This paper will explore the use of breaching experiment in leadership studies.

Harold Garfinkel did a range of experiments involving violations of commonly accepted social rules and norms, seeking to examine people's reactions to such violations, bring social rules and norms to the interactional surface for inspection, and make visible the taken for granted of our sociality (Garfinkel 1964). He instructed students to do experiments in their homes, not using any of their usually taken for granted knowledge, and report back in class how the interaction unfolded.

Such experiments are not widely used within interaction studies. Experimentally contrived disruptions are avoided in favor of seeking out disruptions that arise naturally and spontaneously within social situations (Maynard and Clayman 2003).

In my course in ‘Leader roles in different contexts’, students from the Humanities were instructed to do four experiments: 1) To act like a leader in a situation where it was NOT expected of them; 2) To NOT take leadership in a situation where it WAS expected of them; 3) To act like a follower in a situation where it was NOT expected of them; 4) To NOT follow in a situation where it WAS expected of them. The students were to report their actions, observations and reflections in a closed facebook group.

Subsequently, I have used the lab data to inform my study of leadership and followership. In my paper I will discuss lessons and implications of the breaching experiments. Among these are how leadership and followership are achieved only by means of mutual collaboration; must be considered as a phenomenon produced interactionally by interlocutors in the very local interaction, and may consist of many layers, which gives new perspectives on our understanding of leadership and followership as a reciprocal relation.