strong belief in Jesus Christ. Her ability to pray for me during some of the darkest times will always be remembered with the greatest appreciation. I thank you with all my heart and will always be grateful for our friendship.

All My Love,

Ray

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Abstract.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Leadership Legitimacy Literature Review.....	3
Leading Authorities on Leadership Legitimacy	3
Additional Definitions of Legitimacy.....	39
Anomalies in the Definition or Description of Legitimacy	43
Discussion.....	46
Leadership and the Social-Self, Social-Perceptiveness, and Self-Monitoring	52
Conclusion	54
References.....	57

ABSTRACT

Legitimacy has been recognized as a key component in the social construction of organizations and leadership development. This review explores the constructs of the process of legitimacy and why people voluntarily obey leaders and authorities. Because the psychology of legitimacy has a relational (and instrumental) component, leaders source part of their legitimacy from the relationship with their followers. The leader-follower relationship often stems from follower perceptions and expectations of the leader. Though this concept does not exist in isolation the significance in how the follower perceives the leader is significant. Followers participate and can contribute significantly to effective leadership. Therefore, effective leaders are typically those who follow effectively. This literature review focuses on influence, the leader-follower relationship and theoretically relevant literature around legitimacy judgments and the willingness to obey authorities.

INTRODUCTION

For the inevitability and development of social systems through history to the modern-day endurance of organizations, legitimacy has played a critical role. Thus far understanding the process that underlies legitimacy continues to defy human understanding. Various streams of thought have emphasized the importance of legitimacy in the significance of leadership as a process instead of a person or state. In organizations, the perceptions of legitimacy play a larger role in shaping investor behavior and involvement according to Pollock and associates (2003). The depth of legitimacy can insulate companies from volatility in the market further giving credence to endurance (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Similarly, social psychology demonstrates the legitimacy process as a cornerstone that attempts to explain group and organizational leadership development behavior (Johnson, Dowd, & Ridgeway, 2006).

Given its importance in social systems, legitimacy has been described as the stability of a company or social system and is one of the problems that need to be solved by any of the theories of these processes. Legitimacy constitutes a factor in many of these structures that can destabilize one or more of these systems. Since leadership is a process and not a person, understanding the process opens questions for emphasis about how leadership functions are performed. This process cannot be studied without looking at interactions and input from followers with their expectations, desires, and perceptions. The role of the follower can then be perceived

as having the quality to be a potential leader. The positive qualities of being a good leader, such as honesty, competence, goal setting, and decision-making are also the qualities that make for a good follower. Therefore, it will be the process including influence and the leader-follower relationship that will guide this paper.

The literature viewed will help to frame the understanding around the willingness to voluntarily obey the social rules of an authority figure without regard to how breaking the rules will affect the follower. This belief around legitimate power and how followers internalize the boundaries of this concept will be reviewed (Tyler, 1997; French & Raven, 1959). Legitimacy has been recognized as a key component to the social development of organizations and how leadership is defined (Zelditch, 2001; Tyler, 1997). The goal of this review is to highlight the importance of legitimacy as a general social process in the development of leadership. The author's attempt to uncover the legitimacy process considered the relevant literature of leadership and legitimacy judgments within and between groups and individuals.

LEADERSHIP LEGITIMACY LITERATURE REVIEW

Leading Authorities on Leadership Legitimacy

Ben-Yoav, Hollander, & Carnevale (1983)

Ben-Yoav, Hollander, and Carnevale (1983) described the legitimacy of a leader as a perception that group members develop based on how the group leader acquired his or her power. Their research sampled male college students in groups of four, with 21 groups representing 84 total research subjects. The study was a laboratory design in which the legitimacy of a group's leader was manipulated to examine different leadership outcomes. The general hypotheses in this research were as follows:

1. Elected leaders, compared to appointed leaders would be perceived by followers as more responsive to the followers' needs, more interested in the task, more competent, and preferable as future leaders.
2. The preference for a future leader and the contributions of his followers to the task would be a function of his contributions to the task, defined as how much he talked to followers.

The hypotheses were generally supported. The source of a leader's legitimacy has a significant effect on follower relations and group activity. This study examined only two sources of leader legitimacy – election or appointment. However, the differences are noteworthy. Elected leaders were viewed by group members as more responsive to their needs. The elected leaders were also perceived as being more interested in the team's work and as more competent than their appointed peers. Further, elected

leaders rather than appointed leaders were seen by group members as a better option for future leadership. Even more exciting, the more an elected leader was perceived to contribute to the task, the more group members wished they would remain their leader into the future. Effects were also found that showed that communication among group members changed based on the legitimacy of the group leader.

The results suggest that organizations need to help increase their managers' legitimacy. It seems this can partially be done through more transparent or democratic promotion processes. These results suggest that people who are supervised (i.e., employees) have perceptions of their superiors that have a substantial impact on group dynamics and relationship formation. Managers can take the results as evidence that they should be aware of employee perceptions of them. Supervisors should also develop a strategic plan to increase their personal legitimacy as it relates to future jobs at other organizations. This sort of career legitimacy building can help establish legitimacy early on when forming new relationships with subordinates. It may also be advantageous for managers who lack legitimacy to ask their organizations for development in this area.

The scope of the article revealed that elected leaders have more of an exchange relationship with those who elected them. There are more expectations from elected leaders in the form of rewards, and this can provide potentially more of a response following. Expectations can elevate faster the evaluation by group members, but on the other hand, can make the leader more vulnerable to displacement by the follower in support for the leader. These findings are contrasted with those who are appointed.

Appointed leaders seem to show greater acceptance by followers if expected goals are not achieved. Specifically, followers do not appear to fall away or accuse appointed leaders when a failure occurs. Elected leaders are viewed as more responsive to and interested in followers' needs than those who are appointed, and it seems, therefore, have lower expectation among their followers.

These consequences for leader-follower relations also are reflected in the competence assumptions by group members. This also seems to influence the evaluations of elected leaders being more positive than for appointed ones. Additionally, the more the elected leader participated in the group's goals, the greater the impact of the elected leader's legitimacy. There was no evidence however that the amount of contribution by the elected leader influenced this leader-follower relationship, but the stronger and more positive it was seemed to affect the leader's legitimacy.

Tyler (1997)

According to Tyler (1997), legitimacy can be labeled as the notion from group members (followers) that they should voluntarily follow the rules and authorities regardless of how they are rewarded or punished. To demonstrate the process of legitimacy, Tyler conducted several studies:

Study #1: Family Authority - The study consisted of 335 participants at a university who completed a questionnaire asking the students about a recent conflict they had with their parents.

Study #2: Educational setting (Student evaluations of teachers) - For this study 346 students were asked about a recent conflict they had with a professor. The study pool consisted of 165 students in Japan and 181 students in the U.S.

Study #3: Managerial authority – Chicago: Out of 409 respondents from a random sample contacted by telephone, 303 met three criteria: They worked at least 20 hours per week, had a supervisor, and recently had a personal experience involving that supervisor. From this group, 75% were successfully interviewed. Then a second sample of 106 respondents, from the same sample frame, were asked to remember a personal experience in which they ended up feeling angry or upset with their supervisor. From this group, 73% were successfully interviewed.

Study #4: Managerial authority – California: This study took place in California and had 305 employees in the public sector. These respondents comprised four ethnically based work unions and were given questionnaires that were mailed to them. The questions asked about a conflict they had with a supervisor. The respondents who sent them back represented 29% of employees including 117 Asian, 58 Chicano/Latino, 56 European American, 45 African American, and 25 Other or Mixed.

Study #5: Local Political Authority - Respondents were 401 random sample people of San Francisco who were interviewed by phone. The questions were based on their views on the water crisis and how the government agency (Public Utility Commission) was handling the rules regarding the issue. Of the 401, 63% were eligible for interviews.

Study #6: This study had 502 random sample people from the San Francisco area who were interviewed by phone. The sample was asked about the U.S. Supreme Court including their opinions on the court, views about recent cases, and views about how the court would handle a hypothetical case. Of the 502, 74% were eligible for interviews and successfully interviewed.

Hypotheses for these studies include:

1. Subordinates' evaluations of the actions of authorities are closely tied to judgments about the implications of those actions for their social relationship with the authority in question.
2. People's connection to groups and group authorities is linked to the past or future exchange of resources.
3. Why people do or do not accord legitimacy to leaders and voluntarily defer to their decisions.

The overall evidence found instrumental and relational indices influences of legitimacy. The larger impact of psychological motives was distributed between the two, but experience had the biggest influence on legitimacy dominated by relational judgments for the experience. The attributions of experience on views of legitimacy for authorities is tied to how people are treated more than by a concern about what they will gain or lose. Further, the analysis of the three aspects of legitimacy found that people mostly evaluate authorities based on their relationship with the authority. In another component, people's obedience to group rules and willingness to accept decisions are also connected with experience to a relational component. This study

found that a key element of legitimacy is how group members are treated. People value respect, and when a leader demonstrates this in how they treat subordinates or team members, they are more willing to obey and follow the rules. Additionally, these studies looked at the impact of instrumental judgments on the impact of legitimacy. This contributory component revealed that people were concerned about the favorability of decisions and how they were treated. This willingness to accept decisions is similar to procedural justice theories that show outcome satisfaction is based on instrumental characteristics more than authority evaluations. The important concept of relationship in forming legitimacy should not be undervalued, but it is also limited by this analysis. With this said, people both want to be treated fair and want to know the procedure for which they are being treated is fair. Legitimacy is constructed by those who perceive an authority more by fairness and is influenced by the relationship they perceive to have with that authority.

The effects of relational and instrumental influences on legitimacy can be mostly felt by managers. How a manager treats an employee and the methods they use for the treatment impact the employee's perception of the manager's legitimacy. This perception has a direct relationship to their obligation to follow the rules and accept norms and values the manager most wants the group to embrace. These results can have huge impacts on how teams are formed and can change the dynamic in how they are successful. Managers can use the impact of these studies from obedience to group rules and how they are also dominated by relational concerns. These results point to how a team leader can influence participation and success of a group. Managers who

do not lead a group, but appoint someone could use these understandings to elicit greater success from the team. Relational judgments on legitimacy assessments are driven by overarching concern about how authorities will treat group members (i.e., employees), and these concerns show they also have implications for identity.

Social identity is important because the way an authority treats an employee is seen as the view the company holds for the individual. These feelings can transcend many actions by the employee and their performance under the guidance of authority. For most managers, their financial and career growth is tied to successful advancement in the areas they manage; therefore, as predicted the relational model that influences the judgment of legitimacy assessment points to the fact that people who are treated fairer are more likely to follow the rules and to produce success in groups.

The aspects of legitimacy highlighted in these studies show three areas: the willingness of people to obey and accept decisions; following rules; and good evaluations of authorities. The concept that obligation to obey authorities suggests the label as legitimate. The suggestion that authorities are entitled to obey comes from the belief that power is legitimized through internalized values (French & Raven, 1959). The reason for analysis is to understand the subjective feelings of this obligation to obey by followers to authority figures. Theories explore the attitudes which shape why people volunteer their obligation to authorities and suggest the effectiveness of these leaders is tied to their degree of influence (Tyler, 1997). Some researchers also suggest that consent is necessary for the credence of legitimacy. This consent further

examines the effectiveness of authorities in shaping group behaviors and how this belief molds and shapes the group's values designed around their local social system they participate in.

Social systems are made up of interactions between people through both verbal and nonverbal communications. These communications are driven by rules, norms, patterns, needs, desires, and beliefs. Individuals or members of groups internalize beliefs about their obligation to obey these rules and about feelings to follow authority. Because of this belief, they accept the authority as a leader, further legitimizing that leader as one to follow. Two theories about legitimacy are explored considering the importance of evidence from studies on authorities in political, legal, and other leadership areas of society. For groups, enforcing rules and dealing with conflicts starts with establishing rules and procedures that give form and purpose. This narrative brings effectiveness and purpose to the group, helping to maintain order (Tyler & Dawes, 1993). Each group must have an authority or leader, and this selection process is not always automatic. The leader is expected to present solutions to the team's problems and to be effective, by maintaining order and, specifically, by influencing group members to take action toward the goals of the group. Mostly, members of groups obey the rules and direction from authority leaders, understanding the rewards and punishment plan that may follow if they do not.

This generalization is true when psychologists study people in groups or organizations but, interestingly, they also follow these norms without regard to reward or punishment. Meaning, deeper inside their mindsets, they have formed the

obligation to follow what matters. They are following these social rules that are part of the group and in turn, will also defer to authority when they are asked to go against a social norm. The social experiment by Milgram (1965) demonstrates the extent to which people will go to follow authorities. The psychological framework of legitimacy is the key to building this understanding and acceptance of the strength and influence of authority's ability to move forces. Two models suggested by Tyler (1997) build the basis for legitimacy: a resource-based instrumental perspective, and the identity-based relational model. A further suggestion is that the instrumental perspective is not complete and does not account for legitimacy. Greater evidence shows that group members respond better to a relational model, in other words, how they are treated. Instrumental cannot be discounted, but the greater impact of relational is dominating.

The evidence shows that how people are treated by authorities, separate from what they receive or do not receive from them, influences their legitimacy for the leader. Second, this influence continues to grow when the authority participates and shares membership with the group. Third, when a member can identify on some level with authority, this additionally amplifies the treatment by the authority. Finally, as this judgment of legitimacy is defined by members, they focus on issues of integrity rather than the authority's capability. The relational theory supports these statements and further defines its importance.

Ultimately, how people are treated and respected shows evidence to how legitimate their authority figure is considered. These findings support the importance

of effective leadership frameworks. The link of effectiveness of an authority and his ability is found in the social relationship between the leader and the followers.

Authorities must act in a neutral fashion that does not lead to questions by members whether respect or honesty is an issue. The willingness to volunteer, participate, and obey is linked to how people feel in a group regardless of the members' loss or gain in the group.

Tyler (2006)

A more current paper by Tyler (2006) suggests that legitimacy is shaped by the characteristics of authorities and institutions by the rules that are created and authorities who operate demonstrating the fairness of procedures which people will defer to the decisions of authorities as legitimate. Procedural fairness norms that are seen as consistent actions by authorities are found to shape and define legitimacy. According to Tyler (2006) legitimacy is characterized by the framework by which something is viewed as right and when accepted by people who are willing to defer voluntarily to decisions of authorities and accepting of rules of institutions. The author's general propositions for this paper are,

1. Central to legitimacy is the belief that a rule made by an authority is valid and should be followed. Contrary, wider acceptance is that legitimacy is a perception that one ought to obey given the scope of their fairness and procedural justice in decision-making.

2. Because legitimacy leads to an obligation to follow instead of fear of punishment, willingness to follow authority's decisions and rules is intensified.

The legitimacy research reviewed supports the basic concepts of legitimacy theory. Although the theories were established years ago, the recent studies empirically test its acceptance in social settings. The possession of power and how it influences people by authorities who seek to coerce followers find that incentives and fear are not effective tools. Those who are leading others and who have legitimacy are viewed as being appropriate and fair in their dealings by people who then feel obligated to defer to the decisions and rules made by leaders. Additionally, when an organization has legitimacy, people are more willing to follow the company's rules and policies they create. Some theories point to this legitimacy of rules and policies as a form of social control and design.

The prominent models of social control focus on gaining cooperation from the public through threats of punishment and showing competence from leaders in handling community problems. These promote willingness to follow the rules and to support authorities. Conversely, though, research shows that people will follow authorities more willingly because they are acting fairly in their procedures and treatment of followers. For example, it may make more sense for law enforcement to treat people fairer than it is to put more police on the streets, possibly creating intimidation. The ability to improve their success in keeping crime down may be found more in how they approach people and interact with them in times of crisis

than just cracking down on them. This fairness in police activity would increase their legitimacy (Tyler, 2001, 2004).

Studies in recent years demonstrate how widespread and significant the concern for an understanding of current social arrangements is by believing they are appropriate and fair. This understanding is found in those who can benefit or possibly do not benefit from those arrangements. Additionally, research supports the concept that authorities gain influence through legitimacy by the way they make decisions and exercise authority. This legitimacy is outside of their delivery of rewards or punishments and supports not what is fair and consistent but what is perceived as being fair or supported through ethical procedures. Therefore, the exercise of appropriate actions by authorities legitimates that authority and voluntary deference.

The importance of legitimacy in society and the ability of managers to perform gives them an alternative way of enforcing compliance. Power ends up being shallow and costing resources. When authorities are viewed as legitimate, they have an alternative support for rules and getting performance out of employees when times get difficult. Power over compensation, time off, and the use of punishment can have surface effects on people. When an authority can call upon the contribution and value of an employee while encouraging behavior from employees through their compliance because of legitimacy, authorities have greater capabilities for success.

Weber (1968) argues that social norms, values, and beliefs are part of peoples' "internal motivation systems" that impact them differently than rewards and punishments do. Managers who embrace this concept can see that this internal self-

regulating process allows employees to take on respected obligations and responsibilities from administrators. Accepting this direction from managers is an element of the concept of legitimacy. In other words, those managers who move from force authority with punishment and fear, to fairness and procedural justice will find higher levels of compliance and followership.

The scope of the article revealed the idea of legitimacy which constitutes the importance of research from social psychology. The dynamics of authority show how legitimacy influences the willingness of people to accept rules and direction from authorities. It also argues fairness or democratic procedures are followed in the creation of legitimacy (Lewin & Gold, 1999; Lewin, 1951). The power from legitimate authority when giving directions was best displayed in Milgram's (1975) research in the 1960s. Additionally, research shows decision acceptance is tied to fairness in the way leaders conduct directives and procedures for group members (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). However derived, the impact of this research on the legitimacy of an authority shows the importance of its ability to influence others.

In a social system, legitimacy is central to all parts that make up the culture or state of the organization. The company is then organized around the belief in its norms and values that support its central cause. The systems function efficiently when the central ideology is accepted and followed. In other words, citizens would not follow their company or government in general if they were not seen as legitimate. Since the viability of the institution is relevant for its purpose, as predicted by

legitimacy theory, employees are more willing to follow authority's rules when they believe leaders of the company are fair (Tyler & Blader, 2005).

When it is difficult to persuade people based on their self-interest or with punishment and rewards, legitimacy provides a reservoir of support for organizations which authorities can pull from (Tyler, 2006). During times of crisis, this reservoir is associated with loyalty from the group and provides insulation that the company can use to promote its direction. The organization can struggle financially or ethically while this reservoir of legitimacy insulates the company, keeping workers focused and committed. While companies can survive on legitimacy through a crisis, it is the public institutions that have displayed a tenet for legitimacy that is more important.

For those institutions which embrace the wider concept of legitimacy that is not connected to the use of enforcement by power, a wealth of opportunities and deeper followership await. Compliance through fairness shows greater acceptance and willingness to obey rules and policies by employees. Hence, effective democratic governing depends upon the legitimacy of the state in which an organization operates (Tyler, 2006).

Tost (2011)

For Tost (2011), institutions are deemed legitimate when they are culturally appropriate to the social context in which they are viewed. How legitimate an entity is seen is broadly based on the perception that the actions of authority are desirable, and appropriate within a socially constructed system of norms, beliefs, and values. A follower's perceptions of positive legitimacy judgments for leaders create the

obligation to obey and further supports leader legitimacy. The central propositions in the Tost study are,

1. To integrate social psychological and institutional theories of legitimacy to specify the content of legitimacy decisions.
2. The content are the wide perceptions and beliefs that underlie the judgment of an entity as legitimate or illegitimate.

The impact of conflict between authorities and subordinates on relational fears is higher than from instrumental concerns although both have an impact. Therefore, the content of legitimacy judgments comes from group members whom identity concerns. Even though some researchers view this as unbalanced, Tost (2011) views this as the basis of “different dimensions of perception” that can impact legitimacy judgments at the same time. Tost continues that although relational concerns seem to dominate most cases of conflict, there may be other situations of instrumental judgments that would prevail.

Tost (2011) finds that the two dimensions of legitimacy judgments, relational and instrumental, can both be found to support legitimacy at the same time, or possibly not. Bringing these two dimensions together not as separate models of legitimacy but separate bases allow us to consider a situation in which one or the other will have a greater impact. The argument discovers this is the best way to find out which one has the larger impact on behavior.

Recently, social researchers have added a moral dimension to the legitimacy argument. When individuals have a moral conviction about an issue, this has

influenced perceptions of an agency's legitimacy. With morality acting as a general dimension of evaluation and viewed as separate from relational and instrumental, there is the support that moral concerns are more important than their two cousins. Even though these models may coexist, they should be viewed as three different dimensions of judgment that will influence how people build their concept of leadership legitimacy. This way of looking at them can open opportunities to see how they can contribute to legitimacy understanding. Bringing meaning to how judgments are formed will help organizations and social groups. Since legitimacy supports a change in cognition for individuals who support a social entity, a further understanding may be gained as to how and why people's behaviors change and cause them to support or resist company changes. These variations can happen at the macro level and individual levels, assuming unexpected outcomes occur. Given situations like these and if the judgment of illegitimacy forms, then change in legitimacy can occur for existing authorities and entities by the actions of a change agent, an institutional entrepreneur.

Institutional entrepreneurs are people who take on leadership roles using social skill to bring about institutional change (Tost, 2011). Tost supports the idea that the model of legitimacy judgment process presented here shows how these institutional entrepreneurs are successful. First, they are successful in effect if their influence is targeting how judgments are evaluated. Further, if they target how their followers look on and evaluate an authority or institution, this will matter in their success. These targets must also hold the entrepreneurs in high regard for this consideration

and therefore, challenging the institution is likely. This challenge for the institution can be started by creating the conditions that favor a mental alarm in those they want to recruit for institutional change. One way is to influence the follower's perceptions of the social entity by highlighting the conflicts or concern affecting which entities are the target of reevaluation. Research suggests that which values model to connect to - instrumental, relational, or moral - will have an impact on the success of the entrepreneur's actions.

It is unclear where these leaders will come from, but it is clear they do not need to come from top leadership positions. The position of Mutch (2007) is that individuals who are more autonomous stand out more so for this kind of role. This model supports the idea that institutional change is more likely to happen when someone realizes the legitimacy judgments of a company or institution need to be challenged. This inward look may change how they legitimize an organization and may produce modification and either small or larger change over time.

Managers who have been at a company for a period and now find themselves under new leadership that is taking the company in a newer direction will find this view most helpful. Understanding there are ways for a manager to evoke evolution in a department or institution by means of multiplication instead of considering change by addition (meaning only the manager being the change agent) is welcoming. Bringing the right model into legitimacy judgment assessments is understandable. Some people find grounds to build legitimacy based on strong morals and how an authority exercises these actions, is more important than how well the authority

relates to his or her subordinates. What is good for a manager is that they can stand on solid moral ground and still facilitate institutional entrepreneurship. Managers can also relate to those who exercise autonomy mindsets or at least influence this changing legitimacy mindset. Change is good, and now managers know this change agent does not have to come from the top team members but can pick out of the crowd of all those who contribute to the company's success.

The research in Tost (2011) showed how the model of legitimacy judgments uses institutional theory and social psychology to design a framework to look at the content and the process of legitimacy judgments following how they develop. These results open the knowledge more to the design of legitimacy on all levels including micro and macro. Over recent years, the study of an institutional researcher's views has looked at the constant change by dividing into two areas. First, those who study a proactive approach and those who look at the resistance to change and the perspective of those who fall on each side. Given an integrative theoretical framework for understanding, legitimacy can help to bring clarity to these arguments as well as support change itself. This understanding may lead to recognition of those who are more open to change and identify members of a powerless group inside a power hierarchy who would be prompted to act to change the organizational design.

Focusing at the micro level can open the opportunity to notice when and how someone's belief of legitimacy changes toward an authority figure. Therefore, using the construct of legitimacy as a bridge between the micro and macro levels will help researchers of institutional change with an outline when studying the phenomenon of

change. Individual-level legitimacy judgments come from dimensional designs that are used to evaluate legitimacy. Given the pivotal role legitimacy plays in business and personal social systems the dimensions of relational, instrumental, and moral judgments will continue to be critical in the research since it is an essential component in organizational change.

Johnson, Dowd, & Ridgeway (2006)

For Johnson, Dowd, and Ridgeway (2006) legitimacy is defined as a person not holding the same values, norms, and beliefs as other group members, but who instead, believes and conforms to what they believe those members accept as being legitimate. Legitimacy occurs in a social reality of collective construction where those who participate in the reality presume the elements of legitimacy are all shared. The authors propose the following regarding the social aspects of legitimacy:

1. Understanding legitimacy as a general social process will strengthen different levels of social analysis.
2. Social psychology shows how legitimacy processes focus on the legitimation of organizational forms, practices, and the ability to maintain inequality in organizations.

To understand legitimacy as a general social process, Johnson and his colleagues focused on two areas of social psychology and organizations (Johnson, Dowd, & Ridgeway, 2006). Understanding these areas opens the expansion of the process of how something is deemed legitimate. The acceptance of beliefs for legitimation for the status quo gives legs to the actions for supporting social objects

like worthy and unworthy individuals and organizational forms building legitimacy. Although legitimacy is defined as a belief that is held by individuals, many hold it as a group or collective action. It is construed that organizations, groups, or social systems which have support by their members are more stable when connected to their norms and rules which are less likely to be violated by its members (Johnson et al., 2006). Through the processing of the social order, rules, beliefs, and norms are formed that are presumed and accepted by most others. When people perceive that others support this social order, validation sets in and behaviors follow. Some sociological approaches emphasize the creation and legitimation of new social objects where many focus on the maintenance of legitimacy and the outcomes at the group or organizational level.

With the construction of a social object as being legitimate, the process that is commonly assumed about how things are or supposed to be, supports expectations for what is likely to happen in a situation. Johnson et al. (2006) also suggest how four stages of the process of a new social item gain legitimacy and validation. First, social change happens at the lowest levels of social interaction by the smallest of strategic interests or contingent events. Second, for these social changes to be accepted as legitimate, they must be approved locally and validated. Not only must these be consistent in action but must be a part of or linked to the larger cultural framework. Third, once they are validated, then they are brought into local situations. This validation offers others the acceptance to legitimate the innovation specifically if it

meets the current goals as well as possesses a consensus. Finally, this result solidifies and allows the innovation to be accepted with greater speed and force generally.

This general validity process results in many taken-for-granted practices that are seen in organizations. With this new social object now a part of the organization the legitimacy processes maintain the stability of the object. Across organizations, people will accept tasks and duties that are antiquated and inefficient because they believe they are right or fear of punishment. Acceptance of these practices offers the appearance that the company is legitimate and just in its operations.

Upon expanding their knowledge of legitimacy, managers can implement change in their organization or department with knowing the processes of legitimation. This knowledge will help them to know how to implement changes and even anticipate either conflict or support for these new social innovations. These new novelties can be the element that keeps employees engaged and active. Some managers might find that engagement for long-term subordinates diminishes after time, and acceptance of change toward collective goals could receive higher approvals. Corporations all go through major financial, social, and political ups and downs and the legitimacy of the organization help to insulate the company from delegitimizing. With the observation of certain patterns of behavior as legitimate, this is still based on what is perceived as right and managers can use this behavior to their advantage. Despite the reservations that one observer has about a single behavior, the pattern of behavior will still be legitimate reinforcing the behavior as a standard norm or rule the institution has created.

Weber (1968) states that legitimation occurs when a collective construction of social reality and elements of social order is consistent with values, norms, and beliefs that individuals believe are widely shared. Given the importance of legitimacy in the survival of organizations and social systems, it is perhaps the most critical part in the institutionalization of an organization. Legitimacy seems to provide the insulation and constant support needed to grow an organization and enhances its influences by increasing individuals' loyalty to the company and willingness to follow decisions and policies (Tyler, 2006). The process of institutional change challenges existing beliefs and social realities of individuals' judgments of legitimacy of those entities. Research has focused on this area since legitimacy is essential to institutionalization as a process. Realizing this importance, research on institutional change has recently begun to concentrate on the micro level process involved in institutional change (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004). Even in the expression of observation of certain patterns of behavior as legitimate, this is still based on what is perceived as right in cognitive legitimacy. Despite one observer having reservations about a single behavior, the pattern of behavior will still be legitimate.

Research findings show that people will gravitate to those who are given more legitimacy than those with less. Those who break those group norms and values are less likely to have associations and followers who legitimize their actions. Social psychologists have used the construction of legitimacy to explain social entities, hierarchies, and individuals. Individual-level legitimacy judgments consist of substantive beliefs and perceptions that influence the individual's assessment of

whether the individual is appropriate. Social psychologists articulate the instrumental, relational, and moral dimensions of legitimacy judgments. The instrumental perspective shows that legitimacy is present when a leader communicates that material interest of the individual. For instance, a boss may reward a subordinate with a raise or time off. In contrast, relational examples of legitimacy show levels of respect, gratitude, and status within a group or through group membership (Tyler, 1997). Relational perspective expresses to an entity an individual's social status and improves their self-worth. The empirical evidence suggests that both instrumental and relational concerns have some degree of impact on peoples' legitimacy judgments. However, these two dimensions of legitimacy judgments are not mutually exclusive. For example, an individual may view an entity as legitimate on both relational and instrumental levels.

Although most of the research on legitimacy focuses on explanations of instrumental and relational models, recent studies expose the realm of a moral dimension to legitimacy. As Skitka, Bauman, and Lytle (2009) conveyed, for people who had different degrees of beliefs over an issue for instance, if the Supreme Court had decided on a specific case, and the court decision was the way people thought they would rule, then this action showed perceptions about the Court's level of legitimacy. It has been argued that while moral and relational concepts are similar in reactions, morality concerns are more important than instrumental and relational concerns.

Moral implications toward defining legitimacy are even more of a concern as Scott (2001) explains. The predominant view of this content of legitimacy among scholars of sociologists rests their view in which the primary foundation of legitimacy is the moral status of the entity or the way in which the entity conducts activities and behaviors toward moral and ethical principles (Scott, 2001). Additionally, institutional theorists' views of pragmatic and moral legitimacy overlap with a social psychologist.

Hollander, Fallon & Edwards (1977)

According to Hollander and colleagues, the leader's source of authority affects the leader's actions as well as the perceptions and reactions of followers (Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977). This research involved two experiments of 48 in 12 groups of four and 52 male college students. This study was to report on the influence of appointed versus elected leaders in a four-person discussion group with a decision-making task. The authors hypothesized the following:

1. Newly elected leaders would be more influential than the recently appointed leaders, giving an elected leader more latitude for influence.
2. Greater latitude by followers for elected leaders is restricted by higher expectations for higher performance from followers.
3. Elected leaders should show greater influence with their group than appointed leaders.
4. A group's experience of failure should have more negative effect on the influence of elected leaders than on appointed leaders.

For the first phase, the experiment did not support the hypothesis and found that elected leaders were not more influential than appointed leaders. However, under the second stage of the experiment elected leaders who failed had feedback significantly higher and scored the highest in being the most influential. Conversely, none of the elected leaders with success were the most influential in their group. Consistent with this finding, the groups that had failed were reacted to by the group as having a crisis and rallied around the leader to support, which was greater than when the group experienced success. The group showed higher satisfaction with success but conversely, showed less support for the leader.

Further analysis showed that appointment and success condition showed the highest average results. Additionally, the lowest average was among elected leaders with success. These are the results when considering the interaction of appointment and election leaders and their success or failure. The experiment also considered a leader influence score relative to the members of their group. Regarding influence, the elected/failure leader was the highest scoring group of all four conditions studied.

With the results slightly different than hypothesized, the results showed that appointed leaders are stronger and more influential than elected leaders in the beginning. However, with results showing stronger support for elected leaders who fail, followers are more satisfied with appointed leaders who succeed. The last phase of the experiment showed when the first leader who is elected and failed is replaced by the next elected leader; this scenario exerted more influence. Additionally, this

was found exemplifying the same for replacing an appointed leader who failed with a newly appointed leader.

Helm, & Morelli (1979)

Although Milgram does not define legitimacy, he may have accepted Weber's (1979) definition which generally states that legitimacy corresponds to people's belief or opinion in an institution or person as moral and appropriate then they are legitimate (Weber, 1921). One of the biggest distinctions is the discovery of the difference between someone who is "in authority" and someone who is "an authority." Someone who occupies an office or position but may not have the expertise or special skills is one who is "in authority." When an expert who has experience and special understanding will entitle authority, we can call them "an authority." Even though individuals will make these assumptions on their own legitimacy, how they legitimize these positions is quite different. For many followers, the act is a procedural one and a series of questions that point to how they achieved their position. Did they follow the rules, and were they compliant? This is different when they ask if the person is competent and capable of being the authority. This entire discussion begs the question, are people responding to the appearance of authority and not the actual authority they believe is there? This reaction questions the analyzer's ability to legitimize the person giving directions.

Could someone appear to be an authority, and would this be all it takes to legitimize a person? It may be possible that Milgram's experiment in the 1960s showed a display toward someone we trust (Helm & Morelli, 1979). If a scientist

appears to be competent and capable, does this build more legitimacy faster? Most people would not question the qualifications of a scientist. Further distinctions display how someone has a right to legitimacy by virtue of his or her position or title that is recognized and even presupposes some systems of rules and entitlement. The other distinctions point to deference from others where people will say this person has the right to authority and legal position to govern. For Milgram's scenario, this is disregarded and there is no way of knowing if the psychologist has the right to give orders, but in the experiments, he keeps the authority so long as the participants believe he is legitimate. What keeps someone from connecting solid moral authority to legitimacy? Some would argue that someone with good moral judgment would discontinue the actions of the subjects in his experiments. Milgram states this is not a problem of moral principle but one where a moral principle conflicts with the allegiance to obey authority; in other words, someone who feels an obedience to fulfill another person's wishes. Helm & Morelli (1979) states this is "the individual's actions that are structured by society's definition of what is legitimate."

Milgram's whole experiment and central concept in explaining obedience is the "agentic state" or lack of self-direction and evaluation of the situation. People have a natural tendency for obeying legitimate authority. When this agentic state is started people leave the realm of evaluation. Milgram suggests that the subject has autonomy and expresses it, contrary to what Helm & Morelli (1979) agrees to.

Hollander (1992¹) – Leadership and Followership Relations

Followers make contributions to the effectiveness of leadership at all levels of this relationship. It is critical in the evaluation of leadership to understand that all subsequent levels represent deeper levels of followership prior to just leading. Research in this area focuses on the ability to maintain this position which seems to involve skills of manipulation and impression management which influence those who maintain this position for the leader. What is important to note, is the perception of these skills by followers who keep the value of the leader's position valid and desirable.

This view of leader qualities suggests those who manage manipulative and power-oriented teams look for ways to gain control and power. Gleason, Seaman, and Hollander (1978) tested these ideas in an experiment with psychology students using the Machiavellianism Scale. The high Machs represented those seeking a world to manipulate, control, and have power over. After testing students in categories of high, middle, and lower Machs, the results revealed that those with middle Mach ratings were desired more for leadership than the other levels. Those at the extremes were ignored and less desirable. Qualities showed at the different stages of wanting, getting, and doing represented empathy, creativity, and flexibility were mediators of performance separate from wanting to get the leadership position. An observation is that the desire at each stage changed once that stage was achieved. The higher expectation was in the getting stage which does not seem to be sustained when doing the job.

More evidence is emerging to convey how the relationship and position of leaders is a process and not just identified as a person (Hollander, 1992). The group or organizational dynamics in the workplace offers the leader to perform duties such as information gathering, directing activity, decision-making, goal-setting, and communicating for moving forward as well as conflict resolution. Since all these functions cannot be performed solely by the leader, they must be delegated to followers through a relationship that will affect the follower in many ways. This reciprocal relationship is very active in leading followers to not only be reactive to demands but proactive to assumptions by this leadership and followership relationship.

In a traditional role of leadership, the notion is that power and dominance are the first and only actions by the leader. The power to control and at times inflict pain on subordinates constitutes the meaning of leadership. This destructive view has alternatives that see leadership as the ability to guide institutions with sensitivity and mutual trust instead of force and power. Even Freud (1921, 1960) showed how mutual identification and linked mindsets offer great advancement for the members who participate and the leaders whose function is to advance the goal. This notion lends credence to the idea that it is the follower who allows the leader to proceed with the outcome they request the most. Kipnis (1976) mentions that power will undermine the outcome and destroy authentic leadership efforts and destroys any chance of positive identification between the leader and follower.

A further study delivered by Hollander, Julian, and Sorrentino (1969), showed how the IC (idiosyncrasy credit) model worked with elected and appointed leaders. When an elected leader was told he or she was favored by a group they could move or change the group's direction more so than were leaders who were not as favored by the new group. The study continued that those favored had more freedom to challenge the team's judgments and beliefs. Interestingly if unused credits were not used to help the group in a time of need, this behavior would lose the leader their credit and therefore change the group members' perception of the incompetence and irresponsible actions of the leader (Alvarez, 1968). For followers, issuing and taking away credits through an interpersonal skill set is just as important as how the leader demonstrates interpersonal skill to earn the credit or not. It is understandable that leaders would be cautious in how they spend their time working to build credits in the minds of followers. On the other hand, they would need to be delicate where they spend time if they could quickly lose credits and personal power due to how they are being perceived by followers.

Hollander (1995) - The Centrality of the Leader-Follower Relationship

Followership, as it pertains to the understanding interdependence of leadership, is not new, and leader-centric models fail to explain the full relationship between both. However, the charismatic leader shows qualities that exemplify an emotional bond between the leader and follower. The leader cares and has the emotional capacity to connect with the follower. Unfortunately, there is a darker side to this attribute, and Howell and Avolio (1992) convey that separating the ethical and unethical

charismatic leaders is vital for followers. Without doing so, power-hungry leaders can use charisma to power through relationships with followers. These effects can be damaging to those unaware of its effects. On the other hand, ethical leaders use charisma in socially conscious ways to benefit all who follow them or for the organizations they serve. Many have paralleled the definition of a transforming leader with one of the charismatic traits. The outcomes of both to a group of followers can be a change in behavior by the follower and most certainly an attitude that attributes moral benefits to the relationship. Weber (1946) points to how the appearance of charisma and the acceptance by followers also shows up in the framework of legitimacy. Kipnis (1976) outlines the contrast between power and identification:

1. Power becomes desired as an end in and of itself, to be sought at virtually any cost.
2. Holding power tempts the individual to use organizational resources for self-benefit, even illegally.
3. Creates the basis for false feedback and an exalted sense of self-worth.
4. Moreover, a corresponding devaluation of others' worth, with a desire to avoid close contact with them.

Further analysis shows how inequality is evident when one relationship depends on one who has power and influence over the other. Emerson (1962) said that this situation could cause resentment toward the leader and inhibit growth and mutual respect between the parties. This self-serving attitude undermines the trust built by the two parties complicating the ability of the relationship to move forward in a healthy way.

When charisma and power grabbing is evident in leadership styles, it is usually driven by self-serving biases that are not typical in other social relationships (Hollander, 1995). Leaders tend to create distance and a sense of difference between themselves and their followers. With narcissistic tendencies, the leader draws the follower in for self-serving sacrifices for the leader. Eventually, this also contributes to the distance displaced by this relationship. The positive side of a charismatic ethical leader is one who identifies the responsive participation and consideration of the follower. Hollander, (1995) cites Cantril (1958) who comments that a sensitive leader is perceptive to a follower's reality and guides mutual trust to develop opportunities instead of forcing power over him or her. This mutual identification is a shared bond and understanding that cultivates activity and movement forward to common goals.

For decades, corporate CEOs' attitudes and actions were consistent with distancing themselves and executive management from those performing the work. Additionally, the salaries and bonus structures for executives have not only driven a wedge between their coherence to work together but the differences in their wealth too. This further alienation of followers from their leaders only creates greater resentment.

Leader performance is subjective but is outlined by the achievement of goals. A leader's role is his or her ability to move forward toward agreed upon goals and therefore defines the criteria by which to judge a leader. As described before a leader will be attributed to positive or negative outcomes of the goals. Since followership

defines and propels the performance of a leader forward, how followers are treated affects these outcomes. Pfeffer (1977) defines leader attribution terms as symbols which can be eliminated at the cause of a problem. History and studies show accountability and responsibility do not always go together in defining leaders.

Hollander & Kelly (1990, 1992) performed an organizationally based study where they were looking for responses to good and bad leadership styles. The results suggest that relational qualities and evaluations of distinguishing effective from ineffective leadership were used to describe some of the activities. Activities of note were communicating, supporting, listening, taking needed action, and delegating; these were at the top of the list for effective leadership. This study shows the effects of power shaping of followers' perceptions and responses. A leader's behavior can be challenged through a lens of ethical and moral assumptions. When abuse of power is evident, the social constraints placed on followers change the interactions between the two parties, opening the door for followers to change their acceptance of norms and rules. As leaders climb the corporate ladder, the expectancy for higher moral standards ultimately should follow them. When the leader does not follow this path the willingness to mutually identify is less attainable for the follower. Long-term effects of this action are usually followed by people taking their commitments and allegiance elsewhere.

Felfe & Petersen (2007)

Felfe and Petersen (2007) argue that followers' information processing of an authority's competence to be a leader lies in the mindsets of those followers. How

they perceive and analyze past performance and current capabilities are regarded as implicit leadership theories. They continue that this process is not limited to followers, but all managers and others involved in organizational decision-making as well. These factors are important to study not only from a practical stand but from a theoretical stance as well to understand how biases are influenced by their prototypes of what leadership looks like. It is argued that people who make decisions on the evaluation and capability, as outlined by “romance of leadership” are biased. It is important to note that not every person is romanticized based on ethical or unethical behavior. The quality of decisions and therefore, the quality of the questions that followers ask before romanticizing and further examination of the meanings of the romance of leadership and implicit leadership theories are critical to this perspective.

Implicit leadership theories (ILTs) are outlines and cognitive thought structures of traits and behaviors of what a leader should do and look like. These systems are constructed frameworks like charisma and attributes that people respond to in a positive way (Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). Accordingly, these characteristics describe pieces of a system that is used to identify a leader (Felfe & Petersen, 2007). With self-conceptions present, followers develop thoughts of what is a leader but additionally, there are other influences like cultural commonalities, personality, and situational indicators that all play a pivotal role in these identifications (Keller, 1999). Some situational clues include a winning or losing team, meaning when people are winning they feel more positive toward their leader and the opposite when losing occurs.

Felfe & Petersen (2007) argues implicit leadership theories demonstrate that leaders are elevated by followers, their superiors, and possibly the biases in response to the leaders' behavior. The question becomes what is more weighted, follower biases or the ILTs cognitive framework that responds to charisma and attractiveness of the leaders? If followers influence leaders with feedback and motivation to move forward, then would leaders have a better chance at success and effectiveness through this relationship (Lord & Emrich, 2001)? Felfe & Petersen (2007) argue how studies of bounded rationality show how people use inferential heuristics like rules of thumb, experiences from the past, as well as explicit or implicit theories of justice. The outline of studies performed by Felfe & Petersen (2007) further describes that high probability of success to a follower or decision maker exemplified success and advanced their decision to move forward. The reverse is true for low probability opportunities or in the case of evaluating a leader the same holds true.

The romanticizing process of leadership (RoL) predominantly considers leader-relevant cues. In other words, the follower may go as far as excluding situational clues and context that surround the actions of leaders. The mere fact that romanticizers ignore contextual details shows how they are in love with the role (Meindl, 1995). Not everyone is in love with leadership roles. Employees are more likely to lower their positive impact for a project based on the aspects of the leader. They look closer to the probability of success based on the contexts and less about the leaders. Thus, RoL finds greater extreme decisions that are based on the leader and less about the environment (Felfe & Petersen, 2007). For romantics, the leader is at

the center of their decision-making process and therefore, they tend to be greatly influenced by the leader's positive actions and behaviors.

These effects of RoL will decrease the leader's influence and possibly their effectiveness if romance is low. Even as far as mixed situations, the tendency to lean on the leader's effectiveness rather than important externalities shows how narrow a vision the follower can have. This one-sided influence by the follower can have its consequences. Only focusing on the leader to determine success for the project or company can open the follower to unethical and immoral behavior practices. One can imagine that such one-sided belief could jeopardize the future of the follower (Felfe & Petersen, 2007). Relying on one figure or figures at the top of a company would put an employee's entire future opportunities out of reach. There have been many examples in history and the biggest – Enron – showed how thousands lost their entire retirement, at retirement, because of the romanticizers' decisions to ignore outside conditions which led the company right to bankruptcy.

ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS OF LEGITIMACY

Legitimacy has long been recognized as a fundamental process that is basic to social organization (Zelditch, 2001). Although legitimacy is defined as a belief that is held by individuals, many hold it as a group or collective action. It is construed that organizations, groups, or social systems which have support by their members are more stable in reference to their norms, and rules which are less likely to be violated by its members.

Even though social psychologist definitions of legitimacy run parallel to institutional theorist definitions, some stand out more than others. A substantial portion of the research concentrates on defining legitimacy as the authority's right or entitlement to rule. Tyler (1997) defines legitimacy as "the belief that authorities are entitled to be obeyed" (Tyler, 1997, p. 323). Although this obligation to obey may seem like legitimate judgments, the feelings to do so and to support the leader do not constitute the legitimacy judgment. In other words, to believe or perceive that the judgment that the leader is legitimate and is entitled to power is a perception. This perception that he or she is entitled to power obligates the feeling to comply with the leader's requests. It is important to understand that a feeling of content for requests is a result of legitimacy judgment and not taken because they feel the participant's actions are legitimate. It can simply be because of fear of retribution for noncompliance would produce a negative outcome for others.

In their theory on the legitimation of informal hierarchies, Berger, Luckmann, & Luckmann (1967), define legitimacy as a process by which someone who is part of a larger social network can explain and support for the social entity no matter what the entity is in the group. This level of expression for an object of legitimation is more widely understood and accepted by its norms, values, and beliefs. The judgment of group members and their behaviors to voluntarily obey social rules and authorities no matter the reward or punishment is evident in leader-follower relationships (Bass, 1985). These feelings are internalized by realizing their concept of legitimacy is real. Legitimacy can be labeled as a feeling to be obligated to accept the authority of someone from both perspectives of groups and authority when legitimacy is vital to their success. Instrumental and relational models express these theories. Through these processes, rules, beliefs, and norms are formed that are presumed and accepted by most others. When people perceive that others support this social order, validation sets in and behaviors follow. Weber states that legitimation occurs when a collective construction of social reality and elements of social order are consistent with values, norms, and beliefs that individuals believe are widely shared (Weber, 1968).

Some participants in the social process may find disagreements in the social norms and values, but will still find compliance to legitimation through a construction of social reality. This widely shared value still brings order because they feel in line with most others. For understanding the development of leaders, social psychologists have used the construct of legitimacy to explain the behavioral reactions of people toward authority figures. Although this development is consistent with definitions for

institutional theories, social psychology still leans in a different direction. Further, Weber's formulation of legitimacy is echoed in research by Hannan, Carroll, and Ebrary (1992). Organizational formation of legitimacy is defined by its existence and pervasiveness when taken for granted (Hannan, Carroll, & Ebrary, 1992). When a company is new, the perception is that it needs time to get its feet under itself and therefore its legitimacy is low. While its proliferation in form increases, so does its legitimacy. Usually associated are success and maturity as its form increases and becomes a stable environment for building social actions.

For the area of organizations and the point of view from Meyer & Scott (1983, p. 201) defining legitimacy means a strong cultural support view is bringing institutions and legitimacy stability. Sometimes concepts are tossed around between the definitions of legitimacy and institutions, but both are critical to the formation of social systems. To pull from Douglas (1986, p. 45-46), understanding concepts of who treats institutions as legitimated conventions, he confirms that institutions need to have a process for a way of thinking or formula of the reason for a way of doing things that turns into legitimation and sustainability. Therefore, institutions are linked to a broader cultural framework of beliefs that are accepted social facts. This definition continues the parallel of processes for legitimation.

Further, in the organizational literature is a definition of legitimacy by Suchman (1995, p. 574) that states that in a generalized sense the actions of an entity are desirable and proper within a socially constructed system of shared cognitive thoughts, which legitimacy exists. However, in an organized crime organization, who,

(the participants) shares these norms, beliefs, and values make a difference. Someone can say these individuals have legitimacy but ask who the observers are? Within different behavioral dynamics may rest perceptions of legitimacy that may influence how legitimacy is defined but are generalized in how or if the organization is perceived as legitimate. The road maps to defining legitimacy may be slightly different in the characteristics it focuses on; however fundamental similarities are shared (Johnson et al., 2006).

Moral implications toward defining legitimacy are even more of a concern as Scott (2001) explains how the predominant view of this content of legitimacy among scholars of sociologists rests their opinion. The way in which the primary foundation of legitimacy is the moral status of the entity or the way in which the entity conducts activities and behaviors toward moral and ethical principles defines their view. Additionally, institutional theorist's views of pragmatic and moral legitimacy overlap with a social psychologist. Tost (2011) position is that these two views or constructs do not by themselves define the basis of the legitimacy judgments, rather the perceptions and beliefs that outlined the judgment of the leader's legitimacy gives the follower the notion they are entitled to be followed.

These entity structures consist of normative and regulative activities that provide stability meaning to social behavior (Scott, 1995). Further, institutions are social conventions that organize and participate in regular social behavior. Many institutional theorists viewed legitimacy as a function and performing conformity to these social norms, values, and beliefs (Tost, 2011; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Parsons,

1956; Weber, 1978). Meyer & Scott (1983) proposed a more cognitive definition of legitimacy for organizations as “the degree of cultural support for an organization.” They further explain this is when a company relates to its culture or is seen as relevant then the company provides explanations for its existence, functioning, and jurisdiction or possibly lack thereof (Tost, 2011). Adding that these and other definitions Suchman (1995) broadens the definition of legitimacy by expressing that it is a generalized assumption for an entity that is desirable or appropriate within a social construction.

Anomalies in the Definition or Description of Legitimacy

As mentioned initially, Tyler (1997) states that entitlement by authorities shows that followers have an obligation to obey and follow the rules designed by the leader, simply because of the hierarchal relationship. Legitimate power is built on the existence of consent from the follower, and therefore legitimacy leads to consent, and legitimate power comes from intrinsic values as stated by French and Raven (1959). This type of power and the subordinates feeling to obey have active support for legitimacy judgments, but this desire to comply with this obligation that is assumed does not constitute the legitimacy judgment. The perception that the leader is legitimate is, in itself, an outcome of the acumen or byproduct of this thought and does not make up the boundaries of the judgment. In this understanding of the differences in defining legitimacy, it is important to suggest that the feeling of obligation can come from sources other than legitimacy. In this case, a request from a

leader is just that, a request and noncompliance could mean negative outcomes for the subordinate.

Deeper influences of social psychology theories can be found in the components described by Weber, (1968) classic ideas on legitimacy. Validity and propriety are described as beliefs linked to the individual's formation of legitimacy. Validity pushes an individual to be obligated to obey norms even in the absence of personal approval of them, where propriety believes a social order's norms of conduct are wanted and are appropriate actions to take.

Further research in social psychology has stated fairness as the key determinant of legitimacy judgments (Tyler & Lind, 1992; Tyler, 1997). Because there are other definitions of legitimacy than fairness, it is important to differentiate these from the construct of fairness. For example, one definition by Major and Schmader (2001), states that legitimacy is defined as "subjective perceptions of fairness or justice of the distribution of socially distributed outcomes" (pg. 180). Because the content of legitimacy judgments is made up of beliefs and perceptions that affect the persons assessment of leadership, so too is the appropriateness of legitimacy to its social context.

Weber (1946) distinguishes the core of legitimacy as a charismatic approach "in the eyes of the beholder," who sees a leader not by law, or logic, or even the leader's place in the hierarchy, but because the follower feels the charismatic tug of the individual. This romantic, one-dimensional approach can be interpreted as patterns of emotional connections to an authority figure. Although this may sound romantic the

Milgram studies (Helm & Morelli, 1979), showed how obedience in the realm of legitimacy is an essential structure that helps construct most leader-follower relations. The appearance of authority and the willingness to comply reflects Weber's tradition on the acceptance of the authority figure because legitimacy is perceived.

DISCUSSION

Given the importance of legitimacy in the survival of establishments and social systems, it is perhaps the most critical part in the institutionalization of an organization. Legitimacy seems to provide the insulation and constant support needed to grow an organization and enhances its influences by increasing individuals' loyalty to the company and willingness to follow decisions and policies (Tyler, 2006). Social interaction helps to create and maintain inequality in organizations according to social psychology theories. Within a division and establishment of hierarchies, legitimate power is built on the existence of consent from the follower, and therefore legitimacy leads to consent, while legitimate power comes from intrinsic values as stated by French & Raven (1959). For subordinates in groups, the value in the expression for conforming to social rules, like following the crowd, is coherent in groups irrespective of the likelihood of reward or punishment. The psychological details in feelings will give clues as to why people obey and defer authority to leaders.

It seems that as much focus as there is on the leaders' attributes and actions in what they do in an organization or group setting by defining and understanding leadership, does not exist without understanding the followers and their relationship with the authority figure (Cremer & Tyler, 2005). Although this relationship is important, the emphasis of how it is perceived by the followers and the response they make to the leader show the depth of the experience in the followership relationship with the leader.

The focus for years in the understanding of this relationship was limited to the power hunger and handling by leaders and their actions toward followers to command and control. Understanding has evolved to open the reality to how followers influence the strength of a leader by their perceptions toward the leader. Ethical concerns have been expressed in how power from leaders has abused and manipulated followers for a leader's self-interest and gain. Even to the most elementary understanding, taking advantage of people is not the way to get the best performance from them.

Unfortunately, the leader position is still viewed as a dominant role instead of a voluntary, equal service to others role (DePree, 1989). Interestingly, studies show how incompetent some power-hungry executive leaders are. They show 60% - 70% of respondents indicate their boss is incompetent to do his or her job and referred to them as the main source of their stress (DeVries, 1992). This view of some CEOs today contrasts and is not consistent when trying to compare with how teamwork relates to leader-follower relationships. Working together involves responsibility, transparency, and certainly the absence of the details listed above. The culture of the organization usually is a good indicator of whether the environment is more conducive for democratic or authoritarian styles of leadership.

Hollander (1992²) argues the leader's basis of authority comes from how he or she obtained the role they currently hold. Consequently, this is also the issue of legitimacy. Interestingly, how a follower perceives the reason the leader received his or her role as a leader defines the efforts and motives of followers. Further depth in this area points to the difference in election and appointment positions have been

found to show different effects on follower's legitimacy for leaders (Hollander, 1992²). The election process opens the candidate to criticism and vulnerability by followers. This psychological identification puts more ownership on the backs of followers since they are contributing to the emergence of the leader. The election process also only leads to higher expectations and pressure for the leader to perform. Deeper into the analysis, when leaders of election or appointment responded to positive or critical views by followers, it was elected leaders who seemed to care and had more of a positive reflection toward elected-followers. This continued whether it was positive or negative feedback. In a follower-centric model, the perceptions of followers are incredibly important to a leader's outcome.

The follower relationship is dynamic and when centered with the leader is influenced by the leader's attributes as perceived by the follower. Idiosyncrasies like competence, motivation, and personality characteristics like physiognomies contribute to this perception. According to (Lord & Maher, 1990), these insights parallel the expectations that followers have already formed and understood. Experience and performance of what is considered good leadership are brought forward to a current relationship or followership. These expectancies started with Hollander (1964) which stated, perceptions of leader behavior are derived by followers' expectancies. Additionally, authors have proposed that the concepts of perceptual or attributional perspective allow others to quickly place direction and fault on the leader, even though they may have had no effect on the outcome (Calder, 1977; Pfeffer, 1977).

The increased emphasis on follower perceptions of the leader-follower relationship continues to surface. As Hollander & Offermann, (1990) show this relationship is central to the success or failure of the main people who are expected to take on roles or greater roles of leadership. Attributes that were noticed the most from their studies and from (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988) were ones of interpersonal skills like, respect, honesty, and inspiring relational values that followers gravitated to most. These were in addition to competency and future looking attributes. These significant roles were perspectives from followers which are used by researchers to understand more this leader-follower relationship. Additionally, research has also shown that followers give credit to leaders through their understanding of who the leader is.

A social concept and analysis of idiosyncrasy credit (IC) by Hollander, (1958, 1964), defines how a leader can bring about change through the eyes of followers' perception that the leader is capable, competent, and through which this concept also builds trust. The idea of using credit in our society offers a way to add and take away from the perception of what the leader has or has not in the definition of being a capable and effective leader. Through the IC model, the followers use interpersonal evaluation in which credits are given or taken away from the leader based on performance, competence, and even how well the leader conforms to the group's social norms and beliefs. The addition of credits may come because of the leader's seniority, but this is not always uniformly delivered. Sometimes having credit from one group is not always transferred to another group setting. If this happens, the new

leader may need some other form of credit like a skill set previously needed by the group or possibly a social-economic status to help elevate or promote the group. Additionally, Hollander (1995) suggests in the giving of credits; followers are also influenced by a leader's charisma.

The charismatic leader is a behavioral leader who emotionally opens to the needs of their subordinates. This quality is only valid when followers respond to this openness which gives feedback to the leader. Charisma, as it is referred to, can also be damaging as a leader can seek approval from others (Post, 1986). While addressing a follower-centric model of leadership, according to Bass (1985), transformational leadership is the ability to move and alter the behaviors and perceptions of followers. The goal of this more recent leadership style is to develop an environment in which followers are inspired to perform better and have greater levels of satisfaction. Hollander and Offermann (1990) further express that it is an extension of transactional leadership with great emotional involvement by the leader and further personal growth for the follower. This willingness to pay more attention to followers may be more of a boost for the leader in gratification for ego and self-serving biases. This charismatic attitude can be damaging from the leader fostering an environment of fantasy, over simply getting the job done. Their intentions must be examined around their vision, for there may be good examples to follow, but all consequences should be viewed.

In the complexity of business today, understanding roles and positions can be difficult for followers and subordinates. Romance of leadership (RoL) is understood

by process of information through applicants who are involved in the romance. This process gives a better understanding and a sense of position in the hierarchy of organizations. Leadership is what is pointed to when describing whom we go to for this better understanding. Naturally, people want to make sense during a time of failure or success, and “romance of leadership” positions those whom followers can point to for an explanation, particularly in times of unexpected failure or success.

Meindl, Ehrlich & Dukerich (1985) argue that under this title the love affair with leadership puts pressure on why there are successes and losses in the organization based on leadership, while other factors are minimized or ignored. These are additionally amplified by extreme successes or losses while turning a blind eye to externalities. This “romance of leadership” can and has been used to characterize an authority figure with some individuals more prone to romanticize leadership than others (Meindl, 1990). Meindl (1998), alone and with Ehrlich (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1988) developed a scale to measure the individual differences in RoL. The scale focused on discretion given to leaders for success or failure, the causes for significance toward a leader, and the reasons for using extensive and expensive ways to find new leadership. These proposed tendencies affect the perception of leadership (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Meindl, 1998; Shamir, 1992).

This example shows how people with high levels of RoL take higher risks and neglect cues about the leader like unethical behavior (Meindl, 1995). It is important to note that the relationship between RoL and unethical behavior does not have enough empirical studies to conclude this connection. With this area open to further research

there may be a link between ethical behavior and RoL. Researchers have argued this is important to transformational leadership which also evokes an element of trust, confidence, charisma, and social values (Felfe & Petersen, 2007). According to Meindl (1990), there may be a relationship between RoL and transformational theories. This romance of charisma, vision, and characteristics of the leader are perceptions and attributions given to the leader through the eyes of the follower. Felfe and Petersen (2007) continue that those with high romance of leadership who perceive leaders with unethical behavior will experience disappointment for that leader.

Followers who place an importance on the role of who distributes responsibilities, resources, and communicate direction, tend to enable a leader to be more influential. Little is known, however, about how these decisions influence future consequences since decision-making is forward-directed. Not only are followers influencing who leads, but how established leaders make decisions. As Meindl (1995) argues, RoL is an important cause of followership. The process of growing an organization means the process of managing decisions. This process consists of evaluations and discretionary allotments of time, resources, and organization of skills. Managers calculate these decisions based on probabilities of success and ability to commit to desired goals.

Leadership and the Social-Self, Social-Perceptiveness, and Self-Monitoring

Self-perception in understanding the dynamic relationships in leader-follower relations is pivotal to the advancement of this environment. If the leader's self-image

is distorted, compared to followers' perceptions, this disconnect can lead to adverse advancement in the relationship. Plainly stated, leaders need to understand how they are perceived by their followers. Credit is given or denied through this process. This is exemplified when a leader does not address the needs of followers, or worse, ignores that there are even needs to be met. As Hollander (1992) mentions, this understanding mirrors self-monitoring and the ability by a leader to observe their environment and willingness to alter their own behavior to adapt to the needs of their followers. Hollander (1992) calls it "sensitivity to social cues."

The observation that leaders give in to self-serving biases is prevalent in many relationships. This attitude is enhanced by leadership roles and continued by followers' actions. Without a proper psychological analysis, we would not see how the leader's ego and interpretation of self-lead to cognitive biases (Greenwald, 1985). As the leader focuses on himself, he assumes a high level of acceptance that he is desired for outcomes, results, and the center of knowledge. When in this narcissistic state, it is difficult for leaders to respond to followers' needs and be attentive to their perceptions. Followers are not exempt from this action, and they too may follow similar patterns to serve the self (Hollander, 1978).

CONCLUSION

The direction of this paper is an approach drawn upon a contemporary yet subtle grounding in historical legitimacy theories and definitions. Areas of literature from sociology, psychology and organizational management were used to examine legitimacy as an accepted general social process. Although these areas utilize similar definitions of legitimacy, their direction to its discovery is different. However, the process used and the viewpoints are different. Further, the methodologies employed, though different, we find derive specific core elements of legitimacy as an observed social process as standard (Johnson et al. (2006).

Specifically, the construct of a social object or situation to be perceived as legitimate in an organization involves an implicit (and sometimes explicit) notion as a process that uncovers a set of beliefs of how things are done leading to expectations for what is likely to happen. For this reason, people will assume a leader will act a particular way, partially because they believe this is how a typical authority figure should act – it has been legitimized. For the legitimation process to work, followers must validate the leader and their actions linking them to the existing broader cultural framework (Zelditch, 2001). Understandably, followers are central to the formation and legitimation process of leadership phenomena. Because of this, the leader-follower centric literature examined in this review gave elevated attention to this concept.

How legitimacy claims are processed makes a difference when we interact with those who influence our everyday work lives. At all levels, leaders have legitimacy when followers subscribe to the view that the leader is acting appropriately and therefore, they feel obligated to follow their direction and decisions. For this reason, leaders earn credits with increased legitimacy gaining room to influence those who follow.

Finally, authorities and organizations find legitimacy through the social process of making decisions, giving direction, and participating while followers typically react to this process. This deference to leaders is suggested in research on *how* authorities gain influence over followers by means other than threats and punishment. In short, legitimacy judgments stem from individuals' perception that authorities who act fairly, competently, and who exercise ethical procedures will encourage voluntary deference (Tyler, 2006).

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, R. (1968). Informal reactions to deviance in simulated work organizations: A laboratory experiment. *American Sociological Review*, 33(6), 895.
doi:10.2307/2092682
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Ben-Yoav, O., Hollander, E. P., & Carnevale, P. J. (1983). Leader legitimacy, leader-follower interaction, and followers' ratings of the leader. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 121(1), 111-115.
- Berger, T., Luckmann, P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge* (Anchor books ed., Anchor Books; A589). Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Calder, B. (1977). An attribution theory of leadership. In B.M. Staw & G.R. Salancik (Eds.), *New Directions in organizational behavior*. Chicago: St. Clair Press.
- Cantril, H. (1958). Effective democratic leadership: A psychological interpretation. *Journal of Individual Psychology* 14, 128-138.
- Cremer, D. D., & Tyler, T. R. (2005). Managing Group Behavior: The Interplay Between Procedural Justice, Sense of Self, and Cooperation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 151-218. doi:10.1016/s0065-2601(05)37003-1
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.

- DeVries, D. (1992). Executive selection: Advances but no progress. *Leadership in Action*, 12(4), 1-5.
- Douglas, M. (1986). How institutions think. (1st ed., Frank W. Abrams lectures). Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(1), 122-136.
- Emerson, R. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31-40.
- Felfe, J., & Petersen, L. (2007). Romance of leadership and management decision making. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(1), 1-24.
- Felfe, J., & Schyns, B., (2004). The influence of implicit leadership theories and personality on the perception and acceptance of transformational leadership. In W. Bungard, B. Koop, & C. Liebig (Eds.). Germany: Rainer Hampp Verlag.
- Felfe, J., & Petersen, E., (2007). Romance of leadership and management decision making. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*: 16 (1), 1-24
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*: 150-167. Ann Arbor: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Freud, S. (1921, 1960). Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. New York: Bantam. (Originally published in German in 1921.)

- Gleason, James M., & Others. (1978). Emergent Leadership Processes as a Function of Task Structure and Machiavellianism. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 6(1), 33-36.
- Greenwald, A. (1985). Totalitarian egos in the personalities of democratic leaders. Symposium paper, International Society of Political Psychology Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C. June 20.
- Hannan, M., Carroll, G., & Ebrary, Inc. (1992). Dynamics of organizational populations: Density, legitimation, and competition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Helm, C., & Morelli, M. (1979). Stanley Milgram and the obedience experiment: Authority, legitimacy, and human action. *Political Theory*, 7(3), 321-345.
- Hollander, E. (1964). Leaders, groups, and influence. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hollander, E. (1978). Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships. New York: Free Press.
- Hollander, E. (1992¹). The essential interdependence of leadership and followership. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1(2), 71-75.
- Hollander, E. (1992²). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3(1), 43-54.
- Hollander, E. (1995). Ethical challenges in the leader-follower relationship. *Business Ethics Quarterly: The Journal of the Society for Business Ethics*, 5(1), 55-65.

- Hollander, E., Fallon, B., & Edwards, M. (1977). Some aspects of influence and acceptability for appointed and elected group leaders. *The Journal of Psychology, 95*(2), 289-296.
- Hollander, E., Julian, J., Sorrentino, R., & State (1969). The leader's sense of legitimacy as a source of his constructive deviation. University of New York Buffalo Department of Psychology.
- Hollander, E., & Kelly, D., (1990). Rewards from leaders as perceived by followers. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Philadelphia March 30.
- Hollander, E., & Kelly, D., (1992). Appraising relational qualities of leadership and followership. Paper presented at the 25th International Congress of Psychology, Brussels July 24.
- Hollander, E., & Offermann, L. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 179-189.
- Howell, J., & Avolio, B. (1992). The Ethics of Charismatic Leadership: Submission or Liberation? *The Executive, 6*(2), 43.
- Johnson, C., Dowd, T. J., & Ridgeway, C. L. (2006). Legitimacy as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology, 32*, 53.
- Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(4), 589-607.
- Kipnis, D. (1976). *The powerholders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewin, K., (1951). *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper

- Lewin, K., & Gold, M. (1999). *The complete social scientist: A Kurt Lewin reader* (1st ed.). Washington, DC: *American Psychological Association*.
- Lord, & Emrich. (2000). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 551-579.
- Lord, R. & Maher, K. (1990). Leadership perceptions and leadership performance: Two distinct but interdependent processes. *Advances in applied social psychology: Business settings* (Volume 4), pp. 129-154. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Major, B., & Schmader, T. (2001). Legitimacy and the construal of social disadvantage. In J.T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*: 176-204. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCall, M., Lombardo, M., & Morrison, A., (1988) *The lessons of experience*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Meindl, J. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol.12, pp. 159-203). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Meindl, J. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(3), 329-341.
- Meindl, J. (1998). Appendix: Measures and assessments for the romance of leadership approach. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership*:

The multiple-level approaches: Pt. B. Contemporary and alternative)pp. 199-302). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Meindl, J., & Ehrlich, S. (1988). Developing a romance of leadership scale. *Proceedings of the Eastern Academy of Management*, 30, 133-135.

Meindl, J., Ehrlich, S., & Dukerich, J. (1985). The Romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
doi:10.1086/226550

Meyer, J., & Scott, W. (1983). *Organizational Environments: Ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Milgram, S. (1965). *Obedience to authority*. New York: Harper.

Mutch, A. (2007). Reflexivity and the institutional entrepreneur: A historical exploration. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 1123-1140.

Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43-58. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90005-1

Parsons, T. (1956). Structure and process in modern societies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1:63-85.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(1), 104-112.

- Phillips, N., Lawrence, T., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 635-652.
- Pollock, T., & Rindova, V. (2003). Media legitimation effects in the market for initial public offerings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 631-642.
- Post, J. (1986). Narcissism and the charismatic leader-follower relationship. *Political Psychology*, 7(4), 675-688.
- Scott, W. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Scott, W. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of influence and charisma to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 386-407.
- Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Lytle, B. L. (2009). Limits on legitimacy: Moral and religious convictions as constraints on deference to authority. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(4), 567-578. doi:10.1037/a0015998
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571-610.
doi:10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331
- Thibaut J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Tost, L. (2011). An integrative model of legitimacy judgments. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(4), 686-710.

- Tyler, T. (1997). The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1(4), 323-345.
- Tyler, T. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal authorities? *Behavior Science Law* 19:215-35.
- Tyler, T. (2004). Affirmative action in an institutional context: The antecedents of policy preferences and political support. *Social Justice Research*, 17(1), 5-24.
- Tyler, T. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375.
- Tyler, T., & Blader, S. L. (2005). Can businesses effectively regulate employee conduct? The antecedents of rule following in work settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 1143-1158. doi:10.5465/amj.2005.19573114
- Tyler, T., & Dawes, R. (1993). Justice in organized groups: Comparing the self-interest and social identity perspectives. In B. Mellers (Ed.), *Distributive justice* (pp. 87-108). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyler, T., & Lind, A. (1992). A Relational Model of Authority in Groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25(C), 115-191.
- Weber, M. (1921). *The sociology of charismatic authority*. Republished in translation (1946) in H.H. Gerth & C.S. Mills (Trans and Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 245-252). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. (2 volumes). Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Zelditch, M. (2001). Processes of legitimation: Recent developments and new directions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64